

WOKING BC: DRAFT SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD

POLICY UA4: KINGS COURT, CHURCH STREET EAST, WOKING

GENERAL COMMENTS:

The Policy would be easier to comprehend and interpret if the various development criteria were to be grouped under suitable subject headings, for instance: Use. Infrastructure Contributions. Design. Transport. Drainage & Flood Risk. Sustainability. Etc. This would also preclude the tendency toward duplication and possible conflict that arises in the simple bullet point list.

Kings Court is subject to a current planning application - ref: PLAN/2014/1263 - for mixed-use redevelopment in conjunction with Thomson House. On that basis, Thomson House should be deleted from Policy UA2 and added to Policy UA4, and the red line adjusted accordingly.

The combined Kings Court/Thomson House site has an area of 0.22 hectare.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS:

As noted above, the combined Kings Court/Thomson House site has an area of 0.22 hectare.

The proposed use of this site should be for a mix of office and residential uses (including affordable housing), plus town centre uses (Use Classes A1/A2/A3/B1/D1) at ground floor level on the Chertsey Road frontage. This mix of uses at ground floor level is compatible with the aspiration to create an interesting and vibrant street frontage.

It should be made clear that a comprehensive development brief for this part of Woking Town Centre – including the sites that are subject to Policy UA2, UA3, UA4 and UA33 – should not preclude the redevelopment of each site (or part of site) in isolation.

The references to affordable housing and Community Infrastructure Levy should include a qualifying statement relating to the effect of vacant building credit and viability assessment, in accordance with the NPPF/NPPG.

The estimated capacity of the revised site, including Thomson House, should reflect planning application ref. PLAN/2014/1263, which proposes the erection of 28 dwellings plus 6720 m² net external area of additional office floorspace (9264 m² gross external area).

The site lies some distance from the railway line and is screened from it by existing buildings. Consequently it is not affected by railway-generated noise and that reference should be deleted.

The site is separated from Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area by a main road (Victoria Way) and modern canalside apartments. Consequently, development on this site will not affect the character or appearance of the conservation area and reference to it should be deleted.

WOKING BC: DRAFT SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD

POLICY UA2: TRIZANCIA HOUSE, THOMSON HOUSE & WOODSTEAD HOUSE, CHERTSEY ROAD, WOKING

GENERAL COMMENTS:

The Policy would be easier to comprehend and interpret if the various development criteria were to be grouped under suitable subject headings, for instance: Use. Infrastructure Contributions. Design. Transport. Drainage & Flood Risk. Sustainability. Etc. This would also preclude the tendency toward duplication and possible conflict that arises in the simple bullet point list.

Kings Court (Policy UA4) is subject to a current planning application - ref: PLAN/2014/1263 - for mixed-use redevelopment in conjunction with Thomson House. Also, Trizancia House, Woodsted House (both now demolished) and Chester House (Policy UA3) are currently subject to a separate outline planning application – ref: PLAN/2014/0759 – for mixed office, residential, restaurant and leisure uses.

On that basis, Thomson House should be deleted from Policy UA2 and added to Policy UA4, and the red line adjusted accordingly. Chester House remains in active office use and should be retained as a separate policy in the DPD.

The combined vacant Trizancia House/Woodstead House site has an area of 0.14 hectare.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS:

As noted above, the combined vacant Trizancia House/Woodstead House, excluding Thomson House, site has an area of 0.14 hectare.

It should be made clear that a comprehensive development brief for this part of Woking Town Centre – including the sites that are subject to Policy UA2, UA3, UA4 and UA33 – should not preclude the redevelopment of each site (or part of site) in isolation.

The references to affordable housing and Community Infrastructure Levy should include a qualifying statement relating to the effect of vacant building credit and viability assessment, in accordance with the NPPF/NPPG.

The site lies some distance from the railway line and is screened from it by existing buildings. Consequently it is not affected by railway-generated noise and that reference should be deleted.

The site is separated from Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area by a main road (Victoria Way) and modern canalside apartments. Consequently, development on this site will not affect the character or appearance of the conservation area and reference to it should be deleted.

WOKING BC: DRAFT SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD

POLICY UA33: 101-121 CHERTSEY ROAD, WOKING

GENERAL COMMENTS:

The Policy would be easier to comprehend and interpret if the various development criteria were to be grouped under suitable subject headings, for instance: Use. Infrastructure Contributions. Design. Transport. Drainage & Flood Risk. Sustainability. Etc. This would also preclude the tendency toward duplication and possible conflict that arises in the simple bullet point list. *[For example, the current version has two identical references to service areas and the green infrastructure, trees and public realm criteria are not co-ordinated]*

The site is presently subject to three separate planning applications/permissions affecting the existing office buildings at 121 Chertsey Road, 111 Chertsey Road and 101-109 Chertsey Road (Waterman House). The supporting text should be updated to include the 111 Chertsey Road application (ref: PLAN/2015/0765). We note that each of these applications is for office redevelopment, rather than mixed use.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS:

It should be made clear that a comprehensive development brief for this part of Woking Town Centre – including the sites that are subject to Policy UA2, UA3, UA4 and UA33 – should not preclude the redevelopment of each site (or part of site) in isolation.

In the event that the site (or parts of the site) is redeveloped for mixed office/residential purposes, it is not going to be feasible to include family accommodation (2+ bedrooms) with commensurate private amenity space, whilst at the same time achieving a net density of 250 dph and no net loss of office floorspace. We therefore consider that that reference to family accommodation should be deleted from the development criteria.

The references to affordable housing and Community Infrastructure Levy should include a qualifying statement relating to the effect of vacant building credit and viability assessment, in accordance with the NPPF/NPPG.

The criterion requiring buildings to be of ‘exceptional design quality’ is a subjective term that is not necessary, given that other criteria refer to ‘high design quality’, making improvements to the public realm, and enhancing the town centre. That criteria is therefore unnecessary and repetitive and should be deleted.

The site lies some distance from the railway line and is screened from it by existing buildings. Consequently it is not affected by railway-generated noise and that reference should be deleted.

There is no suggestion that all or part of the Policy UA33 site will come forward in conjunction with Policy UA38 (Walton Road Youth Centre). Development of the latter site will address the building scale found in Walton Road, rather than the more intensive scale in Chertsey Road. Consequently, we consider that cross-reference is unnecessary and potentially unhelpful.