

DPD PLanning Questionnaire

colin weeks [REDACTED]

Sent: 26 July 2015 08:04

To: Planning Policy

Cc: WCRA [REDACTED]; will forster [REDACTED]; Cllr Derek McCrum; Cllr John Lawrence; Cllr Ayesha Azad

Attachments: DRD Reply July 2015l.pdf (109 KB)

Please find attached my copy of my response to the DPD Consultation Questionnaire. I will be pleased to provide further information should you require it.

The summary of my comments are also listed below:

Kind Regards

Colin Weeks
GU22 9PD

Your comment

Unfortunately I have neither the time nor the facilities to look through this MASSIVE tome in detail. I am also concerned that there has been no provision made for LOCAL presentations to be made in all areas – particularly those where important changes are already being made to their location. However looking at **South Woking** I have five main concerns regarding this document:

a) The unwarranted ongoing attack on the Green Belt Land before a clear review of available Brown Field Sites has been made.

b) The lack of definition on the DPD Site Map of the Urban Open Spaces as defined within the September 2008 PPG17 LDF Evidence Base Map of Woking Borough Open Space, Sports and Recreation Audit. This map would appear to indicate that all these areas in the “grey Area” are open to unwarranted development..

I also have been unable to find any WBC Policy documents associated with the development and protection of these areas as recommended within the Houses of Parliament Post Note Number 448, dated November 2013

c) I am unable to find anywhere in this document the proposed “grey” infrastructure plan particularly road works; park and ride facilities; schools and medical facilities/dental facilities etc to support the envisaged Development. These need to be carried out BEFORE the foreseen further new building takes place within South Woking – prime examples are the proposed development at Mayford which currently is “cut off” by three Bridge restrictions. Equally Westfield Road which is used as an A3 Relief Road when ever there is a serious incident on either the A3 or A31. The widening of Balfour Avenue has yet to be proven to be capable of serving the new Kingsmoor Park Estate.

d) The different Planning Designations for Westfield Common - after all Westfield Common is Westfield Common!. If any member of the Planning Committee turns left out of the E & W Restaurant and looks either South or West I fail to see how the land they see can be classed as Urban Land. This split of classification goes against both the historic Planning Documents and those assurances given to all local residents when the Kingsmoor Park development was pushed through against the many local objections.

Your 2008 LDF Evidence Base Report on Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities Assessment Page 46 lists OS-MDS G7 as a 9.67ha site having a Quality Rating of 93% and a Value rating of 80% - figures equal to or better than both Smarts Heath and Prey Heath Common. It is even higher than that shown for parts of Horsell Common. Surely reclassifying it as Urban Open Space will reduce, rather than enhance these ratings.

Furthermore following the approval of Kingsmoor Park, in 2014 the SWT in conjunction with WBC produced a Management Plan for the whole of Westfield Common, which indicated that the whole of Westfield Common has an SNCI rating. This Report clearly shows the work that was identified to be carried out. It was understood that funding would come from the development of these 37 homes. It is hard to understand therefore how apparent double dipping can now take place to justify 37 homes in the Mayford Green Belt.

It should also be noted that around the Northern End of Westfield Common are a number of 17th Century Houses – listings on some of which can be found in Woking BC's list of Historical Houses and the Surrey Group of the Domestic Buildings Research Group. I fail to see how these homes should make the Northern and Western parts of Westfield Common any more Urban than the southern end.

e) My last confusion arises because I do not understand how Common Land, can be used as a SANG to mitigate the building of houses on Green Belt Land. I am also concerned that tarmac paths and roads have already been laid on Westfield Common without providing alternative equal green space eg (Willow Bank; the Play Area and the NW entrance to Kingsmoor Park). How and where is it envisaged that you will put the other needed facilities ie Car Parks

As for Footpaths, there are already a number of established footpaths in existence linking Central Woking; Triggs Lock; Gresham Mill; The River Wey; Send: Ripley; Roundbrige Farm; and Woking itself. It is these that require signposting (I note that a number of the sign posts linking the River Wey footpath and Westfield Common have been broken/removed) and developing into circular footpaths and recreational cycle routes. Walking around the southern part of Westfield Common itself is really, in my view, a little bit of a nonsense.

A further issue is that opening the area up as envisaged in your document is likely to have completely the opposite effect to that envisaged in the SWT management Plan. Since the building of Kingsmoor Park there has already been a noticeable decline in the wild life that we used to see. I fear that turning this area into a SANG would ensure that what is now left would finally disappear, not what I think was the objective of the SWT Management Plan

It is for the above reasons that I believe it incorrect to have different categorisations for the Southern, Northern and Western parts of Westfield Common. I also add that I fail to see the benefit to the Community of classifying the Southern part of Westfield Common a SANG.

Finally I would like to add that with this area of Woking, foreseen to have to accommodate 36/40% of the future population growth of Woking, it is essential that priority is given to both protecting and enhancing the Natural Green Space as previously promised by WBC Senior Management. For this reason alone I believe it paramount that the "Urban Open Space" tag be removed from the Northern and Western parts of Westfield Common and that the whole of Westfield Common be given a "Common" treatment and status within this Plan

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

- a) **Site GB19 should cover the whole of Westfield Common** – not just the Southern Part
- b) **Urban Open Spaces**, as identified in WBC's PPG17 LDF Base Report of WBC's Open Space, Sports Recreation Audit, **should be clearly shown on the allocations site map.**
- c) If one does not specifically exist **a dedicated Planning Document should be developed to outline the Protection required and enhancing planning required of the key Urban Open Spaces within the Borough in accordance with the H of P Post Note Number 44 dated November 2013.** The costs for achieving this to be funded from ALL future development within the Borough.
- d) **This Site Map should also clearly indicate the proposed grey infrastructure Projects required to facilitate current planning** – particularly "Through Roads"; Cycle Ways, Park and Ride Facilities, Central Car Parks together with free ways. **These have to come BEFORE any further development**