

Planning Inquiry Decisions 95/0879 and 95/0980

References made to paragraphs:

- 63 Proposed satellite parking and CPZ (have not been introduced)
- 75 Typical Football crowds then 1,900
- 124-130 Impact on amenity of scheme



WESTFIELD AVE. 95/0879
GOLDSWORTH RD. 95/0980

GOVERNMENT OFFICE
FOR THE SOUTH EAST

The Borough Secretary
Woking Borough Council
Civic Offices
Gloucester Square
Woking
Surrey GU21 1YL

Surrey, East & West
Sussex Area Team

Bridge House
1 Walnut Tree Close
Guildford
GU1 4GA

Switchboard: 01483 882255
Tel: 01483 882
Fax: 01483 7882
GTN: 301349

13 NOV 1997

Our Ref: APP/A3655/96/265157 & SEP/21/A3655/01
Your Ref: DA/Westfield

Date: 12 November 1997

Dear Sir

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 - SECTIONS 77 & 78
APPLICATION BY CONRAD PHOENIX PROPERTIES LTD AND TESCO STORES LTD
- LAND AT WESTFIELD AVENUE/KINGFIELD ROAD, WOKING.
APPEAL BY HUNTING GATE DEVELOPMENTS, RAILTRACK PLC AND LINKSIDE
PROPERTIES LTD - LAND AT GOLDSWORTH ROAD, WOKING**

1. I am directed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to say that consideration has been given to the report of the Inspector, Mr Richard A Morday BA(HONS) MCD MRTPI, who held an inquiry into:

A) an appeal by Hunting Gate Developments Ltd, Railtrack plc and Linkside Properties Limited under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against the failure of Woking Borough Council to give within the prescribed period notice of its decision on an application for the demolition of existing buildings, alteration of levels, erection of Class A1 retail store 5510 sq. m (gross) including crèche, coffee shop, dry cleaners and associated facilities and 560 space surface level customer car park with an additional 7 spaces for staff use, petrol filling station and car wash, replacement showroom, workshop and display facilities for Inchcape Toyota and associated car parking including a new access road and alteration to highway adjacent to the site at Goldsworth Road, Woking; and

B) an application made by Conrad Phoenix Properties Ltd and Tesco Stores Ltd to the Woking Borough Council for planning permission for the construction of a community foodstore with associated parking and servicing, road improvements to Kingfield Road and Westfield Avenue and construction of a community park and flood relief measures on land at Westfield Avenue/Kingfield Road, Woking. The Secretary of State directed in pursuance of section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that the application be referred to him instead of being dealt with by the local planning authority, Woking Borough Council.



GOVERNMENT OFFICE
FOR THE SOUTH EAST

2. A copy of the Inspector's report of the inquiry is enclosed and his conclusions are annexed to this letter. He recommended for SITE A - Goldsworth Road, that the appeal be allowed and that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and provided that an appropriate Agreement between the Council and the applicants is completed, and for SITE B - Westfield Tip, that the application be refused.

3. Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires that proposals shall be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Secretary of State shares the Inspector's views in paragraph 105 of his report on the weight which should be afforded to the adopted and emerging Structure Plan and Local Plan, and the County Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance.

4. The Secretary of State has given very careful consideration to the Inspector's report and to all the arguments put forward for and against the proposals. He agrees with the Inspector's view in paragraph 104 of his report that the main considerations in both these cases are the effect upon the vitality and viability of the proposals on Woking town centre and other smaller centres; the effect of the proposals on the highway network and traffic conditions together with the availability of alternative forms of transport and the possibility of linked transport trips; the implication of the proposals in relation to employment provision; the likely impact upon the amenity of those living in the vicinity of the two sites; and in respect of the Westfield Tip proposal alone; its impact upon the Hoe Valley and the problem of contamination.

5. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's conclusions at paragraphs 106 to 135 of his report on the site specific considerations of both the Goldsworth Road and the Westfield Tip sites. As regards the Goldsworth Road site, he shares the Inspector's view that the site should be regarded as located at the edge of Woking town centre and he accepts that there is no suitable site in the town centre. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that a food superstore as proposed would give rise to linked trips to the primary shopping centre and contribute to the regeneration of the area as well as helping to maintain the vitality of the Town Centre as a whole, all in accord with national retail guidance. He further agrees with the Inspector that the proposal accords with adopted development plans, and that little weight can be afforded to the allocation of the site for employment purposes in the emerging Local Plan Review. Like the Inspector, the Secretary of State is not convinced by the evidence that there is a genuine shortage of employment land. He is satisfied, for the reasons given by the Inspector, that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its impact on traffic and on the amenity of those living nearby.

6. As for the Westfield Tip proposal, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the site is clearly out-of-centre, and would not lead to linked trips with the Town Centre. The proposal does accord with the Structure Plan in that it would not lead to an overprovision of retail floorspace but there is conflict with the Plan in that a location on the edge of the Town centre is possible. The Secretary of State accepts that the proposal would not conflict with the basic shopping policy of the adopted Local Plan if the various advantages put forward by the applicants and the Borough



GOVERNMENT OFFICE
FOR THE SOUTH EAST

Council were accepted to be the very special circumstances needed to justify out-of-centre locations. It is noted that the site is identified as a possible location for a foodstore in the Review of the Local Plan but the Secretary of State shares the Inspector's view that this has arisen largely as a result of the present proposal and should be assessed on that basis.

7. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the proposal would bring improvements in overall highway conditions, and the removal of contaminated land, together with substantial improvements to that part of the Hoe Valley between the proposed store and the southern boundary of the application site. However, he also agrees with the Inspector that although the scheme has substantial benefits, these are overridden, for the reasons set out in paragraphs 124 to 130 of his report, by the very significant detrimental impact upon the amenity of those living nearby, aggravating an already unsatisfactory situation. He shares the Inspector's views in paragraphs 132 to 134 of his report that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the Hoe Valley, contrary to Structure and Local Plan policies. The Secretary of State therefore agrees with the Inspector that the scheme would not meet the criteria which constitute the very special circumstances required by the Local Plan to justify out-of-centre locations.

8. Turning to the Inspector's conclusions on a comparison of the two schemes, the Secretary of State accepts the need in Woking for one additional large foodstore and that this would reduce outflow of expenditure and travel; further, that there is no suitable site in the town centre. However, he agrees with the Inspector, for the reasons given by him, that in terms of PPG6 and development plan retail policies, Goldsworth Road has clear advantages. The Secretary of State also agrees with the Inspector that the Westfield Tip proposal is likely to have an unacceptably detrimental impact upon the vitality and viability of the Kingfield Neighbourhood Shopping Centre contrary to PPG6 and development plan policies. As the Inspector says, neither project has an overriding advantage in terms of PPG13.

9. For the reasons given above, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's conclusions and accepts his recommendations. Since the inquiry Surrey County Council have forwarded a copy of the completed agreement in respect of the Goldsworth Road site between the County Council, Safeway Stores plc, ITMR Limited and Railtrack plc relating to improvement works of the highway at Goldsworth Road/Cherry Street, Woking. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the terms of the agreement meet the test of reasonableness in Circular 16/91, and that the payments required are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. He agrees with the Inspector's conclusion in paragraph 148 of his report about the conditions which should be imposed on any grant of permission for this site.

10. Accordingly, the Secretary of State hereby:

(i) refuses permission for the construction of a community foodstore with associated parking and servicing, road improvements to Kingfield Road and Westfield Avenue and construction of a community park and flood relief measures on land at Westfield Avenue/Kingfield Road, Woking (application number 95/0879); and



GOVERNMENT OFFICE
FOR THE SOUTH EAST

(ii) allows the appeal by Hunting Gate Developments Ltd, Railtrack plc and Linkside Properties Limited and hereby grants outline planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings, alteration of levels and the erection of a Class A1 retail store of 5510 square metres gross floor area, including crèche, coffee shop, dry cleaners and associated facilities and 560 space surface level customer car park with an additional 7 spaces for staff use, petrol filling station, replacement car showroom, workshop and display facilities for Inchape Toyota and associated car parking, the provision of a new access road and off-site highway improvements in accordance with application number 95/0980 and accompanying drawings, subject to the following conditions:

1. approval of the details of the design and external appearance of the Class A1 retail store, the car showroom, workshop and display facilities, and the petrol filling station buildings, and the landscaping of each of that part of the site (hereinafter called " the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the local planning authority in writing before that part of the development is commenced;
2. application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission;
3. the development hereby permitted should be begun either before the expiration of 5 years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later;
4. the Class A1 retail store shall not commence trading until a means of access for vehicular traffic, pedestrians and cyclists has been constructed in accordance with the approved plans;
5. development shall not begin until details of the access to the site by construction vehicles have been approved in writing by the local planning authority;
6. the proposed ground levels of the development shall be in accordance with the illustrative site layout plan reference no. 9422.10E;
7. details of the retaining walls and embankments separating the site from the railway tracks to the south shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority before any development is commenced, and no part of the development shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the approved details;
8. details of surface treatment and lighting to the access road and parking areas shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority, and the works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted;
9. no part of the development shall be occupied until details of both hard and soft landscaping works have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority and



GOVERNMENT OFFICE
FOR THE SOUTH EAST

these works have been carried out as approved in accordance with a programme agreed with the local planning authority;

10. no part of the development shall be occupied until a schedule of landscape maintenance has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority;

11. a tree survey shall be carried out indicating the species, height and general condition of each tree and a plan indicating which existing trees are to be removed and which are to be retained. This information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development;

12. where a tree is to be retained, details shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development indicating how it will be protected during the construction period;

13. no part of the development shall be occupied for trading until drainage works have been carried out in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority;

14. prior to the opening of the Class A1 retail store for trading, details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in respect of the location of bus stops, cycle parking bays, "mobility" and "comfort" standard parking provisions and any recycling facilities to be included within the development;

15. details of the boundary treatment and securing of the Class A1 retail store service area shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the opening of the Class A1 retail store for trading;

16. before the use of the proposed car wash commences, it shall be acoustically insulated in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved by the local planning authority;

17. before the petrol filling station and car wash are opened for use, details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in respect of surfacing of the forecourt areas, the proposed lighting of the forecourt and canopy;

18. prior to the opening of the car showroom, workshop and display facilities for trading, details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in respect of the surfacing of parking and display areas, fencing and lighting and the works shall carried out in accordance with the approved details;

19. as part of the development, a sign board providing details and information relating to the Goldsworth Road Neighbourhood Shopping Centre shall be erected on the site. Details of the siting, construction and display of the signboard shall be submitted to and approved



GOVERNMENT OFFICE
FOR THE SOUTH EAST

in writing by the local planning authority, shall be carried out as approved, shall be erected before the opening of the Class A1 retail store for trading and shall be retained thereafter;

20. the petrol filling station shall not be open for business, nor shall supplies of fuel be delivered thereto outside the hours of 07.00 to 22.00 hours;

11. An applicant for any consent, agreement or approval required by a condition of this approval has a statutory right of appeal to the Secretary of State if consent, agreement or approval is refused or granted conditionally or if the authority fail to give notice of their decision within the prescribed period.

12. The developer's attention is also drawn to the enclosed note relating to the requirements of the Building regulations 1991 with respect to access for disabled people.

13. This letter does not convey any approval or consent which may be required under any enactment, bye-law, order or regulation other than section 57 of the town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Yours faithfully



MISS J R POOL

Authorised by the Secretary of State for the Environment
to sign in that behalf

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

SECTION 77 & SECTION 78

WOKING BOROUGH COUNCIL

APPLICATION

BY

CONRAD PHOENIX PROPERTIES LIMITED AND TESCO STORES LIMITED

APPEAL

BY

HUNTING GATE DEVELOPMENTS, RAILTRACK PLC AND
LINKSIDE PROPERTIES LIMITED

Inspector: Richard A Mordey BA(HONS) MCD MRTPI

Date of Inquiry: 11-14, 18-21 February, 11-14 March, 15-16 April 1997

File Numbers: SEP/21/A3655/01 & APP/A3655/A/96/265157

Tollgate House,
Houlton Street,
Bristol,
BS2 9DJ

July 1997

To the Right Honourable John Prescott MP
Secretary of State for the Environment

Sir,

PREAMBLE

1. I have the honour to report that between 11 February and 16 April, I held a public inquiry (in place of Mr Michael Shaw) at the Civic Offices, Gloucester Square, Woking into the following:-

A) an appeal by Hunting Gate Developments Limited, Railtrack PLC and Linkside Properties Limited under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against the failure of the Woking Borough Council to give within the prescribed period notice of its decision on an application for the demolition of existing buildings, alteration of levels, erection of Class A1 retail store 5510 sq m (gross) including creche, coffee shop, dry cleaners and associated facilities and 560 space surface level customer car park with an additional 7 spaces for staff use, petrol filling station and car wash, replacement showroom, workshop and display facilities for Inchcape Toyota and associated car parking including a new access road and alteration to highway adjacent to the site at Goldsworth Road, Woking.

2. The appeal was recovered for determination by the Secretary of State by a direction made on 2 August 1996 for the reason that it would be most efficiently and effectively decided simultaneously with a called-in application.

3. B) an application made by Conrad Phoenix Properties Limited and Tesco Stores Limited to the Woking Borough Council, for planning permission for the construction of a community foodstore with associated parking and servicing, road improvements to Kingfield Road and Westfield Avenue and construction of a community park and flood relief measures on land at Westfield Avenue/Kingfield Road, Woking.

4. The application was called in for decision by a direction made under Section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 dated 3 July 1996, for the reasons that the Secretary of State wished to be satisfied that due regard is had to Government policy with regard to town centres and retail development as well as to all other material considerations, and on the information available at the time the following were the matters about which he particularly wished to be informed for the purpose of his consideration of the application:

a) the relationship of the proposal with relevant development plan policies;

- b) the relationship of the proposal to Government policy on town centres and retail development;
- c) the relationship of the proposal to Government policy on transport;
- d) the likely effect of the proposal on the amenity of the surrounding area;
- e) the likely effect of the proposal on the Hoe Valley;
- f) whether any planning permission granted should be subject to certain conditions and, if so, the form they should take.

