

Comments for Planning Application PLAN/2020/0568

Application Summary

Application Number: PLAN/2020/0568

Address: Land To The North And South Of Goldsworth Road Woking Surrey GU21 6JT

Proposal: Demolition of all existing buildings and redevelopment of the site for a phased mixed-use scheme, comprising 965 residential units (Class C3), communal residential and operational spaces, commercial uses (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1/D2) at ground floor and homeless shelter (sui generis) within 5 blocks of varying heights of between 9 and 40 storeys (plus rooftop amenity) to the north and south sides of the site together with soft and hard landscaping including public realm works, highway alterations to Goldsworth Road, car parking, cycle parking, bin storage, ancillary facilities and plant (Environmental Statement submitted).

Case Officer: Brooke Bougnague

Customer Details

Name: Mr alastair hargrave

Address: 58 Vale Farm Road, Woking, Surrey GU21 6DP

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Resident (local res.- member of public)

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Generation of noise level
- High-over density of development
- Highway reasons - parking
- Impact of development
- Loss of privacy
- Out of Character
- Overlooking
- Traffic Volume

Comment: Can I state that I am not against good development on brown field sites within the Woking area. However having reviewed this application I see many things wrong with it:

1. Woking needs good affordable and social housing within the area. We have just had a COVID crisis and key workers need homes to reflect our local needs which is beyond commuters. This is an opportunity this proposal lacks and is detrimental to the need for good social mix in Woking. All new residential proposals of that size require 40% of dwellings to be affordable. Affordable housing is only 48 out of 965 homes which is about 5%
2. This scheme has grown taller than the previous one in 2016. This is dangerous given Grenfell. How would a fire be fought on the 40th floor? How would residents there be protected.
3. It is out of keeping for the area. Other brownfield sites near town centre exist in which larger

buildings could be built that would be in keeping with design. I live in a single floor victorian terrace near the site and the differential in size is ridiculous. It will overlook our properties and affect the light into our gardens. We have valued these during this extended period of lockdown. We could not go anywhere. Is the expectation we lose our privacy as a result of this scheme?

4. On that point there is no proposal for any green spaces for the residents of the scheme. We have to assume a new normal now and a need for public space for them is and will be needed. How is the proposal to address this?

5. Commuting - about half of the over 2000 estimated dwellers are likely to be commuters. Have network rail been consulted. My journey to work at several thousands of pounds is already overcrowded. Also light off the building is a concern due it locality to the station and train line.

6. The plan has not laid out how it will deal with the additional infrastructure needs - schools, kindergartens, GP surgeries, youth clubs, community centres and so on. We cannot keep talking about building without consideration of the additional burden this places on other aspects of our community especially now as we see the problems placed on us by a single viral outbreak. We now must assume this can and will happen again. It's already hard for me to see my doctor within time. Schemes should be about building communities, not just buildings with more people.

7. Given covid, how will the scheme deal with the extraction and processing of air in such a huge scheme. This is clearly of critical importance. The new normal demands it.

8. The plan submits 216 parking spaces and work on the assumption that the estimated 2,464 residents will mostly not have cars. This is a constraint is a ridiculous constraint to place on new residents to the scheme. Which 216 and how will overflow be handled. As a resident with only 9-6pm parking rights under the permit there are a further 15 hours in which people park in vale farm road. The situation at commuting times is so ridiculous that cars are now parking outside my home to pick people up from woking station. People leave their cars running and this adds the pollution outside my home. This now is unsustainable. At lowest estimate people will want additional off-street parking in the scheme which cannot be accommodated in the CPZ

9. The scheme will generate noise for a long period of time. We residents have seen in recent times the beautiful effect of noise reduction on our mental welfares. Now the noise is back. The difference is palpable. We have building works and disruption. loss of services at times and noise from the schemes currently in build. It is unacceptable to expect more of this far into the future. The effect on local business too and the council shuts roads or blocks parking to local businesses.

This site needs redevelopment and there is a great opportunity here to do something truly leading edge. This scheme is not that.

I do not concur that this revised scheme does this in the way that works with the local community. The very nature of how this was promoted to the local community shows a lack of regard as do the plans from the developer. When will planners and developers learn that working with the community and understanding their concerns first is good stakeholder management. This is another proposal much like the first two coign church designs in which we have been disregarded. In 15 years living in vale farm road I have seen a constant threat of poor development from planners and developers. To the point Coign is now an excellent example of what could have been

achieved 15 years ago had the council not insisted on 22 floors of flats above a church. The coign got its church and we got a single floor building which was our case 15 years ago. It cost money and lost will.