

Tel: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]



Planning Policy Team  
Woking Borough Council  
Civic Offices  
Gloucester Square  
Woking  
GU21 6YL

Environment &  
Infrastructure Directorate  
Spatial Planning Team  
Surrey County Council  
County Hall  
Kingston upon Thames  
KT1 2DN

Sent by email to: [planning.policy@woking.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@woking.gov.uk)

30 July 2015

Dear Sir/Madam

**Woking draft Site Allocations DPD Regulation 18 Consultation – June 2015  
Comments by Surrey County Council**

Thank you for consulting Surrey County Council on the draft Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) for Woking Borough.

A key issue for the county council is the implications of the draft Site Allocations document's policies and proposals for infrastructure for which the council is the provider, especially transport. The Strategic Transport Assessment has highlighted where increased stress is forecast on the road network and that there is a need to look in more detail at the A245 and B367 corridors and potential impacts in neighbouring boroughs. Therefore, it is important that the development of sites should be subject to appropriate mitigation measures being in place to address impacts on the road network, including cross boundary impacts. As the submission version of the Site Allocations DPD is prepared, county officers will continue to work with borough officers, Highways England and developers to identify where mitigation measures will be needed and the types of potential solutions with indicative costs to update Woking's Infrastructure Delivery Plan and will then review the Woking Borough Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme. County officers will also support the borough council in engaging with neighbouring authorities to address cross boundary transport impacts.

It would be helpful to mention at the start of the document that the county council is now a statutory consultee on surface water drainage and SuDS on major development, and that any flood alleviation/defence schemes must support the priorities and objectives of Surrey's Flood Risk Management Strategy.

Contd/.....

More detailed comments on specific policies in the draft Site Allocations document are set out in the attached annex.

I hope you find these comments helpful. If you require further information please contact Sue Janota by email [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Sue Janota  
Spatial Planning and Policy Manager

## Comments from Surrey County Council on the Woking draft Site Allocations Development Plan Document – June 2015

### Developing in accordance with the Site Allocations

It would be helpful to mention that the County Council is now a statutory consultee on surface water drainage and SuDS on major development, and that any flood alleviation/defence schemes must support the priorities and objectives of Surrey's Flood Risk Management Strategy.

### Site Allocations Proposal Sites

Development and Infrastructure in the Urban Area/Village

- Policies UA1-24, 33, 39-47, sites in and around Woking town centre - There are no in principle transport objections to the proposed land uses. However, due to the number of sites and the anticipated scale of the proposals, it is important that the cumulative impacts and localised access needs are considered and addressed. For example:
  - Policy UA17: The proposed employment development is large scale and includes land use B8 giving rise to concerns over the ability of the local narrow section of Goldsworth Road and the constrained Poole Road / Goldsworth Road junction to provide adequate vehicular access to the site.
  - Policy UA41: The proposed residential development is large scale and the site has a single constrained public highway connection at the A320 Guildford Road next to Victoria Arch giving rise to concerns as to whether this single highway access is capable of providing adequate vehicular access to the site.

In terms of heritage, all the sites over 0.4ha in size are required to be assessed and possibly evaluated for the presence of hitherto unknown archaeological remains, under the terms of Woking Core Strategy Policy CS20. For Proposal site UA23 there are entries listed on the Historic Environment Record.

- Policy UA25: The site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.
- Policies UA26-27: There are no in principle transport objections to the proposed land use. However, depending on the actual scale of development and number of additional vehicle trips, the adequacy of the local road infrastructure may need to be reviewed.

In terms of heritage, Proposal site UA26 is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.

- Policies UA28-29: There is no in principle transport objection to the proposed land use and scale of development. However, works may be needed to improve the estate junctions with the A320.

In terms of heritage, Proposal site UA28 is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.

- Policy UA32: There is no in principle transport objection to the proposed land uses and scale of development.

In terms of heritage, Proposal site UA32 is located within an Area of High Archaeological Potential, although this is currently under review and there are entries listed on the Historic Environment Record. The site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.

- Policy UA34: The site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.

- Policy UA35: There is no in principle transport objection to the proposed land uses and scale of development. However, it is recommended that the feasibility of the proposed fourth junction arm onto Monument Road / Albert Drive (Sheerwater Access Road) is tested before allocation is confirmed.

