

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) Mr _____

First name Christopher _____

Surname Light _____

Position (if applicable) _____

Organisation (if applicable) _____

House name and/or number 16 _____

Street Hillside _____

Locality Egley Road _____

Town Woking _____

County Surrey _____

Post code GU22 0NF _____

Email address [REDACTED] _____

Telephone [REDACTED] _____

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Resident of Woking Borough | <input 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

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:

Yes - 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) GB 8 _____

Section title Land at Egley Road _____

Page number _____

Paragraph number _____

Are you? Supporting Yes- Objecting A combination of these Neutral

Your comment

As a local resident this is the first opportunity I have been allowed to comment on the plans being brought forward for the future of our borough.

I have to say that I am deeply disappointed with what is being proposed and also the manner in which the decisions and options appear to me to have been manipulated.

I believe there is a faction within the council which for whatever reasons wants to expand Woking significantly by building tower blocks in the centre, high density housing in the surrounds, and facilitating urban sprawl as far as they can by abolishing the green belt much further than is necessary.

It appears that Woking Borough Council have grasped with enthusiasm a larger share of Surrey's growth burden than may have been negotiated by neighbouring boroughs who take more notice of their existing residents' views. Unfortunately this has deliberately created a numerical situation where the saving of one bit of green belt appears to result in the sacrifice of another.

These actions appear to be supported by the majority of the present councillors in power, although they are much better placed than local residents to influence which sites are to be developed.

This is a big issue, but the council have chosen to allow the minimum consultancy period, and ensure that those who may oppose are further occupied by producing thousands of pages of reports to read in connection with the controversial siting of a school, athletics track and leisure centre in the green belt next to Egley Road as a separate matter.

The first thing I wish to oppose is the decision to push the green belt boundary out beyond what is absolutely necessary to comply with Government requirements up to 2027.

The arguments for making decisions on the greenbelt beyond this period on to 2040 do not hold water. It does not provide a defensible boundary as a similarly minded council could just push it out further as is being attempted on this occasion. **This is a decision which belongs to the Councillors that we elect at the time, which could be taken when the full effects of the disastrous proposals now before us can be seen. Indeed there are electoral boundary changes taking place as soon as 5 May 2016 when new councillors will be elected following a campaign which may provide full publicity to what has occurred recently and who has supported what.** The seeds of this strategy were planted without consultation with those to be affected and under the radar of any political publicity.

The second comment I wish to make is on The Brett Report. I appreciate that although I am a local resident affected by it, I was not able to have any influence or input until now. However I do feel that it is not as independent as presented. It suggests a school on the Egley Road Site. Where did that suggestion come from in 2013 when senior school numbers were falling before this supposed need was talked up? Or is it a standard developer's tactic for overcoming the "merger of Woking and Mayford Problem?" It is an unimaginative document simply choosing the easy sites put forward by the developers that operate in the same business area as the consultants rather than investigating ways the green belt could be preserved or enhanced perhaps by a garden city development that doesn't impact on so many people's lives, or a more rigorous examination of brown field sites.

The Brett Reports conclusion gives 3 alternatives for development.

The most sustainable option on Brett's system of measurement is option 3.

Option 3. Bring forward parcel 4 first. This would provide 550 dwellings on its own, with 42 additional dwellings which would need to be provided after 2027. All the remaining parcels and sites would then be safeguarded for the period 2027 – 2040. Parcel 7 could be included within the safeguarded area to ensure deliverability and provide flexibility, but investigations would need to be undertaken in regard to its potential availability.

I do not wish to see any development on Green Belt, and prefer brown field sites to be sought more rigorously. However this option seems to provide the most sustainable solution and may disturb the least borough residents.

This would not suit those in power in the council who require the Egley Road site to be built on inter alia to preserve their own ward green sites and provide more customers for the Woking Town Centre shops and cafes as well as providing some solution to the debacle they have overseen at Sheerwater.

The answer was to produce another sustainability report which comes to the conclusion that Egley Road is the most sustainable site. **I have written a critique of this document separately as in my opinion it contains a clear bias and is the bluntest of instruments on a nebulous concept with which to decide an emotive issue of this type.**

As regards the proposals for taking the Egley Road site out of the green belt obviously I object to this for all the reasons that have been raised in connection with the Hoe Valley School Application. Traffic, Pollution, Flooding, Destruction of Trees and Animal Habitat, Archaeological Sites, Merging of Woking & Mayford, Preservation of Escarpment.

