

**DRAFT FARNHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
(REGULATION 14)
RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION**

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
Jack Wingfield	THOU SHALT NOT TRESPASS...!	Noted
Mrs Susan M.M Poole	Green belt area should be retained and there should be wildlife corridors through new development.	Noted. Policy FNPI (c) and Policy FNPI0 (b) incorporate this point.
Mrs Anne Moorey	Lighting for new built environments should not intervene on the natural environment.	Noted. Policy FNPI (f) incorporates this point.
Mr A.J Brooks	I find it hard to imagine why anyone should not agree!	Noted
Helga Giles	Should be land available where wild life could be planned in. All green belt land areas should be retained and there should be sensible wildlife corridors which are not restricted by fencing, buildings etc. through all new development	Noted. Policy FNPI (c) and Policy FNPI0 (b) incorporate this point.
Peter Bridgeman	Respect ASVI and AGLV	<p>A review of the Surrey AGLV by Chris Burnett Associates (CBA) was commissioned by the Surrey Planning Officers Association. (SPOA) in 2007. It concluded that the methodology for designation was outmoded, that national planning guidance no longer supported local landscape designations but a landscape character assessment linked to a criteria-based policy approach. The review recommended that the AGLV be retained until a review of the AONB was undertaken but that any land ultimately falling outside such a designation should be subjected to a landscape character assessment. The AONB review is being undertaken and Waverley Borough Council has undertaken a landscape sensitivity and capacity study.</p> <p>Areas of Strategic Visual Importance (ASVI) are designated in the Waverley Local Plan (2002) as</p>

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		<p>other areas which need protection because of the role they play in preventing the coalescence of settlements or because they are an area of open land that penetrates into the urban area like a green “lung”. They were considered strategic areas because of the part they play in retaining the character of Farnham, Since the Local Plan was adopted, the Farnham Design Statement has identified the distinctive character of each of the areas of Farnham and was adopted as a material consideration by Waverley Borough Council in 2010. In addition the AONB review is being undertaken and Waverley Borough Council has undertaken a landscape sensitivity and capacity study.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan uses the most recent evidence base and takes account of the NPPF. Policy FNP7 seeks to protect and enhance the countryside and Policy FNP8 seeks to prevent coalescence between Farnham and Aldershot; Badshot Lea and Weybourne; Rowledge and Wrecclesham and Rowledge and Frensham.</p>
Chris Meade	Plenty of brownfield opportunities remain - these should ALWAYS be developed before greenfield.	The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
Lucinda Fleming	I all depends how many houses for new development would be built. I am not against small numbers - say up to 20 on the edge of settlements.	Noted.
P. Thomas	Do not understand issues sufficiently	Noted

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
Dennis McQuaid	I support the no development on fields at the Waverley Lane/ Compton area.	Noted
Robert Gerard Verner-Jeffreys	Any hope of common sense rather than box-ticking?	Noted.
Jon Watson	I don't accept the concept of SANG affect, it will concentrate all green space in a single area (Farnham Park) when there should be multiple areas. the affect principle seems to me to simply get developers off the hook and should not be encouraged.	The issue of SANG is overseen by Natural England and the joint Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy, 2013 and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Review 2016. FNP9 to be updated based on up to date evidence.
Anita Scott	Once you build it's gone for ever.	Noted
Tim Clay	Joined-up thinking is needed to accommodate not only sustainable development in Farnham but also the development of surrounding towns which impact Farnham daily (Bordon/Whitehill/Aldershot/Fleet/Farnborough) We need fewer retail parks/superstores - Internet shopping is making them redundant with time and more light industry and affordable housing so that Farnham can share in the in-tech (aerospace, biotechnology, energy, IT business) which might be attracted here.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the influences of surrounding areas and the need for industry and affordable housing.
Mr d Cook	Any area of Outstanding Natural Beauty should be extended wherever possible.	Noted.
M Ryall	As to item 17 please add:- "or reducing the gaps between Farnham & Elstead and Farnham & Frensham." As to item 18 I do not agree that balancing contributions be added to Farnham Park which ius already very substantial. In order to balance the provision of park land North and South of the bypass may I suggest the field area between Abbots Ride and The Bourne stream be made into a park and the stream made an attractive feature? And link this up with Moor Park/Runfold Green Belt area	The gap between Farnham (Rowledge) and Frensham is already protected by Policy FNP8. The gap between Farnham and Elstead is several miles wide with the majority not located within the Plan area. For these reasons it is not considered appropriate to protect this gap. The Town Council is not aware that the field area between Abbots Ride and The Bourne stream is available as alternative SANG and therefore this would not provide a deliverable solution.
Mr Charles Green	No further development increase please	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints.
Janet N Binmore	Use brownfield sites, old sandpit workings. If necessary use old workings for housing rather than conservation? Wet wet land sites.	The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need. Nature conservation remains more appropriate for some sites.
Astaire Lovell	Our green spaces are of vital importance for future generations, to understand the importance of being eco-friendly and what we are trying to protect!	Noted.
Pamela Woodward	17. "The Gap"between Farnham and Aldershot is essential to protect but I'm less convinced of the need to totally protect the other areas mentioned. Farnham & Aldershot are distinct and separate towns, the others are villages that could accommodate appropriate development on their borders. 18. It is important to remember that 'avoidance' should be attempted (see NRM6) before mitigation measures are involved to allow development. This concept should be spelt out in the Neighbourhood Plan. 21. I don't understand why this is being proposed unless it is separating Guildford Borough from Waverley.	The importance of the gap between Aldershot and Farnham is noted and the emphasis of NRM6 is included in the Neighbourhood Plan (page 39). Additional Green Belt land is proposed following an assessment of the characteristics of the land and whether it fulfilled the purposes of the Green Belt as set out in the NPPF. The other gaps are noted as important in the Farnham Design Statement which is already adopted by Waverley Borough Council as a material consideration in considering planning applications. In accordance with the strong support for this policy during consultation it remains important that these features continue to be protected and therefore are included in the Neighbourhood Plan.
Mrs Z Lovell	Areas that have not yet been identified should be included, particularly if the area already abuts AONB. eg: fields on Waverley Lane/Compton One side of Monks Walk is AONB The other side of what is a small country lane should be included. Ref Q.18 It is essential that the SPA is protected, as is	The emphasis of NRM6 is included in the Neighbourhood Plan (page 39). The distribution of development across the Borough (including Dunsfold) is a matter for the emerging Borough Local Plan. The areas proposed for AONB and

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	the 5km zone. NRM6 states that if other sites are available they should be used as in "avoid OR mitigate". A brownfield site has been available for sometime in DUNSFOLD	Green Belt have met the criteria for selection of such designations. Other adjoining areas are not considered to meet the criteria.
David Gibbs	Retain but not extended	It is unclear whether the respondent is referring to the Green Belt; the AONB or both. The areas proposed for AONB and Green Belt have met the criteria for selection of such designations. Other adjoining areas are not considered to meet the criteria and are not proposed as extensions.
Hazel Steel	Q.21 Not enough GB	Noted
Simon Hill	BE3 should extended and respected and NOT overridden.	Saved Local Plan Policy BE3 is the origin for Policy FNP5 – South Farnham Arcadian Areas. This policy will operate in addition to Policy FNPI - Design of New Development and Conservation development which seeks to ensure high quality development which responds to the character of the distinctive area of Farnham in which it is located by way of height, scale, density, layout, orientation, design and materials of buildings and the scale, design and materials of the public realm (highways, footways, open space and landscape). The combination of policies should continue to protect the character of the areas previously designated within BE3. The relationship between Policy BE3 and the proposed Neighbourhood Plan Policies should be made clearer in the Neighbourhood Plan. The area originally designated as Policy BE3 (and now as Policy FNP5) will be reviewed.
Claire Burden	There are proposals for developments that are not included in this plan which I found surprising, such as that by Boyer Planning on the Baker Oates site, Gardener's Hill Road. This suggests that there might be other proposals for new development within the plan that have not been taken into consideration.	The Farnham Housing Land Availability Assessment sets out the reasons for selecting certain housing sites as housing allocations, and for those which have not been selected.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
Heather Hill	The fact that developers are currently trying to get Green filed sites used for development in the South of Farnham is crazy and unlawful. The important of green space, the areas between the villages, the wildlife is critical. It cannot be allowed to become concrete just to hit Waverley planning figures. All towns within Waverley need to absorb development, not just Farnham as it has already become far too over populated	Noted
A McDougall	extend green belt around the north/ north-east of Badshot lea	Noted
Leah Pay	we should preserve the beauty of the area	Noted
Mrs L P Webb	Strongly agree that the Green Belt should be extended as much as possible. This is a part of the country that is heavily populated and there are many areas elsewhere that are much more suitable for large scale development.	Noted
North West Farnham Residents' Association (S.Edge)	Q23 answered as disagree because the AONB extension proposal is incomplete as it has ignored AGLV areas which should be candidate areas (such as the Hopfields) – as proposed by the Surrey AGLV review which categorised the NW Farnham AGLV as amber.	Following appraisal, Natural England (NE) are assessing whether the AONB boundary should be extended to encompass further areas incorporating the River Wey as it enters the town from the south (up to the A31) and areas to the south of Rowledge (up to the Long Road). The Neighbourhood Plan reflects these areas. Within the Surrey AGLV review an amber assessment illustrated an area of AGLV with some shared characteristics to that of the AONB unlike the green assessment which showed identical characteristics to the AONB. The area is not proposed by NE for inclusion in the AONB.
paul tiller	Modernity is ruining the individual character of our towns and villages which have attracted tourists from all over the world for so long. If we do not stop then onecity and town will look like another wherever you go!!!	Noted. Policy FNP1 in particular incorporates this point.
Geoffrey M Simmons and Doreen Simmons (Mrs)	Farnham ought not to grow beyond the small market town which it is or was or it will become an outlying London suburb	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence but attempts to retain the distinctive

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		character of the town.
Mark Butterfield	Please do not allow development on our precious green fields where alternatives sites are available (ideally Brownfield). Any such development will adversely impact on the semi-rural and sylvan nature of many of the neighbourhoods around Farnham. I fully endorse the policy BE3, South Farnham Area of Special Environmental Quality, which states that 'new development' will not be allowed ...if the Council believes that the development would lead to an erosion of an areas semi-rural character.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence but attempts to retain the distinctive character of the town. Policy FNP5 – South Farnham Arcadian Areas replaces BE3 of the adopted Local Plan. The relationship between Policy BE3 and the proposed Neighbourhood Plan Policies should be made clearer in the Neighbourhood Plan.
Thomas Lankester	In line with the National Planning Policy Framework the Farnham Plan should clearly reflect policies to mitigate against Climate Change by emission reductions (renewable energy, avoiding increased fossil fuel use, energy efficiency).	The Neighbourhood Plan and accompanying Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges the importance of climate change. Strategic policies relating to renewable energy, avoiding increased fossil fuel use, energy efficiency will be contained in the emerging Local Plan.
D Arnau	Q.22 Why can you only answer this if you agree with 21?	It was possible to add a comment which qualifies a response to a question.
Kevin Hyman	It seems perverse that the movement of birds and other wildlife is protected by law, and there must be provision within a few miles of SANG. However, school places can be anywhere within Surrey, and our children may be expected to migrate across the county for their education, with little thought for provision of schools and other infrastructure in developments.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan has to take account of the national Planning Policy Framework and adopted Regional Planning Policy as well as national and local school admission policies.
Tim Wilcock	This is not a black or white question. It depends on the nature of the development and how it answers the local need. Affordable housing yes - large houses for London financial downsizers no.	Noted.
Kristen Carter	There should be no development on green field sites or conservation areas.	This approach is contrary to the national Planning Policy Framework and the adopted Local Plan and would result in the Neighbourhood Plan not proceeding to referendum.
ADRIAN DE VERE GREEN	Wooded areas around Frensham, Frensham Vale, Gardeners Hill	The Neighbourhood Plan generally seeks to

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	Road and The Bourne should be protected.	protect woodland through Policy FNPI - Design of New Development and Conservation which seeks to protect and sensitively incorporate natural features such as trees, hedges and ponds and Policy FNPI0 by protecting ancient woodland, veteran or aged trees, and species-rich hedgerows; The wooded areas around Frensham, Frensham Vale, Gardeners Hill Road are located in the countryside and are protected by Policy FNP7 - Protect and Enhance the Countryside. Wooded areas within The Bourne are protected by Policy FNP5 – South Farnham Arcadian Areas.
CPRE SURREY	Green belt should also be extended south of Rowledge as identified by Waverley--it is not clear why you missed this out. THE AGLV should be retained for the duration of the Plan see comment at bottom below	Pages 36 – 37 propose an extension to the Green Belt south of Rowledge though ultimately this is a strategic planning matter for Waverley Borough Council.
Mike Downs	Retain the semi rural feel of the town and not turn it into just any other town by further over development without any Soul or Individual Character	Noted. Policy FNPI in particular incorporates this point.
Peter and Penny Marriott	The questionnaire does not mention the area to the West of Farnham Castle some of which is ASVI designated and some of which is proposed as AGLV by SCC. Due to its proximity to the Castle it has considerable historical significance containing both the winter and summer routes of the Harrow way (6000 years old) and the pilgrims way from Winchester (approx. 1000 year old). It is one of the last remaining areas of hop field and also contains a possible Saxon Gate and pathway to the area of clay behind the Harrow way (Potters Gate). Part of the landscape was also once part of the Deer park for Farnham Castle. It has extremely high historical significance and should be preserved because once it has gone it cannot be replaced.	A review of the Surrey AGLV by Chris Burnett Associates (CBA) was commissioned by the Surrey Planning Officers Association. (SPOA) in 2007. It concluded that the methodology for designation was outmoded, that national planning guidance no longer supported local landscape designations but a landscape character assessment linked to a criteria-based policy approach. The review recommended that the AGLV be retained until a review of the AONB was undertaken but that any land ultimately falling outside such a designation should be subjected to a landscape character assessment. The AONB review is being undertaken and Waverley Borough Council has undertaken a landscape sensitivity and capacity study.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment

Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		<p>Areas of Strategic Visual Importance (ASVI) are designated in the Waverley Local Plan (2002) as other areas which need protection because of the role they play in preventing the coalescence of settlements or because they are an area of open land that penetrates into the urban area like a green “lung”. They were considered strategic areas because of the part they play in retaining the character of Farnham, Since the Local Plan was adopted, the Farnham Design Statement has identified the distinctive character of each of the areas of Farnham and was adopted as a material consideration by Waverley Borough Council in 2010. In addition the AONB review is being undertaken and Waverley Borough Council has undertaken a landscape sensitivity and capacity study. The neighbourhood Plan uses the most recent evidence base and takes account of the NPPF. Policy FNP7 seeks to protect and enhance the area outside the proposed Built Up Area Boundary designated as countryside.</p> <p>The area is not recorded as an area of archaeological potential by Surrey County Council. Policy FNPI should include reference to the need to protect and enhance heritage assets and their setting.</p> <p>Part of the area to the west of Farnham Castle is considered as a suitable option for housing development and now has planning permission.</p>
Bruce Bennett	There are areas of Farnham, in particular to the East of the town centre where much of the built environment of is of poor design	The character of each area is summarised in the Farnham Design Statement. If adopted, the

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	and of such a variety of design and use that it is difficult to define the "distinctive character" so often mentioned in the draft plan. This area is worthy of overarching plan policies. Why reserve such as the "Arcadian" ambition for areas of South Farnham. Should the plan not have some ambition for areas such as the area to the west of Farnham? Could there not be some vision for re-development for such as the Stoke Hills estate to provide higher quality housing and better and denser land use. It is hard to see what benefit the design statement has had in much of recent development in this area. And should there not be specific reference to the East Street development? Should there be a specific policy? This should not be seen as a fait accompli. I do not agree with the inclusion of the land to the south of Monkton Lane as a housing site. This seems to be contrary to the plan policy FNP8 and would definitely diminish the impact of the strategic separation gap. I would wish to see more contemporary design and less reliance on the hackneyed design and pastiche of earlier years in development going forward for all areas. And yes I favour a contemporary approach to East Street.	Neighbourhood Plan would be a Development Plan Document and therefore have a higher planning status than the Design Statement. No sites have come forward as available within the Stoke Hills estate and therefore would not be considered as deliverable as allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan mentions the extant planning permission on land between East Street, South Street and Dogflud Way (page 60). As the development already has planning consent, it can be implemented without a new planning policy. However, if a revised proposal were to come forward, the Neighbourhood Plan should seek to influence an amended scheme through an additional policy.
Raphe Palmer	While these changes are being made, access provision should be made for cyclists and pedestrians, by more footpaths/pavements and cycle ways	Policy FNP23 - Transport Impact of Development seeks to maintain or enhance the existing local footpath and cycle network and where possible to extend the network through a development site and connect the development to them. In addition the Policy seeks only development proposals which would ensure sustainable transport links are provided to the principal facilities including the town centre and the nearest Local Centre; primary school; secondary school and public open space; .
Joseph Michel	These issues are of international importance - they must be paramount to a healthy well functioning society.	Noted
Ian Burgess	.."new development fits well with the character of the town". Farnham is characterised by unique and traditional buildings as	Noted. Policy FNPI in particular incorporates this point and Policies FNP2 and FNP20 in particular

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	well as, crucially and importantly, open spaces with mature trees for amenity close to the centre of our town.	seek to protect open space within Farnham Town Centre Conservation Area and its setting and within the wider town respectively.
Stewart Edge	Reference question 23 - the AONB extension proposal is incomplete as it has ignored AGLV areas which should be candidate areas (such as the Hopfields) – as proposed by the Surrey AGLV review which categorised the NW Farnham AGLV as amber	<p>Following appraisal, Natural England (NE) are assessing whether the AONB boundary should be extended to encompass further areas incorporating the River Wey as it enters the town from the south (up to the A31) and areas to the south of Rowledge (up to the Long Road). The Neighbourhood Plan reflects these areas.</p> <p>Within the Surrey AGLV review the Hopfields was assessed as an area of AGLV with some shared characteristics to that of the AONB unlike the green assessment which showed identical characteristics to the AONB. The area is not proposed by NE for inclusion in the AONB.</p>
julie flude	As previously stated, I feel that any new development should be spread across the whole Borough, and if necessary, even areas which are in Green Belt. I noticed several sites in the Godalming area which are brownfield but in green belt, these were red lighted! As many brownfield sites as possible should be considered first before any greenfield sites. If greenfield sites have to be used, SANG should be provided and no more than 1 x large development (i.e. up to 80 dwellings) should be put forward in any one area. Proof must be offered by the Developers that there are enough school places, that there are adequate sewage works in place, that there is absolutely no risk of flooding and that there are adequate traffic controls in place to sustain their development. Developers should also work very closely with the community involved to ensure that their development meets the needs of the community and is sympathetically designed to blend in with the community and retain as much of the original natural boundaries to ensure the	The distribution of development across the Borough is a matter for the emerging Borough Local Plan. Adopted regional policy clearly states that priority should be given to directing development to those areas where potential adverse effects can be avoided without the need for mitigation measures. In summary, this would mean that housing development should be directed away from Farnham. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints. The constraints have resulted in the proposed distribution of sites around Farnham. The need for infrastructure and distinctive design incorporating natural boundaries is recognised in Policy FNP24 and Policy FNPI in

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	continuation of the present wildlife.	particular.
Patrick Bowes	It is critical given the recent changes in weather patterns that the planning process needs to include a clear ban on removal of natural drainage capacity, eg forestry on sloping land or draining historic flood plains or the path of water courses identifies in land registry searches.	The Neighbourhood Plan generally seeks to protect trees and woodland through Policy FNPI - Design of New Development and Conservation which seeks to protect and sensitively incorporate natural features such as trees, hedges and ponds and Policy FNPI0 by protecting ancient woodland, veteran or aged trees, and species-rich hedgerows; Policy FNPI also seeks to ensure that proposals will not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding itself, and will not result in any increased risk of flooding elsewhere.
Richard Huxford	Any green field areas should be preserved and original farming characteristics maintained.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence but attempts to retain the distinctive character of the town. It is not considered feasible to restrict all development to brownfield sites.
David Mason	I don't believe it is necessary to extend the green belt or Surrey Hills but it is also not desirable to reduce them.	Noted. Evidence has been prepared to support the extension of both areas which remain under consideration.
Richard Rogers	The AONB should be extended to include Gardeners Hill Road and the area between Boundstone Road and Millbridge/Shortfield Common.	Following appraisal, Natural England (NE) are assessing whether the AONB boundary should be extended to encompass further areas which may meet their criteria for designation - incorporating the River Wey as it enters the town from the south (up to the A31) and areas to the south of Rowledge (up to the Long Road). The Neighbourhood Plan reflects these areas. Policy FNP8 aims to prevent coalescence in this area.
Wyatt Ramsdale	I should like the same or more protection applied to small local green areas that are strategic gaps etc of local significance than to the fringes of large protected areas like green belt. It is London's	Policy FNP20 seeks to protect and enhance small areas of Public Open Space as defined on Map H.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	green belt and we have more specific priorities.	
Peter & Sally Mitchell	It is difficult to imagine that anyone could disagree with the above aims!	Noted
Michael H. Thurston	Question 22 The Green Belt should be extended all round Farnham and include those areas currently designated AONB and the proposed extensions.	Not all of the areas around Farnham meet the criteria necessary for Green Belt designation. The designation criteria for AONBs is different from that of the Green Belt and therefore not all AONB designations can automatically become Green Belt.
Tim D. Wilkie	You can't invoke tight limits on development.. Otherwise no one will do the development. The terms and conditions become too onerous.	In order to be acceptable, development must meet certain criteria including those related to retaining important site features, achieving good quality design and ensuring sufficient infrastructure to support the development.
Janet Martin	Such new buildings as are agreed should carry a significant number of smaller properties to allow for first time buyers to enter the market	Noted. Policy FNP12 – Small Scale Dwellings incorporates this point.
Margaret Lennard	Brown sites should be used where possible.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
Charles Fearnley	See later overall comment	Noted
Richard Bass	There is a frensham SPA which is within 5k of Rowledge and possibly parts of the Bourne - this also needs to be taken account of (in the same way as the thames basin and heaths SPA).	The Wealden Heaths SPAs are less of a constraint because adopted regional policy and Natural England do not demand the level of mitigation required in relation to Thames Basin Heaths. In essence, this is because the overall development pressure is less, there is a wider choice of alternative space, and therefore the habitats themselves are less vulnerable.
Mrs Charlotte Bass	Frensham SPA should be taken into account when considering further development in the Rowledge and Bourne areas.	The Wealden Heaths SPAs are less of a constraint because adopted regional policy and Natural

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		England do not demand the level of mitigation required in relation to Thames Basin Heaths. In essence, this is because the overall development pressure is less, there is a wider choice of alternative space, and therefore the habitats themselves are less vulnerable.
Stella Houchin	Only agree to 21 and 22 if no other areas of Green Belt are declassified as Green Belt!	No other areas are proposed for deletion from the Green Belt within the Neighbourhood Plan area.
Andrea Harrison	The Green Belt should be extended to include the fields off Waverley Lane. Currently the map shows an exclusion which is from the proposed extended Green Belt which is jarringly anomalous.	The Green Belt review undertaken for Waverley Borough Council took the view that the area off Waverley Lane did not meet the criteria for designation south of the A31. It is for Waverley Borough Council to determine the extent of the green belt around Farnham and the Neighbourhood Plan will reflect this position.
J Stephen Smith	Why do we ignore co-operation between Waverley/Farnham and East Hampshire when considering how to meet central government inspired demands for new housing. This is wrong. Farnham and Bordon have a common interest in improvement and development of the A325 corridor between Greatham and Wrecclesham, including a Wrecclesham Relief Road - first proposed in the 70s. There seems to be no single place where this wrong thing can be properly called wrong. Much of the relevant land is owned by central government.	Waverley Borough Council has a duty to cooperate with East Hampshire District Council. The Town Council is talking to East Hampshire District Council and Borden Parish Council during the evolution of the Neighbourhood Plan. A Wrecclesham Relief Road was not technically justified by the significant development at Borden and is similarly not justified by the proposals of the Neighbourhood Plan.
MARTIN RUSS	Existing Design Statement is perceived to support the NW Farnham Area of Strategic Visual Importance (no. ASV10) The AMEC Study which was provided for Waverley Borough Council (Part I) regarding Farnham and Cranleigh states that North West Farnham has a "mainly rural character and setting, property pattern and designation and as such, the capacity for development as a whole is likely to be limited". Question 23 is misleading and inaccurate. Natural England have NOT yet proposed this, they have not started their study on this yet. The AONB extension proposal is incomplete because it has ignored	On 26th February 2014, the Natural England Board agreed that during its corporate plan period (2014-2019) it will assess whether the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) boundary should be extended to encompass areas of Downs, Wealden Greensand and Low Weald within and around the locally designated Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). The best estimate is therefore that Natural England will be in a position to progress the work on the

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	AGLV areas which are obvious candidate areas (e.g. Farnham Hop fields), as seen with the Surrey AGLV review which classifies the NW Farnham AGLV as amber (NOT green).	<p>Surrey Hills in approximately 18-24 months according to the Surrey Hills AONB Board. Natural England (NE) are assessing whether the AONB boundary should be extended to encompass further areas incorporating the River Wey as it enters the town from the south (up to the A31) and areas to the south of Rowledge (up to the Long Road). The Neighbourhood Plan reflects these areas.</p> <p>Within the AMEC review, segment 7 is an extensive area where the capacity for development as a whole is likely to be limited This does not exclude smaller areas within it from development. The review shows the Landscape Value as Medium and the Sensitivity High (although this again is for the wider area).</p> <p>Within the Surrey AGLV review an amber assessment illustrated an area of AGLV with some shared characteristics to that of the AONB unlike the green assessment which showed identical characteristics to the AONB. The area is not proposed by NE for inclusion in the AONB.</p>
Barry Russ	The AONB extension proposal is incomplete as it has ignored to date the AGLV areas which should be candidate areas, such as the Hopfields, as proposed by the Surrey AGLV review which categorised the NW Farnham AGLV as amber.	<p>Following appraisal, Natural England (NE) are assessing whether the AONB boundary should be extended to encompass further areas incorporating the River Wey as it enters the town from the south (up to the A31) and areas to the south of Rowledge (up to the Long Road). The Neighbourhood Plan reflects these areas.</p> <p>Within the Surrey AGLV review an amber</p>

