

## Frances West

---

**From:** Amy Loughborough [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 27 September 2020 10:55  
**To:** DevelopmentControl  
**Subject:** PLAN/2020/0568

**Categories:** Frances

Hi,

I am writing with regard to PLAN/2020/0568 to write some of my objections with regard to these plans and ask that these points be taken into consideration as part of the planning consideration process.

Whilst there has already been approval for the development of Victoria Square which comprises of some huge towers already, there are several concerns I would like to raise about this new additional proposal.

### **Development Build Time**

Given the Victoria Square development (PLAN/2016/0742) is still not finished before the next phase on the islands opposite is already beginning I find it a little ludicrous that there are plans to start another HUGE development next door. Residents are enduring years of traffic delays, extra traffic, damage to roads, extra pollution already and the plans to progress with another 8 years of construction on top of the two approved projects is overwhelming. Quality of life for existing residents must be considered as well as planning for the future.

### **Density / Height**

A comparison between PLAN/2020/0568 and PLAN/2016/0742 swiftly shows this new development has a much higher density of 839 compared to the already high 746 for the current development. The height to deliver these DPH are extreme (9-41) compared to even the (10 to 34) and this is extremely concerning. Core Strategy 10 states that a density above 200 dwellings per hectare (dph) would be acceptable in Woking town centre. But this development has a density of 839 dph which is higher than any other building in the area and could be expected in inner city London. This is not justifiable for Woking. With recent Grenfell Towers and knowledge from high rise developments from the 1960's now being pulled down, it seems that the desire for high density housing solutions is being pursued against any other planning recommendations eg adequate space in flats, adequate green space, access to sunshine etc. The height is also extreme and many vantage points in Surrey already demonstrate the blight Woking is causing to Surrey's green views. Woking Core Strategy 24 requires good design that supports the townscape. This development overshadows Victoria Place which was supposed to be the aesthetic focal point of the town centre and creates a messy skyline which contradicts CS 24.

### **Design**

Whilst I understand the sentiment of making "Woking the Singapore of Surrey" I ask if anyone has actually visited Singapore as I find this reference point baffling? The architecture there is well thought out, beautiful individual design with sky gardens. What is being proposed here is Canary Wharf towers let's be honest.

### **Underprovision of Affordable Housing**

Woking Core Strategy 12 states that 40% of new developments of this size should be affordable housing. This development includes only 5% of affordable housing which is in stark violation with CS 12.

### **Not enough accommodation for families**

Woking Core Strategy 11 states that the housing mix should meet local needs as per latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The SMHA recommends around 40% of 3 bed flats. This development offers only 2% 3 bed flats but 61% studios and 1 bed flats. This is in violation to CS11.

Woking's overview and scrutiny committee report (14 Sep 2020) also identified a significant need for 2 and 3 bed homes at 31% and 20% respectively.

### **Parking Spaces**

Whilst the pursuit for green policies is admirable, I find the number of parking spaces severely lacking. Only 216 parking spaces for 916 dwellings is an even lower allocation than the 395 for 560 dwellings included in plan PLAN/2016/0742. This is only saving up future issues with parking in the already congested town centre and causing more issues for local residents whom bear the brunt of excess parking in their own crowded residential roads.

Thanks for considering my feedback as part of the planning process and hope the residents views are taken account of.

Amy

--

Amy Loughborough