5. I firstly heard evidence relating to the appeal (A) as this was principally concerned with shopping and highway matters. I then heard evidence on similar matters in relation to the called-in application (B) and subsequently proceeded to other issues. I have also reported on that basis. There was a considerable degree of overlap between the evidence relating to the two cases. I carried out an accompanied visit to Site A on 17 February and an accompanied visit to Site B on 10 March. I also undertook a series of unaccompanied visits to the areas around the two sites as well as to Woking Town Centre. On 14, 15 and 17 April I visited a number of stores and shopping centres in and around Woking some of which were suggested by the parties. On 8 January I held a Pre-Inquiry meeting in the Civic Offices at which various procedural matters were resolved.

6. Lists of appearances, inquiry documents and core documents which include plans and photographs, are attached to my report. References to paragraphs, as well as to listed documents are given in parenthesis.

BACKGROUND

SITES AND SURROUNDINGS

SITE A - GOLDSWORTH ROAD

7. The appeal site is located to the south west of Woking Town Centre (Doc.48 - TPC2). The easternmost section of its boundary runs close to the south-western part of the Town Centre Inset as defined in the adopted Woking Borough Local Plan (CD2). It has an area of some 4.15ha and is irregular in shape. The western part of the site consists of railway sidings. Towards the north there is an assortment of buildings, some of which are portable, together with structures and some rolling stock. A footpath runs along the northern boundary of this part of the appeal site separating it from the long rear gardens of dwellings fronting Kingsway. Further east beyond the footpath is the cul-de-sac known as Kingsway Avenue. The dwellings here stand at a lower level than the sidings. To the west, on the other side of the footpath, are the much shorter rear gardens of houses in De Lara Way. These are at a higher level than the sidings. Trees and shrubs line these two boundaries. More sidings and the main line railway lie to the south.

8. The north eastern sector of the appeal site fronts onto Goldsworth Road and is currently occupied by car showrooms and workshop together with an open area used for the

storage and parking of vehicles. Goldsworth Road runs north west-south east. It is occupied by a variety of uses, including specialist shops, restaurants and offices.

9. The eastern part of the site consists of the premises and yard of a former bakery which at the time of my visit were vacant. These front to Cherry Street. The sidings stand at a higher level, some 6-7m, above this area and that described in paragraph 8 above. The land beyond the site to the east is occupied by a number of commercial, industrial and storage buildings. The western edge of the prime shopping area of Woking is located some 414m to the east along Goldsworth Road, separated from the latter by Victoria Way which functions as an inner ring road (Doc.41, CD2 & Doc.48 - TPC5).

SITE B - WESTFIELD TIP

10. The application site is situated in a predominantly residential area to the south of the town centre of Woking. Its northern extremity is nearly 600m south of the southernmost edge of the Town Centre Inset as defined in the adopted Woking Borough Local Plan and about 1300m from the edge of the defined Shopping Core (CD2). It has an area of approximately 6.72ha and is very roughly rectangular in shape (CD19).

11. On the northern part of the site there is a group of mainly single storey buildings occupied by various organisations including the St Johns Ambulance Brigade, the Boy Scouts Association and the Girl Guides. Beyond these, to the south, is a hard surfaced area formerly used as a highway yard. Immediately to the west and east is an unevenly raised area which was previously used by the Borough Council as a tip.

12. Much of the southern part of the application site was previously used as allotment gardens. There has been a considerable amount of casual tipping. There is also evidence of digging for bottles. There are a substantial number of trees and shrubs of varying quality largely around the edges of the site (Doc.52).

13. The western boundary is formed by the Hoe Stream which flows in a series of meanders towards the north east. Across the stream from the northern end of the site the gardens of properties in Turnoak Avenue and Hawthorn Close adjoin the western bank. Further south there is an area of grassland beyond which is an extensive area of housing. The short south western boundary consists of a chain link fence alongside which is a public footpath connecting two housing areas. Westwards is a small piece of public open space (Doc.52).

14. The southern/eastern boundary consists of various types of fencing. A footpath runs alongside for almost the whole length of the application site. Towards the northern end the footpath joins Westfield Avenue which links with Kingfield Road which forms the northern boundary. A substantial suburban housing area lies to the east. Beyond the northern end of the site behind the bungalows which front Westfield Avenue, is Woking Town Football Club with a series of spectator stands. The southernmost of the latter is of recent construction and rises to some 15m (Doc.52 - Photo.6). Behind this to the south is the Chris Lane Centre, a tennis and fitness club. To the north of the application site is Woking Park which includes buildings used for leisure activities, the Pool in the Park and the Woking Leisure Centre.

THE PROPOSALS

SITE A - GOLDSWORTH ROAD

15. The appeal application is in outline with all matters reserved with the exception of siting and the means of access. Illustrative drawings indicate that the proposed store would be a single storey building located towards the eastern end of the sidings to the south of Kingsway Avenue (Doc.48). It would have a sales area of 3066 sq m. The car parking area would be to the west in the remainder of the sidings with the store entrance facing. The proposed car showroom and workshop is shown sited to the east of the store. The petrol filling station together with a small motor show case would be sited in the northern part of the site.

16. Road access would be via Goldsworth Road at its junction with Poole Road and Vale Farm Road where a new roundabout would be constructed. The access road into the site would be a dual carriageway off the roundabout leading to a second roundabout within the appeal site. This would enable traffic from Poole Road, which would become one way, to turn eastwards. The access road would continue past the store into the car park. The proposals would involve the regrading of the land so that a large part of the sidings would be lowered.

SITE B - WESTFIELD TIP

17. The application proposals are in detail and involve the demolition of the community buildings at the northern end of the site (CD19). It is proposed that the area where the community buildings currently stand would be occupied by some 385 car parking spaces with the store immediately to the south. The latter would be single storey with a sales area of 2713 sq m. with the main entrance facing towards the car park and Kingfield Road.

18. Development of the store would involve the removal of tipped material and the reduction of the ground level by between 0.5m and 4.5m. The level of the car park area would also be lowered. A detailed landscape scheme was submitted as part of the planning application (CD19). A roundabout is proposed at the junction of Kingfield Road and Westfield Avenue providing access to the site with a modification of the Wych Hill Lane/Claremont Avenue junction, and the carriageway widening over existing bridges .

19. The application also includes proposals for the creation of a wetland community park in the southern section of the site. This would also provide floodplain compensation. A new woodland area is proposed along the south eastern boundary of the site together with new and improved footpaths and a new footbridge across the Hoe Stream. There would be a small parking area and picnic facility to the north of the wetlands.

LOCAL PLANNING POLICIES

20. The relevant development plans are the Surrey Structure Plan which was approved in 1994 and the Woking Borough Local Plan which was adopted in 1993 (CD's 1,2 & 4).

21. Policies DP15, 16 and 17 of the Structure Plan are concerned respectively with the provision of retail floor space, retail development outside town centres and the role of town centres. All are relevant to both cases. Policy PE6 which is concerned with the safeguarding and enhancement of the quality, amenities and environmental value of river corridors within urban and rural areas is relevant to the Westfield Tip site. The southern section of the latter lies within the Surrey Green Belt. Consequently, Policies PE1 and 2 apply. The Structure Plan is now under review, one of the aims being to bring retailing policies into line with revised PPG6. Supplementary Planning Guidance dealing with Policy DP16 (Retailing Developments Outside Town Centres) in the light of changes in Government Guidance was adopted by the County Council in 1996 (CD1).

22. The Woking Borough Local Plan was adopted at the end of 1993 (CD2). Policy SHP1 of the Local Plan seeks to maintain and strengthen the existing pattern of shopping in the Borough and is relevant to both the Goldsworth Road and the Westfield Tip sites. The reasoned justification to the policy indicates that in very exceptional circumstances superstores may be permitted in appropriate out-of-centre locations. The Goldsworth Road site is unallocated on the Proposals Map. All but the north east corner of the Westfield Tip site where it is proposed to place the store and car park is included in a defined River Corridor whilst the southern two thirds is included in the Green Belt. Policies GRB 1 and 2 therefore apply, as does ENV13 which aims to preserve and enhance the visual character of the Hoe Stream.

23. The First Review of the Local Plan was placed on deposit in November 1996. Shopping Policy SHP1 seeks to maintain and reinforce the shopping pattern of the town and SHP2 aims to control major out of centre retail development. The justification to the latter policy refers to a recent shopping study of the Borough which indicates that Westfield Tip is identified as a suitable site for a food superstore (CD12). Green Belt Policy GRB1 seeks to control development in the Green Belt and NE6 is intended to protect the Hoe Valley.

24. Site A is allocated as an industrial site in the Proposals Map of the Review. Consequently several employment policies would apply as well as Policies DP1:1-14 of the Structure Plan. Site B is shown as Green Belt and River Corridor with the exception of the north east section and a strip along the Hoe Stream. The Local Plan Issues Report of October 1995 proposed to extend the Town Centre boundary to include the appeal site. Other policies are mentioned in the Council's pre-Inquiry statement. I refer to these as and when necessary.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

SITE A - GOLDSWORTH ROAD

25. An application in respect of the former bakery site for the retention of the existing workshop, warehouse and offices and the construction of three units for B1 and B8 use was approved in March 1992. Otherwise applications have related to minor matters. Applications in respect of the car sales site have also been for minor development. There is no relevant history in respect of the sidings (Doc.48 - App.8).

SITE B - WESTFIELD TIP

26. A series of applications relating to the northern part of the site have been submitted by the Council in recent years but these have not been determined (Doc.55). Planning permission has been granted for the construction of replacement community buildings within Woking Park (Doc. 48 - App.21 & Doc. 60 - App.4).

THE RETAIL SITUATION IN WOKING

27. Woking Town Centre is classified, along with four others, Camberley, Epsom, Redhill and Staines, as a Group 2 - Major Town Centre in the Surrey Structure Plan (CD1). Guildford is the only superior centre in the County hierarchy being classified as a Regional Centre. Retailing in Woking Town Centre is dominated by the Wolsey Centre which was opened in the 1970's and the more recent Peacocks Centre, opened in the early 1990's. Both contain a high proportion of branches of national multiples. The Wolsey Centre includes a branch of J. Sainsbury's of some 1380 sq m net sales area. A Marks and Spencers' food hall of 750sq m is located in the Peacocks Centre. These are the only convenience foodstores in Woking Town Centre. An Asda superstore of 2860 sq m closed in 1994. The Town Centre shopping area is tightly contained by the railway to the south, Victoria Way to the north and west, and by office and entertainment developments to the east (CD2).

28. The adopted Local Plan identifies nineteen Neighbourhood Shopping Centres (CD2). The most significant of these can be classified as district shopping centres in terms of Annex A of PPG6 and are located north, west and north east of the Town Centre (Doc. 55-RJF3). Two of these, Goldsworth Park and West Byfleet, contain large foodstores. Several freestanding superstores are located at a distance from Woking Town Centre, to the west, north-east and south.

29. Although specific calculations vary, there is agreement between the appellants, the applicants and the Borough Council that there is a significant outflow of expenditure on food to stores situated outside Woking's primary catchment area particularly to the south to Guildford (CD's 12 & 13, Docs.48-App.23, 55-App.4, 57 & Doc.17). There will be a growth in the volume of convenience expenditure. It is also agreed between those three parties that there is both a qualitative and a quantitative need in Woking for one additional large foodstore to serve the central and southern parts of the Borough and that there are no suitable sites in Woking Town Centre (Doc.48 - APP.13).

THE CASE FOR THE APPELLANTS - SITE A - GOLDSWORTH ROAD

The material points are:-

30. In terms of Government and local policy the Goldsworth Road site is clearly preferable to Westfield Tip in that it is closer to the Town Centre, closest to the primary shopping area and would result in meaningful non-car linkage to the Town Centre.

31. The appeal site is not strictly speaking on the edge of centre in that it is more than 300m from the primary shopping area. However it is on the edge of the Town Centre as defined in the adopted Local Plan. The front of the site is within the Town Centre as shown

on the Deposit Draft Local Plan of 1996 but it was all included in the Town Centre in the Local Plan Review Issues Report which preceded it (CD4).

32. It would be just over 600m from the store door to the primary shopping area. It was stated on behalf of the Council that 10 minutes amounts to a comfortable walking distance for food shoppers. At a speed of 1.2m per second a shopper would cover 720m. The walk is level along wide footways through a busy mixed commercial area (Docs.5, 48 - TPC5 & 55). The crossing of Victoria Way with its two pedestrian crossings is not a barrier to linkage which is a clear possibility. The latter was accepted on behalf of the Council. Recent appeal decisions support this approach (Doc.48 - Apps.16 & 17).

33. There are only a few vacant units on Goldsworth Road and there is a reasonable level of pedestrian activity. Since the strengthening of the primary shopping area there has been some decline in the retail function of Goldsworth Road which is defined as a neighbourhood shopping centre in the adopted plan (Doc.13 & CD2). The intention is to maintain its retail character. The present proposals would undoubtedly enhance the commercial functions of the area and would also assist the objectives of regeneration contained in the Deposit Draft.

34. On the question of need there is no real difference between the two sites. The railway is not a barrier to movement as was suggested at the Inquiry (Doc.57 - App.B). The appeal site is well located to stem the substantial leakage to Sainsbury's store at Knaphill which is only 2-2.5 minutes away by car. Safeway are anxious to gain representation in Woking and have bought a section of the appeal site. They will meet the identified need with a high quality operation with a full range of goods and facilities. These would include a filling station which would not be available on the Westfield site. Convenient, low priced petrol is an important element of modern convenience retailing.

35. Overall, development at Goldsworth Road would not pose problems of detrimental impact on vitality and viability of existing centres. There would be some limited effect upon Goldsworth Park but, as was acknowledged on behalf of Tesco, not sufficient to justify refusal. Because of its proximity, there would also be some impact upon Sainsbury's in the Wolsey Centre. However, that store is trading well over the company average and is frequently crowded and its viability would not be threatened (Doc.48 - App.23 & Doc.40). The proposal would pull trade from peripheral areas and would help to strengthen both the Town Centre and Goldsworth Road itself. This would accord with paragraph 1.1 of PPG6 as well as with the Structure and Local Plans. This would not be the case with the Westfield Tip site.

36. On PPG13, the County Council has raised no objections. On consultation the County Council as Highway Authority had no objections to the proposal subject to the completion of a legal agreement and the imposition of appropriate conditions (CD9 & Doc.62). Because it is in an edge of centre location it is bound to be closer to the greatest density of buses since the town centre tends to be the focus of routes. The PTAL approach indicates a positive advantage in terms of accessibility to bus services (Doc.49). Neither of the two sites show any advantage for cycle users. There would be a slight advantage in favour of the Westfield site as far as overall travel reduction is concerned.