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		assessment illustrated an area of AGLV with some shared characteristics to that of the AONB unlike the green assessment which showed identical characteristics to the AONB. The area is not proposed by NE for inclusion in the AONB.
brian martin	I consider that the green belt is already adequate.	Noted.
Mrs Judith K Hunt	Any moves to protect natural areas within and around the town must be encouraged. We need green spaces, areas of open land, trees, rivers, streams and as little interference with all these as possible. The current Green Belt should be protected and where ever possible, extended.	Noted. Policies FNP7 and FNP20 in particular incorporate these points.
Paula Haldenby	I think that AONB areas should be incorporated into the Green Belt. It doesn't seem logical to dispense with some existing Green Belt in order to move them somewhere else. WHY???	The designation criteria for AONBs is different from that of the Green Belt and therefore not all AONB designations can automatically become Green Belt. No other areas are proposed for deletion from the Green Belt within the Neighbourhood Plan area.
Wilkes	All available brown sites MUST be used first. Likewise empty houses must be used.	The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need. The use of empty homes is appropriate but would not add to the existing dwelling stock.
Cliff Watts	Increasing the land protected by special designation should not encouraged (Q23) if it results in additional pressure on the remaining unprotected areas.	It is appropriate for the Neighbourhood Plan to acknowledge the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and to attempt to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints. Evidence supporting constraints has been presented alongside the Neighbourhood plan. The constraints have resulted in the proposed distribution of sites

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		around Farnham.
Mrs Patricia Cook	We all need trees and green spaces to breathe. Although I do agree that new homes need to be built, it must be understood that extra concrete means less drainage and more flooding. Farnham and the surrounding villages need to be protected in a sensitive way from avaricious property developers. This is our town and we love it. We need to look after our green spaces for future generations, but at the same time giving them somewhere to live. It is a very fine balancing act.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence but attempts to retain green spaces with, and around, the town.
Cheryl Cross	Build around the pub, it is good for our business and the community.	It is believed that this comment relates to development at Hale Road. This site is located within an Areas of High Landscape Value and Sensitivity and part of the setting of a designated heritage asset. See responses to the Housing Sites.
Darren Stairs	Make the housing have as smaller impact as possible by having it of similar style to the existing housing from which it should extend from.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence. The Farnham Housing Land Availability Assessment illustrates how the Town Council has sought to minimise the impact of development.
Karen May	Extend existing housing.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence. The Farnham Housing Land Availability Assessment illustrates how the Town Council has sought to minimise the impact of development and the loss of open space which separates the distinctive parts of Farnham. See response contained in the Housing Chapter.
David and Liz Meads	Pros and cons should be weighed up. I want this land at Hale Road to be developed as in the meeting on the land they said they would do some car parking for the church.	This site is located within an Areas of High Landscape Value and Sensitivity and part of the setting of a designated heritage asset. See responses to the Housing Sites..
Leo Danielle	We need more housing next to the hotel. It is good for local	It is believed that this comment relates to

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	businesses and good for the church. There is housing there already so it can be added to.	development at Hale Road. This site is located within an Areas of High Landscape Value and Sensitivity and part of the setting of a designated heritage asset. See responses to the Housing Sites.
Victoria and Roy Carpenter	Please make sure that the housing that we should have is not in main view of the road etc and is next to existing housing.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence. The Farnham Housing Land Availability Assessment illustrates how the Town Council has sought to minimise the impact of development and the loss of open space which separates the distinctive parts of Farnham. See response contained in the Housing Chapter.
Matthew Walls	Housing is urgently needed in this area and I like the Hale site that I mentioned because it is tucked out of major view. This is key.	This site is located within an Areas of High Landscape Value and Sensitivity and part of the setting of a designated heritage asset. See responses to the Housing Sites.
Andrew Quail	Re: Q.17: You cannot apply the same criteria to all of the examples you gave. For example it is very important to maintain a buffer between the TOWNS ofm Farnham and Aldershot, but NOT between little villages ie Wrecclesham and Rowledge and Frensham. Re: Q.18: THERE SHOULD BE NO DEVELOPMENT ON ANY GREENFIELD SITES in Farnham. All requirements could be met by developing DUNSFOLD Aerodrome and other brownfield sites within the borough.	<p>The importance of the gap between Aldershot and Farnham is noted The other gaps are noted as important in the Farnham Design Statement which is already adopted by Waverley Borough Council as a material consideration in considering planning applications. In accordance with the strong support for this policy during consultation it remains important that these features continue to be protected and therefore are included in the Neighbourhood Plan. The identification of such gaps helps protect these greenfield sites from development.</p> <p>The distribution of development across the Borough is a matter for the emerging Borough Local Plan. Adopted regional policy clearly states that priority should be given to directing development to those areas where potential</p>

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		adverse effects can be avoided without the need for mitigation measures. In summary, this would mean that housing development should be directed away from Farnham. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints. The constraints have resulted in the proposed distribution of sites around Farnham. It is not considered feasible to restrict all development to brownfield sites.
Matthew Watson	Removal of pylons is something that should be taken into consideration. This is a big plus as it vastly improves the line of sight and impact of housing.	The removal of pylons is not an overriding determinant of the suitability of a site for development.
The Bourne Residents' Association	The residents' committee are concerned about the protection of natural wildlife corridors. By allowing more and more building in sem-rural areas habitat and foraging areas are being destroyed for many of our animals. Our natural pollinators the bees, are in decline partly due to the lack of bee friendly plants. Butterflies also are suffering.	Noted. Policy FNPI (c) and Policy FNP10 (b) incorporate this point. The Neighbourhood Plan also acknowledges that the extensive landscape of the South Farnham Arcadian Areas also forms part of the town's green infrastructure and provides habitats for wildlife.
Su McGRory	Some of these questions and the answer choices seem to suggest that development which has an adverse environmental effect is ok if the developer makes financial contributions as mitigation. I don't think that this is ok.	The Neighbourhood Plan has attempted to avoid development in areas with within nationally recognised and locally important constraints. Outside such areas, mitigation of such impacts is a recognised planning requirement. In order to be acceptable, development must meet certain criteria including those related to retaining important site features, achieving good quality design and ensuring sufficient infrastructure to support the development.
Jerry Hyman	The questions in this section are badly worded. Anyone (like myself) who agrees with the (proposed) WBC Green Belt extension (Q21) and/or the FTC NP Green Belt extension (Q22)	Noted. The comments box allows for further qualifications to a response.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	and/or the NE AONB extension (Q23) but who wants other areas to be also be included in the proposals would have to 'disagree', even though they do want the proposed extensions. My 'disagreement' in response to these questions does not mean that I disagree with what is proposed; it indicates that I disagree with the scope, because I consider that the proposed new 'boundaries' are not those that I would choose myself, and that further extensions should be incorporated. However, the protection Farnham should receive by virtue of proximity to the TBHSPA and WHSPAs overrides most of these considerations. FTC's refusal to respect the Habitats constraints is an utter disgrace, because it is deliberate.	The issue of SANG is overseen by Natural England and the joint Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy, 2013 and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Review 2016. FNP9 to be updated based on up to date evidence.
Matthew Elliott	The fields to the west of the castle, running from Three Styles Road through to the Castle should be preserved to give the Castle a setting appropriate to its character and history. The Castle, one of Farnham's most renowned buildings has been lost in overgrown trees. It is also threatened by surrounding development.	Part of the area to the west of Farnham Castle is considered as a suitable option for housing development and now has planning permission.
Kevin Lewis	The Green Belt is a blunt instrument and should not be used as a blanket block on progress - we need houses. It is more about scale, sensitive and high quality design, etc	Only parts of the areas around Farnham meet the criteria necessary for Green Belt designation and not all areas are proposed for inclusion within it. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the importance of scale and sensitive and high quality design,
Paul Burch	Please explain why the built up area boundary has been changed without notification to include the Hop Fields and Coxbridge Fields without any reference to or information for the residents?	The purpose of this initial consultation is to allow involvement of residents.
Janet Maines	Once there is encroachment into the green areas separating our villages successive planning applications for housing in these areas will be difficult to resist.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints. Policy FNP8 seeks to prevent coalescence between Farnham and Aldershot; Badshot Lea and Weybourne; Rowledge

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		and Wrecclesham and Rowledge and Frensham. Gap between Rowledge and Boundstone to be added to FNP 8.
Julian Spickernell	I am strongly against the principle of trading one space for another. In many cases it is simply not valid to create or designate an ecologically comparable site elsewhere to the site that is being developed. It also ignores the damage to the local environment and loss of habitat in that environment	In relation to the SPA, the SANG policy is based on the joint Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy, 2013 which is accepted by Natural England and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Review 2016. FNP9 to be updated based on up to date evidence.
alan johnson	The danger is that using such limited criteria might well mean that the parts of Farnham that have the poorest quality of environment become the areas that have to suffer the greatest housing development	The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints. The constraints have resulted in the proposed distribution of sites around Farnham.
Graham Precious	The area between Boundstone and Rowledge should also be included in the areas where development should not be permitted. The area of open countryside is essential to maintain the separate identity of Rowledge and prevent coalescence of Boundstone and Rowledge.	Agreed. The distinctive areas of Boundstone and Rowledge are currently separated by a gap and development which would result in coalescence would result in a loss in identity and distinctiveness between these areas. Add Boundstone and Rowledge to Policy FNP8 - Preventing Coalescence
Alasdair Cockburn	Far more emphasis seems to be placed on the Thames Basin Heath SPA compared with the Wealden Heath SPA. This may reflect current pressure but it cannot be assumed that over the period under review that Wealden Heath will continue to be less of an issue than Thames Basin. Both are equally protected by European Directives and in the overall context of Waverley's Local Plan recognition of this is vital. The Neighbourhood plan should reflect this.	The Thames Basin Heath SPA is protected by adopted regional planning policy, the Wealden Heath SPA is not. The Wealden Heaths SPAs are less of a constraint because Natural England does not demand the level of mitigation required in relation to Thames Basin Heaths. This is not entirely related to overall development pressure but also because there is a wider choice of alternative space, and therefore the habitats themselves are less vulnerable.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
Mrs Michelle Quinlan	Brownfield sites should be exhausted first before green belt is even considered	The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
Mr Thompson	The AONB extension proposal is incomplete as it has ignored AGLV areas which should be candidate areas (such as the Hopfields) - as proposed by the Surrey AGLV review which categorise the NW Farnham AGLV as AMBER (NOT GREEN)	Following appraisal, Natural England (NE) are assessing whether the AONB boundary should be extended to encompass further areas incorporating the River Wey as it enters the town from the south (up to the A31) and areas to the south of Rowledge (up to the Long Road). The Neighbourhood Plan reflects these areas. Within the Surrey AGLV review an amber assessment illustrated an area of AGLV with some shared characteristics to that of the AONB unlike the green assessment which showed identical characteristics to the AONB. The area is not proposed by NE for inclusion in the AONB.
Kenneth Alan Richardson	The valley between Rowledge and Wrecclesham should be protected against any development including the woods around Browns Walk.	Noted. Policy FNP8 seeks to prevent coalescence between Rowledge and Wrecclesham.
Jenny Reynolds	What about AGLV areas?	A review of the Surrey AGLV by Chris Burnett Associates (CBA) was commissioned by the Surrey Planning Officers Association. (SPOA) in 2007. It concluded that the methodology for designation was outmoded, that national planning guidance no longer supported local landscape designations but a landscape character assessment linked to a criteria-based policy approach. The review recommended that the AGLV be retained until a review of the AONB was undertaken but that any land ultimately falling outside such a designation should be

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		<p>subjected to a landscape character assessment. The AONB review is being undertaken and Waverley Borough Council has undertaken a landscape sensitivity and capacity study.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan uses the most recent evidence base and takes account of the NPPF.</p>
Celia Sandars	Policies should not just aim to protect what we have already but provide for enhancements to the natural and built environment via specific provision relating to new development, e.g., areas of uncut grassland in any new recreational spaces.	The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to protect existing site features and also seeks enhancements where appropriate.
Maggie Wilson	As long as it is not very visible but blends in well then it should be considered. All housing must continue from existing housing.	<p>Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence. Policy FNPI I – Housing Site Options requires open space and landscape buffers to be provided in the more sensitive parts of the site where development would be more intrusive in the landscape.</p> <p>Further emphasis should be made to the distinctive character of areas of the town in relation to Policy FNPI I – Housing Site Options</p> <p>Consultation on the draft Neighbourhood Plan gives the opportunity for further discussion with local residents about the principle of development and the density, form, layout, dwelling mix, landscaping and access for these sites.</p>
Mark and Lorraine Wilson	Housing should have as limited visibility as possible and naturally progress from the development area that it is adding to.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence. Policy FNPI I – Housing Site Options requires open space and landscape buffers to be provided in the more sensitive parts of the