I appreciate that these will be covered by reports, but although totally professional these will not be independent but will be commissioned by developers to justify what they want to do or provide mitigation, possibly elsewhere.

Much depends on what the council has decided on the School, Athletics Track and Leisure Centre, although as they have already spent a scandalous sum of ratepayers and taxpayers money on the project without planning permission, or indeed securing ownership of the site, it is inconceivable it will not be pushed through. I note there are many “cut n paste” supporters for the school mainly from addresses outside the immediate area alongside many objections from those who live do locally and will be adversely affected. However I doubt much support will be received in favour of building the houses, except from those anxious to protect the green belt in their area . Interestingly there is also little apparent support for the Leisure Centre and Running Track.

In these circumstances, the ideal solution would be to leave this site completely in green belt so that it can properly provide the gap between Woking and Mayford and the true impact of the School, Athletics Track and Leisure Centre can be assessed. The option is thus retained for expansion of playing fields or other amenity land should the school expand.

This is assuming that the site for the school can be acquired from the land owner without the council’s commitment to push through the release of land from green belt. This is a transaction which has been much delayed and must ultimately be completely transparent and examined by an authority totally independent of those who are party to creating it.

I would also like to remind the council that the feature of the Hook Heath Escarpment should be preserved and that any development should be in keeping with the type of property already in the area. This is almost impossible in the context of building affordable houses in a high cost area such as this, particularly as edge of settlement developments are supposed to be for family homes.

This area is proposed to be decimated by Woking Borough Council and so it is important to retain a semblance of greenery. To do this I believe it would require the density to be significantly lower than the 40 dwellings per hectare proposed.

The proposal to achieve the Green Belt objective of retaining the gap between Woking and Mayford cannot be credibly achieved simply by keeping a grass verge and the back land field to the South of the site clear.

I would like to comment on the Habitats Regulations Assessment

I have read the Habitats Regulations Assessment. It is very heavily qualified at the beginning and at the conclusion stage. In the light of the absence of an accurate traffic assessment it appears to me to be a pretty meaningless document, but perhaps an executive summary could highlight the important conclusions concerning the various sites and their reliability in the opinion of the report’s authors.

I would now like to comment on the Draft sustainability Appraisal – Appendix 12 Green Belt Sites

I have reviewed the Sustainability Appraisal Report and have found it to appear biased in terms of being an objective review of the sustainability of the Nursery Land Site adjacent to Egley Road, Mayford. I have reproduced the wording from the report where I have disagreed with the wording and the overall ratings that have been applied. My comments are in this bold type.

Mayford and Sutton Green Ward Site Allocations

Scoring System:

++ Very positive impact + Positive impact 0 Neutral impact - Negative impact -- Very negative impact

Effect depends on how allocation implemented

SITE/0009/MAYS, SHLAAMSG009: Nursery land adjacent to Egley Road, Mayford, GU22 0PL

18.29 hectare site for residential including Affordable Housing, education (secondary school) and recreation/open space

SA Objective Decision-making criteria Indicators and targets

Shortterm 0-5yrs Medium term 5-20yrs Long-term 20+yrs

Comments

(justification of score + cumulative effects + mitigation

measures)

Social objectives: supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities

1. Provision of sufficient housing which meets the needs of the community and which is at an affordable price

3 +'s awarded. These are self fulfilling as anywhere where houses are built achieve this.

2. Wellbeing of the population and reduce inequalities in health

The site will contribute to the provision of recreation and green space – new and existing residents are likely to benefit from recreation facilities provided to support the site development.

3 +'s awarded. These again are self fulfilling as anywhere a leisure centre is built achieves this, although most local residents are against the leisure centre and running track.

The site is within walking distance of nearby green spaces such as Smarts Heath and Prey Heath, and Hoe Stream footpaths are also nearby.

Quite a long walk from the North of the site actually. If you were taking your dog you would use the car for the first bit of the journey.

Close proximity to local shops in Mayford Neighbourhood Centre also encourages walking.

There is only a small cramped Post Office and a Gents Hairdressers. I live at the north end of the site and always take my car. This comment betrays this documents bias.

Enhancement of pedestrian and cycle links to Neighbourhood, Local and Town Centres encourage sustainable travel.

Again this is stretching it for a positive comment. It is very rare that anyone would walk from Hillside to the centre of town let alone from the other end of the Egley Road Site.

