

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), 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 or on **01483 743871**.

Your details

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

Title: Mr / Mrs / Miss / Ms / Other (please specify) _____

First name _____ Stuart _____

Surname _____ Jarvis _____

Position (if applicable) _____

Organisation (if applicable) _____

House name and/or number _____ 10 _____

Street _____ Engliff Lane _____

Locality _____ Pyrford _____

Town _____ Woking _____

County _____ Surrey _____

Post code _____ GU22 8SU _____

Email address _____

Telephone _____

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

- Resident of Woking Borough
 - Someone who works in Woking Borough
 - Someone who visits Woking Borough
 - Someone representing a group or organisation

 - Owner of land in Woking Borough
 - Planning / land agent
 - Developer
 - 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
- 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 12 _____

Section title _ SITE/0004/PYRF, SHLAAPY004: Land rear of 79-95 Lovelace Drive, Teggs Lane, Pyrford, Surrey, GU22 8QZ 11.43 hectare site for residential including Affordable Housing and open space _____

Page number _____ 1552 and 1554 _____

Paragraph number _SA Objectives 2 and 5 _____

Are you? Supporting Objecting A combination of these Neutral

Your comment

I would like to make the following points which I feel have been omitted from, or inaccurately represented, in WBC Appendix 12: Sustainability Appraisal Tables (in which site GB12 appears under SITE/0004/PYRF, SHLAAPY004):

Under SA objective 2 there is a comment stating “Development of the site would contribute to the provision of open space – new and existing residents are likely to benefit from open space provided to support the site development”. It appears to have slipped the council’s attention that these are currently designated green belt sites and are therefore already completely open. Development of green belt can only lead to less open space than was there initially as it is eradicating it. It may make some areas of the existing fields more accessible but a) they will not be open areas in terms of open countryside, b) with the number of dwellings proposed for the sites, if there are any open spaces left, they will be so small as to be insignificant, and c) this argument entirely misses the point as no-one wants to access these areas apart from the local farmer. The rest of the community merely wish to observe and enjoy its tranquil beauty from a distance, not have it desecrated. Also to state that existing residents will benefit from them is pure fantasy; once again they benefit much more from having the open spaces provided as they are right now without the developments. This is clearly a contrived statement to provide an argument in support of decimating designated green belt.

SA objective 5 refers to times to walk to the nearest GP, local shops, local primary and secondary schools, and Woking Town Centre from these sites. Apart from the local primary school these are utterly disingenuous (are they for adults, sick adults on the way to the GP, adults with children, or for children alone walking to school?). From the times stated they can only be for fit adults used to walking which discounts much of the population. The distances to the local GP (1.5 miles), local secondary school (2.3 miles) and Woking town centre (2.6 miles) are too far for people to walk to these days when modern cars are generally available. At present the route to Woking would entail walking by a busy road (Pyrford Common Road) that does not have a pavement beside it, and would therefore be downright

dangerous. Even if a pavement were provided it would still be too far, parents would discourage children from walking for various safety reasons, etc. Time restraints, busy roads and safety issues, traffic fumes and noise, and other practical reasons all combine to compel people to use vehicles. Similar arguments apply to access to the local secondary school and GP (particularly if people are unwell). Even the local shops will not be accessed on foot except in the most unusual circumstances. This can be verified by observing the established pattern at the shops now for residents who live closer to them than the new people will on these sites. Only a very small percentage of people walk to them, partially for practical purposes (carrying shopping, time, etc) and partially for convenience, and hence the parking areas are virtually continually full throughout opening hours. Parking space cannot be increased so it is quite obvious that a large increase in the number of vehicles attempting to access these shops will, for much of the time, result in chaos in the area.