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		<p>site where development would be more intrusive in the landscape.</p> <p>Further emphasis should be made to the distinctive character of areas of the town in relation to Policy FNPII – Housing Site Options</p> <p>Consultation on the draft Neighbourhood Plan gives the opportunity for further discussion with local residents about the principle of development and the density, form, layout, dwelling mix, landscaping and access for these sites.</p>
Stephen and Alexis Porter	In question 18 you mention SANG. I am in construction and it is essential that developers provide their own SANG to allow construction to continue in Farnham. If a site has its own SANG then it should be promoted. The Land at Hale Road, Farnham does I believe. It is also suitable as it is sympathetic to the area and development but is not too visible. I attended the meeting when the developers put up the tent and it is a great site.	Noted. This site is located within an Areas of High Landscape Value and Sensitivity and part of the setting of a designated heritage asset. See responses to the Housing Sites.
Noel Moss	The west end of The Bourne Valley is also of high landscape value. To the above extensions should be added the strip of land bounded 1. In the north by the Boreas Dene public footpath 2. In the east by Waverley Lane 3. In the south by Monks Walk and 4. In the west by Redhill House. This would take in part of the stream valley, ancient woodland, Compton Field (a lovely hilly meadow) and the Monks Walk Meadow which is already an SSSI because of rare wild flowers.	The Town Council agree that land to the west of the Bourne Valley is of high landscape value and sensitivity as it is a candidate area for an extension to the AONB. The Town Council has sought a review of the landscape sensitivity and capacity study conducted for the Borough Council. Following appraisal, Natural England (NE) are assessing whether the AONB boundary should be extended to encompass further areas incorporating the River Wey as it enters the town from the south (up to the A31) and areas to the south of Rowledge (up to the Long Road). The Neighbourhood Plan reflects these areas.
Lynne and Robert Porter	Why not extend the existing housing. People don't like it on a	This site is located within an Areas of High

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	new area so keep it to extending and Hale is extending. It is also not in peoples face but it back there and screened with the big trees.	Landscape Value and Sensitivity and part of the setting of a designated heritage asset. See responses to the Housing Sites.
Patricia Bayliss	All existing green belt areas should be maintained. Q.21 Provided it does not have a negative effect on the other green belt areas.	Noted. No other areas are proposed for deletion from the Green Belt within the Neighbourhood Plan area.
Rowledge Residents' Association (Mr R G Precious)	The area of open countryside between Boundstone and Rowledge should also be included in the areas where development should not be permitted (refer point 17 above) This is essential to maintain the separate identity of Rowledge and prevent coalescence of Boundstone and Rowledge	Agreed. The distinctive areas of Boundstone and Rowledge are currently separated by a gap and development which would result in coalescence would result in a loss in identity and distinctiveness between these areas. Add Boundstone and Rowledge to Policy FNP8 - Preventing Coalescence
David King	I don't think that existing Green Belt areas should be withdrawn. These areas have been in existence for many years - why disband them now and bring others in to replace them/ I'm all for new Green Belt areas, but not to the detriment of existing ones.	Noted. No other areas are proposed for deletion from the Green Belt within the Neighbourhood Plan area.
David Brinton	The Bourne Woods should be protected from development and access maintained for local residents and walkers generally.	Noted. Bourne Woods are located outside the Built Up Area Boundary and are not allocated for development.
David and Shireley Wardell	I object strongly to question 17. How can you just keep piling housing in the center and think it is ok. Over time all settlements grow and it is better for the community, for the roads, it relieves pressure on doctors, schools etc as new surgeries are built. Many of us want the Lower Hale site as it is close but not too close and extends from the existing housing. It is not right to say that towns can not grow a little. I admit that one should not merge two towns unless it is necessary but there are many sites that naturally extend towns and areas but do not merge them. All towns were once small areas anyway and they have grown. Question 17 has an obvious answer and that is that they should be able to grow and develop. Otherwise one would build sky scrapers in Farnham!	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints. The constraints have resulted in the proposed distribution of sites around Farnham. The Lower Hale site is located within an Area of High Landscape Value and Sensitivity and part of the setting of a designated heritage asset. See responses to the Housing Sites.
Alexander and Helen Thompson	I approve of housing but want it to be in keeping with the other	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	houses around it.	need for additional development based on up to date evidence. Further emphasis should be made to the distinctive character of areas of the town in relation to Policy FNPI I – Housing Site Options.
Jo Huddleston	When forestry commission allow tree thinning/felling they should be required to state and police a reliant/biodiversity condition. At the moment they just walk away, leaving a sand desert.	This issue is not a matter controlled by planning.
Ian Capon	Ensure alternative access is provided...Biles and Walking infrastructure..Dual Use	Policy FNP23 - Transport Impact of Development seeks to maintain or enhance the existing local footpath and cycle network and where possible to extend the network through a development site and connect the development to them. In addition the Policy seeks only development proposals which would ensure sustainable transport links are provided to the principal facilities including the town centre and the nearest Local Centre; primary school; secondary school and public open space;
Robert Wilks	Housing should be focussed around extending the current housing areas as long as it is not highly detrimental to the existing views. There will always be an impact on views but they should be limited.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence. Policy FNPI I – Housing Site Options requires open space and landscape buffers to be provided in the more sensitive parts of the site where development would be more intrusive in the landscape.
David Bell	Coxbridge Farm fields should not be built on. I live on Hazell road and not only will this affect the beautiful views we currently have the quality of my families life and the value of my property will be affected regards David Bell	Noted. See response contained in the Housing Chapter.
Ian Capon	Ensure easier access via careful infrastructure for bikes and walking - Dual use..	Policy FNP23 - Transport Impact of Development seeks to maintain or enhance the existing local footpath and cycle network and where possible to extend the network through a development site

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		and connect the development to them. In addition the Policy seeks only development proposals which would ensure sustainable transport links are provided to the principal facilities including the town centre and the nearest Local Centre; primary school; secondary school and public open space;
Mark AND Jane Lee	The pros of it should outweigh the cons. Remove that pylon and build on the burial ground. They haven't buried anyone there in years and they keep marketing it. There are spaces at the Church there left over so it shouldn't be a burial ground. There are houses there already and it is quite well hidden.	This site is located within an Areas of High Landscape Value and Sensitivity and part of the setting of a designated heritage asset. See responses to the Housing Sites. The removal of pylons is not an overriding determinant of the suitability of a site for development. See response contained in the Housing Chapter.
Kris Charij	I don't agree with housing that is obviously seen. Why can't you add to the existing housing areas and keep it out of the view of the wider area. Of course you cant build a house and make it invisible, it will be seen by some people but an extension to existing housing in an area that is screened by trees would be best. I liked the burial site as it was out of the way but there are houses there anyway. There is also that pylon over it that they said they would remove. Build there.	This site is located within an Areas of High Landscape Value and Sensitivity and part of the setting of a designated heritage asset. See responses to the Housing Sites. The removal of pylons is not an overriding determinant of the suitability of a site for development. See response contained in the Housing Chapter.
Angela Redley	Farnham is already densely populated and further houses could harm the character of the town. Also the road system, even with a bypass are unable to cope most of the day. Subsequently there is high pollution, which is not good for the environment.	Noted. It is accepted that road congestion is an issue at Farnham. Surrey County Council Highways have provided feedback on the sites allocate in the Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood Plan and have indicated the highways should be able to cope with effective mitigation planned alongside development.
Kathleen Parrish	Much thought should be given to the impact of Global Warming preserving areas to help combat it and for the provision of wildlife. What you cannot do is to continually build more and more to house more and more human beings, we need the wildlife too and the green open areas consisting of trees and Natural Beauty. Might I add that Human Beings are now becoming a pest on this planet.	Noted. Policies in the Neighbourhood Plan seek to protect green infrastructure, landscape of high value and sensitivity, natural beauty and biodiversity.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
Tilly Casson	Whilst it is important to preserve areas of outstanding natural beauty so that people, now and in future, can enjoy them it is important to bear in mind that less than 4% of this country has been built upon therefore it is relatively easy to get out into open space already available. As human beings we spend more of our waking hours in urban environment compared to the time we spend in open countryside so it seems madness that we are being crammed in like battery chickens! Our quality of life would be greatly improved if we lived in less cramped conditions- this may mean rethinking the green belt.	The Green Belt is not proposed as a constraint all around Farnham and the Neighbourhood Plan identifies areas suitable for expansion at densities which are similar to adjoining areas. Nevertheless, the protection of countryside is also seen as an important objective.
Janine sparks	We need to protect and increase green belt. This should be a 360 degree protection: below ground, on the ground and in the air above green belt. Only by doing this will we have effective protection in place to preserve green space for future generations, and to save everyone from effects of poor air quality that is inevitable if the green belt "lungs" are built upon.	Not all of the areas around Farnham meet the criteria necessary for Green Belt designation. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints. The constraints have resulted in the proposed distribution of sites around Farnham. Policies in the Neighbourhood Plan seek to protect green infrastructure, landscape of high value and sensitivity, natural beauty and biodiversity.
William Bryce	The ANOB extension, as proposed, is inadequate because it has overlooked AGLV areas.	A review of the Surrey AGLV by Chris Burnett Associates (CBA) was commissioned by the Surrey Planning Officers Association. (SPOA) in 2007. It concluded that the methodology for designation was outmoded, that national planning guidance no longer supported local landscape designations but a landscape character assessment linked to a criteria-based policy approach. The review recommended that the AGLV be retained until a review of the AONB was undertaken but that any land ultimately falling outside such a designation should be subjected to a landscape character assessment.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		<p>Following appraisal, Natural England (NE) are assessing whether the AONB boundary should be extended to encompass further areas incorporating the River Wey as it enters the town from the south (up to the A31) and areas to the south of Rowledge (up to the Long Road). The Neighbourhood Plan reflects these areas.</p> <p>Waverley Borough Council has undertaken a landscape sensitivity and capacity study.</p>
Matthew Felix Williamson	<p>Why has the town boundary been changed without consultation? Why have areas of South Farnham been given the term of 'Arcadian areas' sounds like something an estate agent has come up with to increase the value of a property.</p>	<p>The purpose of the Reg 14 plan is to encourage consultation about all aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan. The boundary defined in the Neighbourhood Plan is the Built Up Area boundary, which seeks to define the distinction between the built up area and the countryside.</p> <p>Arcadian area is a term which seeks to capture the character of the areas previously designated as POLICY BE3 – South Farnham Area of Special Environmental Quality and POLICY BE6 – Low Density Residential Areas in the adopted Local Plan. The relationship between Policy BE3 and the proposed Neighbourhood Plan Policies should be made clearer in the Neighbourhood Plan. The area originally designated as Policy BE3 (and now as Policy FNP5) will be reviewed.</p>
Ruth Scott Plummer	<p>Try to build on spare plots already within the built up areas rather than in new parcels of land in the country</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where</p>

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		there is housing need.
Ella Burrows	As I say, housing is very important and is needed but it should be designed to limit the visual impact and be in keeping with the immediate area of housing development. The site I visited shows a natural extension from the existing houses and is out of the way but still easy access to central Farnham.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence. Policy FNPI I – Housing Site Options requires open space and landscape buffers to be provided in the more sensitive parts of the site where development would be more intrusive in the landscape. This site is located within an Areas of High Landscape Value and Sensitivity and part of the setting of a designated heritage asset. See responses to the Housing Sites.
Francoise Hancock	The proposed extended Green Belt cannot be policed adequately in either Runfold or Badshot Lea due to the proliferation of small land ownerships. Its boundaries will be eroded overtime. It is totally unreasonable to expect some local land owners to be constrained by Green Belt policies which will almost certainly not apply to the Travelling community. Essentially you are consigning the area to future piecemeal development and encroachment without providing the tools for local people to act in the best interests of everyone who lives there.	The application of Green Belt policy does not depend on land ownership.
John Hook	I am concerned about the ramifications of "provision of SANG at Farnham Park". The encouragement of more access to Farnham Park should not be accompanied by any change to its existing character e.g.provision of "facilities" such as play areas , extra signboarding etc . Farnham Park is one of the unspoiled natural gems of Farnham that should be preserved as such .	Noted. Any changes would have to be agreed with Natural England.
Millar	Serious money needs to be spent on removing traffic from the town centre and improving existing bottlenecks.	Noted. It is accepted that road congestion is an issue at Farnham. Surrey County Council Highways have provided feedback on the sites allocate in the Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood Plan and have

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		indicated the highways should be able cope with effective mitigation planned alongside development.
Timothy Coombes	Is there mention of WBC Policies BE3 and BE6 in the draft Neighbourhood Plan that I missed? If not, should these be given explicit emphasis?	Policy FNP5 – South Farnham Arcadian Areas covers the areas previously designated as POLICY BE3 – South Farnham Area of Special Environmental Quality and POLICY BE6 – Low Density Residential Areas.in the adopted Local Plan. The relationship between Policy BE3 and the proposed Neighbourhood Plan Policies should be made clearer in the Neighbourhood Plan. The area originally designated as Policy BE3 (and now as Policy FNP5) will be reviewed.
Stewart Badger	In the Bourne, the ASEQ should be extended, the gaps present today are an aberration and should be addressed. Possibly other designation should also be adressed in the bourne, AONB & AGLV	Policy FNP5 – South Farnham Arcadian Areas covers the areas previously designated as POLICY BE3 – South Farnham Area of Special Environmental Quality and POLICY BE6 – Low Density Residential Areas.in the adopted Local Plan. The relationship between Policy BE3 and the proposed Neighbourhood Plan Policies should be made clearer in the Neighbourhood Plan. The area originally designated as Policy BE3 (and now as Policy FNP5) will be reviewed.
Steven Braysher	Extending green belt and AONB areas should be based on fact rather than subjective opinions of people determined to "protect" themselves from local development. I would like to understand the justification before providing a positive answer.	Following appraisal, Natural England (NE) are assessing whether the AONB boundary should be extended to encompass further areas incorporating the River Wey as it enters the town from the south (up to the A31) and areas to the south of Rowledge (up to the Long Road). Waverley Borough Council has undertaken a landscape character, sensitivity and capacity study. The review identifies areas of High Landscape Value