Optimising/mitigating measures:

- Improve pedestrian and cycle links to recreation spaces and local centres

What local centres? What improvements to pedestrian links? Any cycle route cannot get past Hillside and the proposed cycle route via Westfield is unlikely to have much demand. I don't think it would be safe to promote 2 way cycling and pedestrians together just North of

Almond Avenue.

- Provision of open space and green infrastructure – with links to surrounding GI network

I think this statement should be clarified. Where exactly is this open space, green infrastructure and GI Network going to be when the green belt is pushed out as far as proposed?

3. Reduce vulnerability to flooding and harm from flooding on public well-being, the economy and the environment

The site is in Flood Zone 1 (low risk), where development is recommended to take place. The eastern boundary of the site is adjacent to land classified as Flood Zone 2 and 3 (around the Hoe Stream). A site-specific flood risk assessment is required for proposals of 1 hectare or greater in Flood Zone 1 (NPPF, para. 103) All significant forms of development are required to incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) as part of any development proposals. If this is not feasible, the Council will require evidence illustrating this (Policy CS9). Available information suggests pluvial flooding in the locality.

The Environment Agency has identified a 50% risk of surface water flooding. Core Strategy Policy CS9 (para. 5.50) requires developers to work towards replicating greenfield run-off situations (e.g. through minimising paved areas, keeping drains clear, general maintenance), followed by source control measures. A Flood Risk Assessment will be required for development proposals within or adjacent to

areas at risk of surface water flooding. Due to the loss of green field land, development will lead to an increase in the likelihood of surface water flooding. Mitigation measures to be considered to reduce any risk of surface water flooding. Taking into account the above, a neutral score. Optimising/mitigating measures:

- Design of the development would have to take into account SuDS and provide suitable surface and foul water drainage
- Flood Risk Assessment

3 Zero's awarded. I think it should be 3 minuses. The A320 floods at the moment. Building Car Parks, Roads and Drives is bound to make things worse. Risks Assessments and SUDS will just be rearranging the chairs on the Titanic.

4. Reduce poverty, crime and social exclusion

Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD, 2010) does not identify any issues at this location.

Whilst the housing element of the development will overall have a neutral impact on this objective, the development is a mixed use development to include additional education infrastructure. The development of additional/improved infrastructure will assist in supporting communities. There is the opportunity for the recreation facilities to provide community infrastructure as part of the development of the site, which will encourage engagement in community activities.

Careful design of the scheme could reduce the fear of crime. Optimising/mitigating measures:

- Design of the scheme to seek to design out crime and reduce the fear of crime. For example,

designing in natural surveillance

3 +'s are awarded. How can this be? At present these are fields! What is proposed is a school of adolescents, a car park, a leisure centre, a sports track and 50% affordable housing. All the locals' fear of crime will go up. Phrases like design out crime by designing in natural surveillance bring the creditability of this document into disrepute. This is spin of the highest order to conjure up a positive here. This rating should be 3 –'s

5. To improve accessibility to all services and facilities

3 0's awarded here and I would agree with that although the comments made are misleadingly positive.

Site is located within suitable walking distance of Mayford Neighbourhood Centre

There really isn't much to walk to at the Mayford Neighbourhood Centre.

- 21-25mins walk to nearest GP

Almost no-one would walk to the doctors from the Egley Road

- 20-30mins walk to nearest railway station

Hardly anyone would walk 2.5 miles to Woking Station. The walk to Worplesdon Station is treacherous. Try it – even in daylight.

- 10-20mins drive to Town Centre

Is this measured before or after the school, leisure centre and running track are built? No-one knows how long this drive will take in the future.

- within 250m of cycle route and public footpath along canal

It's a rarely used cycle route.

- Adjacent to bus services and bus stops on Egley Road

The bus service is very very sparse.

- Education facilities will be accessible within the site, and Barnsbury Primary School is opposite site over Egley Road
- Bus routes and stops along Egley Road encourage accessibility to services and facilities in the Town

Well they don't really because buses are very infrequent.

Centre (20mins bus time). The site is also within cycling distance of Worplesdon Station (but 20 minutes walking distance).

Walking to Worplesdon Station is quite a walk and is absolutely treacherous. I see a number of brave souls walking from Pyle Hill. There is no pavement and the road is a busy rat run. Who knows what it is like in the dark or when it is raining. The solution is not immediately obvious to me.