Considering the number of dwellings proposed (423 between this site and the immediately adjacent site of GB13) the number of new vehicles in the area will be around 1000. These would make journeys every morning and evening, and some also during the daytime for school runs, shopping, recreation, etc. The vehicles must travel in one of three directions, viz. towards West Byfleet, Woking, or Guildford. The road to Guildford is via a narrow lane that has a set of three single-track bridges in the middle controlled by traffic lights. These were recently rebuilt, entailing a road closure of over six months, and existing queues of traffic in the rush hours can be several hundred metres long. It was felt preferable to retain the existing road scheme however to preserve the ambience of the area. The effect of significant extra traffic has not been addressed in this document but it may well be that a full road widening scheme with two-way bridges may be required. In the Woking and West Byfleet directions there are also considerable traffic issues during rush hours and at other times. The village atmosphere of West Byfleet has already been all but destroyed by developments there and increased traffic can only make it worse.

Other traffic problems in the area include the situation outside the local primary school where parking already causes a chaotic state of affairs for half to three-quarters of an hour each morning and afternoon as the road is effectively reduced to a single lane for a distance of 300 metres or so for traffic passing in both directions during these periods. With the additional traffic it can be seen that it could well become completely unacceptable but the sustainability document does not propose a solution.

As facilities whether recreational (restaurants and pubs, gyms, golf clubs, tennis clubs, etc) or utilitarian such as shops, stations, etc are remote from these so will nearly always entail transportation. These vehicular journeys could be avoided if sites were found in areas that do already have some or all facilities within walking distance.

In conclusion to SA objective 5 it is therefore clear from the above that far from improving access to all facilities these developments can only realistically serve to exacerbate access. Similarly it can be seen that the comment in SA objective 2 "The development would help to support existing services and facilities in the community" is incorrect. The existing services and facilities will most probably be swamped beyond breaking point. Additionally the comment in SA objective 7 "The site... has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions" has no foundation; it is pure wishful thinking by the author and should be excluded.

Other relevant issues that have not been addressed in the sustainability document include:

- The local primary school is already turning local children away as it is full and does not have room for expansion. Although plans exist for it to be rebuilt the size of the school is fixed.
- The local secondary school (Fullbrook) is attempting to downsize as it is so large.

- Even the existing pre-school amenities are full and will require new or expanded premises to accommodate several hundred new children in the area.
- For the plans to be successful therefore they should include the provision of pre-school, primary and secondary education establishments. This is absolutely fundamental to the sustainability of the area but has been ignored apart from references to the time it would take pupils to walk to schools that do not have the capacity to accommodate them.
- The local medical practices are operating at capacity as witnessed by the time required for appointments. They too have extremely limited parking facilities but the new residents will have to drive to them to attend appointments if they can get them. Are there plans for new practices to be established on the new sites or elsewhere? If so they should be cross-referenced.
- Utilities (i.e. power supply, sewage treatment, phone masts,) should be fully assessed. The sewage treatment plant for this area is located in Wisley, I believe. Is there room for expansion of the plant there and even if there is how will it impact the village there?
- Cafes, restaurants and public houses are not established in the local vicinity of these sites. Transportation will therefore again be necessary but issues such as the potential drink-driving incidences due to this are not considered. A development in Woking, where these amenities are within practical rather than hypothetical walking distances, must have a lower probability of generating such incidences. As the number of affordable homes must be increased to 50% for green belt developments this may also assist in reducing pressure on incomes.
- The planning policy is supposed to deal with the sustainability of developments. Sites GB12 and GB13 are the most remote from any amenities in the whole of the Woking borough. They will therefore always be more problematic and more expensive than proposed sites in urban areas and thus the least sustainable. In addition there is the basic tenet in the first place that these would be developments on designated green belt and would thus ruin the area.

Finally I would like to reiterate that these proposed developments are sited on Green Belt land. From section 9.79 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 “the fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openess and their PERMANENCE”. These proposed developments will permanently destroy this area of open countryside which will be a loss not only to Pyrford but also to Woking as it will be another urban area that road users must endure when travelling in this direction before reaching open countryside. In any planning justification therefore the council should fully substantiate their reasons for desecrating green belt land but they have completely ignored it.

