

# Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD)

## Regulation 18 consultation questionnaire

18 June 2015 – 31 July 2015



### How to respond to this Consultation

The Site Allocations DPD public consultation documents are available on the Woking2027 website (see [www.woking2027.info](http://www.woking2027.info)), local libraries and the Council's Civic Offices.

You can use this form to let us have your comments on the draft Site Allocations DPD. Additional copies of this questionnaire can also be downloaded from the website.

Alternatively, the Woking2027 website features an online version of this questionnaire and an interactive map of the proposed development sites, through which you can let us know your views.

The public consultation is open to **5pm on Friday 31 July 2015**. Unfortunately we cannot accept responses received after 5pm on the closing date.

Data Protection: Please be aware that representations received by the Council will be made publicly available. If you have any questions about completing this form please contact the Planning Policy team by email [planning.policy@woking.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@woking.gov.uk) or on **01483 743871**.

### Your details

**Please provide your contact details below.** We are unable to accept anonymous or confidential responses.

Title: Mr

First name Gerry

Surname Hickey

Position N/A

Organisation N/A

House name and/or number Beech Lawn

Street Beech Grove

Locality Mayford

Town Woking

County Surrey

Post code GU22 0SX

Email address [REDACTED]

Telephone

**Please select your status or that of any party you are representing:**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident of Woking Borough        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Owner of land in Woking Borough |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Someone who works in Woking Borough          | <input type="checkbox"/> Planning / land agent                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Someone who visits Woking Borough            | <input type="checkbox"/> Developer                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Someone representing a group or organisation | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)                     |
- 

If you are an agent representing another party, please state who:

---

---

---

**Please note that everyone responding to this consultation will be notified of future Woking Borough planning policy consultations. If you would prefer not to be contacted in the future, please tick**

**Woking Citizens' Panel**

Woking Citizens' Panel is comprised of a group of residents from across Woking from all backgrounds, ages and ethnicities. They are contacted a number of a times each year, via email or post, and asked to provide their views on all kinds of issues that affect local people.

**Would you like to join the Woking Citizens' Panel?**

Yes  No  I am already a member

**Please provide your comments using the questions on the following two pages and return the whole questionnaire – including any additional comments pages – by 5pm, Friday 31 July 2015:**

- By email to: [planning.policy@woking.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@woking.gov.uk)
- By post to: **Planning Policy, Woking Borough Council, Civic Offices, Gloucester Square, Woking, Surrey, GU21 6YL**

Please note that responses will not be individually acknowledged.

**Thank you for taking the time to respond.**

## Your views

Please complete a separate copy of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire for each individual site or section that you wish to comment on.

**Which consultation document does your comment concern?** Please tick one option only:

Site Allocations DPD       Sustainability Appraisal Report       Habitat Regulations Assessment  
**or**  General comment (not specific to any one of the consultation documents)       Suggest a new site

**Which site or section of the document does your comment concern? (if applicable)**

Please state all that apply:

Site reference: (please select and note number) UA / GB \_\_\_GB7 GB8 GB9 GB10 GB11

Section title \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Page number \_\_\_\_\_

Paragraph number \_\_\_\_\_

**Are you?**  Supporting       Objecting       A combination of these       Neutral

**Your comment**

### **Traveller Site, Ten Acre Farm (DPD 2015, GB7)**

#### **Objections to expansion of Ten Acre Farm by up to 12 Traveller pitches**

#### **KEY ARGUMENT**

#### **Site not currently deliverable**

*If letters sent to confirm availability with landowners have not established them as available, they have not been included in the assessment. If the landowner identified a site as not available, then the site is not considered further for Gypsy and Traveller use (WBC Green Belt Review 2014 – GBR)*

Woking Borough Council (WBC) approached Mr Lee, owner/occupier of Ten Acre Farm to ask if the site was available. Residents understand that the site is not available and that Mr Lee has not, to date, confirmed availability. **With no written confirmation of availability, the site must be removed from the DPD.**

*At the time of the GBR this land (Ten Acre Farm) was promoted for residential development but was unavailable for increased Traveller accommodation use (GBR). This has not changed and Mr Lee (owner/occupier) continues to seek planning approval for his own residential use.*

*The site has a low existing use value and residential development is likely to be economically viable at a low density (GBR). This is confirmed through Mr Lee (owner/occupier) continuing to seek planning approval for his own residential use.*