37. The Borough Council raised a last minute objection on the grounds of loss of employment land after the Rule 6 Statement was issued. It has been known that the site was surplus since 1994. At the time of consideration of the appeal application, officers of the Council stated that the proposal would create significant employment opportunities and pointed out that the former bakery on the site had been vacant for at least 7 years despite marketing. It was considered that there were sufficient grounds for departing from policy (CD9).

38. The County Council in consultation pointed out that Structure Plan Policy DP10 states that, whilst the loss of existing suitably located industrial and commercial land to other uses will normally be resisted, on sites near to town centres there may be occasions where changes to another use, such as retail, could be acceptable (Doc.48 - App.4). It was concluded that given the site's characteristics and that both the proposed retail use and car-showrooms would generate jobs, this loss could be justified.

39. On 9 September 1996 it was proposed that the land should be allocated as EMP 10 in the Review of the Local Plan. The only change in circumstances which it has been possible to identify was the current Inquiry and the Council's support for the Westfield site. EMP 10 is now subject to objection (Doc.48 - App.10). At the present time, the site provides some employment at the garage and 25 jobs on the sidings; Safeway would provide some 286. It is unlikely that the site would create the same number of jobs if developed under EMP 10 due to the proximity of the main line railway and the levels of the land. Paragraph 7.41 of the Deposit Draft states that it would also be suitable for car parking in accordance with Policy WTC21 which indicates a preference for sites in, or close to, the western part of the centre (CD4). This indicates that the Council regards the site as being close to the Town Centre.

40. If it were to be used for employment, take-up in the short to medium term would be extremely unlikely. There is sufficient Class B employment land and premises, some 30,813m, to meet the anticipated needs of industrialists. This includes the land that will be released as a result of the recent planning permission granted to Mclarens following a public inquiry (Doc.45). There is a substantial amount of excess office floorspace which is suitable and likely to be developed for non-B1(a) employment uses (Doc.50 & CD7). Opportunities are coming forward to re-evaluate and re-cycle existing buildings and sites. The appeal site is also poorly located in relation to the main road network and it adjoins residential areas. A store on the appeal site would be more acceptable in relation to the latter than some uses which might arise as a result of an employment allocation. Although there is no guarantee that the sidings could be used for freight delivery or the movement of spoil, the appellants would be willing to consider this if it were found to be economically feasible. However this would be dependent upon the freight distribution company, English, Welsh and Southern Rail Ltd. A condition to this effect would be too onerous. A foodstore would make a significant contribution to employment and as an inspector stated in a report in respect of an appeal relating to a proposal for a superstore at Tooting Bec, all jobs are valuable to those who take them (Doc.48 - App.26).

THE CASES FOR THOSE SUPPORTING THE PROPOSAL

THE CASE FOR SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

The material points are:-

41. The proposal satisfies the requirements of Structure Plan Policies DP15 and DP16. It would not lead to an over-provision of retail floor space. The site is on the edge of Woking Town Centre and would function as such. Paragraph 3.14 of PPG6 is not intended to be applied rigidly and although not ideal, the Goldsworth Road site is within an acceptable walking distance of the centre. In terms of the latter it is the best available site. Paragraph 4.14 of RPG9 points to the dense network of town centres in the South East which serves it well for shopping and states that these should be the focus for retail development. This applies particularly to Surrey and questions the justification for such development which is not in or adjoining town centres. It is also possible from the edge of the appeal site to see a very clear and well defined route to the shopping core through an important transitional area.

42. Goldsworth Road presents the best available opportunity for a large food store to promote choice and competition within Woking Town Centre in terms of its vitality and viability. There is no doubt that it is more likely than the Westfield Tip site to sustain and enhance the centre because of its potential to generate linked trips. Such trips need not necessarily involve two types of shopping but convenience shopping and another type of transaction or purpose for visiting. A superstore in this location would restore choice and competition to the centre which has seen the loss of Asda.

43. Although it is claimed that the railway is seen as a barrier, turnover and trade diversion estimates show significant amounts of expenditure moving both north and south of the lines both now and in the future (Docs.40 & 57 - App.B). The area is well served by bus routes. A County Council sponsored access bus would make the store accessible to the elderly and disabled. Although it does not fulfill all the criteria of paragraph 1.8 of PPG13 it comes much closer to doing so than Westfield Tip, mainly because of its proximity to the Woking Town Centre. The Council as Highway Authority has no objections to the proposal subject to the completion of an agreement and the imposition of conditions (Docs.62, 73 & 74).

44. The Borough Council is keeping its options open. When reporting in respect of a duplicate application for development of the Goldsworth Road site, officers advised that it might be necessary to reconsider that proposal in view of the decision which was still to be made on the Westfield site (CD11). This indicates that there is no overriding objection as far as the Council is concerned to retail development on the appeal site by reason of emerging local plan policy or development control.

THE CASE FOR THE SURREY CPRE AND THE HOE VALLEY AND KINGFIELD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

The material points are:-

45. It is a matter of commonsense that the Goldsworth Road site is better related to Woking Town Centre than the Westfield Tip site and this is reflected in both the adopted and

the emerging Local Plan. Although not ideal, it goes a long way to meeting the sequential test and there would be a definite possibility of linked trips. It is considered that the need for a new store is overstated and there is no absolute need in that there are ten large foodstores within ten minutes of the centre of Woking. Nevertheless, Goldsworth Road has an overriding advantage in terms of fostering sustainable development based upon the town centre.

THE CASE FOR INTERESTED PERSONS

A number of local residents and businesses supported the proposal by means of written representations (Doc.70). The material points are:-

46. There is a need for a new foodstore in or near the centre of Woking. With the closing of Asda there is now only Sainsbury's which is too crowded. People need convenience and choice. The Council has tried to attract another and this is the opportunity. The closure of the Co-op superstore means there is nothing for those living in the western part of the town. A store on the application site would support the Town Centre, not damage it. Goldsworth Road is designated as a shopping area and the proposed development would help revive the area which has suffered some decline.

47. The proposal would lead to highway improvements. The site is only 10 minutes walk from the bus and railway stations as well as being close to a bus route. There is convenient pedestrian access and it would have minimal impact upon the surrounding area. An existing nuisance would be removed. Additional industry would have a detrimental impact. Councillors have attempted to delay the decision in favour of the Westfield site.

THE CASES FOR THOSE OBJECTING TO THE PROPOSAL

THE CASE FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

The material points are:-

48. The Erdman Lewis report of 1994 identified a considerable outflow of convenience goods expenditure and considered that a site in the south of the town would be the most appropriate (CD12). Since that time Asda has closed and Sainsbury's have opened at Knaphill. A more recent survey shows a reduced leakage to the west but not so substantial to the south (CD13). There is not even a district centre in the south of the town. It was agreed at the Inquiry that a new superstore should preferably serve the central and southern parts of Woking. Although unlikely to close, Waitrose at Goldsworth Park would be affected more seriously by a store on the appeal site than at Westfield. Two stores would cause material harm at Goldsworth Park.

49. In terms of the sequential approach of PPG6, it is common ground that there is no suitable site in the Town Centre. The issue is whether the proposed store at Goldsworth Road is edge of centre or, as was argued on behalf of the appellants, edge of local centre. The purpose behind the guidance is that there should be a high proportion of linked trips which implies an easy walking distance between a store and the Town Centre. The Secretary of State's decision in respect of a proposal at Daventry is very significant in this context whilst that in respect of a proposal at High Wycombe is not (Doc.48 - Apps.16 & 17).

50. The Goldsworth Road site is clearly not edge of centre in terms of the guidance in PPG6. Shoppers would have to walk some 623m or 634m from the store door as shown on the illustrative plan (Docs 41 & 48). It would not be convenient for them to walk the 675m to the Cawsey Way bus station nor approximately 1km to the railway station. There could be some linked trips but in terms of PPG6 there would not be a significant amount. Nor is there much potential for "walk-in custom" in that the nearest dwelling would involve a walk of some 350m. Only if an additional pedestrian access was provided would there be significantly more dwellings within 5 minutes walk of the appeal site than is the case at Westfield Tip and there would still be significantly less within 10 minutes (Doc.58). Whilst Goldsworth Road would have higher level of accessibility by cycle than the tip site, the latter would be more accessible by public transport and specific proposals have been put forward for the diversion of bus routes. The Goldsworth Road site would be slightly less accessible for motor vehicles than Westfield Tip and this would result in slightly greater travel distance savings for the latter (Docs 21 & 58). Neither site is within easy walking distance of the Town Centre. The Goldsworth Road proposal provides additional junction capacity but could lead to problems because of the loss of capacity at Victoria Way. However, overall neither proposal has an overriding advantage in terms of the aims of PPG13 (Doc.58).

51. On the question of the Town Centre boundary, the County Council originally placed considerable emphasis on the Issues Report (CD3) but now the boundary has been redrawn in the Deposit Draft. It was accepted that this cannot be given any weight. It was also submitted on behalf of the County Council that Goldsworth Road was not clearly separate from the Town Centre. It should not be argued that it must, therefore, be edge of centre. This does not meet the sequential test. The area is not an edge of local centre as was argued for the appellants. Goldsworth Road is a transitional area, strong in B1 office uses with some very specialist shops and a few restaurants. There is no evidence that the appeal site had any functional relationship with the Goldsworth Road centre. The appeal site is clearly out-of-centre. This is borne out in the case of an appeal decision letter relating to numbers 79-87, Goldsworth Road which are nearer the shopping core than the appeal site. The Inspector stated that the site is not in the Town Centre (Doc.56 - App.5).

52. The site is the only piece of new industrial land allocated in the emerging plan, EMP10 (CD4). There is reference to the possibility of using part of the Goldsworth Road site for car parking in connection with the office and other uses on the western side of Woking. That does not give support to the proposition that it would be sufficiently close to the Town Centre to lead to a significant number of linked shopping trips.

53. There are three objections to the new allocation. One of these has been lodged by Railtrack on the grounds that the land would be more appropriately used for retail purposes (Doc.48 - App.10). None are to the principle of employment allocation. The appeal site is large and has the advantage of a potential rail link. The allocation would help meet the PPG13 aim of achieving a better balance between employment and population. A substantial amount of potential industrial land has gone to B1 uses. The appeal site would undoubtedly make a useful contribution to the stock of industrial land. The fact that the site is allocated for employment purposes is a substantial reason for refusing planning permission.

THE CASE FOR INTERESTED PARTIES

TESCO STORES LIMITED

The material points are:-

54. Several identical matters of concern were dealt with on behalf of the Borough Council. The Goldsworth Road proposal is a wholly speculative venture. Safeway PLC bought a small part of the appeal site a day before the Inquiry. Development would be dependent on other land owners. The site is not edge of centre. It is clearly out-of-centre and development as proposed would be in direct conflict with paragraph 3.12 of PPG6. It is not within easy walking distance. The entrance to the store would be 634 m from the edge of the primary shopping area and the centre of the car park, 694m (Doc.41).

55. The store's appearance when approached from Goldsworth Road would be very unwelcoming. The walk from the appeal site to the Town Centre is not easy nor attractive. It involves crossing Victoria Way, a busy through route and several junctions with a lengthy walk from the roundabout at the site entrance. The site constitutes backland on the edge of a transitional area which has no centre and it has only a minor retail function. The railway and bus stations are much too far away for people to walk carrying shopping. No comfort should be drawn from the proposal at Chard which was a very specialised case (Doc.48 - App.17).

56. A new foodstore should be located in the southern half of the town to counter spending outflows. A location north of the railway which is a positive barrier to north and south vehicular movement would not be well placed to meet this identified need and would merely exacerbate the existing imbalance in the distribution of foodstores. Higher levels of trade diversion would arise than at Westfield particularly in relation to the district centre at Goldsworth Park which has suffered a substantial impact as a result of the opening of the Sainsbury's store at Brookwood.

57. Seven road junctions in the vicinity of Goldsworth Road are operating at or near capacity. The County Highways Department withdrew its original objection on the grounds that the traffic associated with the proposal could be accommodated at the year of opening. An assessment of the material produced on behalf of the appellants indicates that in the future, at two junctions, that of A320 Victoria Way with Chertsey Road and that with Chopham Road, Peacocks car park, A324 Lockfield Drive and Church Street West, there would be no available capacity and there would be severe congestion in an area where some already occurs (CD28). The Goldsworth Road site is not as well served by bus services as Westfield nor would reduction in travel distances be as great (Doc.54 - ARB8 & 13-15). The site is allocated for employment purposes in the Local Plan Review and development for retailing would be contrary to the Structure Plan (CD's. 1 & 4).

THE CASE FOR INTERESTED PERSONS

Several local residents, businesses and the Woking District Chamber of Trade and Commerce objected to the proposal by means of written representations (Doc.70). The material points are:-

58. The development would result in a loss of business and jobs. It would have a detrimental impact upon highway conditions and residential amenity and there would be an increase in atmospheric pollution. There is no justification for another filling station. It would also have a detrimental impact upon the vitality and possible viability of the Town Centre. Hammerson's who have a long leasehold ownership of Wolsey Place point to the importance of Sainsbury's as an anchor store and as support for linked trips. The current proposal would have an unacceptable effect upon the vitality of Sainsbury's, Wolsey Place and Woking Town Centre.

THE CASE FOR THE APPLICANTS - SITE B - WESTFIELD TIP

The material points are:-

59. On the basis of the need for a new food superstore, the Westfield site is the better located of the two proposals. It could be accommodated into the retail hierarchy without a significant impact on any existing shopping centres. It would make a more substantial contribution to the clawback of trade particularly from Burpham near Guildford. There is currently no substantial store or centre in the south of the town (CD's 12 & 13 & Doc.55). The site is accessible by a variety of means of transport and would lead to a reduction in travel distance for food shopping and a greater overall reduction than Goldsworth Road (Doc. 54). Unlike the latter it would have a convenient walk-in catchment area and would lead to linked trips between the store and the nearby leisure facilities. It would also provide some 270 jobs.

60. Since there is no suitable town centre or edge of centre site it is acceptable in principle in terms of PPG6. It is also in accordance with Policies DP15 and DP16 of the Surrey Structure Plan (CD1). Although the adopted Local Plan should only be given limited weight in view of its date, the proposal complies with that plan (CD2). The Review indicates that expenditure in the Borough could justify a food superstore to serve the south side (CD4).