The site is outside of the Neighbourhood Centre but is within reasonable walking distance of key services and facilities therein. The need to travel to access services and facilities would not be reduced. The development would help to support existing services and facilities in the community. Development of the site would bring forward essential community infrastructure including schools and recreation space, thus improving accessibility to these services for new and existing residents. There are opportunities to improve access to existing services by improving sustainable transport and green infrastructure as part of the development.

There are very sparse "Key Services" at the Neighbourhood Centre

Optimising/mitigating measures: Improvements and increased accessibility to cycle, pedestrian and public transport networks, particularly east to Barnsbury Primary School and beyond to services in Westfield (overcoming severance by Hoe Stream) and the Hoe Valley Linear Park; and south to Mayford Neighbourhood Centre and to recreation space beyond.

Despite the best efforts being made, most people will be coming to the School, Leisure Centre and Running Track by Car. I wish everyone would be honest about that. And when it rains, as it often does in this country, even those that might walk or cycle will seek vehicular transport.

6. *Make the best use of previously developed land and existing buildings*

Environmental objectives: protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment

- result in the loss of greenfield land (including gardens)?
- support the restoration of vacant /contaminated land?

Site is open land in the Green Belt. Impacts on this objective is predicted to be neutral.

In fact this will result in loss of green field land and should therefore be 3 –'s Contaminated land is dealt with below.

7. *Minimise air, light and noise pollution.*

Would the development of the site / policy option:

- affect an existing AQMA or lead to its designation?
- help to improve air quality? • support specific actions in designated AQMAs?
- avoid an increase in congestion which may cause pollution from traffic?
- ensure people are not exposed to greater levels of noise?
- ensure people are not exposed to light pollution?

The site is adjacent to a busy road to the east and a railway line to the west, thus increase vulnerability to noise and air pollution. Detailed design of development can incorporate mitigation measures to reduce exposure over time (e.g. as landscape buffers mature). New recreation space may incorporate floodlighting which could increase light pollution. The site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, including bus routes, cycle routes and public footpaths, and has potential to reduce reliance on the private car, and therefore associated vehicle emissions by promoting walking and cycling. The propose mitigation measures are likely to neutralise the short term negative impacts in the medium to long term. Optimising/mitigating measures:

Design of development to incorporate mitigation measures to reduce impacts of noise.

Any floodlighting to be sensitively designed to minimise light pollution.

This should clearly be 3 double minuses rather than 1 minus and 2 zero's. This development will clearly pollute the air with much more traffic, subject neighbours to floodlights, and noise. The trees have been growing for 100's of years. The maturing of landscape buffers is hardly going to affect things much. You can promote walking and cycling all you like. And good on you for doing so. But this is going to have minimal effect on the extra pollution we locals can expect. To shop for food people will either drive to the supermarket, or as is the modern way order online for delivery by vehicle. Many other deliveries are also be made by vehicles these days. I wish I had more faith in the sensitive design of floodlights to make this light pollution bearable.

8. *Reduce land contamination and safeguard agricultural soil quality*

The site is not classified as high quality agricultural land.

Sorry, I am beginning to suspect ambiguous statements like this. Is the land grade 3a or not? If so this becomes 3 –'s

Development of the site has the potential to remediate historic contamination on the site. Historical contaminative uses may have led to soil and groundwater contamination in and around the former nursery buildings that will need to be considered during any development of the site. If contamination were present it would be remediated as part of the construction process, thus contributing

positively towards this objective.

Optimising/mitigating measures: Land contamination assessment to be conducted.

It seems ironic that the fact that the farm has contaminated this land and water course gives the present owner a plus for clearing it up, albeit it is a small area of the site, and where they are going to build the school which can remain in green belt anyway, so shouldn't affect the score in a positive way.

9. Conserve and enhance biodiversity

The site is currently designated as Green Belt land, and made up of a series of fields divided by a number of mature trees and hedgerows that may form habitats for particular species of wildlife. The land is within a Tree Preservation Order Area. Development may have negative impacts on the biodiversity of this landscape. Any development will be subject to extensive masterplanning to ensure that the integrity of the landscape gap between Woking and Mayford will be maintained – built development is likely to be located to the north of the site, leaving a wide landscaped verge along Egley Road and retaining open fields to the south (potentially school playing fields). The site has the potential to include landscaping, improved green

links, and large areas of open space, which may have benefits to biodiversity (leading to a neutral score in the medium to long term). Although there are no ecological designated nature assets on the site itself, there are a number of SNCIs in close proximity to the site (but separated by Egley Road) and development should have regard to their conservation.