The Council is acting contrary to its own Strategic Land Accommodation Assessment 2014 (SHLAA) by including Ten Acre Farm as an extended Traveller site. **The site should not be included in the DPD.**

#### **IMPACT**

## 1 Site Concentration

ALL of Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough - Ten Acre Farm, Mayford; Hatchington, Burdenshott Road (one mile from Ten Acre Farm); and Five Acres, Brookwood Lye (three miles from Ten Acre Farm). Mayford already provides a major contribution towards the Traveller Community. **There is no justification for further expansion in Mayford.**

## 2 Inappropriate Development in Green Belt

**The proposal is, by definition, inappropriate development in the Green Belt** contrary to Policy CS6 (Development in the Green Belt) of the Woking Core Strategy Publication Document 2012 and Section 9 (Protecting Green Belt Land) of the National Policy Framework. These set out limited circumstances where development is considered to be appropriate within the Green Belt.

## 3 Special Circumstances

In the absence of Very Special Circumstances being demonstrated that would justify an exception, there is a presumption against such development. Unmet demand does not constitute 'very special circumstances'.

The previous Government (Communities and Local Government Minister, Brandon Lewis MP Statements July 2013, January 2014) made it clear that unmet demand for sites, whether for traveller sites or conventional housing, is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute very special circumstance justifying inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The Secretary of State wishes to re-emphasise this policy point to both local planning authorities and planning inspectors as a material consideration in their planning decisions.

It is therefore considered that even should the Council not be able to demonstrate a five year supply of Traveller sites, this need **would not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness** to amount to the very special circumstance to justify the development in the Green Belt.

## 4 Impact on Visual Amenity, Character and Local Environment

*According to Woking Core Strategy 2012, Policy CS14 criteria states "The site should not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment".*

*Policy H, paragraph 24b, of the PPFTS requires sites to 'positively enhance the environment and increase its openness'. Policy CS21 states that the new development 'should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area in which they are situated', and Policy CS24 states that any development proposal should conserve and where possible enhance existing character.*

Smarts Heath Road is a residential road of some 22 houses, including two 16<sup>th</sup> Century Grade Two listed buildings in close proximity to Ten Acre Farm, leading directly through Smarts Heath Common onto open countryside.

The private traveller site at Ten Acre Farm was granted permission for 5 caravans for one family in 1987 (87/0282). **It was never envisaged that this traveller site would be expanded outside Mr Lee's immediate family.** They have lived in the road for well over thirty years, and for many years, before taking up residence at Ten Acre Farm, lived at number 22 Smarts Heath Road.

Additional pitches, will, according to the Council's Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) comply with the design principles set out by Government practice guidance which is currently 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites, May 2008'. These guidelines state what each 'pitch' must have. **Up to twelve of these pitches each needing an amenity building, hard standings for a large trailer and touring caravan, and two vehicles WILL have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area and the local environment, and certainly WILL NOT positively increase the openness of the area, nor**

## **the rural street scene.”**

This will have an adverse impact on the openness, character and appearance of the area, dominate the nearest settled community and reduce the amenity value contrary to Policies CS6 (Green Belt), CS14 (Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People), CS24 (Woking's Landscape and Townscape) of the Woking Core Strategy 2012, the Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight SPD.

It is worth pointing out that over the years, **successive planning inspectors have refused residential applications on this site because it would reduce the openness of a green belt area.**

## **5 Business Use**

*Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially residential and those living there are entitled to a peaceful and enjoyable environment. Draft Communities and Local Government guidance on site management proposes that working from residential pitches should be discouraged and that residents should not normally be allowed to work elsewhere on site (Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008). Yet the DPD states “Potential for inclusion of an element of business use, where this would support residents living and working on site.”*

Woking Core Strategy 2012, Policy H, paragraph 24b, of the PPFTS requires sites to ‘positively enhance the environment and increase its openness’. Policy CS21 states that the new development ‘should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area in which they are situated’, and Policy CS24 states that any development proposal should conserve and where possible enhance existing character.