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		and High Landscape Sensitivity. The Neighbourhood Plan reflects these areas.
Julie Russ	<p>10b) The Design Statement is believed to support the NW Farnham Area of Strategic Visual Importance (ASVI0. 10d) The Coxbridge site would require new buffers for existing developed areas. 14) These protections should cover all existing residential areas, not just the "Arcadian Areas" of South Farnham. Every area has its own special character, eg, NW Farnham, surrounded as it is by agricultural land, is essentially rural in character and this should be protected. The AMEC Study for Waverley Borough Council, Part 1, Farnham and Cranleigh states when referring to the segment which includes North West Farnham: "With its mainly rural character and setting, property pattern and designation, capacity for development in the segment as a whole is likely to be limited". The ASVI designation applies to the complete Hopfields Site in the Waverley Local Plan 2002 and this stands until such time as a new local plan changes it. The new local plan has not yet been approved and finalised. Moreover land immediately to the north and west of the Hopfields is classed as AGLV, yet neither of these designations is mentioned in the Neighbourhood Plan, 16c) Should state high landscape value OR sensitivity as this would include more areas, including North West Farnham. 17) I support the Farnham/Badshot Lea/Aldershot strategic gap but would question the new Wrecclesham/Rowledge/Frensham gaps. 18b) Policy FNP9 states that the only way potential housing sites can be shown to be deliverable in the short/medium term is for on-site SANG provision as an integral part of the development. However, for the Hopfields an offsite SANG in Church Crookham has been proposed which is further away than the SPA. Common sense suggests that this will NOT protect the SPA from increased visitor pressure and Waverley Borough Council will be failing in its duty to do so if the SANG is accepted. 21) The proposed area is mostly an area (area 'W2')</p>	<p>Areas of Strategic Visual Importance (ASVI) are designated in the Waverley Local Plan (2002) as other areas which need protection because of the role they play in preventing the coalescence of settlements or because they are an area of open land that penetrates into the urban area like a green "lung". They were considered strategic areas because of the part they play in retaining the character of Farnham, Since the Local Plan was adopted, the Farnham Design Statement has identified the distinctive character of each of the areas of Farnham and was adopted as a material consideration by Waverley Borough Council in 2010. In addition the AONB review is being undertaken and Waverley Borough Council has undertaken a landscape sensitivity and capacity study. This identifies areas of high landscape value and sensitivity (the combination of which generally indicates that the landscape should be conserved) – but this does not include the Hopfields site. A review of the Surrey AGLV by Chris Burnett Associates (CBA) was commissioned by the Surrey Planning Officers Association. (SPOA) in 2007. It concluded that the methodology for designation was outmoded, that national planning guidance no longer supported local landscape designations but a landscape character assessment linked to a criteria-based policy approach. The review recommended that the AGLV be retained until a review of the AONB was undertaken but that any land ultimately falling outside such a designation should be subjected to a landscape character assessment. The</p>

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	<p>of the previous AGLV which was categorised RED – as not meeting AONB criteria - in Waverley's 2008 study. It is NOT significant for prevention of the coalescence of Farnham and Aldershot and so cannot be justified on this basis. A small part alongside the A31, previously in the Strategic Gap, might be justified. 23) The question is misleading: Natural England have not proposed this as they have not yet started their study 24) The AONB extension proposal is incomplete as it has ignored AGLV areas which should be candidate areas (such as the Hopfields) – as proposed by the Surrey AGLV review which categorised the NW Farnham AGLV as amber.</p>	<p>AONB review is being undertaken and Waverley Borough Council has undertaken a landscape sensitivity and capacity study. Natural England (NE) are assessing whether the AONB boundary should be extended to encompass further areas incorporating the River Wey as it enters the town from the south (up to the A31) and areas to the south of Rowledge (up to the Long Road). The Neighbourhood Plan reflects these areas. The Hopfields area is not proposed by NE for inclusion in the AONB. The Neighbourhood Plan uses the most recent evidence base and takes account of the NPPF</p> <p>In relation to land at Coxbridge, Policy FNPI I – Housing Site Options seeks open space and landscape buffers in the more sensitive parts of the site where development would be more intrusive in the landscape and the safeguarding of the residential amenities of adjoining occupiers in respect of privacy, daylight and sunlight. Further emphasis should be made to the distinctive character of areas of the town in relation to Policy FNPI I – Housing Site Options.</p> <p>NW Farnham does not exhibit the characteristics of the proposed Arcadian Areas but the Farnham Design Statement has identified the distinctive character of each of the areas of Farnham and was adopted as a material consideration by Waverley Borough Council in 2010. This is cross referenced in Policy FNPI – so enhancing its status.</p> <p>The importance of the gap between Aldershot and</p>

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment

Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		<p>Farnham is noted. The other gaps are noted as important in the Farnham Design Statement which is already adopted by Waverley Borough Council as a material consideration in considering planning applications. In accordance with the strong support for this policy during consultation it remains important that these features continue to be protected and therefore are included in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>It is unclear which small part off the A31 is considered suitable. See responses to Housing Sites.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan makes it clear that Natural England have not yet proposed an extension to the AONB.</p> <p>Part of the area to the west of Farnham Castle is considered as a suitable option for housing development and now has planning permission.</p> <p>The proposed Green Belt designation is based criteria other than landscape. The area sought for protection by the extended Green Belt is considered to be important in preventing the coalescence of Farnham and Aldershot.</p>
Heather Simpson	There is a need for more local parks to avoid the use of cars.	Noted. Policy FNP20 states that residential development proposals will be expected to provide for new public open space to a set standard either through on site provision or a financial contribution to off site provision but that on larger sites, amenity greenspace and children's and young people's equipped space should be provided on

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		site.
Julie Russ	<p>14) The protections suggested for the "Arcadian Areas" of South Farnham should be afforded to ALL residential areas, not reserved exclusively for this area. Every area of Farnham has its own particular character which should be protected. For example, North West Farnham, surrounded as it is by agricultural land, is rural in character and this is acknowledged in the Neighbourhood Plan: "With its mainly rural character and setting, property pattern and designation, capacity for development in the segment as a whole is likely to be limited".The historical aspect of this area has been ignored in the Neighbourhood Plan, eg, the historic Hopfields, the Pilgrim's/Harrow Way. From no other area of Farnham is it possible to walk across fields into the town centre and enjoy a view of the town in which the parish church is prominent. The whole of the Hopfields is included in the ASVI in Waverley's Local Plan, 2002 which is current until the New Local Plan is finalised and approved. The area immediately to the north and west of the Hopfields is designated as AGLV, in the same plan, yet neither of these designations is afforded to this area in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>21) The proposed area is mostly an area (area 'W2') of the previous AGLV which was categorised RED – as not meeting AONB criteria - in the Waverley 2008 study. It is NOT significant to prevention of the coalescence of Farnham and Aldershot and so cannot be justified on this basis. A small part alongside the A31, previously in the Strategic Gap, might be justifiable. Question 23 is misleading as Natural England have not proposed this and have not yet started their study. The AONB extension proposal is incomplete as it has ignored AGLV areas which should be candidate areas (such as the Hopfields) as proposed by the Surrey AGLV review which categorised the NW Farnham AGLV as amber.</p>	<p>See previous response.</p> <p>The area is not recorded as an area of archaeological potential by Surrey County Council.</p>
John Williamson	These questions (21,22 and 23 are so biased to obtain a pre determined result they will never pass any sort of rigorous	Not accepted.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	inspection.	
Leila Cameroon	The town and surrounding countryside are desirable due to it's natural and built environments and these should be strongly protected.	Noted.
David Edwards	The questions make the unsubstantiated assumption that new development WILL take place. Call me cynical but such development benefits Farnham Council in at least two ways: income from developers and increased Council Tax revenue from new residents. What FC is currently failing to do is consult with existing residents and Council tax payers on the necessity and desire (or not) for development.	The Regulation 14 was an extensive consultation exercise which engaged existing residents and stakeholders in the future of Farnham. The need for development was set out in accompanying evidence base.
Mary Ann Coombes	Am very concerned that the result of the current SPA protection policy will, given the constraints on identified SANG space, could result in greenfield development being more deliverable than brownfield development within Farnham. The SPA/SANG policy would therefore conflict with recent guidance from DCLG about giving priority to development on brownfield sites rather than greenfield sites. The retention of all remaining SANG allocation in Farnham Park for brownfield development is an absolute priority as is the identification and purchase of additional suitable SANG space by WBC, using SANG contributions.	Noted. The Town Council is not aware of recent guidance from DCLG which gives priority to development on brownfield sites rather than greenfield sites.
Simon Paterson	The areas of special scenic value such as fields above Art College and to west and east of crondall lane should be protected.	Areas of Strategic Visual Importance (ASVI) are designated in the Waverley Local Plan (2002) as other areas which need protection because of the role they play in preventing the coalescence of settlements or because they are an area of open land that penetrates into the urban area like a green "lung". They were considered strategic areas because of the part they play in retaining the character of Farnham, Since the Local Plan was adopted, the Farnham Design Statement has identified the distinctive character of each of the areas of Farnham and was adopted as a material consideration by Waverley Borough Council in

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment

Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		<p>2010. In addition the AONB review is being undertaken and Waverley Borough Council has undertaken a landscape sensitivity and capacity study. This identifies areas of high landscape value and sensitivity (the combination of which generally indicates that the landscape should be conserved) – but this does not include the Hopfields site. A review of the Surrey AGLV by Chris Burnett Associates (CBA) was commissioned by the Surrey Planning Officers Association. (SPOA) in 2007. It concluded that the methodology for designation was outmoded, that national planning guidance no longer supported local landscape designations but a landscape character assessment linked to a criteria-based policy approach. The review recommended that the AGLV be retained until a review of the AONB was undertaken but that any land ultimately falling outside such a designation should be subjected to a landscape character assessment. The AONB review is being undertaken and Waverley Borough Council has undertaken a landscape sensitivity and capacity study. Natural England (NE) are assessing whether the AONB boundary should be extended to encompass further areas incorporating the River Wey as it enters the town from the south (up to the A31) and areas to the south of Rowledge (up to the Long Road). The Neighbourhood Plan reflects these areas. The Hopfields area is not proposed by NE for inclusion in the AONB. The Neighbourhood Plan uses the most recent evidence base and takes account of the NPPF</p>

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
Jane Brooks	I don't think any greenfield sites should be built on until all brownfield sites have been used up.	The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
Derrick Price	Q.17 I strongly agree that Farnham Town should not be allowed to coalesce with Compton. Q.18 Should only be allowed on Brownfield sites Q.23 Should also include areas up to the town boundary to the south of the town.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need. Following appraisal, Natural England (NE) are assessing whether the AONB boundary should be extended to encompass further areas incorporating the River Wey as it enters the town from the south (up to the A31) and areas to the south of Rowledge (up to the Long Road). The Neighbourhood Plan reflects these areas.
Jennifer Price	17. Farnham should not be allowed to encroach on Compton 18. Brownfield sites only	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
Dr Keith Newman	Open Areas close to the town centre should be kept.	Noted. Policy FNPI in particular incorporates this point and Policies FNP2 and FNP20 in particular seek to protect open space within Farnham Town Centre Conservation Area and its setting and within the wider town respectively.
Mary Hearn	I think that mitigations, SANGs and financial contributions relating to the environment are a way of 'cheating' in terms of developing and managing these areas. I disagree in principle with	Mitigation is a recognised planning requirement in relation to certain constraints. In order to be acceptable, development must meet certain criteria

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	these wriggle room manoeuvres with regard to the natural and built environment.	including those related to retaining important site features, the provision of SANG, achieving good quality design and ensuring sufficient infrastructure to support the development.
Farnham Society (Andy Macleod)	The Society strongly supports policies to ensure good design in the built environment	Noted
Andrew Macleod	Protecting the natural and built environment by enforcing policies on high quality design of new developments is vitally important.	Noted
david hayes	Brownfield sites should be used before any consideration is given to greenfield sites	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
Nick Thurston	It is shameful to even consider trashing our heritage - give the developers an inch - give them a mile.....	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to protect important heritage assets.
Brian Hollis	Future developments should only be permitted on existing or future Brown Field sites	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
Helen Locke	It's important that access can be gained to green areas, often it's difficult to cross busy roads. If areas are protected, we should be able to enjoy them.	Noted. Policy FNP20 - Public Open Space should include reference to accessible public open space.
Pamela Pownall	Q.21 & 22 If Green Belt is designed to prevent urban sprawl between towns, applying it to Moor Park Valley and Runfold is not appropriate. Moor Park valley should have protection for landscape reasons (see Q.23) Aldershot/Farnham separation by applying GB is logical use. Q.23 AONB should be extended to cover areas across south of Farnham outside the BUAB.	The Green Belt review undertaken for Waverley Borough Council proposes an extension to the Green Belt. It is a strategic planning matter for Waverley Borough Council to determine the extent of the green belt around Farnham and the Neighbourhood Plan will reflect this position.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		Following appraisal, Natural England (NE) are assessing whether the AONB boundary should be extended to encompass further areas incorporating the River Wey as it enters the town from the south (up to the A31) and areas to the south of Rowledge (up to the Long Road). The Neighbourhood Plan reflects these areas.
Simon Elson	the restoration of the three mineral sites will contribute to this biodiversity, landscape and green space provision.	Noted
Darren Collins	The Council must continue to protect against "garden grabbing" to avoid impact to street scene and avoid over development	Noted. Policies FNPI and FNP5 in particular seek to prevent development which would be detrimental to the character of an area.
Simon Johnson	No building on green field sites should be allowed as this necessarily reduces the amount of our countryside.	It is appropriate for the Neighbourhood Plan to acknowledge the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and to attempt to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints. Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
Dr H.DuMoulin	Fields in close proximity to Surrey Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty should be the last to be burdened by further development.	Noted. Policy FNP7 (b) seeks to conserve and enhance landscape and scenic beauty of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and its setting.
Robert C. Gentry	I am currently unable to understand how in the long term it will be possible to extend the Green Belt and at the same time cater for additional population and housing growth in the area. I am not for a minute advocating wholesale construction on all Green Belt land. However, as this country no longer grows enough food to sustain itself while the population continues to rise, we	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints. Not all land surrounding Farnham is appropriate for, or proposed as, Green