Optimising/mitigating measures:

Conduct an ecological assessment / tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features on site and adjacent to site. **Careful design of layout to take into account SNCI, Nature Reserve, and vegetation forming 'Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance' on adjacent land, to preserve their integrity.**

As the site is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, a financial contribution towards SANG and SAMM would be required. The site is approximately 600m away from proposed Mayford SANG. Contribution towards SANG and SAMM of the SPA. Take opportunities to make positive contribution towards biodiversity through the creation of alternative green spaces, retention/enhancement of any features of nature conservation value on-site, and creation of linkages with GI network.

The proposal will devastate the habitats in this area of green belt and it is hard to justify anything other than 3 –'s. It is insufficient to separate Mayford and Woking with just a roadside verge and making contributions to SANGs elsewhere provides little comfort to local residents. It is hard to reconcile the preserving of the integrity of the escarpment with the favouring of building to the north of the site.

10. Conserve and enhance and where appropriate make accessible for enjoyment the natural, historic and cultural assets and landscapes of Woking

I am content with the assessment of 3 double minuses here.

11. Reduce the causes of climate change – particularly by increasing energy efficiency and the production of energy from low and zero carbon technologies and renewable sources – and adapt to its impacts

The residential development would be required to achieve the energy and water components of Level 5 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM 'very good' for any nonresidential buildings over 1,000 sqm.

OK

The site offers good accessibility to most local facilities, and should ensure emissions from private car use do not significantly increase as a result of the development.

I really disagree with this statement. It makes me cross to see such nonsense written and important decisions based on the statement. How many extra traffic movements are forecast to the School, Leisure Centre and Running Track? And how many will it be in

reality? What about all the coaches and delivery lorries? Most of the 188 houses will have at least one car which will make a number of journeys each day. This should be 3 –‘s

Development of the site could potentially lead to an increase in hard landscaping, and in turn could increase surface water runoff. This could be mitigated against through the use of adaptation measures (such as SuDS).

Any high energy use buildings within the development should consider establishing or connecting to an existing CHP network. The neutral score reflects the potential increase in carbon emissions through private car use, and potential increase in surface water runoff, against the implementation of the Code for Sustainable Homes/BREEAM. Optimising/mitigating measures: Design of the development to have regard to incorporation of SuDS and other adaptation measures such as green infrastructure features. Design of development to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5 and BREEAM 'very good' for any nonresidential buildings over 1,000 sqm., and take account of layout, landform, orientation and landscaping to maximise efficient use of energy and adapt to the impacts of climate change. Undertake feasibility study for connection to CHP network.

These are all fine words. I await the results of the feasibility study with interest, as this is normally code for – we don't think it can be done!

12. Reduce the impact of consumption of resources by using sustainably produced and local products

use and re-use renewable and non-renewable resources. The climate change SPD encourages developers to use locally sourced materials to minimise impact of development on use of resources. The neutral short term score reflects that the Core Strategy Policy and Climate Change SPD are relevantly new and that these improvements are likely to build up over the medium to long term. In particular, there is often a short term lag between the adoption of the policy and guidance and its implementation within new developments.

I think this should be 3 zero's. A bit of lip service may be paid, but it is hard to imagine that significant building products will be sourced locally, and sustainability has been with us for many years with timber for example.

13. Reduce waste generation and disposal and achieve sustainable management of waste.

The Council has effective measures, policies and guidance in place to reduce the amount of household and trade waste that is generated from both existing and new development. The negative short term score reflects that all new development will result in a net increase in the amount of waste that is produced within the borough. However through the sustainable management of waste, the amount of waste produced will reduce over a medium to long term, and is reflected in the neutral score. Optimising/mitigating measures:

Design of development should facilitate the reduction of waste and the recycling and composting of the waste produced.

OK

14. Maintain and improve water quality of the region's rivers and groundwater, and manage water resources sustainably.

Planning policy requirements should ensure the development is water efficient by achieving Level 5 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM 'very good' for any nonresidential buildings over 1,000 sqm.

The Environment Agency has confirmed that there are no Groundwater Source Protection Zones within the Borough, and the site is not located near the Borough boundary (and any development is therefore unlikely to affect zones within neighbouring boroughs). Optimising/mitigating measures: Design of the development would have to provide suitable wastewater and sewerage infrastructure.