61. It is difficult to assess the likely impact of a superstore on a centre such as Kingfield and in particular, upon Shaws supermarket. The methodology used on behalf of the Residents' Association is of limited utility in assessing the possible impact on Shaws (Docs. 65 & 66). From the available evidence the latter performs a principally topping up role as was shown in the Harvey Cole and the JMA studies (Doc.55 - App.6 & CD13). That store is unattractive and not particularly well run. The other units at Kingfield appear to be trading satisfactorily for this type of centre. Tesco would have a predominantly main food shopping function and there would therefore be only a minimal effect on Kingfield.

62. There are currently some highway problems in the vicinity of the application site. The proposals would result in an overall highway benefit to all road-users as well as accommodate activity generated by a superstore (Doc.54 - ARB 1-4). The improvements would bring road safety and capacity benefits well beyond the year of store opening. The site is well served by public transport, better than Goldsworth Road, and the diversion of two bus routes has already been agreed. The needs of cyclists and pedestrians are catered for.

63. It is not normal practice to assess road systems against exceptional conditions. If normal football crowds are taken into account, the road improvements would accommodate

these satisfactorily (Doc.54 - ARB 17). By the same principle there are currently 15 Saturday afternoons when there are home games which coincide with peak shopping times. In any event the number of times capacity at the ground is reached are limited. In addition the Council plans its own improvements which include satellite parking and a controlled parking zone but these would only occur if the Westfield development proceeds.

64. Westfield Tip presents an intractable problem and a genuine dilemma for the Borough Council which owns the site. The land is contaminated. The tip constitutes a potential hazard for which the Council would be liable in the event of untoward occurrences (CD's 14-16). The removal of the source of contamination is wholly in the public interest. There has been a gradual evolution of a solution to the problem since 1990. In 1992/3 the County Council acknowledged the need for substantial built development (Doc.33). A superstore is the only development that can achieve decontamination and secure objective HV39 of the Hoe Valley Management Plan (CD6). It is the only way forward. Local Government finance cannot achieve it.

65. The various environmental agencies are not opposed to the project, only the County Council. Currently the site partially maintains the gap between the residential areas east and west of the Hoe. That gap is virtually absent in the northern sector where the community buildings dominate (Doc.52 - photo's 1-6). The footpath along the eastern side of the site has a poor ambience and the fencing creates a threatening atmosphere (Doc.52 - photo 10). The tip itself has a negative impact in landscape terms. Apart from the north east corner, visibility of the site from surrounding residential properties is limited because of topography, trees and hedgerows.

66. The proposal would result in a number of environmental improvements. Amongst these are the removal of the unsightly community buildings with a consequential opening up and landscaping of the northern end of the site; improvement of landscaping, public footpaths and access; amenity, nature, and conservation benefits. The development could be accommodated in a visually acceptable manner without detriment to local residential amenity. It would have a low profile with interest provided by three towers (CD's 18 & 19). There would be some noise impact from the proposed development. However this would not be of such a magnitude to cause harm or exceed the recommended limits of PPG24 and an appropriate condition could be imposed (Docs.53 & 76).

67. The proposal accords with a range of Structure Plan and Local Plan environmental, conservation and recreational policies. It would also serve to protect and enhance the open character of the Green Belt and facilitate access to it. The proposals for a riverside park and wetland area also accord with the Hoe Valley Management Plan for the creation of a country park (CD6). The provision of new community buildings will only be possible if the scheme goes ahead. The scheme is entirely in the public interest. Comprehensive conditions together with a section 106 Agreement would ensure that the scheme is properly controlled and all the claimed advantages implemented (Docs.75-76).

THE CASES FOR THOSE SUPPORTING THE PROPOSAL

THE CASE FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY - SITE B

A number of matters raised are similar to those of the applicants The material points are:-

68. A southern location for a superstore which would serve an area deficient in such provision, counter leakage, result in shorter journeys and have less impact upon Goldworth Park is preferable. The Kingsfield local centre and a store at Westfield would have discrete walk-in catchments. The former caters primarily for top-up shopping. There might be an impact upon the Kingfield centre of 10% which could mean an impact of between 6 and 7% on Shaws but that store would be unlikely to close (Doc.57). There is probably main food shopping at Shaws but this is likely to be small in scale. Similarly there is a relatively small proportion of car shoppers going to the store, approximately 60%, and the amount of linked trips is likely to be limited (Doc.66 & CD13). Even if Tesco's does have some impact upon Shaws there will plenty of available expenditure on which to draw, some £834,000 (Doc.30). That means the store would not close. In any event it is not the role of the planning system to restrict competition or preserve existing commercial interests. If it closed the store could readily revert to unit shops and it does not necessarily underpin the whole centre. Other shops are in competition with Shaws and might benefit from its closure. It was also indicated that if Tesco opens, Shaws plan to invest and improve.

69. The store proposal should not be seen in isolation. The park and wetland areas are part and parcel of the application. Currently the tip site is both dangerous and visually intrusive. It is contaminated and the Council continues to monitor it. There is no present risk but the tip remains a liability (Doc. 59). The presence of methane has been reported (CD's.14-17). The alluvium does not act as an aquiclude. It is possible for leachate from the waste to percolate down to groundwater and the available evidence indicates that this does occur. There are no reports of leachate "breakouts" into the Hoe Stream but the risk remains. Given the level of dilution it is not surprising that no chemical effect upon the water quality of the stream has been detected. The reinstatement of 17,000 cu.m of flood storage capacity would assist in reducing the effects of major flood events if only to a minor extent. The scheme produced by LDA does not provide for a low permeability cap and the additional flood storage capacity required by the Environment Agency (Doc.77).

70. There is little prospect of the necessary improvements being carried out if the proposals are not permitted. The possibility of doing nothing or less had been considered. Alternative uses such as residential, light industrial or parkland would not be viable by significant margins (Doc.60 - App.5). The estimated costs of the proposed community buildings has increased but this is the result of detailed appraisal and the need to provide proper standards of space and accomodation.

71. Ideally it would be preferable to see no built development but that is unrealistic. The proposals would enhance the landscape and amenity value of the Hoe Valley (CD's 18 & 19). Currently the site is degraded with a number of trees of poor quality. The more important landscape features, such as the banks of the stream and the mature trees in various parts of the site would be retained except for those trees directly affected by buildings. Visual penetration of the site would be increased whilst extensive planting would significantly reduce

the visual impact of the store and car parking. Similarly planting and earth modelling would reduce the likelihood of overlooking of rear gardens or disturbance from the parkland.

72. The Hoe Valley is one of the most important linear open spaces in the borough. The scheme would improve a substantial section of it and increase public access and facilities for informal recreation. The landscape character of the northern part of the site would inevitably change but it must be remembered that this is where the valley enters the urban area. The relationship between the buildings and the landscape has been sensitively handled. However it has not been possible to achieve the Hoe Valley Management Plan minimum width of 10m in all instances (CD6). The proposed footprint of the store and car park falls within that figure at four locations, a total of 83m, less than a quarter of the entire riverside (CD19).

73. The Management Plan does indicate that it would be of greater value to incorporate larger areas within the Stream meanders as conservation areas. The scheme does meet this objective as it retains the bluffs in the meanders as part of a densely wooded buffer strip. These, together with the wetland areas, would both preserve the stream as a habitat corridor and generally.

74. It was submitted on behalf of Railtrack that there is no need to reclaim the tip nor provide for additional water storage (Doc.48 - App. 18). The suggestion is that all that is needed is some peripheral planting, some limited capping, the filling of holes and new fencing. This would be quite inadequate. Habitat generation would be very limited, the hazards would still be present, official public access would not be permissible and fencing would only serve to emphasise the derelict nature of the site.

75. On the question of residential amenity, there is concern at the cumulative impact of the football ground and the proposed store. It is not sensible to plan roads on the basis of the exceptional and the combined impact should only be taken into account if they exacerbate conditions markedly. It does not follow that maximum attendance of 6000 generates three times more congestion than a more typical crowd of 1,900 (Doc.58).

76. Football matches are a fact of life in the area and the Tesco proposal would not exacerbate the situation. It might improve it. During the current season Woking Town Football Club had 24 home matches (Doc.58). The peak periods of traffic activity associated with those home fixtures would be likely to deter shoppers. This factor coupled with the proposed road improvements means that the traffic which would be generated by the foodstore at peak times associated with home games would not be substantial in terms of traffic congestion.

77. The road proposals which are an integral part of the scheme would bring about significant improvements (CD19). In terms of highway safety, the proposed new roundabout would be likely to reduce the potential for conflict as would the footway/cycleway proposals and the traffic calming measures (Doc.54). Overall the scheme would increase capacity and improve traffic flows and would result in greater travel distance savings than the Goldsworth Road proposal (Doc.21). However on balance neither of the proposed foodstores would have an overriding advantage in terms of achieving the transport objectives of sustainable development and other material considerations in respect of traffic and highways.

78. Although not part of the application, the scheme would serve to stimulate the provision of new community facilities in nearby Woking Park (Doc.48 & Doc.60). It would also make a significant contribution to the provision of local employment. The proper implementation of the scheme could for the most part be achieved by means of conditions (Doc.76). An Agreement would be required to deal with aspects of landscape management, the provision of a hydrological study, traffic management and a programme of works (Doc.75).

THE CASE FOR INTERESTED PARTIES AND PERSONS

The material points are:-

St JOHN AMBULANCE - WOKING COMBINED DIVISION

79. The headquarters stand on contaminated ground which has an adverse effect on members and course attendees. There are problems of access particularly at times of emergency. A new building would have proper means of access together with garages and storage for items such as oxygen and Entinox. The proposal would be advantageous for a number of the organisations currently housed at the northern end of the site. There is little variety of shopping facilities in South Woking. A store on the tip would save congestion travelling north via the railway arches.

WOKING DISTRICT SCOUT COUNCIL

80. The building at Westfield is used for meetings, seminars and courses. The Council as landlord has always been very supportive. A new building would help improve assistance to the various Scout groups and enable a resource centre to be developed. It would provide a facility to help young people.

WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

81. Several organisations have supported the proposal by means of written representations. The **Guides and Sea Rangers, the 7th Woking Scout Group, the No 1349 (Woking) Squadron Air Training Corps** all mention the advantages of new premises. The first two refer to the community benefits for young people. **Woking and District Chamber of Trade** point to the removal of contaminated land, road improvements and a store which would fill a need and help reduce travel distances.

82. Several local residents are supportive because of the advantages to the organisations, the removal of the tip and the dilapidated buildings, the need for a store in the south of the town, road and drainage improvements, convenient parking, the provision of the country park and better access for the elderly and disabled compared with the Town Centre (Doc.72).

THE CASES FOR THOSE OPPOSING THE PROPOSAL

THE CASE FOR SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

The material points are;-

83. The Westfield Tip site is unconnected with Woking Town Centre and is clearly an out-of-centre site. It is therefore inappropriate for the location of a foodstore in terms of PPG6 and Policy DP16 of the Structure Plan. The aim of the sequential approach is not, as Tesco appear to stress, to achieve an even distribution of large convenience stores throughout the urban area. It was stated on behalf of the applicants that the choice of site did not arise as a result of the sequential test but that the most important factor was the Council's support. In effect the Borough Council resolved to oppose the Goldsworth Road proposal because it had already resolved to support Westfield and this raised the objection of cumulative impact (CD9).

84. The Westfield site has not emerged from the Local Plan process and is not identified as such in the Deposit Draft of the Review (CD4). Indeed the applicants have objected to the plan on this basis (Doc.55 - A10). The Council's development commitment does not even conform to the Deposit Draft policies SHP1 and 2 which point to town centre or edge-of-centre sites (CD1). It seems possible that the Council may have been unduly swayed by the prospect of resolving the potentially expensive problem of the tip at a profit. As was admitted it is difficult for the Council to be totally objective in these circumstances.

85. It has not been claimed that the proposal would sustain or enhance the viability of Woking Town Centre nor that it would focus development where proximity of businesses would facilitate competition and maximise opportunities for non-car borne travel. It was submitted on behalf of the Council that the impact of the two schemes on the Town Centre and other centres as well as the clawback of trade would be very similar. Although the Westfield site would be likely to claw back more trade than Goldsworth Road, it was accepted that the real issue was which scheme would claw back more to the benefit of Woking Town Centre in accordance with the objectives of PPG6. It was also accepted that shopping development at the Westfield site was likely to change patterns of shopping in that part of the town in that those who previously did their top-up shopping at Kingsfield might prefer to carry out a more substantial excursion to a Tesco store.

86. No overriding advantage in terms of the transport objectives of sustainable development has been claimed. It seems that the Council supports the development of a store on the Westfield Tip for reasons of extraneous advantage. The promotion of retail development in order to restore derelict land appears to be contrary to guidance contained in paragraph 3.24 of PPG6.

87. Structure Plan Policy PE6 (River Corridors) indicates that in river valleys such as that of the Hoe, planning authorities will safeguard and enhance the visual qualities, amenities and environmental values of river corridors within urban and rural areas. Development affecting rivers and streams will not normally be permitted where it is likely to prejudice potential recreational and amenity use, or reduce water or ecological quality. The explanatory text states that particular attention needs to be given to the setting of those corridors which pass

through built up areas (CD1). It has also been agreed by the Surrey Nature Conservation Liaison Group that the waterbody of the Hoe Stream should be designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance. As yet this has not been shown on a statutory plan (Doc.62 - App.1).

88. Although the scheme would improve the appearance of the Hoe Valley as well as improve public access, it would also lead to substantial built development in an open section of Woking Park. The store itself would be within the 10m corridor identified in the Hoe Valley Management Plan at a number of points (CD's 6 & 19). The additional built development would prejudice the visual and ecological qualities of this part of the river corridor and the quality of access along the river would not be appropriate for purposes of informal recreation. The earlier less substantial proposal would have been prominent but offered the possibility of modification at the detailed application stage (Doc. 33).

THE CASE FOR HUNTING GATE DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED, RAILTRACK PLC AND LINKSIDE PROPERTIES LIMITED

The material points are:-

89. The Westfield Tip proposal is contrary to national retail planning advice and local planning policies. The site is out of centre and unrelated to any shopping centre. The principal catchment area would be identical to Goldsworth Road that is, the urban area of Woking (Doc.57). The trade draw would be from a very similar area and the clawback slightly in favour of the proposed Tesco store but that would be very small in terms of the total amount of car-borne convenience expenditure within the study/catchment area and largely irrelevant in the context of policy (Doc. 40).