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

If appendix 12 is to be used to judge the sustainability of developments it should accurately reflect the consequences to local infrastructures. I feel the points above show that this is not the case. It is inadequate to say that studies for effects of traffic, congestion in schools, effects on other services, etc will be completed at a later date. Appendix 12 should therefore be amended to include the above points if it is to provide an accurate reflection of the impact of these sites so that they may be properly assessed when planning permission is considered.

These comments are page 6 of 10 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).

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 13 _____

Section title: _ SITE/0005/PYRF, SHLAAPY005: Land east of Upshot Lane and south of Aviary Road, Pyrford, GU22 8QZ
10.91 hectare site for residential including Affordable Housing and open space _____

Page number ____ 1563 and 1566 _____

Paragraph number __ SA Objectives 2 and 5 _____

Are you? Supporting Objecting A combination of these Neutral

Your comment

I would like to make the following points which I feel have been omitted from, or inaccurately represented, in WBC Appendix 12: Sustainability Appraisal Tables (in which site GB13 appears under SITE/0005/PYRF, SHLAAPY005):

In point 2 there is a comment stating “Development of the site would contribute to the provision of open space – new and existing residents are likely to benefit from open space provided to support the site development”. It appears to have slipped the council’s attention that these are currently designated green belt sites and are therefore already completely open. Development of green belt can only lead to less open space than was there initially as it is eradicating it. It may make some areas of the existing fields more accessible but a) they will not be open areas in terms of open countryside, b) with the number of dwellings proposed for the sites, if there are any open spaces left, they will be so small as to be insignificant, and c) this argument entirely misses the point as no-one wants to access these areas apart from the local farmer. The rest of the community merely wish to observe and enjoy its tranquil beauty from a distance, not have it desecrated. Also to state that existing residents will benefit from them is pure fantasy; once again they benefit much more from having the open spaces provided as they are right now without the developments. This is clearly a contrived statement to provide an argument in support of decimating designated green belt.

SA objective 5 refers to times to walk to the nearest GP, local shops, local primary and secondary schools, and Woking Town Centre from these sites. Apart from the local primary school these are utterly disingenuous (are they for adults, sick adults on the way to the GP, adults with children, or for children alone walking to school?). From the times stated they can only be for fit adults used to walking which discounts much of the population. The distances to the local GP (1.5 miles), local secondary school (2.3 miles) and Woking town centre (2.6 miles) are too far for people to walk to these days when modern cars are generally available. At present the route to Woking would entail walking by a busy road (Pyrford Common Road) that does not have a pavement beside it, and would therefore be downright dangerous. Even if a pavement were provided it would still be too far, parents would discourage children from walking for various safety reasons, etc. Time restraints, busy roads and safety issues, traffic fumes and noise, and other practical reasons all combine to compel people to use vehicles. Similar arguments apply to access to the local secondary school and GP (particularly if people are unwell). Even the local shops will not be accessed on foot except in the most unusual circumstances. This can be verified by observing the established pattern at the shops now for residents who live closer to them than the new people will on these sites. Only a very small percentage of people walk to them, partially for practical purposes (carrying shopping, time, etc) and partially for convenience, and hence the parking areas are virtually continually full throughout opening hours. Parking space cannot be increased so it is quite obvious that a large increase in the number of vehicles attempting to access these shops will, for much of the time, result in chaos in the area.

Considering the number of dwellings proposed (423 between this site and the immediately adjacent site of GB12) the number of new vehicles in the area will be around 1000. These would make journeys every morning and evening, and some also during the daytime for school runs, shopping, recreation, etc. The vehicles must travel in one of three directions, viz. towards West Byfleet, Woking, or Guildford. The road to Guildford is via a narrow lane that has a set of three single-track bridges in the middle controlled by traffic lights. These were recently rebuilt, entailing a road closure of over six months, and existing queues of traffic in the rush hours can be several hundred metres long. It was felt preferable to retain the existing road scheme however to preserve the ambience of the area. The effect of significant extra traffic has not been addressed in this document but it may well be that a full road widening scheme with two-way bridges

may be required. In the Woking and West Byfleet directions there are also considerable traffic issues during rush hours and at other times. The village atmosphere of West Byfleet has already been all but destroyed by developments there and increased traffic can only make it worse.

