

# 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 Bounague

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Timothy Harris

Address: Penylan, Heathside Park Road, Woking, Surrey GU22 7JE

## Comment Details

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

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- High-over density of development
- Highway reasons - parking
- Impact of development
- Out of Character
- Overlooking

Comment: I attended the "consultation" exhibition at Christchurch and have carefully considered the developers proposals. I am and have been a resident of Woking for nearly 40 years.

I wish to OBJECT to the above planning application on several grounds: -

- Number and Height of Buildings. The number and height of building is excessive and too close to similar constructions in progress. The "wind tunnel" effect experienced by pedestrians near to Victoria Arch is already pronounced and will get worse with more extremely high buildings in a relatively small area. To build a 40-storey building for residential use in a place like Woking or anywhere is verging on the ridiculous. Construction of any high rise is vastly more expensive than low rise construction.

- Number of Residential Units. This number of additional residential units cannot be sustainable in that they cannot be supported by public services. Woking Council already has huge debts but still must continue to provide public services to these new residents. It seems unlikely that that it will achieve this despite increased income from Council Taxes. The number of units allocated for "public" or "affordable" housing is pitiful. If there is a housing shortage in Woking, then it is people

on low incomes who require that housing. This development does not address that issue.

- The developers propose to include a homeless shelter in the development. This is a diversion; if there is a need from the homeless then provide homes, not shelters.
- The proposed number of included parking spaces in the development is woefully inadequate and will result in further pressure on surrounding streets and public car parks.
- The buildings on this land at present may well have reached their "use by date". If this is the case, then the land would be better used as low-rise low-density social housing to replace some of the perfectly good houses taken down in Sheerwater.
- As a retired commuter I know well how crowded and uncomfortable travelling from Woking to London can be at peak times. Woking Station is not fit to take possibly more than a thousand additional commuters from such a development.
- The disruption from this proposal together with other schemes in progress is likely to continue for the next ten years. We are told there are also proposals to build further extremely high buildings on the BHS, H G Wells and Concord House sites yet the provision of public housing is abysmally low.
- We are about to face one of the worst recessions for many years. This development must have been assessed in a business model giving the investors the maximum return on their investment. What evidence is available to assure all stakeholders including the existing residents and Council Tax payers of Woking that there is the demand for such accommodation at a price to make the development financially feasible.

T R Harris