**The inclusion of business use would inflict a small-scale industrial estate with associated noise, traffic, and nuisance to residents in the road which is totally out of keeping with the amenity and character of the immediate area.**

## **SITE SELECTION**

### **1 Sequential approach**

*A sequential approach must be taken in identifying suitable sites for allocation, with sites in the urban area being considered before those in the Green Belt. The GBR (Green Belt Review) recommended the following in priority order:*

- 1. Safeguard existing sites to prevent their loss to other uses;*
- 2. Grant full planning permission for existing sites with temporary permission;*
- 3. Allocate sites within or adjacent to the urban area*
  - a. Potential new sites within the urban area*
  - b. Potential new sites within the urban extensions recommended for the Green Belt release;*
- 4. Allocate sites within the Green Belt*
  - a. Potential intensification of existing sites within the Green Belt;*
  - b. Potential new or expanded sites within the Green Belt*

The Council's TAA states “the site and its immediate surrounding could be explored for its potential for future **expansion** to accommodate additional pitches”. The DPD uses the term from the GBR of ‘intensification’ of Ten Acre Farm which is incorrect. The TTA term of ‘expansion’ is the correct term for the DPD proposal. As pointed out earlier, it was never envisaged that this traveller site would be expanded outside Mr Lee's

immediate family. **The council has chosen to set aside the GBR recommendations, selecting the lowest priority rating of 4b when proposing to expand the existing site at Ten Acre Farm by up to twelve additional pitches.**

No independently verified evidence has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for Traveller site development in its Plan, nor as to why sites identified in the Council's Green Belt Review as available and viable have not been included, whilst sites specifically excluded (Ten Acre Farm, Smarts Heath Road) and Five Acres (Brookwood Lye) are the ONLY sites put forward.

## **2 Other potential sites**

In the GBR, Option to meet future need for pitches included WOK001 land south of Murrays Lane, West Byfleet – 4 pitches; and WOK006 land off New Lane, Sutton Green – 3 pitches. There are also sites identified adjacent to the urban area outside of the Green Belt with the capacity to deliver 15 pitches each combined with a mixed and balanced community: land identified to the west of West Hall, Parvis Road, West Byfleet (WGB004a/SHLAAWB019b) and land south of High Road, Byfleet (WGB006a/SHLAABY043). **These options have been omitted from the DPD with no explanation** other than “it is easier to expand existing sites in the Green Belt”, as stated publicly by a planning officer at the Mayford Community Engagement meeting on Monday 6 July 2015.

## **3 Accessibility**

Woking's Core Strategy 2012, and SHLAA 2014, state that Traveller sites should have safe and reasonable access to schools and other local facilities. **Smarts Heath Road is not currently close to schools and it does not have easy access to local facilities.**

SHLAAMSG025 Ten Acre Farm Desktop Survey indicates that... *“The site has average accessibility to key local services (schools, GP surgeries and to Woking Town Centre). Accessibility to the nearest village centre by bike and foot is good/average.”* In reality, **Mayford has no supporting infrastructure** in the form of shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities, schools or employment opportunities. Due to a poor public transport system with infrequent and limited bus services residents living on any major development in the Village would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.

Further... *where a site is isolated from local facilities however, either by distance or through lack of adequate public transport facilities and/or is large enough to contain a diverse community of residents rather than one extended family, provision of a communal building is recommended (Designing Gipsy and Traveller sites 2008).*

**Such a building, if located towards the front of the site as recommended, WILL NOT positively enhance the environment and increase its openness, respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area, conserve and enhance the existing character.**

## **4 Environmentally Sensitive Sites**

*Any proposal that will have an adverse impact on environmentally sensitive sites that cannot be adequately mitigated will be refused.*

Ten Acre Farm has four boundaries – Smarts Heath Common, the Hoe Stream (with railway line behind), the B380 road, and a boundary with Number 1 Smarts Heath Road and adjacent nursery land. Smarts Heath Common is a SSSI (Special Sites of Scientific Interest), designated by Bird Life International as an “Important Bird Area”. The Hoe Stream is an SNCI (Site of Nature Conservation Importance), described as important in the Borough providing a valuable link and habitat corridor for other SNCI sites in the Hoe Valley.

A Ten Acre Farm extended **Traveller site WOULD have an adverse impact on the two environmentally**

sensitive sites that form the boundary of the land.

## **SITE IS NOT SUITABLE**

The SHLAA noted that there are a number of physical and environmental problems associated with this site.