90. Unlike a store at Goldsworth Road, a Tesco at Westfield would have a damaging impact upon the nearby Kingfield District Shopping Centre and particularly upon Shaws supermarket. This would be contrary to PPG6 and development plan policies which seek to safeguard such local centres. It is only 700m from the Westfield site to the Kingfield Centre. Some £410,000 could be diverted from the centre with about £330,000 from Shaws which could lead to ~~553X~~ the closure and possibly the end of the company (Doc.48 - App.23, Docs.65 & 66).

91. It is claimed on behalf of the Council that Westfield has a marginal advantage over the other site in terms of savings in travel distance (Doc. 18). The claims made on behalf of Tesco are totally unreliable (Doc. 21). In the light of paragraph 4.10 of PPG6 and the Secretary of State's lack of regard for substantial savings at High Wycombe these claims are not of significance (Doc.48 - App. 16).

92. It would be a curious choice to site another major traffic attractor here. With possible peak attendances of 6000 there would increasingly be severe congestion on match days without satellite parking and controlled parking zones (Doc.49 - App.H). It is likely that attendances and capacity would increase leading to extensive queuing and the use of alternative residential roads. The use of car parks near the Town Centre would transfer the problem closer to the centre. There could be serious difficulties in providing satellite car parks as proposed by the Council as there would be need for third party land (Doc.48 -

App.21). It is clear that the proposal is contrary to Policy SHP1 of the adopted Local Plan (CD2).

93. The Westfield site stands in an environmentally sensitive area which is protected by a number of policies. The area is already well endowed with public open space and public means of access. The proposal does not accord with paragraph 3.24 of PPG6 which states that retail development should not simply be used to restore land unless it would help to support the vitality and viability of existing centres. The restoration of a very small proportion of the floodplain would bring little benefit to an area where the problem is in any event, minimal. The Environmental Agency would prefer to see no development as was also submitted on behalf of the Council (Doc.51 - App.E & paragraph 71).

94. There is no evidence of problems arising as a result of contamination and the Council is under no obligation to do anything. There is no risk to local residents from gas. Methane in the hut area may need venting. The alluvium is an aquiclude which prevents any perched water from the tip entering the groundwater. Leaching tests have shown that contaminants are not present in mobile form. The Environmental Agency has powers in relation to pollution and have not required any significant action. River quality is satisfactory and the idea of breakout from the tip into the stream is alarmist (Doc.51). There is no need for the comprehensive scheme now proposed. There has been no attempt to assess the possibility of a less expensive scheme with a Derelict Land Grant. Such a scheme could meet the main objectives of the development plan and the Hoe Valley Management Plan without the need for a new store (Doc.48 - App.18).

95. The proposal is clearly contrary to Structure Plan and Local Plan policies. The store would stand very close to the Hoe Stream and would dominate this part of the valley with an urban complex in a semi-rural area (CD19). There would be a significant loss of trees and the proposed new community buildings would result in development on an attractive area of meadowland grass. Residential amenity in the area would suffer because of the impact of traffic, the introduction of lights, road signage, construction traffic and the combined noise generated by increased vehicular movement, a store and the football ground. The Council has already bought, for £750,000, 7 dwellings blighted by the ground and the Tesco proposals.

THE CASE FOR THE SURREY CPRE AND THE HOE VALLEY AND KINGFIELD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

The material points are:-

96. The Tesco proposal is contrary to national and development plan policies. The Westfield Tip site is not allocated either in the adopted or the emerging local plan. The sequential test has not been applied and the site is out of centre with no possibility of linked trips. The only real issue relating to leakage of trade is whether it gives rise to extra journeys which could be halted by a new store within the built up area.

97. It was agreed on behalf of the applicants that the vitality of the Kingfield Centre was an interest of acknowledged importance and that Shaws supermarket was an important part of that centre. Some 60% of the turnover of the latter is car-borne which in view of the proximity of the Westfield site could easily divert to a new store (Doc.66). The impact is

likely to be a loss to Shaws of 25-30% of turnover which would render it unviable. The turnover of Shaws at Stanwell excluding that associated with wine and spirits since the opening of Tesco on the Ashford Hospital site has fallen by 35.63% (Doc.65 - App. SA2). In this context it should be noted that Shaws predicted this loss at the inquiry into that proposal where the Inspector accepted the much lower figures of the Council and Tesco (Doc. 65). Closure of Shaws at Kingfield would undoubtedly impact upon the centre as a whole and impact upon those who rely on that store, particularly the elderly and those who do not have access to a car, of whom there is a high proportion in this area, as well as lead to loss of choice.

98. As far as the alleged exceptional circumstances are concerned, there is no overriding need to undertake major ameliorative measures of the tip. There is no evidence that there is significant contamination of the Hoe Stream. As was accepted the leachate becomes increasingly dilute over time as it migrates. In any event, it is proposed to remove only a sixth of the total material on the site, an indication of the small risk. There is no requirement for the Council to take any action to alleviate contamination or reduce risk from landfill gas. The Environment Agency will always endeavour to increase flood storage facilities but in the event of a serious flood the effect of the current proposals would only be marginal. The Council has actively supported the Football Club, it should also invest in the improvement of the Westfield Tip (Doc.64).

99. The effects of traffic and loss of amenity are closely related. The Westfield/Kingfield area already suffers from traffic congestion at peak periods and generally higher volumes of traffic than is acceptable in a residential area (Doc.67). The superstore together with increased attendances at football matches would exacerbate the situation. Much of the loss of amenity occurs during the leisure periods of local residents. The Council already recognises in the Review of the Local Plan that the A427 is unsuitable for use by HGV's and causes noise and disturbance to local residents (CD4). There would inevitably be increased pollution in the form of noise and lighting. There would also be difficulties of movement for pedestrians and cyclists.

THE CASE FOR INTERESTED PERSONS

100. **Mrs Gruselle, Mr Davey, Ms Butcher, Mr Shirley, Mr Pattison and Mr Williams** all questioned the need for an additional superstore. They expressed concern at the impact on existing shops and those using them, at the impact of increased traffic on the residential area around the Westfield Tip site and at the detrimental effect upon residential amenities and the environment.

101. **Mrs Gruselle** pointed out that there is a large number of elderly persons in the Westfield and Kingfield area. Immediately opposite Shaw's is a County Council home for the elderly. The residents are currently able to use the shop for their day to day needs. **Ms Butcher** drew attention to the problems of disabled shoppers and pointed to the help which is available at Shaws.

102. **Messrs Davey, Shirley, Pattison and Williams** pointed to the existing traffic problems arising from the concentration of facilities in and adjacent to a residential area; Woking Leisure Centre, the Chris Lane Centre, the football ground and the various

community buildings. A superstore would merely serve to exacerbate an already unacceptable situation. Mr Davey indicated a number of planning policies which would be contravened by the proposal.

103. A large number of persons and organisations have objected to the proposal by means of written representations (Doc.71). In essence their concerns are similar to those expressed by objectors at the Inquiry. A list on page 68 of the Committee Report of 30 January 1996 effectively summarises the nature of all the points made by these objectors to the Council, the Government Office for the South East, the Planning Inspectorate and directly to myself (CD 8).

CONCLUSIONS

104. In the light of the foregoing and taking into account all the evidence that was submitted, what I saw during my site visits, together with the reasons for call in of the Westfield Road application and the matters listed in paragraph 4 of my report I am of the view that the main considerations in both these cases are as follows:-

- a) the effect upon the vitality and viability of the proposals upon Woking Town Centre and other smaller centres;
- b) the effect of the proposals upon the highway network and traffic conditions together with the availability of alternative forms of transport and the possibility of linked shopping trips;
- c) the implication of the proposals in relation to employment provision;
- d) the likely impact upon the amenity of those living in the vicinity of the two sites;

in respect of the Westfield Tip proposal alone:-

- e) its impact upon the Hoe Valley and the problem of contamination.

With these points in mind and in view of the sequence of the presentation of the cases, I first address the status of the various development plans and relevant associated documents, site specific matters relating to Site A under the following headings: retailing, employment, highways and traffic, and amenity. I subsequently examine site specific matters relating to Site B under the same heads together with the Hoe Valley and contamination. I then undertake a comparison of the two schemes under relevant heads and consider planning agreements and suggested conditions which should be imposed if consent were to be granted.

DEVELOPMENT PLANS

105 The Structure Plan is under review but remains as the approved statutory Plan (paragraph 21). The related Supplementary Planning Guidance deals with Policy DP 16 in the light of changes to PPG6. Whilst this should be borne in mind, it has no statutory significance and should, in my view, be afforded very little weight. Since the adoption of the Local Plan the revised PPG's 2, 6 and 13 have been issued. Consequently the plan is out of date in some respects. Nevertheless, it remains as the statutory Local Plan and in my view, despite submissions to the contrary, it continues to carry substantial weight (paragraph 60). The Review Local Plan has taken recent changes in Government Guidance into account. However it is at an early stage. The Deposit Draft was published only three months before the opening of this inquiry and substantial weight should not be afforded. I agree that no weight should be placed upon the Local Plan Issues Report of October 1995 (paragraphs 24 & 51).

SITE SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS

SITE A - GOLDSWORTH ROAD

RETAILING

106. In view of the differences between the parties on the relationship of this site with the Town Centre, together with the changing approaches of the Borough Council, it seems to me necessary to consider the character of the centre and the adjoining areas in some detail. (Paragraphs 22-24, 31-34, 41-44, 45, 49-51, 54-55).

107. In my opinion the Peacocks and Wolsey shopping centres provide a highly concentrated retail focus and make the major contribution to the vitality of the Town Centre (paragraph 27). They also occupy a high proportion of the Shopping Core as defined in the adopted Local Plan Town Centre Inset. Another contributory factor to vitality is the Victoria Entertainments Centre which is located in the eastern part of the Peacocks Centre.

108. The Town Centre is linear in form. From my many visits, it is clear to me that activity and vitality decline in all directions away from the two retail centres. For some distance to the east, office uses predominate with a few small shops interspersed. Beyond is a primarily residential area centred on Walton Road. Immediately to the south towards Chertsey Road is an area of small specialist shops and non-retail uses. Further to the south, beyond the railway, there are a number of commercial and institutional uses. Victoria Way and the Basingstoke Canal provide a wide barrier between the Town Centre and the extensive residential area of Horsell to the north. Westwards, on the other side of Victoria Way which narrows as it approaches the railway are Goldsworth Road and Church Road West. In terms of land use, this area is very similar to those to the east and south of the Shopping Core. There is a concentration of offices on Church Road West whilst Goldsworth Road contains a mix of uses including new office development (Paragraph 8).

109. As a result of this analysis I have come to the firm conclusion that, in terms of land use and function, the Goldsworth Road area as far west as Poole Road, is part and parcel of Woking Town Centre as are those areas to the east and south of the Shopping Core. There is no question that they are part of the core. However all three exhibit characteristics associated with town and city centres outside such a core. There is a high proportion of non-retail uses including offices, services, specialist shops, cafes, restaurants and take-aways. Goldsworth Road and High Street/Broadway/ Chertsey Road may also be described as typical town centre transitional areas (paragraph 51). Clearly I differ from the Inspector who determined an appeal in respect of no's 79-87, Goldsworth Road (paragraph 51). His decision letter does not contain an analysis of the Town Centre and it is unlikely that he had access to as much evidence and information as has been submitted in these current cases. In coming to my conclusions I have also borne in mind that the eastern section of Goldsworth Road is shown as a Neighbourhood Shopping Centre (albeit referred to as a transitional area in the reasoned justification) on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map. There is no doubt in my mind that it does not function as such.

110. In the light of the preceding paragraph I have also come to the conclusion that the appeal site is located at the edge of Woking Town Centre. There is no available site closer

(paragraph 29). Because it is not clearly separate from the Town Centre, it cannot, in terms of PPG6, be regarded as being out-of-centre. On the other hand the store door as shown on the illustrative plans would be more than twice the distance from the primary shopping centre that paragraph 3.14 of the Guidance suggests that shoppers would be willing to walk, especially when carrying shopping (paragraphs 31 & 32, 50 & 54).

111. Nevertheless it seems to me that the site does have several advantages in terms of PPG6. It was submitted on behalf of the principal parties objecting to the scheme that the approach to the proposed store would be unwelcoming (paragraph 55). However I am not convinced that that need necessarily be the case nor that a door could not be nearer the front of the appeal site. The appeal application is in outline only and if approved, detailed design could in my view lead to a building, planting and access which would be visually acceptable and an enhancement of the current situation (paragraph 15).

112. The whole of the walk from the appeal site to the primary shopping area is level. There is a clear visual link in that the Town Centre can be seen from the northern edge of the site. Because of the variety of uses along Goldsworth Road, I consider that it provides an interesting approach. I do not accept that crossing Victoria Way presents any difficulties (paragraph 55). At the eastern end of Goldsworth Road it is quite narrow. I experienced the pedestrian crossing on a number of occasions and found no difficulty and little delay. In addition I consider that, because of the narrow road, the number of pedestrians and the scale of the surrounding development, there is always a feeling of being within a busy town centre. I do not consider that this applies to the crossing via Church Road West. Here, Victoria Way is wider and the buildings on either side larger, which in my opinion creates a bleaker, anonymous environment.

113. From the evidence and my own experience it takes less than ten minutes to walk from the appeal site to the primary shopping area (paragraph 32). It was stated on behalf of the Council that this would be a comfortable distance for food shoppers. There is no doubt in my mind that a food superstore as proposed would give rise to linked trips. Depending upon the type of food to be purchased, shoppers could either use the store prior or subsequent to a visit to some part of the Town Centre. As was submitted on behalf of the County Council, given the range of uses and facilities, such trips need not necessarily involve two types of shopping (paragraph 42). Alternatively, users of the proposed foodstore could combine bulk shopping with other visits which could include the type of shopping which did not involve the carrying of heavy bags. In other words the proposal would accord with paragraph 3.14 of PPG6, one trip serving several purposes. There could also be some linked trips by persons using the bus or railway stations as they are within ten minutes comfortable walk of the appeal site. However this seems unlikely for those carrying heavy shopping (paragraph 50). I carefully studied the other appeal decisions relating to proposed superstores which were drawn to my attention but I did not find these very helpful in that I regard the geographical and other circumstances of those cases to be significantly different from those at Goldsworth Road (paragraphs 32, 49 & 55).