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	must find ways to address the reality of the situation - even in leafy Surrey. I am a private pilot and therefore spend a lot of time looking down on the area surrounding Farnham. It is inconceivable to me that all of the open space I see requires protection. Therefore as long as the risk of flooding is not substantially increased and all of the the supporting infrastructure is provided, some of the land should be given up to meet the inevitable expansion needs. We must be realistic and the challenge of course is to convince other through communication along with the application of sensible, practical AND architecturally appropriate development!	Belt allowing some capacity for growth.
E. A. Cooper	Q. 17 - Hale should be included in this list. Q. 19 - All house building should stop until it can be proved that SANGS work.	This site is located within an Areas of High Landscape Value and Sensitivity and part of the setting of a designated heritage asset. See responses to the Housing Sites. The SANG policy is based on the joint Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy, 2013 which is accepted by Natural England and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Review 2016. FNP9 to be updated based on up to date evidence.
Martin Angel	The rich biodiversity of the Compton Fields, its bordering trees and ancient hedgerow should be protected	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan does not propose to allocate a site in this area.
Jill Bowden	It is important to maintain the character of the area or it could turn into an area such as Woking which has been spoilt by too much building whilst the roads have remained the same resulting in massive traffic jams.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence but attempts to retain the distinctive character of the town. Surrey County Council Highways have provided feedback on the sites allocate in the Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood Plan and have indicated the highways should be able cope with effective mitigation planned alongside development.
David CEveritt	We should try and avoid making areas will little access to areas of natural (unbuilt) land. So that easy access can be got to open	Noted. Reference Farnham Housing Land Availability Assessment for the criteria used to

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	recreation areas.	select suitable housing sites.
Mrs S R Jacobs	Why is the existing environment not protected? Developers appear cutting down trees during the night without a licence for example. The penalties (like those imposed on the banks) need to be much more appropriate. Extending Green Belt in all directions leads to increasing management costs when budgets are being cut and removes some of the sites that could be developed eventually.	Noted. The unauthorised removal of protected trees is a matter of enforcement by the Borough Council as local planning authority. The Neighbourhood Plan does not propose to extend the Green Belt in all directions. There are no management costs directly associated with Green Belt designation.
John Trillwood	Brownfield sites should be used before greenfield sites.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
Ian Holder	Brownfield sites should be used for all development, the use of natural, unused or greenfield sites should only be contemplated when all brownfield sites have been used.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
Tim Thackeray	To preserve the character of the town and the amenity value of its surroundings you also need to protect the fields NW of Beaver's Road and the UCA., possibly by extending the green belt here also (Note that I own one of these fields).	Noted. Areas of Strategic Visual Importance (ASVI) are designated in the Waverley Local Plan (2002) as other areas which need protection because of the role they play in preventing the coalescence of settlements or because they are an area of open land that penetrates into the urban area like a green "lung". They were considered strategic areas because of the part they play in retaining the character of Farnham, Since the Local Plan was adopted, the Farnham Design Statement has identified the distinctive character of each of the areas of Farnham and was adopted as a material consideration by Waverley Borough Council in

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment

Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		<p>2010. In addition the AONB review is being undertaken and Waverley Borough Council has undertaken a landscape sensitivity and capacity study. This identifies areas of high landscape value and sensitivity (the combination of which generally indicates that the landscape should be conserved) – but this does not include the Hopfields site. A review of the Surrey AGLV by Chris Burnett Associates (CBA) was commissioned by the Surrey Planning Officers Association. (SPOA) in 2007. It concluded that the methodology for designation was outmoded, that national planning guidance no longer supported local landscape designations but a landscape character assessment linked to a criteria-based policy approach. The review recommended that the AGLV be retained until a review of the AONB was undertaken but that any land ultimately falling outside such a designation should be subjected to a landscape character assessment. The AONB review is being undertaken and Waverley Borough Council has undertaken a landscape sensitivity and capacity study. Natural England (NE) are assessing whether the AONB boundary should be extended to encompass further areas incorporating the River Wey as it enters the town from the south (up to the A31) and areas to the south of Rowledge (up to the Long Road). The Neighbourhood Plan reflects these areas. The Hopfields area is not proposed by NE for inclusion in the AONB. The Neighbourhood Plan uses the most recent evidence base and takes account of the NPPF.</p> <p>The Hopfields site does not fulfil the criteria for</p>

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		selection as Green Belt.
Charles Stuart	Approaches to Farnham must be protected	Noted.
Penny Hardcastle	I think that Farnham and Aldershot should remain clearly independent places since they are so different but if there should be a coalescence between areas such as Weybourne and Badhsot Lea I don't see any problem/	The importance of the gap between Aldershot and Farnham is noted The other gaps are noted as important in the Farnham Design Statement which is already adopted by Waverley Borough Council as a material consideration in considering planning applications. In accordance with the strong support for this policy during consultation it remains important that these features continue to be protected and therefore are included in the Neighbourhood Plan.
John Coutts	Question 20 (like others) is too general and emotionally charged to answer. Which species; which habitats. Conservation is important and needs to be based on evidence; however some the regulations (eg SPAs) are too restrictive.	Noted.
Jason griffiths	It is essential that we respect the areas of landscape value	Noted. Policy FNP7 (c) seeks no detrimental impact on areas having high landscape value and sensitivity.
Chris Searle	Important to protect the green belt for future generations.	Noted.
Jon Watson	I do not accept the concept of SANG offset. First, it will concentrate all Farnham's green space in Farnham park rather than securing diverse green areas in the town. Secondly it provides scope for double counting and other abuse by developers.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan is considering other locations for SANG other than Farnham Park. There should be no double counting in assessing SANG contribution.
Jon Watson	I strongly believe that the concept of SANG offset is dangerous. It can only lead to concentration of green space while at the same time providing an easy out for developers.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan is considering other locations for SANG other than Farnham Park. There should be no double counting in assessing SANG contribution.
Nicholas Scales	Ideally Green field building should be kept to a minimum where able, and alternative browfield sites should be considered.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		there is housing need.
Jon Watson	The SANG offset concept is just plain wrong. It appears to be open to abuse and double counting acting as a developers charter. But most importantly we do not want all open green spaces concentrated, we need multiple such spaces.	Noted. The SANG policy is based on the joint Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy, 2013 which is accepted by Natural England and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Review 2016. The Neighbourhood Plan is considering locations for SANG other than Farnham Park. There should be no double counting in assessing SANG contribution.
Elizabeth Leslie	Q 18 is difficult to answer. I don't want to have the Thames protection area degraded or overused by Developers paying towards some phoney mitigation scheme	The SANG policy is based on the joint Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy, 2013 which is accepted by Natural England and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Review 2016. FNP9 to be updated based on up to date evidence.
Sharon Hill	Farnham needs to realise that keeping buildings such as the Redgrave are a waste of time as it will never be what it was as the younger population have no desire for it.	Noted.
Celia Sadek	Maintaining open spaces is essential given the already high levels of pollution in Farnham.	Noted. Policies FNP2 and FNP20 in particular seek to protect open space within Farnham Town Centre Conservation Area and its setting and within the wider town respectively.
Charles Stuart	Protection to the River Wey and tributaries must be given – pollution, phosphates etc must be reduced	Noted. Policies FNP2 and FNP20 in particular seek to protect open space within Farnham Town Centre Conservation Area and its setting and within the wider town respectively. Policy FNP10 (c) seeks to promote biodiversity enhancements, including restoration and re-creation of wildlife habitats within the Biodiversity Opportunity Areas where appropriate, which include the River Wey and its tributaries. .Natural England are assessing whether the AONB boundary should be extended

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		to encompass further areas incorporating the River Wey as it enters the town from the south (up to the A31)
Chris Sampson	The strategic gap between Badshot Lea and Weybourne/Aldershot should be retained	Noted. Policy FNP8 seeks to prevent coalescence between Farnham and Aldershot and Badshot Lea and Weybourne.
ben stanley	Farnham is a beautiful SMALL Georgian town that is thriving, adding more residents will not improve the situation.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints.
Sue Hall	BROWN SITES ONLY	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
Mike Field	It means that we end up with a beautiful area.	Noted
JW Leslie	Not happy that Farnham Park is used to offset over usage of Thames Heath Basin special protection area	The SANG policy is based on the joint Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy, 2013 which is accepted by Natural England and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Review 2016. FNP9 to be updated based on up to date evidence.
Mrs Valerie Nye	When considering building on the semi rural outskirts of towns far more consideration must be given to the sympathetic design and character of the houses. Common practice is just to build a mini estate of identical houses with no adequate internal storage, sound insulation or outside space.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence but attempts to retain the distinctive character of the town. Amenity issues in relation to adjoining residents are already incorporated into Policy FNPI and FNPII. Further emphasis should be made to the distinctive character of areas of the town in relation to Policy FNPII – Housing Site Options.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
Philip Feibusch	There are still a large number of brownfield sites that can be used for development of dwellings. Focus should be on these first.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
BRIAN STENNING	What about land south of Badshot Lea, behind Beect Tree Drive?? Or are we to be ignored and have all the housing dumped here??	Part of the land south of Badshot Lea is considered suitable for housing development. The area further to the south of this site is proposed to be outside the Built Up Area Boundary where development is restricted. The Neighbourhood Plan proposes Green Belt designation to the north and east of Badshot Lea and seeks to prevent coalescence with Weybourne.
Antony Patterson	Arcadian areas' is an artificial and poor description of the South part of Farnham. The whole of South Farnham (Waverley), The Bourne and Moor Park should be covered by the policy FNP5 and care must be taken that this does not reduce the current protection given to parts of the Bourne by Policy BE3. The boundary of the Built up area should be altered to exclude the are south of Latchwood Lane (down to Gong Hill drive). The boundary of the AONB east of Old Frensham Road need to be checked, as it currently does not include all of Clumps Road which I believe to be AGLV but not AONB.	Saved Local Plan Policy BE3 is the origin for Policy FNP5 – South Farnham Arcadian Areas. This policy will operate in addition to Policy FNPI - Design of New Development and Conservation development which seeks to ensure high quality development which responds to the character of the distinctive area of Farnham in which it is located by way of height, scale, density, layout, orientation, design and materials of buildings and the scale, design and materials of the public realm (highways, footways, open space and landscape). The combination of policies should continue to protect the character of the areas previously designated within BE3. The relationship between Policy BE3 and the proposed Neighbourhood Plan Policies should be made clearer in the Neighbourhood Plan. The area originally designated as Policy BE3 (and now as Policy FNP5) will be reviewed.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		Following appraisal, Natural England (NE) are assessing whether the AONB boundary should be extended to encompass further areas incorporating the River Wey as it enters the town from the south (up to the A31) and areas to the south of Rowledge (up to the Long Road). The Neighbourhood Plan reflects these areas.
BRIAN STENNING	Why not extend the green belt to land south of Badshot Lea? IE south of Beech Tree Drive. OR is this area of Badshot Lea not considered worth fighting for? If this area is developed it will completely ruin the southern part of Badshot Lea.	Land south of Badshot Lea does not meet the criteria necessary to designate Green Belt. Part of the land south of Badshot Lea is considered suitable for housing development. The area further to the south of this site is proposed to be outside the Built Up Area Boundary where development is restricted. The Neighbourhood Plan proposes Green Belt designation to the north and east of Badshot Lea and seeks to prevent coalescence with Weybourne. The location of the Green Belt in this area is a strategic planning matter ultimately for determination by Waverley Borough Council.
Brian	Waverley has destroyed the ambiance of Wrecclisham by exploiting the absence of a strong Farnham town council, which would exist in a more efficient unitary authority. WBC's aim is to preserve the maximum number of councillors.	Non land use matter.
Mrs Libby Ralph	The area of Farnham Old Park should be protected as a green lung for the town, enhanced for biodiversity around existing Ancient Woodland pockets, and preserving the rural gap to the Hampshire border	Noted. Additional text will be added to the Neighbourhood Plan about Farnham Old Park. Part of the area to the west of Farnham Castle is considered as a suitable option for housing development. Part of this site has planning permission.
Mr E Spencer	No building or redesignation of land usage (other than green belt proposals) should be allowed where it would impact transition of	Noted. Policies FNP8 and FNPI0 apply. No change to the flood plain designations are proposed and