Other traffic problems in the area include the situation outside the local primary school where parking already causes a chaotic state of affairs for half to three-quarters of an hour each morning and afternoon as the road is effectively reduced to a single lane for a distance of 300 metres or so for traffic passing in both directions during these periods. With the additional traffic it can be seen that it could well become completely unacceptable but the sustainability document does not propose a solution.

As facilities whether recreational (restaurants and pubs, gyms, golf clubs, tennis clubs, etc) or utilitarian such as shops, stations, etc are remote from these so will nearly always entail transportation. These vehicular journeys could be avoided if sites were found in areas that do already have some or all facilities within walking distance.

In conclusion to SA objective 5 it is therefore clear that far from improving access to all facilities these developments can only realistically serve to exacerbate access. Similarly it can be seen that the comment in SA objective 2 "The development would help to support existing services and facilities in the community" is incorrect. The existing services and facilities will most probably be swamped beyond breaking point. Additionally the comment in SA objective 7 "The site... has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions" has no foundation; it is pure wishful thinking by the author and should be excluded.

Other relevant issues that have not been addressed in the sustainability document include:

- The local primary school is already turning local children away as it is full and does not have room for expansion. Although plans exist for it to be rebuilt the size of the school is fixed.
- The local secondary school (Fullbrook) is attempting to downsize as it is so large.
- Even the existing pre-school amenities are full and will require new or expanded premises to accommodate several hundred new children in the area.
- For the plans to be successful therefore they should include the provision of pre-school, primary and secondary education establishments. This is absolutely fundamental to the sustainability of the area but has been ignored apart from references to the time it would take pupils to walk to schools that do not have the capacity to accommodate them.
- The local medical practices are operating at capacity as witnessed by the time required for appointments. They too have extremely limited parking facilities but the new residents will have to drive to them to attend appointments if they can get them. Are there plans for new practices to be established on the new sites or elsewhere? If so they should be cross-referenced.
- Utilities (i.e. power supply, sewage treatment, phone masts,) should be fully assessed. The sewage treatment plant for this area is located in Wisley, I believe. Is there room for expansion of the plant there and even if there is how will it impact the village there?
- Cafes, restaurants and public houses are not established in the local vicinity of these sites. Transportation will therefore again be necessary but issues such as the potential drink-driving incidences due to this are not considered. A development in Woking, where these amenities are within practical rather than hypothetical walking distances, must have a lower probability of generating such incidences. As the number of affordable homes must be increased to 50% for green belt developments this may also assist in reducing pressure on incomes.
- The planning policy is supposed to deal with the sustainability of developments. Sites GB12 and GB13 are the most remote from any amenities in the whole of the Woking borough. They will therefore always be more problematic and more expensive than proposed sites in urban areas

and thus the least sustainable. In addition there is the basic tenet in the first place that these would be developments on designated green belt and would thus ruin the area.

Finally I would like to reiterate that these proposed developments are sited on Green Belt land. From section 9.79 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 “the fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their PERMANENCE”. These proposed developments will permanently destroy this area of open countryside which will be a loss not only to Pyrford but also to Woking as it will be another urban area that road users must endure when travelling in this direction before reaching open countryside. In any planning justification therefore the council should fully substantiate their reasons for desecrating green belt land but they have completely ignored it.

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

If appendix 12 is to be used to judge the sustainability of developments it should accurately reflect the consequences to local infrastructures. I feel the points above show that this is not the case. It is inadequate to say that studies for effects of traffic, congestion in schools, effects on other services, etc will be completed at a later date. Appendix 12 should therefore be amended to include the above points if it is to provide an accurate reflection of the impact of these sites so that they may be properly assessed when planning permission is considered.

These comments are page _10_ of _10_ 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).