### **1 Contaminated Land**

*In the GBR, sites (such as Ten Acre Farm) were REJECTED as a possible Traveller site due to concerns over contamination of land.*

**Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites 2008 Health and Safety Considerations.** *Sites must not be located on contaminated land. Only where land has been properly decontaminated should development be considered on that land. Remedial work should only be undertaken by approved contractors in accordance with relevant standards, to ensure the contamination has been remedied to the standard on which housing development would take place. These processes can be prohibitively expensive and should be considered only where it is financially viable from the outset.*

DPD states “Current or historical contaminative uses may have led to soil and groundwater contamination in and around this former farm that will need to be considered during any development of the site, dependant on detailed proposals and consultation with Environmental Health and the Environment Agency. **Investigation will be necessary and remediation likely to be required.”. Ten Acre Farm is unacceptable as an expanded Traveller site being sited on contaminated land. Only where land has been properly decontaminated should development be considered on that land.**

### **2 Risk of Flooding**

*The Council will not allocate sites or grant planning permission for additional pitches for Gypsies and Travellers in the functional floodplain for Flood Zone 3a (DPD). The Council’s TTA states “subject to overcoming any issues about flooding, the site and its immediate surrounding could be explored for its potential for future expansion to accommodate additional pitches”. Some 10% at the rear of the site is Flood Zone 3, whilst a further 15% is in Flood Zone 2. **This will push the proposed site closer to the road frontage which will have unacceptable adverse impacts on the visual amenity, openness and character of the area.***

### **3 Infrastructure, Services and Cost**

*Any site considered for allocation must be deliverable (including affordable to its intended occupiers) so as to ensure that needs are met. Policy CS14 criteria states that “The site should have adequate infrastructure and on-site utilities to service the number of pitches proposed”.*

There is **little in the way of infrastructure** at Ten Acre Farm, no surface water and storm water drainage, no main sewer, a driveway that does not conform to present day ‘emergency vehicle’ requirements, no water hydrant, no site lighting, no mains gas, and it has minimal connection to water and electricity services.

The site is adjacent to the main railway line from Waterloo station to the south and west coasts and so **would require significant acoustic barriers** to be erected.

**Pitches would have to be raised clear of any flood risk.**

Similar sites have cost in excess of £125,000 per pitch to develop

Feb 2014 - Lower Bristol Road, Bath, 13 pitches cost £2.5 million

**The costs of preparation of Ten Acre Farm as a Traveller Site is likely to be in excess of £1.5 million.**

#### **4 Additional Health and Safety Considerations**

*Traveller Sites should provide visual and acoustic privacy, and have characteristics which are sympathetic to the local environment. When selecting locations for permanent sites, consideration needs to be given to the relatively high density of children likely to be on the site. When considering sites adjacent to main roads and railway lines, careful regard must be given to the health and safety of children and others who will live on the site; and the greater noise transference through the walls of trailers and caravans than through the walls of conventional housing, and the need for design measures (for instance noise barriers) to abate the impact on quality of life and health (Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites 2008).*

Public usage of Smarts Heath Common means that there is **no visual privacy** on the site. The proximity of the main railway line from Waterloo to the south and west coasts means that it is **unlikely that acoustic barriers would alleviate the noise** of regular express trains. The road that borders the site is the B380, the approved **'lorry' route in the area**. There is **no footpath on the Ten Acre Farm side** and so children would have to cross this road to reach a footpath.

5. Additional traveller pitches would present a serious risk to children from the site in its close proximity to the Hoe stream; existing camping or other activity on the other side of the river have already given rise to bridging, floating obstructions and other debris in the river. Any additional occupiers and any business activity permitted or otherwise would only exacerbate the risk which will inevitably add to the likelihood of uncontrolled flooding.

**Arguments against Developing Green Belt (relevant to GB8,**



## **GB9, GB10, GB11)**

### **National Planning Policy Factors:**

- National Policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in “exceptional circumstances” – this has not been proved by Woking Council, especially as Policy clearly states that “housing need – including for Traveller sites – does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.”
- No evidence (independently verified) has been produced to demonstrate that Woking Council has exhausted Brownfield sites for development in its Plan
- The Green Belt Review incorrectly dismissed the Green Belt Purpose “To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns” stating that “Woking is not considered to be a town that has a particularly strong historical character” – however Mayford does have a strong history and is mentioned in the Domesday Book.
- Green Belt land in Mayford is fundamental to the physical separation of Woking, Mayford and Guildford – this is incorrectly classified only as “important” in the Green Belt Review
- There is only two miles between the Mayford roundabout and Slyfield, which results in a high risk of coalescence between Woking and Guildford should Mayford develop further
- Woking Council openly states that it considers land available for development (for example owned by the Council or a Developer) as more “viable” for removal from the Green Belt – the ownership status of land has no bearing on whether it should be Green Belt or not.