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	wildlife and fauna, e.g. existing gaps between villages. Equally where there have been recent cases of flooding or waterlogging. There should be no arbitrary changes to flood plane designation and subsequent relaxation for study and flood mitigation by and development.	Policy FNPI seeks to ensure no development has adverse consequences for flooding.
Ian Webster	Green Belts need to be preserved.	Noted.
CHRISTOPHER BURTON	The Built Up Area boundary (Map A) includes a number of green field sites for example land at Waverley Lane, Coxbridge Farm and adjacent to the art college. The implication is that the Town Council regards development of these areas as acceptable. In accordance with the NPPF development should be targeted at brownfield sites. More specifically the existing Waverley Local Plan (para 6.20) states that permission to build on greenfield sites will only be given if it is not possible to demonstrate a five year supply of building land across the Borough as a whole. The future of Dunsfold is thus a critical consideration. The starting point for the Farnham Local Plan should be the existing Built Up Area boundary and the objective should be to extend this as little as possible.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints. The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need. There is not a 5 year land supply within Waverley Borough.
Carolyn Bennett	The more the better for the benefit of the future generations	Noted
Kelvin Forster	The rural and biodiverse nature of large swathes of Farnham can never be repaired once it has been destroyed by over-development. Any potential development must be considered in these terms. It should not be assumed that any area outside designated protected areas (such as AONB) is of lesser importance or quality and therefore built upon. Many of our green sites in south Farnham are unprotected by such policies yet are much-valued and create the feeling of space, allow habitat for wildlife and prevent unwanted urbanisation.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints.
Mr Jim Pressly	Whilst the unique architectural and green characteristics of Farnham should be maintained, sympathetic, high quality changes to buildings should be allowed; we should not attempt to freeze Farnham in a particular (Georgian?) era; it is the Grand Designs effect - I empathise with the frustrations of people who want to	Noted. Whilst policies seek development which responds to the heritage and distinctive character of the individual area of Farnham in which it is located, this need not prevent innovative approaches to design.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	want to build a potentially iconic, state of the art building but are frustrated by bureaucracy.	
CW.WICKS	Some of the questions are difficult to understand, as they are asking as if building will be carried out now and in the future. I can insure the councils/ planning officers and appeal officers, that THEY already know, or at least should look into the fact that Farnham CANNOT ACCEPT MORE HOUSING FARNHAM IS FULL.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints.
Claire Swannie	I have not answered questions 18 and 20 because I believe green belt land should not be used for building in any circumstances.	Noted.
catherine wood	There is no such thing as mitigation. A habitat takes generations to develop. Just setting aside a rubbishy piece of disused land to compensate is NO compensation for loss of habitat for flora and fauna	In relation to the SPA, the SANG policy is based on the joint Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy, 2013 which is accepted by Natural England and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Review 2016. FNP9 to be updated based on up to date evidence.
Clare Eaton	Any Green Belt land is there for a purpose and should not be allowed to be built upon otherwise a dangerous precedent is set.	Noted.
Alison	As a resident near Coxbridge farm I see an array of wildlife that would be lost including kestrels and red kites these fields should not be used. The fields opposite Crondall lane are useful dog walking fields and the community uses them these should not be touched	Noted. Policy FNP10 which seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity will be applied to this site.
Alison Burns	The survey options do not allow for any disagreement to further development.	Disagree and Strongly Disagree options were available.
N Burch	Whilst in agreement with the aims of specially-protected zones such as green belt and AONB for instance, I feel it is a mistake to be too prescriptive against what might be perfectly acceptable development in some situations. There are countless examples of rural dwellings that are beautifully constructed with oak, brickwork, render, clay tiles, traditional windows, mature planting, etc,etc that massively contribute to the beauty of the area. My opinion is that more of this "heritage" style low-	Sustainable development is more likely to be delivered through a number of identified sites within, or close to, the built up area rather than an equivalent number of dwellings within the surrounding countryside.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	density housing spread thinly across Farnhams rural neighbourhood would be far preferred by the general populace than new housing estates built on green fields around the town settlement boundaries!	
Leigh Brooks	The Local Plan should make a distinction between High Quality Design and simple pastiche of historical styles. Good Design can be of any style and attempts to impose architectural styles were no overriding style exists not only leads to lowest common denominators in terms of design but goes against the NPPF and will inevitably lead to successful planning appeals costing the town unnecessary expense by trying to hold on to dogmatic ideas about what constitutes Good Design. Consideration could be given to setting up a Design Panel of properly qualified design professionals to consider planning applications to help the council in their responses to Waverley Borough Council.	Noted. Whilst policies seek development which responds to the heritage and distinctive character of the individual area of Farnham in which it is located, this need not prevent innovative approaches to design. The idea of a local Design Panel is noted but is outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan.
Caragh quigley	We need to protect our green areas and not allow further building on green sites.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints. The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need. Policy FNP1 in particular incorporates this point and Policies FNP2 and FNP20 in particular seek to protect open space within Farnham Town Centre Conservation Area and its setting and within the wider town respectively.
Edward Walters	The Farnham area includes many beautiful rural areas. These areas, once destroyed, will never be regained. Accordingly they should be protected as a high priority & rather than attempting to build on or near them in a sympathetic manner, effort should	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	be made to find alternatives to avoid affecting them at all.	important constraints. The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
Mrs C W Crawte	The The Green Belt was created to help keep us healthy & provide us with food. This is a rural community in Surrey & not an overflow for farnborough & aldershot.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints.
Susan Everitt	Having green, natural spaces around built up areas is important for mental and physical health of residents. Over 35 years we have enjoyed walking the lanes around our area	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints.
Helena Adams	Brownfield sites should always be built on in preference to greenfield sites.	The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
Daniel Chase	It should remain as complete as possible during and after all works.	Noted
Roy Charles Sawyer	No encroachment whatsoever on our beautiful Green Belt land nor further erosion of current village environment. Never recoverable once covered in concrete, etc.!!	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints.
Noel Hogan	There is clearly a need for some development and therefore some areas will need to be identified for this. It is not possible to disagree with every development or area suggested for development and a balance must be found	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
Brian Edmonds	Waverley BC planning approvals have destroyed hedges that once provided an excellent natural habitat for a diversity of birds.	Noted. Policy FNPI and Policy FNPI0 incorporate this point.
andrew binmore	Alternative rural/agricultural/horticultural use of sites should be sought to give land a real use rather than standing "idle" or semi derelict as owners simply sit on it in the hope of the expectation of gaining Planning Permission if they simply wait until people are fed up with a site thats looks a total mess. It may be a bit draconian but what about compulsory purchase or public subscription to buy threatened land?	Compulsory purchase of derelict land would be a last resort where other available sites were available.
Roger Steel	Extend green belt across South Farnham to preserve green fields	The area around south Farnham does not meet the criteria necessary for Green Belt designation.
JW Leslie	I don't believe Farnham Park can adequately mitigate damage to Thames Heath basin	In relation to the SPA, the SANG policy is based on the joint Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy, 2013 which is accepted by Natural England and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Review 2016. FNP9 to be updated based on up to date evidence.
North West Farnham Residents' Association (S.Edge)	a) Note comments on the 'objectives' of the plan which have been made above under Q9 'comments on the vision' b) NWFRA has written separately with comments on the selection process for housing sites – and particularly failings in the assessment criteria used (which fail to assess amenity, AGLV status, current ASVI status; agricultural value; and traffic effects of developments) Note other comments which could not be made against particular items above: Q9 and Q52 Improved infrastructure is needed for existing population: to ensure this is provided as well as for new development seems unfortunately unlikely Q16 c But should be high landscape value OR sensitivity (would include more areas, including in NWFarnham) Q17 Support Farnham/Badshot Lea - Aldershot Gap. But question new Wrecclesham – Rowledge – Frensham gaps Q18b Must be adequate: proposed SANGS at Church Crookham for Hopfields site is not and this policy should clearly NOT allow	A review of the Surrey AGLV by Chris Burnett Associates (CBA) was commissioned by the Surrey Planning Officers Association. (SPOA) in 2007. It concluded that the methodology for designation was outmoded, that national planning guidance no longer supported local landscape designations but a landscape character assessment linked to a criteria-based policy approach. The review recommended that the AGLV be retained until a review of the AONB was undertaken but that any land ultimately falling outside such a designation should be subjected to a landscape character assessment. The AONB review is being undertaken and Waverley Borough Council has undertaken a landscape sensitivity and capacity study.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment

Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	<p>this Q21 The proposed area is mostly an area (area 'W2') of the previous AGLV which was categorised RED – as not meeting AONB criteria - in their 2008 study. It is NOT significant to prevention of the coalescence of Farnham and Aldershot and so cannot be justified on this basis. A small part alongside the A31, previously in the Strategic Gap, might be justified.</p>	<p>Areas of Strategic Visual Importance (ASVI) are designated in the Waverley Local Plan (2002) as other areas which need protection because of the role they play in preventing the coalescence of settlements or because they are an area of open land that penetrates into the urban area like a green “lung”. They were considered strategic areas because of the part they play in retaining the character of Farnham, Since the Local Plan was adopted, the Farnham Design Statement has identified the distinctive character of each of the areas of Farnham and was adopted as a material consideration by Waverley Borough Council in 2010. In addition the AONB review is being undertaken and Waverley Borough Council has undertaken a landscape sensitivity and capacity study.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan uses the most recent evidence base and takes account of the NPPF. Policy FNP7 seeks to protect and enhance the countryside and Policy FNP8 seeks to prevent coalescence between Farnham and Aldershot; Badshot Lea and Weybourne; Rowledge and Wrecclesham and Rowledge and Frensham. The gap between Boundstone and Rowledge should also be protected.</p>
Thomas Lankester	<p>The forward (2031) vision, and policies, should reflect a town that has played its part in addressing climate change, reduced its dependence on imported energy and improved local air quality by: -supporting plug-in and low carbon vehicles; -reducing the need for natural gas; -actively supporting the deployment of renewable power and heat technologies. The neighbourhood</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan and accompanying Sustainability Appraisal acknowledges the importance of climate change. Strategic policies relating to renewable energy, avoiding increased fossil fuel use, energy efficiency will be contained in the emerging Local Plan.</p>

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	plan should support developers by mapping out where Farnham's renewable resources (solar, anaerobic digestion, biomass and other renewable heat, and small hydro) can be utilised.	
John Steed	I support the fact that the fields on the south of Waverley Lane are omitted from the suitable sites list given the existing traffic congestion caused by the level crossing and schools.	Noted.
Peter and Penny Marriott	The fact that all of Farnham is protected by it's proximity to the two nearby SPA's is not adequately brought to the attention of people filling in this form. It should have been first and foremost as a reason for little or no development in Farnham and a chance to mention that Dunsfold should be developed before green fields anywhere in Waverley.	Policy FNP 9 deals with the TBH SPA. This policy is based on the joint Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy, 2013 which is accepted by Natural England and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Review 2016. The emphasis of NRM6 is included in the Neighbourhood Plan (page 39). The distribution of development across the Borough (including Dunsfold) is a matter for the emerging Borough Local Plan. The areas proposed for AONB and Green Belt have met the criteria for selection of such designations. Other adjoining areas are not considered to meet the criteria. FNP9 to be updated based on up to date evidence.
Sylvia Singleton	The character of Farnham is very much related to its overall size, the architecture and the variety and proportion of its green spaces such as Farnham Park, with the various fields, meadows, and woodland making it a wonderful place to live.	Noted.
Ian Burgess	Development is accepted as a requirement but this must not be at any cost. Brownfield and appropriate small scale development should be the primary choice for Farnham Town, with responsibility for the development of larger projects shared with our fellow towns in Waverley at appropriate sites: notably Dunsfold as a large scale brownfield site with reasonably good accessibility.	The distribution of development across the Borough (including Dunsfold) is a matter for the emerging Borough Local Plan. The areas proposed for AONB and Green Belt have met the criteria for selection of such designations. Other adjoining areas are not considered to meet the criteria.
Charles Fearnley	First, I'd like to say how much I appreciate the work put into this	Noted.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	<p>project by all involved - it's becoming an excellent statement of Farnham's ideal future path, and will form a useful and (hopefully!) effective document. I am a member of the Bourne Conservation Group, and have been partly involved in producing our group submission, and will let that speak for me on ecological and conservation matters. I have a couple of suggestions re "nuts and bolts", already mentioned to Carole and Rachel, but noted again here. I'm aware that the current document is by no means the final version, but would suggest (for the electronic version) of the final document: 1) Higher resolution maps. I believe that inserted pdf maps of higher resolution will resize automatically as needed, but can be zoomed in to greater extent to show detail as needed. Alternatively, high resolution maps could be provided separately on the website - in the additional documents area. 2) Internal links, so that clicking on a heading or title near in one part of the document will go automatically to the section concerned. 3) An index - either conventional, or possibly of the type often shown on the left of pdf documents. Any or all of the above will make the final version easy to access and use, and with luck will impress the government inspector! Looking forward to the next version</p>	
Roger Smith	<p>THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SHOULD ALSO GIVE PRIORITY TO THE PROTECTION OF NORTH WEST FARNHAM</p>	Noted.
Jerry Hyman	<p>I attended the 11th December 2014 Meeting of Farnham Town Council in order to ask a Public Question and make an Item 4 Statement regarding the draft Neighbourhood Plan. It was disappointing that FTC would not agree to comply with the Habitats legislation; in my opinion the Members of any public body that deliberately evades the highest-level planning law, sacrificing the endangered species, environment (and the interests of the townspeople they supposedly serve) should be jailed for Misconduct in Public Office. During the Council</p>	<p>The distribution of development across the Borough (including Dunsfold) is a matter for the emerging Borough Local Plan. The emphasis of NRM6 is included in the Neighbourhood Plan (page 39). Policy FNP 9 deals with the TBH SPA. This policy is based on the joint Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy, 2013 which is accepted by Natural England and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area</p>

