

# 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 929 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 37 storeys (including 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) (amended plans and reports received 13.11.2020).

Case Officer: Brooke Bougnague

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Scott Kennedy

Address: 1B The Grove, Horsell, Woking, Surrey GU21 4AE

## Comment Details

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

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

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

Comment: I object to this development for the following reasons:

1. The density and height of the development will not add any value to Woking and will overlook all housing around Goldsworth Road (Kings Way, Goldsworth, Oaks Road etc) also York Road as well. Victoria Sq, was meant to be the "flagship" development, but this seems to be bigger and so Victoria Sq no longer "flagship"?

2. The density and proximity of towers look too close and do not help with crime prevention. After the towers on Guildford were built we saw crime/issues at this development. This development is major thoroughfare for people coming/going to the station late at night and crime/anti-social issues

need to be addressed. This type of development will cause problems in this area.

3. The allocation of 3 bedroom and affordable housing is very low

4. 929 units can result in approx 2000 people living in relatively small space, the units are only just above the acceptable standard and we have seen before in previous developments in history what happens in tall overcrowded buildings. We are sold the dream of "Singapore" of Surrey. If you have been there and where "real" people live, it's not very wonderful, most folk do not live in the nice waterlined towers. This will be "Croydon-isation of Woking" We are supposed to have learned from the 1960's?

4. The country-side views from Guildford and Surrey hills will be affected. The Victoria development has already had a bad affect on the views and loss/out of character in the green, rolling green-belt nature to Surrey

5. The town plan for all the Towers need to be viewed as a single plan rather than 1 by 1. Every development in Woking seems to involve very high-rise towers. This development is just outside the core town centre location and the beginning of lower rise housing part of Woking. Previous attempts to build high on Coin Church, new power station, with housing units have shown, people of Woking do not want this scale of development on this side of town, it is out of character.

6. The noise and traffic from construction will considerable, with everything needing to be transported by road. There are already other developments planned and this will bring additional CO2, noise for many years, affecting people's health who border this development and those along the roads into Woking.

7. Parking, there is clearly insufficient parking, are 1000+ people expected to work in London or only commute by train? This is unrealistic for most people. So we will have additional 1000 cars in the town, either in other car parks or requesting on street parking. It must be made clear that nobody from this development will NOT EVER be allowed to apply or receive on-street parking permits.

8. Pressure on local infrastructure, based on the local availability of school places, and the new residents supposed to walk, as having no car? is this development going to fund the expansion of places in the nearest schools (primary and secondary?)