

## Hannah Dale

---

**From:** Hana Stevenson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 November 2020 14:04  
**To:** DevelopmentControl  
**Subject:** Objection to plan/2020/0568

Dear Planning Authority,

I am writing to **object** to PLAN/2020/0568 on the following grounds:

**Height, mass and bulk of proposed buildings** – this is utterly disproportionate to the surrounding area. The highest building should be in the Town Centre yet this proposal would see even higher buildings, when surely the height should decrease as you move further out of the centre. Consideration should be given to the local area; a large majority being family homes, often turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century builds that contribute to the local character of Woking and a feeling of openness and suburbia. These towers would dwarf us, are completely out of keeping with the local area and bring us on the edge of a metropolis in the making. Many of us moved out of London to escape that very environment! This contravenes CS11 Housing Mix as the proposed heights do not take into account the neighbouring character and as such would have a harmful impact on the character of the surrounding area, therefore contrary to Woking CS (2012) CS21. I totally understand the need for redevelopment and housing, but the heights proposed here are unacceptable and at the very least, be lower than those of Victoria Square. It MUST pay due regard to scale and height in order to make a positive contribution to the character of the surrounding area (CS21) which the current plan most certainly contravenes. There is no satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties, with its proposed bulk creating an overbearing effect on the local neighbourhood (CS21)

**Local infrastructure and parking** – it can already be shown that Goldsworth Road has a huge pinch point for traffic at the proposed site end of the road. As such, the local infrastructure already struggles with the traffic of existing dwellings (not to mention the appalling queues of cars trying to reach McDonald's). What plans are there to prevent excessive congestion (CS16)? You assume many people will not have cars given the ridiculous number of parking spaces currently proposed (just 22% of the homes would have a singular car parking space) yet the Core Strategy CS17 notes that Woking is to attract new residents based on 'facilitating effective access to the countryside'. How will these people get to the countryside without a car? I strongly suspect the number of car parking spaces required has been grossly underestimated here. This brings me on to a further issue of where will these new residents park their cars? The surrounding areas are already suffering from a high density of cars parking for access to the shops and cannot support further cars searching for long term parking. Living on one of these adjacent roads I would be directly impacted by this, making it hard for visitors to my home to park on my street. The old application in 2016 had more parking spaces allocated (395 spaces) for fewer flats (560 flats) proposed (71% of flats afforded a car parking space in the 2016 application) – to have the number of flats almost double in this application, yet the number of parking spaces reduced to just 22% of properties with a car parking space is completely inappropriate and is a great cause for concern.

**Affordable housing** – This development fails to deliver sufficient affordable housing with a mere 5% of the new homes being as such.

**Schools** – With the local primary school already oversubscribed where are the Council suggesting any new resident's children attend? CS19 states that the Council will work with partners to provide such infrastructure to support the growth of the borough. With 3 young children myself, I am increasingly concerned over the pressure on school places in Woking.

**Density and amenity space**- The proposed density of these flats leave them with inadequate amenity space contravening CS17.

Regards

Hana Stevenson, [59 Kingsway, Woking, Surrey, GU21 6NS](#)

Sent from my iPhone

*This email is being sent to you on behalf of a Teach First Ambassador.*

*Any opinions expressed in this email are solely those of the sender and do not necessarily represent those of Teach First.*