In terms of heritage, Proposal site UA35 is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.

- Policy UA37: The site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.
- Policy UA49: It is recommended that the adequacy of the local road access to the site, between the A245 and the B385, is reviewed before allocation for industrial use is confirmed. Scotland Bridge Road is residential in character. Camphill Road has a substandard bridge over the Basingstoke Canal, a restricted three-way signalled tunnel under the railway, traffic calming at the southern end and a restricted right turn from the A245 / Camphill Road signalled junction. B1c development maybe more suited to these local road access constraints.

In terms of heritage, Proposal site UA49 is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.

- Policy UA51: There are no in principle transport objections to the proposed land uses. However, depending on the actual scale of development and number of additional vehicle trips, the adequacy and arrangement of the local road infrastructure within the town centre may need to be reviewed. There may be an opportunity for the southern side of the development site to give land towards improving the capacity constrained A245 / Station Approach / Pyrford Road / Camphill Road signalled junction.

In terms of heritage, Proposal site UA51 is located within an Area of High Archaeological Potential, although this is currently under review. The site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.

#### Development and Infrastructure Sites to be taken out of the Green Belt.

- Policy GB1: The site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20. There may be a possible Roman Road running through the site.
- Policy GB4: Access direct from the A245 is likely to be problematic, due to the local constraints of the nearby Queens Avenue junction and the road embankment leading to the bridge over the M25. The site layout/design should provide as direct as possible a route from the development to local bus stops. It is suggested that air quality effects from the close by M25 be taken into consideration as existing houses adjacent to the M25 corridor to the north in Runnymede borough are within designated AQMAs. There are no in principle transport objections to the proposed land use subject to the above provisos and requirements and these are reflected in the policy.

In terms of heritage, Proposal site GB4 is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.

- Policy GB5: The development should provide a footway on the south side of Rectory Lane along the development site frontage and pedestrian crossing(s) to the existing footways opposite. Rectory Lane / Church Road local bus stops closest to the development site will require improvement by the developer. It is suggested that air quality effects from the close by M25 be taken into consideration as existing houses adjacent to the M25 corridor to the north in Runnymede borough are within designated AQMAs. There are no in principle transport objections to the proposed land use subject to the above provisos and requirements and these are reflected in the policy.

In terms of heritage, Proposal site GB5 is adjacent to two Areas of High Archaeological Potential, although these are currently under review. The site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.

- Policy GB6: It is suggested that, if not already done, the land-take of the proposed transport infrastructure improvement be established to fix the limit of the site red line or the junction be allocated without a fixed red line boundary.
- Policy GB7: The site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.
- Policy GB8: New site access/ junction(s) onto A320 are likely to be needed to provide vehicular access to the site. Pedestrian facilities will be needed on the west side of the A320 along the site frontage and pedestrian/cyclist crossing(s) over the A320 will be needed to connect to existing pedestrian/cyclist facilities. The borough council is referred to the county council's transport response to the recently lodged planning application for development at this site.

In terms of heritage, Proposal site GB8 is located within an Area of High Archaeological Potential, although this is currently under review. The site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.

- Policy GB9: New site access/ junction(s) onto A320 are likely to be needed to provide vehicular access to the site. Pedestrian facilities will be needed on the west side of the A320 along the site frontage and pedestrian/cyclist crossing(s) over the A320 will be needed to connect to existing pedestrian/cyclist facilities. Additional bus stops along the A320 site frontage will be needed. There are no in principle transport objections to the proposed land uses subject to the above provisos and requirements and these are reflected in the policy.

In terms of heritage, Proposal site GB9 is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.

- Policies GB10 and 11: Bus accessibility is a problem due to there being no bus service running along Saunders Lane or nearby, and the distance from the two sites to the nearest bus service on the A320 is far in excess of the recommended maximum. 'walk to the bus stop' distance. There is a need to examine this issue in more detail with Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport Group before the allocations are confirmed.

The Smarts Heath Road railway bridge is a signal controlled single lane operation and consequently a throttle point on the road network. The sites could come forward for development between 2027-204 and it is likely that background traffic growth might use up any spare bridge capacity before their development is underway. Therefore, any additional traffic from development on Proposal sites GB10 and GB11 and other development sites nearby will lead to increased congestion and measures will be necessary to increase capacity.