114. From my visits and the evidence it is clear that Goldsworth Road has experienced recent investment as well as some decline. It was suggested that the latter is due to the strengthening of the retail core (paragraph 33). I accept the submission made on behalf of the appellants that a foodstore as proposed would be likely to contribute to the regeneration of

the area as well as help maintain the vitality of the Town Centre as a whole thus supporting the aims of national retail guidance. As was submitted by the County Council and interested persons, it would restore choice and competition in the centre which has seen the loss of the Asda store (paragraphs 42 & 46). On the point made by an individual objector that there is no justification for another filling station, it is not the role of the planning system to restrict competition or preserve existing commercial interests (paragraph 58).

115. As far as development plan retail policies are concerned, the proposal accords with Structure Plan policies DR15, 16 and 17 in that it would not lead to an overprovision of retail floorspace, it is located on the edge of an existing town centre, and it would help promote the role of that centre. In coming to these conclusions I have borne in mind that the plan is now under review to bring retailing policies into line with the latest PPG6 (paragraph 21 & 105). The proposed development would support Policy SHP1 of the adopted Local Plan in that it would help to strengthen the existing pattern of shopping (paragraph 22). It also accords with Policies SHP1 and 2 of the Deposit Draft of the Review (paragraph 23). It was stated on behalf of Tesco that Safeway Stores PLC had only very recently acquired a small part of the site (paragraph 54). That, in my opinion, does not affect its suitability for the proposed development.

EMPLOYMENT

116. It was submitted that the only reason for the allocation of the major part of the appeal site for employment purposes was the Council's support for the Westfield scheme (paragraph 37 & 84). I do not consider it appropriate for me to conclude on that matter. Nevertheless it is a very recent allocation to which there are objections (paragraph 39). Consequently, as I have indicated in paragraph 105, I consider that little weight should be afforded.

117. I am not convinced by the evidence that there is a genuine shortage of employment land (paragraphs 40, 52-53 & 57). In any event the appeal proposals would provide around 300 jobs and I agree with the other Inspector that all jobs are valuable to those who take them (paragraph 40). Different types of employment might be available if the site were allocated for employment purposes but it seems unlikely that the numbers would be as great in view of its physical shortcomings (paragraph 39). I also accept that the site is not well related to the highway network for employment uses and there is no guarantee that the railway would be used for distribution purposes (paragraphs 40 & 53). I agree too that a store on this site would be more acceptable than some possible employment uses in relation to the nearby dwellings (paragraphs 40 & 47).

118. In coming to my conclusions on this matter I have given weight to the fact that the County Council indicated that the loss of possible employment land could be justified (paragraph 38). I have also taken into account that the Borough Council's officers appear to have no overriding objection and that the reasoned justification for the employment proposal in the Deposit Draft states that the site could be used in part for town centre car parking (paragraphs 39 & 44). To my mind the latter point indicates that the Council regards the site as being close to the centre.

HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC

119. On the traffic impact of the proposal, the Highway Authority has no objection and on the longer term impact it seems to me that the evidence submitted was limited and not conclusive (paragraphs 36, 43 and 57).

AMENITY

120. Development at Goldsworth Road would be both acceptable as well as an improvement on existing conditions as far as the amenity of those living nearby is concerned (paragraphs 40 & 47). I also consider that it would relate satisfactorily in visual terms to the surrounding area because of the store's location adjacent to the commercial area of Goldsworth Road (paragraph 15).

SITE SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS

SITE B - WESTFIELD TIP

RETAILING

121. The Westfield Tip site is clearly out-of-centre (paragraphs 10, 83, 89 & 96). As far as PPG6 is concerned, a store would not lead to linked trips with the Town Centre but it could lead to some associated with the various leisure facilities in this part of Woking (paragraphs 14 & 59). The proposal accords with Policy DP15 of the Surrey Structure Plan in that it would not lead to an overprovision of retail floorspace. I do not accept that it is in accord with DP16 as submitted on behalf of the applicants (paragraph 60). In terms of that policy, a location on the edge of the Town Centre is possible, namely at the Goldsworth Road site. I have again borne in mind that the Structure Plan is under review in order to bring it into line with the revised PPG6 (paragraphs 21, 105 & 115).

122. The scheme would not conflict with the basic shopping policy of the adopted Local Plan if the various advantages cited by the applicants and the Council were accepted to be the very exceptional circumstances discussed in the reasoned justification for SHP1 (paragraph 22). Although not a specific policy, the Westfield Tip is identified as a suitable site for a food superstore in the Deposit Draft of the Local Plan Review (paragraphs 23 & 60). This has arisen largely as a direct result of the present proposal and should be assessed on that basis (paragraph 84).

HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC

123. It seems to me that the package of highway proposals would provide significant improvements to current conditions (paragraphs 18, 62 & 77). The provision of a roundabout at the Kingfield Road/Westfield Avenue junction, the modification of the Wych Hill Lane/Claremont Avenue junction, the provision of a footbridge over the Hoe Stream and the carriageway widening over the existing bridges, together with various traffic calming measures would overcome a number of difficulties which were described in evidence and experienced and observed by myself at different times. From the evidence I also consider that the improvements would accommodate traffic generated by the foodstore.

124. However, I have also observed conditions before and after an evening football match as well as studied the relevant evidence. On the occasion of my visit, attendance was not particularly high. Nevertheless, there was extensive queueing, confusion, difficulties for the many pedestrians and parking on grass verges. The situation was compounded by traffic movement to and from both the Woking Park leisure facilities, the Chris Lane Centre and the community buildings (paragraph 102). It was maintained on behalf of the applicants that the proposed improvements would benefit both normal traffic conditions as well as those experienced on the days when home matches are played. In making these submissions, it was maintained that it is normal practice to make assessments at normal peaks, on Friday evening peaks and on Saturdays, not at exceptional times (paragraph 63 & 75).

125. As far as this case is concerned, I consider this to be shortsighted as well as ignoring the likely impact upon the amenity of those who live in the vicinity which I discuss in the next three paragraphs. Currently home matches occur on 24 occasions, an average of approximately once a fortnight but concentrated into the season. This, in my opinion, represents an unacceptable number of occasions when there is likely for the reasons advanced by objectors to be extensive queueing and disturbance in this residential area (paragraph 92). I am not convinced from the evidence submitted on behalf of the applicants that this would not be the case and I also consider that the use of existing car parks and the creation of controlled car parking zones may not be feasible (paragraph 63). I do not agree that shoppers would be deterred because there was a home match (paragraph 76). That would involve keeping abreast of fixtures which for those without an interest in the game, and I believe there are many, would in my view be unlikely.

AMENITY

126. I have come to the firm conclusion that the impact of the proposal on the amenity of those living in the vicinity of the application site is one of the most significant objections to it. The matter is closely related to that of highway and traffic conditions which I have discussed in the preceding three paragraphs. It would, as was submitted at the Inquiry, be a curious choice to site another major traffic attractor here (paragraph 92). In recent years the Pool in the Park, the Woking Leisure Centre, the Chris Lane Centre and the new stand at Woking Town Football Club's ground have all been developed in or near an extensive residential area (paragraphs 14 & 102). It is now proposed to construct a large superstore with associated car parking in the heart of this area and only separated from the football ground and the Chris Lane Centre by Westfield Avenue.

127. It was submitted on behalf of the Council that football is a fact of life in this area. In my view on match days those living there already experience conditions which are not normally regarded as acceptable within a residential area (paragraph 76). There is noise and disturbance from traffic and pedestrian activity, music from the ground, together with the presence of flood lighting. As was pointed out the disturbance occurs during what for many are leisure periods (paragraph 99). This is combined with the activity associated with the other centres. To this it is proposed to add the store and car park. Whilst I accept that noise levels from the proposed development alone would not be likely to conflict with the recommendations of PPG24, I do consider that the cumulative effect of additional noise, lighting, movement and congestion would seriously exacerbate an already unsatisfactory

situation (paragraph 66, 92, 99 & 102). To this must be added the possibility of increased attendance and capacity at the football ground.

128. It is also possible that with continued success this level of disturbance could occur on more occasions. In coming to my conclusions I have borne in mind that the Council is very supportive of the football club and has also bought dwellings whose occupants were likely to be affected by the conditions in the vicinity of the ground (paragraphs 95 & 98). Clearly home games would lead to the least acceptable conditions. However, the introduction of yet another major non-residential use which would be active seven days a week and most evenings would exacerbate an already unacceptable situation and have a seriously detrimental impact upon residents living in the vicinity.

129. I have also come to the conclusion that the proposed superstore would have a detrimental visual impact upon the surrounding residential area. It would have a low profile which, it was claimed, would respect the scale of nearby housing (paragraphs 17 & 66). It seems to me that the building would be a typical late twentieth century superstore. Whilst it would be single storey with a mono-pitched roof and the northern elevation punctuated by two towers with a third to the south, its mass would be totally out of scale with the surrounding dwellings. The width of the building would take up the majority of the unbuilt area between the Hoe Stream to the west and the rear gardens of properties in Westfield Avenue to the east. In depth it would penetrate extensively along the Hoe Valley. Added to this would be substantial areas of hard surfaced car parking and service areas as well as illumination. Because of the extent of the building and car park I am of the opinion that the proposed landscaping would only have a limited ameliorating effect particularly along the eastern boundary.

130. The store would be sited a short distance from the football ground. In my view the new stand is intrinsically a well designed structure but there is no doubt that it is visually intrusive. In this area of traditional low-rise, including single storey, suburban dwellings, the stand is over-dominant and unsympathetic to its neighbours. This discordance is emphasised when it is illuminated and the ground, flood-lit. The close proximity of the store and the football ground would not only be visually intrusive but I also consider that the combination would be visually overbearing for those living nearby.

THE HOE VALLEY AND CONTAMINATION

131. There is no doubt that the project, if implemented, would lead to substantial improvements to that part of the Hoe Valley between the proposed store and the southern boundary of the application site (paragraphs 12, 18-19, 66-67, 69, 71-73 & 88). The wetlands and wooded area would be a considerable improvement on the existing degraded landscape. Public access would also be improved. The proposals for the southern end of the site would accord with Structure Plan Policy PE6 as well as those relating to the Green Belt (paragraphs 21, 67 & 88). Similarly the scheme for that part of the site would comply with both the adopted Local Plan and the Deposit Draft as well as with the non-statutory Hoe Valley Management Plan (paragraphs 22 & 23). However, as was submitted on behalf of both the County Council and Railtrack, it would not be in accordance with paragraph 3.24 of PPG6 (paragraphs 86 & 93).

132. In addition, the proposals for built development are clearly contrary to Structure Plan and Local Plan policies as well as to the aims of the Hoe Valley Management Plan (paragraphs 21-24, 87 & 95). Although the northern end of the tip is degraded with several nondescript buildings, it is largely undeveloped with a number of trees and hedgerows (paragraph 14). As was indicated on behalf of the applicants, the site is visually tightly contained except in the vicinity of the community buildings. Elsewhere the topography and vegetation provide substantial screening (paragraph 65). Although the community buildings and much of the fencing are unattractive elements in the valley, from my own observations the bulk of the northern part of the site does not impinge visually on the surrounding area.

133. The proposed store and car park would fill and dominate this part of the valley. The building itself would be very close to the Hoe Stream at a number of points (paragraphs 72 & 88). This, in my view, could have serious consequences for habitats as well as for the river corridor. Whilst it is unlikely to happen in the near future, the site has the potential for development or landscape improvement which would accord with all the various development plan policies as well as with the Hoe Valley Management Plan (paragraphs 21-23).

134. Although not a matter for decision in this case, if the store goes ahead, the Council's intention is to resite the various community facilities in Woking Park (paragraphs 26, 66, 78-81 & 95). A further consequence of the proposal, therefore, would be yet more built development in the Hoe Valley. Whilst this would be clearly of advantage to the users, it would be detrimental to the open character of the valley as well as contrary to planning policies (paragraphs 21 & 87). On the question of the County Council's attitude to an earlier application for B1 uses, that proposal was less substantial and in outline only (paragraphs 64 & 88). In any event it does not affect my conclusions on the present proposal.

135. There was disagreement as to the likely level of contamination of the tip and the amount of treatment which is needed (paragraphs 64, 69 & 94). I find the evidence on the levels of percolation of leachate and contamination inconclusive. It was stated on behalf of Railtrack that river quality is satisfactory (paragraph 94). The proposal would remove some of the contaminated land, but by no means all of it (paragraph 93). Similarly it would result in some restoration of the floodplain but the Environment Agency has indicated that there would be a net benefit but would prefer that there is no substantial built development near a watercourse (paragraph 93). The Council continues to monitor the situation and the various agencies have powers to act if necessary (paragraphs 94 & 98). In my judgement the improvements which would arise from these elements of the scheme are outweighed by its overall shortcomings. I have noted the suggested improvements put forward on behalf of Railtrack. These are an alternative to the proposal and would improve the situation to some extent, but they are not currently a matter for decision (paragraph 94).

COMPARISON OF THE TWO SCHEMES

RETAILING

136. I accept that there is both a quantitative and a qualitative need in Woking for one additional large foodstore (paragraphs 29 & 48). This would reduce outflow of expenditure and travel. I also accept that there is no suitable site in the Town Centre. Neither of the two proposals fully satisfy the advice contained in PPG6. However, that for Goldsworth Road is

much closer to doing so. I have concluded that it is on the edge of the Town Centre but it is not edge-of-centre in terms of the definition in Annex A of the Guidance, that is between 200-300m of the primary shopping area. On the other hand, as far as paragraphs 3.13 and 3.14 are concerned it would give car borne shoppers an opportunity to park, immediately enter the Town Centre to carry out their other business and follow a level route to the primary shopping area and other parts of the centre and to undertake major foodshopping either before or afterwards. It would also, in my view, contribute towards the regeneration of the Goldsworth Road area and help sustain the Town Centre itself. Thus it would contribute to one of the fundamental objectives of PPG6 which as was submitted on behalf of Railtrack would not be the case with a store on the Westfield Tip (paragraph 35). I agree with the point made on behalf of the County Council in relation to Regional Guidance (paragraph 41). Town Centres are thick on the ground in Surrey and as was put in evidence this calls into question the justification for retail provision which is not in or adjoining town centres. As I have indicated in paragraph 115 it would also accord with a number of development plan policies.