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment

Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	<p>Meeting, Cllr John Ward made insulting, untruthful and entirely inappropriate criticisms of myself and Mr Alan Earwaker (who he deliberately called "Mr Earwig"); he questioned my integrity and indicated that I was not welcome at the meeting. From the support that Cllr Ward received from other Councillors it was clear that the Members of the Town Council have no respect for law-abiding members of the public who oppose Councillors' deliberate lawbreaking. Unless Cllr Ward can demonstrate that my words are untrue, I expect a public apology. . The text of my Question and Statement are as follows. (Unfortunately the formatting (underlining and emboldening etc) have been lost in copying it into this comment box) : Question regarding Minutes of 23rd Oct Council where Members agreed to consult upon draft NP Since the Cllr Briefing at WBC on 2 Dec there have been rumours that Waverley, in particular Cranleigh and Farnham, are being lined up to accept housing allocations from London, Woking and Guildford, such that WBC's Local Plan allocation may increase by 2 or three thousand homes above the 'scenarios' that have already been consulted upon (perhaps 11,000 in all, and that Farnham will be targeted to receive the thousands of extra homes. Farnham residents can expect FTC to apply the legal constraints upon development correctly, to ensure the town receives the protection by from being severely compromised by excessive greenfield housing development - protection that Farnham is afforded by law, but which the town is still being denied by local politicking. The draft NP pays lip service to the Habitats and Air Quality constraints that protect Farnham, but proposed a "pragmatic" approach, rather than a lawful approach. To quote from p16 of the draft NP, [NB: only emboldened wording read out] "New housing development at Farnham is currently severely restricted by Special Protection Areas (SPAs) at Thames Basin Heath and Wealden Heaths which are protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives. Adopted regional policy clearly states that</p>	<p>Avoidance Strategy Review 2016. FNP9 to be updated based on up to date evidence. An Appropriate Assessment is to accompany the Reg.15 Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment

Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	<p>priority should be given to directing development to those areas where potential adverse effects can be avoided without the need for mitigation measures. In summary, this would mean that housing development should be directed away from Farnham. Nevertheless, the draft Plan has taken a pragmatic approach which recognises the broad regional policy but also seeks to meet some of the housing need locally.” A recent ruling of the Supreme Court determined that public Consultations must include all the information necessary for the public to reach an informed view of the realistic options available; the Habitats Directive requires an Appropriate Assessment, and in the absence of such an assessment, the only option available to Farnham is strictly limited development in accordance with the Art 6(4) tests of ‘no alternative solutions’ and IROPI. The NP must conform with the NPPF which refers to the Statutory Constraints of Habitats/Waddenzee (para 113 FN24, Circ 06/05). It is plain fact that the draft NP fails to comply with those constraints as it merely assumes that SANG equals legality, without providing the required AA to support that dubious assumption, and without any Art 6(4) justification. Thus there can are no doubt whatsoever that the draft NP and the Consultation are unlawful. The draft NP tells us that the law applies, yet “nevertheless” an unlawful, ‘pragmatic’ approach is proposed. The Questionnaire seeks support for that approach, without outlining the alternative of a lawful, limited Art.6(4) solution. Does this Council accept that it has no authority to conduct a consultation that seeks residents’ support for what is clearly an unlawful approach, and does FTC accept that the consultation must therefore be deemed null and void ? (Agenda Item 4) Statement regarding Minutes of 23rd Oct Council agreement to consult upon draft NP I went through the draft NP to inform my response, due by Mon 15th. I noticed that the ‘timetable’ on p3, in the last of the green green boxes, states, “Winter 2015 > Adoption - Plan given full</p>	

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment

Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	<p>weight by MSDC to determine planning applications if approved at referendum” MSDC? Not WBC ? I briefly wondered whether we’ve obtained independence from Waverley BC, but sadly not. I Googled the phrase used, and found it within the Cuckfield PC NP, Mid-Sussex, nr Tonbridge Wells. I found that the format of FTC’s draft NP, and much of the text, had been cribbed from the Cuckfield NP ; Cuckfield is less than a tenth the size of Farnham, 1476 dwellings (3500 residents) and is planning for 30 new homes to be built over the next 16 years. That’s very different to Farnham’s situation, and hence the approach taken by FTC is in many ways quite inappropriate. Rather than use the constraints that are enshrined in planning law to defend Farnham robustly, it is clear that those constraints have been quite deliberately evaded in order to convince Farnham residents that they must prepare for and accept a substantial proportion of Waverley’s increasing housing allocation. We defeated this in WBC’s first draft CS in November 2006; its Groundhog Day. If Farnham residents knew how this Cuckfield rip-off draft NP is evading the legal constraints by being what the NP calls ‘pragmatic’, I expect there would be a great deal of anger vented. What this Council is doing is quite plainly unlawful. In view of this, and in view of the expectation of a far higher housing allocation being targeted at Farnham, the results of the current consultation will be meaningless. Farnham residents have already suffered eight years of WBC evading the high-level legal constraints that protect Farnham, and unless FTC acts decisively to scrap the unlawful ‘pragmatic’ approach, you will be guilty of deliberately allowing our enviable heritage to be wrecked. It is Christmas, and the most appropriate gift this Council could give to Farnham is a clear confirmation that you are scrapping the pragmatic NP in order to create a lawful one to protect the town. - which residents will happily help with. I simply ask that instead of wasting everyone’s time in pursuit of stuffing Farnham by evading</p>	

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	the law, I ask that this Council demonstrates an intention to instead stuff the turkeys at Waverley that are targeting Farnham, by sending a clear Christmas message that from now on you will be serving Farnham properly, through a New Year Resolution to fully respect the applicable planning law in a revised draft NP.	
Mrs Michelle Quinlan	If money is going to spent on Farnham park, adequate provision should be considered for Litter and dog waste removal Cycle lanes and running tracks Dog and boot wash facilities at ends of park	Such measures would need t be part of detailed mitigation measures at Farnham Park.
Jenny Reynolds	The proposed Neighbourhood Plan seems to be biased towards protecting the part of the town south of the River Wey whereas the retention of the historical character of Farnham itself seems to have been placed in jeopardy by the failure to protect our defining Hopfields in NW Farnham.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence and attempts to meet part of this need within nationally recognised and locally important constraints. Within the 2014 AMEC Landscape review, segment 7 is an extensive area where the capacity for development as a whole is likely to be limited This does not exclude smaller areas within it from development. The review shows the Landscape Value as Medium and the Sensitivity High (although this again is for the wider area).
David Bell	Do not build on Coxbridge farm fields please	
Janine sparks	Just take care of this sensitive part of the country.	Noted.
Stewart Badger	I still remain to be convinced, with actual empirical evidence, that SANGS are fit for purpose. Before greenfield is lost forever, "but it's OK there is a SANG", that actually doesn't materially improve matters. And again to iterate, No to greenfield countryside development, not while there are viable brown sites.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need. The SANG policy is based on the joint Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy, 2013 which is accepted by Natural England and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		Review 2016.
Sarah Denyer-Evans	I still remain concerned that whilst there is a need for affordable housing, I am not sure I would wish to see so many greenfield sites removed from our landscapes with rural and semi rural environments changed forever. I would like to see affordable housing for the children of the future but I do not wish to see them deprived of their countryside. I also still cannot see that house prices locally will allow my children to buy their own property in due. It appears the Housing numbers and drive towards house building is being driven by Central Government policy regardless of whether there is suitable infrastructure in place. It is frightening to think that all these houses are built and then the infrastructure is not able to cope with the influx of people, houses and vehicles.	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the influences of surrounding areas and the need for industry and affordable housing.</p>
Nick Thurston	I find this consultation divisive. The consultation also has a message that says were are going to build anyway. Not one main stream political party represents me my views on preserving our heritage. For a variety of reason this country is too over populated as indeed the whole world is. There are obvious signs the eco systems are straining under the burden of over population i.e. witness declining bee population, destruction of natural habitat, a 60% decline in wild life in this country, over the past ten years, extreme weather, yet still we are stupid enough to continue destroying our environment. It is utterly and completely mad that we are proposing to contribute to this. The bit of madness in my area is that someone somewhere wants build on Waverley Lane Fields despite the fact that 1. The loss of natural habitat for bees is defined as one of the reasons for their decline 2. The location is too far from Farnham 3. The roads around the site are too narrow 4. The are no foot paths near the site 5. The access to Farnham is limited by traffic queues from the level crossing 6. More cars providing more pollution in Farnham. Pollution levels in and around Farnham are already defined as illegal 7. Ancient woodland is on the site. 8.	

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
	There is a flood zone at the bottom of the site 9. Roads are clogged enough as it is around this area 10. There is enough pressure already on school places already An environmental scientist/academic was once asked what is the best advice you can give someone concerned about protecting themselves from environmental changes - all he could say was " Don't be under forty"	
Pamela Pownall	Presence of ancient woodland in Waverley Lane fields is omitted from your list of ancient woodland sites.	The FHLAA identifies the presence of ancient woodland on this site.
Simon Johnson	It is important not to let Farnham sprawl out across the surrounding countryside. All development should be on brown fields sites, never on green fields around the edge of the town.	The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
Martin Angel	It is important that all proposed developments of >10 units should be supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment conducted at a suitable time of year. Maintaining and even enhancing the biodiversity of the Town is very important. Consideration should be given to developing Farnham as an Urban Area of Biodiversity Opportunity.	The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity.
Andrew Kilpatrick	We must maintain the quality of our locality at all costs	Noted.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
Nigel Bourne	I note that the councillors responsible for the local plan all live in south Farnham and that both the large scale green space developments they propose are in north west Farnham. Some of these people previously came to see the residents of north west Farnham at the church on Three Stiles Road and gave assurance that they would help to ensure that the Beavers Hop Fields would be protected. These people should be ashamed of themselves as it is clear that they have been self-serving and corrupt, ensuring that their own areas would be protected first. They should look to their consciences and ensure that the proposed built up area is adjusted to exclude the Beavers Hop fields. Just because they have run a consultation and the vast number of South Farnham residents have outvoted those in the North West does not mean that development is right. It is their very great responsibility to future generations to consider the bigger picture. If they don't feel able to do this then they should resign from the committee or prepare for a very unpleasant fight with their North West Farnham residents. As yourself the question - can you live with your decision to build over thousands of years of Farnham heritage and millions of years of Natural Beauty? Can you?	The Town Council is responsible for the Neighbourhood Plan. Part of the area to the west of Farnham Castle is considered as a suitable option for housing development and now has planning permission. The housing allocation on land to the rear of Three Styles Road is proposed to be deleted from the Neighbourhood Plan.
Steve Smith	Always build on brown field sites first. Only build where there is adequate capacity on the existing roads and on the likely traffic routes on to the main arteries	The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
Thomas Clayton	Any additional development where possible should not extend Farnham's boundaries into Greenfield sites. Brownfield sites should be developed first and greenfield should not be considered until the latest possible time. The Farnham traffic problems should be resolved before developments of significant size (greater than 50 properties) are given the go ahead.	The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
Mrs P Boxall	Flooding in Badshot Lea. If any build was to go ahead in Badshot Lea how would this problem be overcome? What are your plans?	Noted. Policies FNP8 and FNPI0 apply. No change to the flood plain designations are proposed and Policy FNPI also seeks to ensure that proposals will not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding itself, and will not result in any increased risk of flooding elsewhere.
Kelvin Forster	The plan should seek to enhance cohesive and sustainable development within the settled boundaries whilst maintaining the rural character of the outlying areas, protecting wildlife habitat and green spaces and avoiding further urbanisation. Development outside of the existing settled boundaries should be severely limited.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the need for additional development based on up to date evidence but attempts to retain the distinctive character of the town.
John Elliott	Although I have agreed each of the sites listed to ensure Farnham has a contingency of sites to comply with the local plan. I am opposed to all planning applications on individual Green field sites until I am convinced that development on Green field is absolutely necessary	The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
Helena Adams	I would like to see us developing sites which are already residential/business use rather than digging up grass.	The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.
matt perry	do not build in the rural areas around rowledge or frensham	The Neighbourhood Plan uses the most recent evidence base and takes account of the NPPF. Policy FNP7 seeks to protect and enhance the countryside and Policy FNP8 seeks to prevent coalescence between Farnham and Aldershot; Badshot Lea and Weybourne; Rowledge and Wrecclesham and Rowledge and Frensham. The

Other comments related to the Natural and Built Environment		
Respondent	Representation	Response (Bold text indicates recommended amendments to text)
		gap between Boundstone and Rowledge should also be protected in Policy FNP 8.
Alan Holroyd	We should use brown field sites only.	The Neighbourhood Plan supports the use of appropriate brownfield sites for development but National Planning Policy Framework does not support the sequential approach of brownfield before greenfield sites for development where there is housing need.