Additional comments on the two proposal sites are as follows:

- Policy GB10: There is no continuous footway on the north side of Saunders Lane. Hook Hill Lane is unsuitable for vehicular access to the development site, except perhaps an extremely small part, because the lane is narrow, is unlit, has no footways / pedestrian facilities and has a very substandard bridge over the railway line. Vehicular site access from Smarts Heath Road is very difficult due to the proximity of the Saunders Lane junction and railway bridge. The site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20. There is a known Roman Road projected to run through the site.
- Policy GB11: There is no footway on the north side Saunders Lane. The street lighting is intermittent / poor. Footway, street lighting and pedestrian crossing improvements will be required. The site is over 0.4ha and will need

to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20. There is a known Roman Road projected to run through the site.

- Policies GB12 and 13: Both the section of Upshott Lane and all of Pyrford Common Road have no footways and are unlit, giving poor non-car facilities for south and westbound travel. Pedestrian and road crossing facilities will be needed for site occupiers to access the existing pedestrian facilities on Coldharbour Road. Pedestrian and road crossing facilities will be needed for site occupiers to access local bus services, which are currently limited to 1/hour in each direction.

In terms of heritage, both Proposal sites are located within an Area of High Archaeological Potential, although this is currently under review. Both sites are over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.

- Policy GB14: Hook Hill Lane is narrow, mostly unlit, has no footways / pedestrian facilities, has steep gradients on its northern sections and has a very substandard bridge over the railway line. The site is poorly accessible by public buses. Access requirements will need to be taken into account in determining the specific form of green infrastructure land use of the site.

In terms of heritage, Proposal site GB14 is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.

- Policy GB15: Significant A245 site access junction is likely to be needed to provide vehicular access to the site and further off-site highway improvements may be necessary on the A245. There is a need to address the lack of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure on the south side of the A245 and to provide new/improved pedestrian/cyclist north-south crossing facilities over the A245 to enable access to the existing urban area / local destinations. Bus stops should be located close to the A245 site frontage and the site layout / design should provide as direct as possible a route from the houses to those stops. There are no in principle transport objections to the proposed land use subject to the above provisos and requirements and these are reflected in the policy.

In terms of heritage, there are entries listed on the Historic Environment Record and the site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.

Proposal site GB15 is within a minerals safeguarding area (for sand and gravel) and opportunities for prior extraction should be fully investigated.

- Policy GB16: Significant A245 site access junction likely to be needed to provide vehicular access to the site. Depending on the scale of employment use, further off-site highway improvements maybe necessary on the A245. There is a need to address the lack of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure on the south side of the A245 and to provide new/improved pedestrian/cyclist north-south crossing facilities over the A245 to enable access to the existing urban area / local destinations and pedestrian / cyclist facilities. Bus stops should be located close to the A245 site frontage and the site layout / design should provide as direct as possible a route from the development to those stops. There is no in-principle transport objection to allocating the site for employment development, subject to the above provisos and requirements and these are reflected in the policy.

In terms of heritage, there are entries listed on the Historic Environment Record and the site is over 0.4ha and will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20.

- Policy GB17: Highway access to the stated SANG car park only seems feasible from the Old Parvis Road and Marrays Lane, due to the access constraints of the M25 and A245. In terms of heritage, there are entries listed on the Historic Environment Record.

- Policies GB20 and 21: Access to the stated SANG car park only seems feasible from the private road between the High Street and the developed Mill.
- Policy GB22: There is a Scheduled Monument on site – Woking Palace - and the site is within an Area of High Archaeological Potential. As it is over 0.4ha, any proposals will need to be assessed under Core Strategy Policy CS20. Historic England will need to be consulted, as will the Friends of Woking Palace, Surrey Archaeological Society and Surrey County Council Heritage Conservation Team. The Surrey County Archaeological Unit also has extensive experience of this site and should be involved in devising any detailed proposals.
- Policy GB23: Under the current schools expansion programme there will be building on this site over this year and next year. In the event that future expansion at either school may be necessary, we would wish to see the reasoned justification include the following additional wording:

Accordingly, it is allocated for continued use as open space. However, if there is a local need for additional school places locally, we will take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meet requirements. As per Paragraph 72 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the need to create, expand or alter schools will be given great weight in decision making.