137. The Westfield Tip site can only satisfy the sequential test if the Goldsworth Road site is discarded, there being no Town Centre or edge-of-centre sites available (paragraph 29). Unlike Goldsworth Road, it would not lead to linked trips to the Town Centre although it could lead to such trips in relation to the leisure facilities. I consider this to be only a minor advantage taking into account all other relevant factors. I have stated in paragraph 115 that it would not be fully in accord with development plan policies. I have therefore come to the conclusion that in terms of PPG6 and development plan retail policies, Goldsworth Road does have clear advantages.

138. As far as clawback is concerned the tip site has some merit. It would fill a gap in the retail hierarchy in that there is currently no food superstore in the south of the town and a store in this location is especially likely to retrieve food trade currently leaking to Guildford, more so than Goldsworth Road (paragraph 59). In my view it would not have a detrimental impact upon the Town Centre. A store at Site A would probably lead to higher food trade diversion from Goldsworth Park and the Town Centre although I accept that the former would not cease to be viable (paragraph 35). As far as the Town Centre is concerned, it seems likely that Sainsbury's in Wolsey Place is over-trading and is frequently crowded (paragraphs 35 & 46). Marks and Spencer has only limited food choice. Consequently, a foodstore at Goldsworth Road could lead to greater choice and more comfortable shopping conditions. It would also be likely to result in greater clawback from Sainsbury's at Knaphill (paragraph 34). Overall I do not consider the relative volumes of trade retrieval to be fundamental to the decision on these cases when weighed against other factors (paragraph 89).

139. Of more concern, in my opinion, is the impact upon the Kingfield Centre. A store at Goldsworth Road would have only a limited effect. However, because of its proximity it seems to me that a store at Westfield Tip would be likely to have serious consequences for Shaws supermarket and the local centre. There are even more problems in assessing impact at this end of the shopping hierarchy than at the macro-scale (paragraph 61). Whilst accepting these deficiencies, on the basis of the evidence and from my own visits to Kingfield and Stanwell, I have come to the conclusion that the possible impact upon the local centre is another serious objection to the Westfield proposal.

140. It was stated on behalf of the applicants themselves that unlike Goldsworth Road a store at Westfield would have a convenient walk-in catchment (paragraph 59). That itself is cause for concern. It was stated on behalf of the Council that the two stores would have largely discrete walk-in catchment areas (paragraph 68). From the cartographical evidence and on the basis of my own experience I consider that the walking possibilities have been underestimated (paragraph 90). A ten minute walk from the tip would take the average walker almost to the Kingfield Centre.

141. Whatever the current proportion of top-up shopping as opposed to car borne shopping, and whatever the amount of available expenditure, the proposed store site is very close to Shaws and the local centre (paragraph 68). The former and the nearby shops have a limited range of goods for sale and in answer to my question at the Inquiry it was stated on behalf of the firm that Shaws was currently unattractive. It also has no parking facilities.

142. Rather than rely on attempts at arithmetical assessment and on surveys which to my mind were lacking in rigour, it seems to me to be a matter of commonsense that a superstore such as that now proposed by Tesco offering a comprehensive range of goods and facilities would be likely to attract large numbers of shoppers from the Kingfield area. Currently top up shopping may predominate because of the absence of a large convenience foodstore in this part of Woking. With the advent of such a store shopping habits could change significantly (paragraph 85). The provision of free parking, taxi phone links and bus services could mean that Shaws and the other shops would be left with little but very minor top up shopping and the business of those unable or unwilling to go to Tesco's. With this in mind together with the information provided by Shaws relating to Kingfield and Stanwell there is to my mind a distinct possibility that the store could cease to be viable (paragraph 97).

143. It was indicated by a representative of Shaws that there has been a substantial loss of trade at the shop at Stanwell as well as closure of some shops since the opening of the Tesco store on the former hospital site at Ashford (paragraph 97). That scale of loss had been predicted by the company but not accepted either by the Inspector or the Secretary of State in determining the appeal lodged by Tesco. Shaws at Stanwell is further from the new Tesco than Shaws is from the tip site. It seems to me that a lesson should be learned from the Stanwell situation. It was claimed on behalf of the Borough Council that Shaws does not necessarily underpin the Kingfield Centre (paragraph 68). No substantive evidence was submitted on this but it is clear that it is the most substantial shop in the centre and is seems likely that its closure, together with the opening of a Tesco, could well lead to general decline.

144. While I accept that Shaws could physically convert back to unit shops there is no guarantee that this would happen if the appeal proposal were to go ahead (paragraph 68). The point that Shaws would invest and improve if Tesco opened, to my mind, merely indicates that something would have to be done if the store and the company were to attempt to survive (paragraph 68). In conclusion on this matter, in my view the development of a food superstore at Westfield Tip is likely to have an unacceptably detrimental impact upon the vitality and viability of the Kingfield Neighbourhood Shopping Centre contrary to PPG6 and Structure and Local Plan policies (paragraph 21-23). The criticism of the store made on behalf of Tesco does not affect my conclusions on this (paragraph 61).

HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC

145. In terms of PPG13, I accept that, as submitted by both the Council and Railtrack, the Westfield site has a slight advantage over Goldsworth Road as far as overall travel reduction is concerned (paragraphs 36, 59 & 68). It seems to me that the figures produced on behalf of the applicants relating to this matter are not convincing (paragraphs 59 & 91). Taking all the evidence into account and acknowledging possible shortcomings of the PTAL approach, Goldsworth Road is likely to be more accessible in terms of public transport largely because of its location close to the Town Centre. Neither site has any significant advantage as far as walking and cycling are concerned. On the basis of the criteria of paragraph 1.8 of PPG13 used by the County Council, Goldsworth Road comes closer to satisfying these, again because of its proximity to Woking Town Centre (paragraph 43). I find that I agree with the point made on behalf of the Borough Council that neither project has an overriding advantage in terms of PPG13 (paragraph 50).

146. It was submitted that the railway is a barrier to north-south movement in the town (paragraphs 56 & 79). I do not consider that the evidence justifies this claim. In my opinion this effect is very slight as borne out by the evidence of the appellants (paragraph 34). Those living in the south of the town would have easy vehicular access to a store at Goldsworth Road which would be significantly nearer than the superstore at Burpham as well as being close to the Town Centre.

OTHER MATTERS

147. Both proposed stores would provide a similar level of retail employment (paragraphs 39 & 59). Goldsworth Road because of other proposed uses would employ rather more in total. It would also have the advantage of providing a filling station with the possibility of lower prices (paragraph 34). A store on the former railway sidings would be acceptable environmentally whilst a store on the Westfield trip would lead to significant related environmental improvements but would not be acceptable in terms of its likely impact upon residential and visual amenity (paragraphs 117, 124-128).

PLANNING AGREEMENT - SITE A - GOLDSWORTH ROAD

148. The agreement drawn up between the County Council, Safeway Stores, ITMR Limited and Railtrack plc meets the test of reasonableness described in paragraph B8 of Annex B of Circular 16/91 (Doc.73). It is needed for the development to go ahead. The latter should not be permitted without it. The payments required are, in my view fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development.

CONDITIONS - SITE A - GOLDSWORTH ROAD

149. The conditions which the Council would wish to impose are included in Document 74. All save (a), (b) and (c) are acceptable to the appellants. If the Secretary of State is minded to grant permission for the appeal proposal I consider that conditions 1-19 are all necessary and conform with the advice in Circular 11/95. As far as (a) is concerned, I accept the submission made on behalf of the appellants that this would be unduly onerous and could cause unreasonable delay (paragraph 40). The petrol filling station would be quite close to

some dwellings in Kingsway Avenue and Kingsway. Consequently I consider that (b) should be imposed in the interests of residential amenity. Apart from a reference in the County Planning Officer's Strategic Consultation Report, no evidence was submitted by the County Council in relation to (c) (Doc.62 - App.2). It seems to me, therefore, that it would not be appropriate to include this condition.

PLANNING AGREEMENT - SITE B - WESTFIELD TIP

150. The matters included in the completed agreement meet the test of reasonableness of Paragraph B8 of Annex B of Circular 16/91 (Doc.75). The scheme consists of an integrated set of proposals. It is very unlikely that the additional benefits it affords would be implemented in the absence of such an agreement. In my view it would be inappropriate for the development to go ahead without it. As far as paragraph B9 of the circular is concerned the contribution to be made by the developer is properly related to the proposal.

CONDITIONS - SITE B - WESTFIELD TIP

151. Document 76 lists the conditions which have been agreed between the applicants and the Council. If the Secretary of State is minded to grant permission, I consider that they accord with the principles of Circular 11/95. On a matter of detail, it seems to me that conditions 16 and 17 could be combined. The words "in writing" should be added after "agreed" or "approved" in numbers 3, 10, 12, 23-25, 28-29, and 32. I consider that condition number 5 which deals with archaeological matters should be included in this instance whereas I have taken the opposite line with Goldsworth Road. In this case the parties are in agreement, the site is very extensive and there is obvious evidence (paragraph 12). The Environment Agency has requested the inclusion of four conditions (Doc.77). In my view, these are covered by conditions 6-10.

OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

152. There is a need for a large foodstore in Woking. Neither proposal completely satisfies the guidance of PPG6. The Goldsworth Road site comes very close to doing so and has the additional advantage of the likelihood of helping the revitalisation of a part of the Town Centre. It accords with approved and adopted development plans. On the other hand it conflicts with the employment allocation of the Review of the Local Plan. However that plan is at a very early stage. I accept that the proposal could provide more jobs than would be likely if other types of development were to proceed. A foodstore on the appeal site would be an improvement on the current situation in terms of residential amenity and the appearance of the area.

153. The Westfield Tip is out-of-centre and, in view of my conclusions on Site A, the proposal does not accord with PPG6. It partially accords and partially conflicts with Structure Plan retail policies. The site has been identified as a possible location for a food superstore in the Review of the Local Plan. A superstore at Westfield would result in a slighter greater retrieval of trade leaking to Guildford as well as a greater reduction in travel. However, in my view it could lead to a significantly detrimental impact upon the vitality and viability of the Kingfield Neighbourhood Shopping Centre.

154. The proposal for Westfield Tip would provide improvements in overall highway conditions, the removal of contaminated land together with landscape improvements. To my mind, although the scheme has substantial benefits, these are overridden by the very significant detrimental impact upon the amenity of those living nearby. It would, in my opinion, exacerbate an already unsatisfactory situation. Coupled with this is the unacceptable impact upon the Hoe Valley, contrary to Structure and Local Plan policies. The scheme would not therefore, meet the criteria which constitute very exceptional circumstances as outlined in the reasoned justification to Policy SHP1 (paragraph 22).

RECOMMENDATIONS

SITE A - GOLDSWORTH ROAD

155. I recommend that the appeal be allowed and that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and provided that an appropriate Agreement between the Council and the applicants is completed.

SITE B - WESTFIELD TIP

156. I recommend that the application be refused.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your obedient servant

RICHARD A MORDEY

RefNos:APP/A3655/A/96/265157
& SEP/21/A3655/01

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANTS

SITE A - GOLDSWORTH ROAD
APP/A/35655/A/96/265157

Mr C Lockhart-Mummery QC

instructed by Town Planning Consultancy
Limited, 118, Southwark Street,
London SE1 0SW

He called:

Mr T H Waring BA(Hons) MRTPI

Associate, Town Planning Consultancy

Mr A K Jenkinson BSc MHIT

Technical Director, The Denis Wilson
Partnership, 88-90, Guildford Street,
Chertsey, Surrey KT16 9AD

Mr N Smith BSc Estate Man DipTP
FRICS

Director, Hurst Warne Limited, Chartered
Surveyors, 33, Kingston Road, Leatherhead,
Surrey KT22 7TU

Mr P Howitt

Director of Corporate Development,
Safeway Stores PLC, Safeway House,
6, Millington Road, Hayes, Middlesex
UB34AY

Miss N Gibb MSc BSc

Hydrogeologist, Littlefell, Church Road,
West Peckham, Maidstone, Kent, ME18 5JL

FOR THE APPLICANTS

SITE B - WESTFIELD TIP
(SEP/21/A3655/01)

Sir E Eyre QC
Miss M Cook

of Counsel, instructed by Berwin Leighton,
Adelaide House, London Bridge, London
EC4R 9HA

They called:

Mr J Stevenson MA MPhilDIP.Econ Dev MRTPI ARICS MIENV Sc MIPRE MIBM M.Inst Pet	Partner EPCAD Consultants, Woolstone Centre, 6 Mill Lane, Woolstone, Milton Keynes, MK15 0AJ
Mr D F Sharps, CEng FIMechE FIOA	Senior Partner, Sharps Redmore Partnership.
Mr A R Boreham CEng MICE MIHT Dip TE DMS	Managing Director, Alan Boreham Associates Limited, Consulting Engineers, 1 Argent Court, Southfields Business Park, Sylvan Way, Basildon, Essex SS15 6TH
Mr R J Flack BA(Hons) MRTPI	Senior Partner, Development Planning Partnership, 21 The Crescent, Bedford, MK40 2RT
Mr J Gildersleeve	Director, Tesco PLC, Tesco House, Delamere Road, Cheshunt, Waltham Cross, Herts, EN8 9SI

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Mr D Mole QC	instructed by the Borough Solicitor, Woking Borough Council, Civic Offices, Gloucester Square, Woking, Surrey GU21 1YC
--------------	--

He called:

Mr S Scott-Brown DipTP MRTPI	Partner, Scott Brown Partnership, The Old Smithy, Stow Bedon, Attleborough, Norfolk NR17 1BX
Mr J R Morrissey BSc Econ(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI	James Morrissey Associates, 1 Market Square, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 1EV
Mr K C D Mitchell MSC MCIT MIHT	Partner, Peter Brett Associates, Consulting Engineers, 16 Westcote Road, Reading, Berkshire RG30 2DE
Mr A Needham MSc BSc(Hons) CEng FICE MIWEM MIHT	Director, Weeks Technical Services Limited, The Oasis, Newnham Court, Bearsted Road, Maidstone, Kent ME14 5LH
Mr M D Stone ASVA	Principal Valuer, Woking Borough Council
Mr S Rendall, BSc(Hons) ALI	Principal Landscape and Countryside Officer, Woking Borough Council

FOR SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

Mr A Kelly

of Counsel, instructed by J H Jessop, County
Solicitor, County Hall, Kingston-upon-Thames,
Surrey KT1 2DN

He called:

Mr R A Hargreaves BSc DipTP
MRTPI MIM

Assistant County Planning Officer,
Surrey CC

INTERESTED PARTIES

HOE VALLEY AND KINGFIELD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Mr M Dawes BSc