### **Landscape and Environmental Factors:**

- The Green Belt Review was worryingly inconsistent in its approach as it identified areas of land not to be considered (due to a number of constraints), however it then proceeded to recommend land that contained these constraints (Mayford included). The Brett & Associates Report rejected the 10 Acre Site as a Traveller site.
- Land relating to Special Protection Areas (including a 400m buffer) was excluded from consideration of the Green Belt Review to protect endangered birds. Prey Heath and Smarts Heath are SSSIs (Special Sites of Scientific Interest) and are designated by Bird Life International as “Important Bird Areas” and therefore should also have buffers applied for the same reason.
- The Mayford Village Society is currently pursuing the inclusion of Prey Heath and Smarts Heath into the Thames Basin Heaths SPA (Special Protection Area) which, if successful, will result in a 400m development buffer zone within which development is not allowed.
- Land North of Saunders Lane includes “Escarpments and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance” (1999 Local Plan Policy NE7 –referred to as CS24 in the Woking 2027 submission) and therefore should not be considered for development.
- The Green Belt Review proposes to change boundaries without a Landscape Character Assessment – this questions the validity of the Review and suggests why areas of landscape importance NE7/CS24 have been ignored.
- Areas of Mayford are recommended to be released from the Green Belt on the basis of “creating a

defensible Green Belt boundary” – “strong” boundaries are considered to be motorways, district roads, railway lines, rivers, prominent physical features, protected woodlands – the proposed changes would in fact make a weaker boundary due to removal of the escarpment

- The Green Belt Review indicates that a school on Egley Road would maintain the openness of the area, however this is misleading if the school is merely a Trojan horse as a precursor to housing on fields either side of the school later on.
- Mayford is a key area for the absorption of rainwater to alleviate flooding. Developing on the land proposed will increase surface water and increase flood risk to surrounding properties.

#### **Infrastructure Factors:**

- The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of the ease of access to Woking Town Centre, stating that it takes 7 minutes to travel from Mayford to Woking. The report acknowledged that this was estimated using Google Maps timings. At peak hours the actual travel time can be over half an hour.
- Mayford has a very poor road network. Roads are narrow and most are unlit at night with few pedestrian footpaths. Traffic is gridlocked in the Village at peak hours. This will be further adversely affected by traffic from 550 new homes being built on Mayford’s boundary at Willow Reach and Kingsmoor Park. The proposed school for Egley Road will further exacerbate this situation.
- Mayford has a poor public transport system with limited bus services.
- Worplesdon Station is inaccessible with unlit pedestrian footpaths leading to and away from the station.
- There are three single line bridges, two with traffic lights in the village. Those on Smarts Heath Road and Hook Hill Lane service the area proposed to be developed - neither could handle additional traffic. The third services Worplesdon Network Rail station which would notice a major increase in congestion.
- The Green Belt Review recommended Mayford on the basis of proximity to a “Local Centre”, however, other than a Post Office and Barbers, Mayford has no supporting infrastructure in the form of shops, doctors, dentists, medical facilities, or schools. Residents living on any major development in the Village would be isolated unless they have a vehicle.

It has also been brought to my attention the proposal for housing, roads, flooding risk & the football club in Guildford.

The football club and new pitch/s are to move to Salt Box Road with associated additional traffic.

Slyfield Industrial Estate is to be expanded. **Also planned are 1,000 new homes are to be built around the Slyfield Industrial Estate.**

As this is part of the Guildford DPD it has not been disclosed to Woking residents and **certainly not to residents of Mayford. The traffic movements from 1,000 houses at Slyfield travelling on the A320 through Woking is significant and gridlock inevitable**

**Proposed modifications** – please explain what changes you consider should be made, if any (for example, changes to the text, a site boundary, etc.)

**The removal of GB7 Ten Acre Farm proposed expansion of the private Traveller site by up to 12 pitches from the DPD for the reasons stated above.**

These comments are page \_\_11\_\_ of \_\_11\_ pages.

### **More comments?**

If you would like to make additional comments about other proposed sites or sections of any of the consultation documents, please complete further copies of pages 3 and 4 of this questionnaire. Please ensure that these are firmly attached with the main questionnaire - including pages 1 and 2 providing your details - and return this by email or post to the Council (contact details on page 2).

