

	Name of respondent	Summary of representation	Officer's response
1	M Meinke	<p>Is there a similar SPD relating to construction, and to the approval of new builders' yards? Problems noted with such building sites and builders' yards in Woking include significant air pollution, demolition without proper screening, storage and movement of materials in the open air. At Total Concrete, Monument Way, these issues affect users of the adjacent canal path. WBC should advise businesses about grants for updating equipment and vehicles, to reduce pollution for both site workers and the public. Air pollution from these sites should be monitored and policies should require relevant conditions on planning permissions.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.2: The last sentence is worrying; should be rewritten for clarity. If the sentence means 'flexibility to cram too many buildings into too small a space' rather than 'flexibility to ensure a healthy environment' it makes the policy useless.</p>	<p>Pollution is addressed by policies DM5, DM6 and DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD and advice on applications is received from the Council's Environmental Health department. The use of conditions to control pollution arising from construction, including the issues mentioned, is standard.</p> <p>Agree this could be confusing. Specific references to dense urban locations and the historic environment are made in the text of the SPD. Remove the final phrase as follows: <i>The Council will use this guidance to help determine planning applications, but will apply it flexibly, having regard to the individual circumstances and other material planning considerations of each case, such as development within dense urban locations or the historic environment.</i></p>

		<p>Paragraph 1.5: what justification could there be for allowing closer spacing? There is already a lack of green space in busy areas. In and around the town centre, people congregate in groups to socialise; they probably have little space at home; we could be moving towards slum development.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.4: Concerned that this point (r.e. respect for context) means that where an area has undergone densification and become more busy recently, that process will be allowed to continue- that would not be fair. Maybury is such an area and it has various problems, for example recent development of fast food units. Does the paragraph mean that more fast food units would be allowed?</p> <p>It is difficult for information about planning proposals to circulate in the Maybury area, due to a lack of unity among the different parts of</p>	<p>As is apparent from Appendix 2, the proposed 30m rear-to-rear distance for three- or more storey residential buildings (as those in the town centre are likely to be) is relatively large. Potential justifications for diverging from these distances are set out in the SPD. This is a different issue from the application of standards for internal space or external amenity/green space.</p> <p>Where an area includes a mixture of higher and lower density buildings, then regardless of their age, both of those building types will form part of the context. It would not be appropriate for the design of new development to ignore the presence of high density buildings on a neighbouring site, any more than to ignore the presence of low density buildings on a neighbouring site. In addition, indicative density ranges for residential development are set out in the Core Strategy (policy CS12), which places part of Maybury in a 'high density residential area' around the town centre. Hot food takeaways and associated amenity issues are covered by a separate Hot Food Takeaway SPD (adopted 2014).</p> <p>Proposals regarding the publicising of planning applications are set out in the draft Statement of</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>the area. Greater effort in advertising planning information would help.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.2: Could this mention the placement of utility cabinets and parking areas for telecom/delivery vehicles, to ensure space for both these things is incorporated into initial designs of development, and they do not have to be squeezed into locations that were not originally intended?</p> <p>Paragraphs 3.4, 3.10: There is no evidence of money having been spent on highway or drainage improvements in our area; how would we know if it had been? Could CIL funds be allocated away from our area towards those with neighbourhood forums? Which council officer is responsible for ensuring fairness of the CIL budget and publicising the availability of the money collected for the area appropriately? I am not aware of such publicity for Maybury.</p> <p>Woking Park is too small, cannot accommodate any more activities. Every area should have green spaces with clean air</p>	<p>Community Involvement (consulted on September-November 2021; the respondent also produced a response to that consultation)</p> <p>Agree with regard to utility cabinets. Insert reference into Paragraph 2.6, to read: '<i>Particular care should be taken when siting bin stores, <u>utility cabinets</u> and similar domestic structures...</i>'. Parking for telecom and delivery vehicles would come under the category of visitor parking, which is addressed by the Parking Standards SPD (2018) (Table 3)</p> <p>The CIL charge includes a 'neighbourhood portion' comprising 25% of locally generated CIL receipts in areas with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan, and 15% in areas without. These proportions are set out in national regulations. The way this is implemented in Woking is set out on the following webpage, and the pages linked to from it:  <a href="https://www.woking.