Campaign Officer, CPRE, Surrey, The Institute,
High Street, Leatherhead, Surrey KT22 8AH

He called:

Mr P Arnold

Secretary, Hoe Valley and Kingfield Residents
Association, Secretary of Woking District
Committee, Surrey CPRE

Mr H Enmarch-Williams

Hoe Valley and Kingfield Residents Association

Miss L Shaw

Hoe Valley & Kingfield Residents Association,
Project Manager, S L Shaw Limited,
7A Hetheridge Arcade, Cumberland Road,
Heatherside, Camberley GU15 1AX

Mr C A Waghorn BCom ACMA FIMC

S L Shaw Limited

Miss R Williams BEd

Chairman, Hoe Valley and Kingfield Residents
Association

ST JOHN AMBULANCE

Mr D A Robinson

Divisional President, St John Ambulance, Catalpa,
Grange Road, Horsell, Woking, Surrey GU214DA

WOKING DISTRICT SCOUT COUNCIL

Mr I Scott

Woking District Scout Council, District
Commissioner, 7 Orchard Mains, Wych Hill,
Woking GU22 0ET

INTERESTED PERSONS

Mrs S Gruselle	County Councillor, Surrey County Council, Inglemere, Egley Road, Mayford, Woking, Surrey GU22 0NQ
Mr D P Davey	9 Greenmeads, Westfield, Woking, Surrey GU22 9QJ
Ms S Butcher	67 Granville Road, Kingfield. Woking, Surrey GU22 9ND
Mr H Shirley	Borough Councillor, Everley Cottage, Wych Hill Lane, Woking, Surrey GU22 0AH
Mr J D Pattison	Borough Councillor, 19 April Avenue, Westfield, Woking, Surrey
Mr R Williams	14 Kingfield Gardens, Kingfield Green, Woking GU22 9DI

INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

- Document 1 - Lists of persons present at the Inquiry and at the Pre-Inquiry Meeting.
- Document 2 - Notice of Inquiry.
- Document 3 - Note re Comparative Retail Figures.
- Document 4 - Note on Pedestrian Walk Distances to the south of Woking.
- Document 5 - Schedule of Land Uses: Goldsworth Road, Woking.
- Document 6 - Notes of meeting at PBA's offices.
- Document 7 - PPG13 : Measures of Accessibility.
- Document 8 - Woking Town Centre Parking Study - Final Report Colin Buchanan and Partners.
- Document 9 - PPG13 - A Guide to Better Practice.
- Document 10 - Letter from Boreham Consulting Engineers to Mr K Mitchell, Peter Brett Associates 11 February 1997.
- Document 11 - Appeal Decision Letter : T/APP/A1910/A/95/261764/P5.
- Document 12 - Letter from the Government Office for the South East to the Borough Planning Officer - 18 December 1996 together with Objection to the Woking Borough Local Plan.
- Document 13 - Note on Land Use Change in Goldsworth Road 1991-97.
- Document 14 - Woking Controlled Parking Zone.
- Document 15 - Minutes of a meeting of the Council's Local Plan Sub - Committee.
- Document 16 - URPI Information Brief 95/1 Derivation and Use of URPI Consumer Retail Expenditure Estimates.
- Document 17 - Retail Impact Assessment - Woking.
- Document 18 - Supplementary Technical Note proposal by K C D Mitchell re car parking.
- Document 19 - Revised PPG6 : Consultation Draft July 1995.

- Document 20 - Appeal decision letter T/APP/F5540/A/96/263655, 263653, 263654/P7.
- Document 21 - Comparison of Annual Travel Distance Savings using the revised turnover at Goldsworth Road.
- Document 22 - Diagram of Claremont Avenue/Kingfield Road/Wych Hill junction.
- Document 23 - Woking Borough Council, Development Control Sub-Committee Agenda Notes 5 September 1995.
- Document 24 - Woking Impact Study - Tables.
- Document 25 - Comparative Impact Tables.
- Document 26 - Appeal decision letter T/APP/G5750/A/96/262342/P5.
- Document 27 - Letter from Department of the Environment to Mr C Bishop, Berwin Leighton.
- Document 28 - Woking Shopping Survey - Top Up Shopping - Desagregation of Local Woking.
- Document 29 - Customer Survey - Shaws.
- Document 30 - Turnover calculations.
- Document 31 - Letter from Department of the Environment to Head of Legal Services, LB of Newham.
- Document 32 - Surrey CC - Strategic Consultations re Westfield Tip.
- Document 33 - Consultation Report - Surrey CC to Borough Planning Officer 9 September 1994.
- Document 34 - Call-in decision - EMP/2810/218/12& EMP/2810/223/2.
- Document 35 - Newspaper Cutting re proposed store at Pulborough.
- Document 36 - Letter from John Gardiner to Ivan Woolf.
- Document 37 - Letter from Tesco to John Gardiner 16 August 1996.
- Document 38 - Woking BC - Personnel & Management Committee - 22 June 1992 - Agenda Item No 15 Westfield Tip.

- Document 39 - Correspondence between Landscape Design Associates and Mr Rendall.
- Document 40 - Revised Store Turnover of Safeway.
- Document 41 - Appeal Site at Goldsworth Road, Woking : Schedule of Walking Distances.
- Document 42 - Letter from CPRE (Mr Dawes) to the Environment Agency.
- Document 43 - Letter from Environment Agency (Miss S Zabados)
- Document 44 - TPC response to objections by Montague Evans re Appeal by Rail Track, Huntingate/Linkside at Goldsworth Road, Woking.
- Document 45 - Appeal decision SEP/31/A3655/1/01.
- Document 46 - Appeal decision : T/APP/Z3825/A/96/273244/P2.
- Document 47 - "Neighbourhood Shops Matter Too" - British Independent Grocers Association.
- Document 48 - Appendix to Mr Waring's proof of evidence, including the application plan and illustrative drawings.
- Document 49 - Appendices to Mr Jenkinson's proof of evidence.
- Document 50 - Appendices to Mr Smith's proof of evidence.
- Document 51 - Appendices to Miss Gibb's proof of evidence.
- Document 52 - Appendices to Mr Stevenson's proof of evidence.
- Document 53 - Appendices to Mr Sharps' proof of evidence.
- Document 54 - Appendices to Mr Boreham's proofs of evidence.
- Document 55 - Appendices to Mr Flack's proof of evidence.
- Document 56 - Appendices to Mr Scott-Brown's proofs of evidence.
- Document 57 - Appendices to Mr Morrissey's proof of evidence.
- Document 58 - Appendices to Mr Mitchell's proof of evidence.
- Document 59 - Appendices to Mr Needham's proof of evidence.
- Document 60 - Appendices to Mr Stone's proof of evidence.

- Document 61 - Appendices to Mr Rendall's proof of evidence.
- Document 62 - Appendices to Mr Hargreave's proof of evidence.
- Document 63 - Appendices to Mr Dawe's proof of evidence.
- Document 64 - Appendices to Mr Arnold's proofs of evidence.
- Document 65 - Appendices to Miss Shaw's proofs of evidence.
- Document 66 - Appendices to Mr Waghorn's proof of evidence.
- Document 67 - Appendices to Miss William's proof of evidence.
- Document 68 - Appendices to Mrs Gruselle's proof of evidence.
- Document 69 - Bundle of letters of objection to the Goldsworth Road proposal - APP/A3655/A/96/265157.
- Document 70 - Bundle of letters supporting the Goldsworth Road proposal.
- Document 71 - Bundle of letters objecting to the Westfield Tip proposal - SEP/21/A3655/01.
- Document 72 - Bundle of letters supporting the Westfield Tip proposal.
- Document 73 - Planning Agreement - Site A - Goldsworth Road.
- Document 74 - Suggested conditions - Site A - Goldsworth Road.
- Document 75 - Planning Agreement - Site B - Westfield Tip.
- Document 76 - Suggested conditions - Site B - Westfield Tip.
- Document 77 - Conditions suggested by the Environment Agency

CORE DOCUMENTS

- CD 1 - Surrey Structure Plan 1994.
- CD 2 - Woking Borough Local Plan 1993.
- CD 3 - Woking Local Plan Review Issues Report of October 1995.
- CD 4 - Woking Borough Local Plan Review Deposit Draft of November 1996.

- CD 5 - A Countryside Strategy for Woking - Woking Borough Council 1992.
- CD 6 - Management Plan for the Hoe Valley - Consultative Draft 1994.
- CD 7 - Economic Plan for Woking.
- CD 8 - Woking Borough Council Report to Development Control Sub Committee 30.1.96 and to Full Council 22.2.96 including Report of late objections 22.2.96 (refers to Planning Application 95/0879).
- CD 9 - Woking Borough Council Report to Development Control Sub Committee 9.7.96 including Supplementary Report (refers Planning Application 95/0980).
- CD 10 - Woking Borough Council Report to Development Control Sub Committee 12.11.96 (refers to Planning Applications 95/0879 and 95/0980).
- CD 11 - Woking Borough Council Report to Development Control Sub Committee 9.7.96 including Supplementary Report (refers to Planning Application 96/0269).
- CD 12 - Woking Borough Council Retail Report and Appendices - Erdman Lewis 1994.
- CD 13 - Woking Household Shopping Survey of November 1996 - James Morrisey Associates.
- CD 14 - Site Investigation of Westfield Tip by Clayton Environmental Consultants of November 1995 and Summary Report of John Allen Associates.
- CD 15 - Report on a Geotechnical Investigation of Westfield Tip for Clayton Environmental Consultants on behalf of John Allen Associates by Soils Limited of November 1995.
- CD 16 - Correspondence from Contest Melbourne Weeks to Woking Borough Council of 5.1.96.
- CD 17 - Report of Contamination at Westfield Tip by Contest Melbourne Weeks 1991.
- CD 18 - Tesco Stores Limited Promotional Brochure on Westfield Tip.

CD 19 - Drawings which accompanied Planning Application No 95/0879.

MSA 9508 - 08F	MSA 9508 - 09D	MSA 9508 - 10A
MSA 9508 - 11	MSA 9508 - 12	MSA 9508 - 13A
MSA 9508 - 14A	MSA 9508 - 15A	MSA 9508 - 16H
MSA 9508 - 17E	MSA 9508 - 18B	MSA 9508 - 19
MSA 9508 - 22	MSA 9508 - 23	MSA 9508 - 24
MSA 9508 - 25	MSA 9508 - 26	

JAA 1434 R D 02F	JAA 1434 R D 04A	JAA 1434 R D 05
JAA 1434 R D 06	JAA 1434 R D 07	JAA 1434 GM R 09A
JAA 1434 GM R10	JAA 1434 GM R11A	JAA 1434 GM R13

JAA 1434 SWP 01	JAA 1434 SWP 03	JAA 1434 SWP 04
-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Survey Sheets

3549	3515	3515	3515	3515	3515
------	------	------	------	------	------

CD 20 BS 4142 of 1990 Rating Industrial Noise affecting Mixed Residential Development.
BS 8233 of 1987 Code of Practice for Sound Insulation of Noise Reduction of Buildings.

CD 21 - Inspection and Report on 31 Trees at Westfield Tip by John Dolwin BSc(For) Farbor FICFO Arboricultural and Forestry Consultant.

CD 22 - Woking Borough Council "Monitoring Report MR1/96 Employment Development 1988 to 1995 September 1996".

HIGHWAYS

CD 23 - Transportation Study for Conrad Phoenix Properties Limited of October 1995.

CD 24 - Kingfield Highway Study for Directorate of Central Services of Woking Borough Council.

CD 25 - Journey Saving Comparison for Conrad Phoenix Properties Limited of January 1996.

CD 26 - The Denis Wilson Partnership letter addressed to Director of Technical Services at Woking Borough Council FAO Mr G Wallace dated 4 October 1995.

- CD 27 - The Denis Wilson Partnership letter and enclosures addressed to Director of Technical Services at Woking Borough Council FAO Mr G Wallace dated 9 October 1995.
- CD 28 - The Denis Wilson Partnership letter addressed to Director of Technical Services at Woking Borough Council FAO Mr P Uttley dated 22 December 1995.
- Enclosures: (i) Highways and Transportation Implications
Assessment December 1995
(ii) Appendix A - G December 1995
(iii) Appendix H - N December 1995
- CD 29 - The Denis Wilson Partnership letter and enclosures addressed to Director of Highways and Transportation at Surrey County Council FAO Mr T Goodworth dated 9 February 1996.
- CD 30 - Surrey County Council facsimile to The Denis Wilson Partnership FAO Mr M Stevens dated 16 February 1996.
- CD 31 - The Denis Wilson Partnership letter and enclosures addressed to Mr T Goodworth at Surrey County Council dated 28 February 1996.
- CD 32 - Woking Borough Council facsimile and attachments addressed to Mr M Stevens at the Denis Wilson Partnership dated 28 March 1996.
- CD 33 - The Denis Wilson Partnership letter and enclosures addressed to Director of Technical Services at Woking Borough Council FAO Mr P Uttley dated 12 April 1996.
- CD 34 - Woking Borough Council's letter addressed to Mr A Dumbrell at The Denis Wilson Partnership dated 17 April 1996.
- CD 35 - The Denis Wilson Partnership letter and enclosures addressed to Mr T Goodworth at Surrey County Council dated 22 April 1996
- Enclosures (i) Development Traffic Impact April 96
(ii) Development Traffic Attraction/Development Traffic Distribution and Assignment April 96
- CD 36 - The Denis Wilson Partnership letter and enclosures addressed to Mr T Goodworth at Surrey County Council dated 23 April 1996.

- CD 37 - The Denis Wilson Partnership letter and enclosures addressed to Mr G Wallace at Woking Borough Council dated 30 April 1996.
- CD 38 - The Denis Wilson Partnership letter and enclosures addressed to Director of Highways and Transportation at Surrey County Council FAO Mr T Goodworth dated 13 May 1996.
- CD 39 - Surrey County Council's highway observations (Form CR1) to Woking Borough Council dated 18 June 1996.
- CD 40 - Surrey County Council's amended (Form CR1) to Woking Borough Council dated 20 June 1996.
- CD 41 - Surrey County Council's County Planning Department's letter and enclosure addressed to Borough Planning Officer at Woking Borough Council dated 4/March/96.
Enclosure County Planning Report Strategic Consultation WO95/0980 dated 22 February 1996.