

plan/2015/0703 and Woking 2027 DPD Consultation

frank hopson [REDACTED]

Sent: 31 July 2015 15:49

To: Planning Policy

Cc: [REDACTED]

Mr Frank Hopson,
1, Drakes Way Mayford,
Woking, Surrey, GU22 0NX

Email: [REDACTED]

Telephone: [REDACTED]

31st July 2015

Dear Sirs,

Regarding: Woking 2027 DPD Consultation

I have been a resident of Mayford for 32 years and am aware of the Woking 2027 planning proposals that will impact Mayford. My comments are not specific to any of your documents, however I will refer to the specific site references that I am concerned about:

Site Reference: GB7 (Ten Acre Farm, Smarts Heath Road)

I strongly object to the proposal to increase the number of Traveller Pitches on this land.

Currently, Woking's Traveller sites are concentrated in one part of the Borough – Hatchington, Burdenshott Road (one mile from Ten Acre Farm), Ten Acre Farm, Mayford, and 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.

Additionally, Ten Acre farm is adjacent to Smarts Heath Common, an SSSI, used by residents of Mayford for leisure purposes. Any increase in the present Traveller site of five caravans at 10 Acre Farm would decrease the visual amenity and character of the area and also increase risk to wildlife due to increased number of domestic animals in close proximity.

Over the years successive Planning Inspectors have refused applications on this site because they reduce the openness of a Green Belt area.

Site References:

GB8 (Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road)

GB9 (Woking Garden Centre, Egley Road)

GB10 (Land to the north east of Saunders Lane, between Saunders Lane and Hook Hill Lane)

GB11 (Land to the north west of Saunders Lane)

GB14 (Land adjacent to Hook Hill Lane, Hook Heath)

I strongly object to the proposal for housing on all of the above sites.

The housing will fill in any green space between Mayford and Woking, thereby turning Mayford into a suburb of Woking and increasing greatly the risk of merging of Woking and Guildford – the

whole purpose of the Green Belt. There appears to have been no consideration for preserving Mayford as a separate settlement to Woking, nor the impact on the character of the Village. There also appears to have been no consideration to the impact on Mayford's infrastructure that the increased population will result in. More people mean more cars and more strain on the transport infrastructure. I note that there are no plans to upgrade the roads (some of which have no pavements) or railway bridges (which are all single lane) nor robust solutions to deal with the existing traffic problems on Egley Road. Houses cannot just be built in areas that have no supporting infrastructure – there will be gridlock. Prey Heath Road will become even more dangerous to pedestrians as increased traffic to Worplesdon station will be faced with a growing number of people walking on the road (as there are no pavements). Not only will the wildlife in the developed areas be wiped out, but also there will be increased risk to wildlife in our protected Heaths (Smarts Heath and Prey Heath) due to the proximity of the development.

With specific reference to the proposed School and Leisure facility.

- a) I believe it disingenuous to cojoin what are two separate proposals. The extent of the leisure complex is totally greater than any need of the School which itself has gyms within its own plans.
- b) The leisure facility appears to be of a larger area than the School itself and should be separately considered by the Planning Committee. Furthermore, as I understand it, this facility will be owned (but not managed) by the Council and to my mind the Council should not be involved in the decision process given the apparent conflict of interest.
- c) On site parking. Once the School is operating at full capacity, will there be sufficient for teaching and support staff and visitors not to mention pupils. There is no separate parking provision for staff and users of the leisure facilities and no mention of anticipated numbers. Furthermore, are pupils to be exposed to a site open to the general public?
- d) Egley Road. Very busy at peak times already and the proposed traffic lights will exacerbate the "flow".

Will parking restrictions be imposed and on surrounding residential roads?

- e) Drainage. From the plans it is clear that surface water will be dealt with primarily using sustainable drainage. Given the erection of buildings there is going to be a higher need than current for excess water to flow offsite. The plans detail extra culverts but do not show where these go beyond Egley Road. If their ultimate destination is the Hoe Stream, what consideration has been given to this extra flow bearing in mind that we continue to see flooding beyond the Stream even after the works undertaken a few years ago.
- e) Noise. There will be increased traffic noise but of most concern is the likely impact of the number of people on the proposed development. In particular, I understand there will be a significant spectator capacity for the outdoor athletics track albeit prospective numbers are defined. Where will they park?
- f) Light pollution. This is likely to be very significant and detrimental to a quiet rural environment and the people who live within it.

Please reconsider your plans - what is currently planned will have a devastating impact to Mayford as a Village. Mayford is unique in the U.K. and is mentioned in the Domesday Book

I am a member of Mayford Village Society and am happy to associate myself with their aims and representations.

Yours

Frank Hopson