OK

15. Reduce the need to travel, encourage safe, sustainable transport options and make the best use of

existing transport infrastructure.

The site lies within walking distance of Mayford Neighbourhood Centre where some shops are located, and is considered to have good connections into the existing urban area to the north. The Town Centre is within suitable cycling distance, and is well connected via bus routes.

I just disagree totally with this statement. There is a Post Office and a Gent's Hairdresser in Mayford. Stop misleading readers of this report. What is the urban area to the North? The Town Centre may be well connected with bus routes, but not with Buses! The route is not particularly cycle friendly. It is uphill to town and dangerous. It should be 3 –'s

Primary schools are within walking distance, and a secondary school will come forward as part of the development, reducing the need to travel for new and existing residents and improving proximity to key services.

Well Schools basically.

It is considered that the site is in a sustainable location which would reduce reliance on private car use, and support the use of public transport.

I just totally disagree with statement. It is completely unjustifiable. Who considers it sustainable? Those who want to build on it? How on earth can developing this site reduce reliance on private car use, and support the use of the minimal public transport that is available?

A degree of severance is caused by the railway line, Egley Road and Hoe Stream.

Optimising/mitigating measures:

Transport Assessment and Travel Plan to consider impacts on existing transport infrastructure, and provision of improved sustainable transport infrastructure, including pedestrian and cycle facilities, and additional bus stops. Economic objectives: building a strong, responsive and competitive economy.

There has not been a proper independently produced Transport Assessment and Travel Plan to date. What has been produced has been described as woefully inadequate and I agree with that comment.

16. Maintain high and stable levels of employment and productivity, and encourage high quality, low impact development and education for all.

The education facility would improve access to and participation in education. It would also provide jobs and therefore encourage diversity and quality of employment in the Borough.

This is self serving. Anywhere you build a school gets the 3 ++'s You cannot take the plusses for the school in this assessment, but then ignore the school on the negative scores for increasing car movements.

17. Provide a range of commercial development opportunities to meet the needs of the economy and, in particular, support and enhance economies of town, district, local and neighbourhood centres

The development of the site could support the vitality of the nearby Neighbourhood Centre and other services and facilities within easy access of the site, including those rural businesses to the south of the site.

Again this is self serving. Anywhere you build some houses gets the 3 +'s

Overall Conclusions

Summary of Social Impacts & Issues

The site could provide housing and associated benefits such as affordable housing, which is needed in the area;

It is not needed in our area any more than it is needed in Hook Heath, St John's, or West

Byfleet.

Positive health impacts due to provision of recreation space as part of the development

Not for the local residents who will suffer from more traffic and pollution

Adjacent to land classed as Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3, and at risk of surface water flooding;

Site has the ability to bring about future community infrastructure, including a new school and leisure facilities. Summary of Environmental Impacts & Issues

Loss of Green Belt and greenfield land resulting in potential negative impacts on biodiversity on site – ecological survey / landscape assessment / tree surveys required.

It's not "Potential" negative impact. How could it be anything but negative?

Potential adverse impacts on integrity of surrounding environmentally sensitive areas;

Opportunity to improve provision of, and connectivity to surrounding, GI assets;

So we destroy our green fields, but can easily drive somewhere else where there might be an opportunity to create some?

Development would bring about improvements to land of lower landscape quality, but with potential impacts on landscape character relating to separation of settlements and Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance;

EXACTLY

Exposure to noise, air and light pollution;

EXACTLY

Within Tree preservation order Area;

Site is located on a minor and major aquifer – proposed land-use should not have significant impact on water quality, but should be considered;

Yes

Sustainably located within walking distance of Mayford Neighbourhood Centre and bus routes to Town Centre - supports existing and creation of new sustainable transport options;

I don't think it is particularly sustainably located. Buses are not frequent and never will be unless substantially subsidized. The Mayford Neighbourhood Centre is not the "Go To" destination that is painted in this report.

Impacts on existing transport infrastructure;

This is one of the major major problems with this site which has not been properly researched probably because of fear of what that research would reveal.

Potential remediation of land contamination if present on site.

Could you not require the present landowner to do this anyway?

Summary of Economic Impacts & Issues

Improved access to and participation in education via the education facility;

Increase in job opportunities provided by the education facility;

A residential site increases the supply of land for housing and plays a role in supporting local services.

This is what the council is really trying to achieve against the wishes of local residents. Local Services are already fully supported and utilised.