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning/planning-policies-and-guidance/how-we-spend-income-cil-levy">https://www.woking.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning/planning-policies-and-guidance/how-we-spend-income-cil-levy</a></p> <p>This is provided for by paragraph 3.11 of the SPD; and policy CS17 and Appendix 4 of the Core</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>(especially where homes are small, with small or no gardens) and CIL should be used to provide more of these spaces.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.10: Will planning permissions include conditions regarding the maintenance of wall and roof gardens and other areas of relaxation?</p> <p>Paragraph 3.18 and Appendix 1 (Recommended Garden Amenity Area): Elderly and disabled people in sheltered accommodation need green, recreational space and fresh air just like everyone else (good for their health); internal space, or a loggia above ground floor level, is not enough. External areas allow residents to meet visitors in some privacy. See the Railway care home in Oriental Road for an example.</p>	<p>Strategy. The Town Centre Masterplan will include proposals for the public realm in the town centre.</p> <p>This is common practice for the Council, in line with policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies DPD. However, it would be worth including a sentence to the end of this paragraph to cement its usage, as follows: <u>'Where communal outdoor amenity space is proposed, its retention and maintenance for the lifetime of the development (as well as a management plan) should be secured by planning condition.'</u></p> <p>This appears to be a misunderstanding; the SPD does require garden amenity space for sheltered accommodation, it simply does not require it to be of a specific size.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Appendix 1 (Recommended Garden Amenity Area). Special treatment for conservation areas allows for the continuation of an unfair policy: people living in less affluent areas are treated worse, in terms of their amenity and health. The document should seek to ensure that buildings are of an appropriate size and quality to ensure the good health of everyone in the town.</p>	<p>Conservation areas and other older housing areas receive special treatment for the sake of their heritage value and townscape character, not for the amenity of their residents. However, the final sentence is supported. Therefore amend the second bullet on page 24 to read: <i>'Standards of amenity may be relaxed for housing in Woking Town Centre and West Byfleet District Centre which are close to a range of facilities although the Council may <u>will normally</u> seek a contribution towards improvements to the public realm in lieu of on-site amenity provision.'</i></p>
2	C Hutchison (Carter Jonas) on behalf of Ecoworld	<p>The proposed update is welcomed; the current SPD is very old.</p> <p>Different approaches should be taken to matters such as separation distances and daylight/sunlight in areas like the Town Centre, as opposed to the rest of the borough.</p> <p>The document should be updated to provide a measuring tool that considers the individual circumstances of allocated sites.</p> <p>The provision of high density residential development in tall buildings is an important aspect of the Council's housing strategy, as detailed in the report to Executive in July 2021 regarding the Town Centre Masterplan. The draft SPD should be updated to reflect this, and the direction of growth set out in the future</p>	<p>Support welcomed. The SPD provides a useful guide to the way the Council manages development across the borough. Certain sections of the SPD refer to development being treated differently in different areas. Overall, the SPD is flexible enough to allow it to be applied to the various character areas in the Borough, including the Town Centre. Together with the Design SPD and Woking Character Study, there is a sufficient body of evidence to allow for the assessment of development in different contexts across the Borough.</p> <p>With regard to the Town Centre specifically, there will be additional layer of guidance in the Town Centre Masterplan which will establish some key principles against which applications in this area will be assessed.</p>

		<p>Masterplan. More emphasis should be placed on the flexibility advocated in national policy to achieve a high quality of design, in turn allowing for a design-led approach to mitigating impacts on outlook, amenity and daylight.</p> <p>The findings detailed in Appendix 2 (specifically, that several authorities have back-to-back distances much less than 30m, and only two have specific distances for flats) should inform the content of the SPD, by introducing flexibility in the design development of town centre schemes.</p>	<p>Appendix 1, which contains the recommended rear-to-rear distances for Woking, already states <i>'Standards of amenity may be relaxed for housing in Woking Town Centre...'</i></p>
3	J Greene (Spatial Planning, Surrey County Council)	No comments	Noted
4	T Howe (Historic Environment Planning, Surrey County Council)	No comments	Noted

5	B Ginn (National Highways)	No comments	Noted
---	----------------------------	-------------	-------