Summary of optimising/mitigating measures:

- Affordable housing to be provided in line with Policy CS12. If this can not be achieved then evidence will need to be submitted to support otherwise
- Site to provide high quality homes that meet the construction and design standards set out in the Core Strategy and relevant SPDs
- Provide a mix of dwellings types and sizes to address the nature of local needs as evidenced in latest SHMA (Policy CS11)
- Provide a mix of dwellings types and sizes to address the nature of local needs as evidenced in latest SHMA
- Improve provision of and connectivity to recreation space (main road and railway act as barriers)
- Design of the development would have to take into account SuDS and provide suitable surface and foul water drainage.

Previous Council efforts at avoiding flooding in this and other areas of Woking have proved singularly unsuccessful.

- Flood Risk Assessment
- Design of the scheme to seek to design out crime and reduce the fear of crime. For example, designing in natural surveillance

What is natural surveillance? Houses overlooking each other? I do not wish to be part of that myself.

- Secure contribution to provision of essential transport infrastructure related to the development of this site.

This could never be enough, it really couldn't. I suspect that WBC's or SCC's opinion of essential transport infrastructure differs from what the local residents know is required.

- Improve access to key services and facilities by improving connectivity to cycle routes and public footpaths – particularly east to Barnsbury Primary School and beyond to services in Westfield, and south to Mayford Neighbourhood Centre and to recreation space beyond.

Barnsbury Primary School is the only positive example available in this proposal, but I think any parent allowing their 5-10 year old child to dice with the A320 rush hour traffic on a bike would be mad. The much vaunted Mayford Neighbourhood Centre really is not a "Go To" destination as depicted in this report.

- Detailed site layout may require landscaping to buffer against the noise impacts from the road and railway line.

Totally unnecessary. That has never been a problem. It is the existing local residents who will need the sound buffering from the Running Track PA and general hubbub.

- Design to take into account adjacent flood risk and surface water flood risk and to incorporate measures to reduce any increased risk of flooding of adjacent land caused by

development (e.g. Sustainable Drainage Systems)

- Conduct landscape assessment / ecological assessment / tree survey to determine levels of biodiversity and valuable landscape features on site and adjacent to site, taking into account the site is within Tree preservation order Area.
- Careful design of layout to take into account environmentally sensitive sites and vegetation forming 'Escarpment and Rising Ground of Landscape Importance' on adjacent land, to preserve their integrity.

I trust that “Retaining their integrity” means not building near them or obscuring in any way.

- Retain protected tree belts and improve landscaping to enhance sense of separation between the two settlements.

Good.

- Contribution towards SANG and SAMM of the SPA.

That is of little comfort to those who are adversely affected.

- Take opportunities to make positive contribution towards biodiversity through the creation of alternative green spaces, retention/enhancement of any features of nature conservation

value on-site, and creation of linkages with GI network.

- Design of development should facilitate the reduction of waste and the recycling and composting of the waste produced.

I trust this will be suitably sited.

- Design of the development would have to provide suitable wastewater and sewerage infrastructure.

Well what would the alternative be?

- Design of development to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5 and BREEAM 'very good' for any non-residential buildings over 1,000 sqm., and take account of layout,

landform, orientation and landscaping to maximise efficient use of energy and adapt to the impacts of climate change.

- Conduct a Transport Assessment and create Travel Plan to enhance sustainable transport options.

I suspect this is an impossible task, but if the Assessment and Plan are carried out properly and published they will be revealing. I suspect that the sustainable enhancements will be small and be dwarfed by the traffic problems that will become evident.

- Noise Impact Assessment to be conducted, identifying any necessary mitigation measures.
- Air Quality Assessment is recommended.

These should be essential and not just “Recommended” The noise mitigation should be actionable if not effective.

- Further investigation into potential land contamination.
- Archaeological investigation to be conducted.

I hope these are proper investigations and not just desk top reports to cover off.

- Undertake feasibility study for connection to CHP network

I am already looking forward to seeing this as I suspect this is code for “We don't think this is feasible”

- Any floodlighting to be sensitively designed to mitigate light pollution.

How about an off switch at 9PM?

- Consideration of site's location on a minor and major aquifer and potential affect on water quality.

Glad to hear this will be given consideration. I look forward to seeing the results and hope this isn't another code for “No action required”

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

I think someone should take an even-handed look at this sustainability assessment and not be afraid to change the conclusion.

These comments are page 16____ of 16 ____ 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).