

## **Planning Committee**

**20 October 2021**

### **Late Representations**

Since the last date for the submission of views on applications/matters before the Committee this evening, representations in respect of the under mentioned applications/ matters have been received. The letters, copies of which will be available for inspection by councillors at the meeting, are summarised below.

#### **Item 5 – Planning Applications**

**20/P/02173 – (Page 15) – Land at Burpham Court Farm, Clay Lane, Guildford, GU4 7NA**  
**Worplesdon Parish Council** wishes to reiterate its objection to planning application no: 20/P/02173 for the following reasons:

A Road Safety Audit is required for the proposed pedestrian crossing due to (a) the flooding of the highway that occurs near the entrance to Safeguard, Clay Lane (see attached photos) and (b) the dense, lingering fog which forms over the highway at the same location.

1. A detailed design for the footpath crossing access is required, as the land drops steeply away from the highway on the northern side of Clay Lane.
2. Due to the known, and repeated flood events which occur at Burpham Court Farm/Clay Lane details of the walkways within the SANG need to be provided, otherwise the SANG will be inaccessible throughout certain times of the year. See attached photograph.
3. Who will manage the SANG, once created?
4. Who will own the freehold of the SANG, once created?
5. What is the cost of the management of the SANG over the 125 year period? Has this been comprehensively costed?
6. A S106 Agreement for the associated SANG management costs is required to be entered into, to ensure that the funding to manage the site will be available over the 125 year period.
7. Has Climate Change been taken into account when assessing the viability of the SANG at Burpham Court Farm?
8. No visibility splays have been provided for the potential crossing points – at a location which is a known traffic accident blackspot.
9. Swept paths of a box van have been provided which is welcome and acceptable, however, it would have been expected that the largest vehicle to access the SANG would be a maintenance vehicle and trailer. This should have also been assessed.
10. There is no mention of a height barrier to prevent inappropriate parking at the SANG car park. This should be secured by a planning condition.
11. Provision of a SANG car park is integral to the suitability of the SANG site. It would be wholly inappropriate for motorists to park on the verges along Clay Lane.

**20/P/02155 – (Page 71) – Weyside Urban Village (Slyfield Regeneration Programme), Slyfield Green, Guildford, GU1**

#### **Additional Representations**

Name: Mrs Fiona Dunn

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Summary below, full comments on Public Access

I would support development of the area however not to the scale being proposed. I feel there are fundamental issues with planned access and parking that have been overlooked

and make this development feel as though it will significantly cause a negative impact on our Slyfield area.

Point 1 - They are not allocating enough parking for the new home owners within the plan

Point 2 - There is no planned access road onto the development from Burpham side all access is Slyfield / Stoke Road.

Point 3 - Negative impact of increase buses causing Woodlands road to shake.

Point 4 - Current prohibitive cost of taking a bus short distances.

Point 5 - Impact on road traffic and congestion.

Point 6 - Current GP Crisis

**Name: Mr Jim Allen**

**Summary below, full comments on Public Access**

I remain concerned that even at this late stage in respect of the Weyside Urban village planning application and proposals.

1. A satisfactory entrance to this site is still far from being displayed - the use of estate streets to get around the problem of this 'dead end canyon' development -

2. It is becoming more of a canyon, the more accommodations units being added, the more Ghetto like it becomes

3. This canyon is going to end up a slum, ghetto, overcrowded without water or parking.

4. Should we even be considering this development until a more certain longer lasting water supply is discovered.

5. No method of transport out of the site save 'buses on a wet day' with nowhere for the buses to park when not in use.

Yet this proposal is over 400 metres to a bus stop with little opportunity to get to a bus stop.

6. Failure to provide facility to turn Right at the main entrance on the A320 will lead to increased accidents on the A320.

7. No provision for workers travelling by bus to Woking, as no facility to turn right at main entrance to the estate. And it appears buses will 'go round a circle clockwise' only going to Guildford but nowhere else

8. No provision for delivery vehicles to cross to Stoughton From Weyside without 180 degree turn at head of A3 Northbound on A320. Or going through 'estate roads' unsuitable for large vehicles

9. Inadequate parking for private vehicles

10. Road surfaces inadequate to cope with Fire Engines which need to access all buildings especially over 3 stories high by Ariel platform equipment.

11. 'Matador' Square – poor name.

12. Total and utter failure to accept the SANG proposal is zone 3B flood plain in fact this application is so out of kilter an out line detail for 'full application is clearly very wrong.

13. Will Flood as Zone 1 area next to Zone 2 area

13. Net average density of 116 dph - is extremely high for the urban area in comparison the highest density in Burpham is 52dph the lowest 16dph I believe the proposed density is simply too high for safe, crime free, comfortable 'happy living'

14. Garden Mews look like Barracks

15. The Wharf looks like something out of Miami Florida

16. Green Lanes - are forgetting the need to access by fire engines and delivery vehicles

17. Woking road gateway is highly restrictive and in the wrong place for an all access all direction entry / exit.

18. Slyfield Green is not a suitable access for 3565 people or part thereof.

19. There does not appear a turning provision within the roads design for delivery vehicles to turn around.

20. I believe the access to the site should be directly in/out off Bellfield's roundabout - you want the omelette time you accepted you have to break the eggs.

22. Page 194 Bellfield's road is indicated as a 'temporary' access clearly indicating the failure to ascertain a proper access from day one.

23. Can GBC actually afford to move to the new site -

24. Page 20 claims 3,000 residents yet with an increase to 1550 accommodation units the number must actually be greater than 3565 than 3,000 thus is misleading

25. The SMC 'principle' has not been tested in the court of public opinion,

26. Page 217 discusses walking distances but takes the fit able person under 55

27. Repeats same point on flooding

The proposal is fundamentally flawed at all levels. From financial viability, using residents money to move the STW, to the density of properties and lack of parking provision. All are very bad planning to the Nth degree

**Name: Mr & Mrs S Kale**

Summary below, full comments on Public Access

1. A re-consultation period of 14-days is not enough for this type of complex planning application.
2. There is a clear conflict of interest as the application is being sponsored and decided by Guildford Borough Council. The application should be put to a local referendum.
3. Development is too close to and will result in further congest an already overcrowded road network. Proposal will result in major impact on the flow of traffic in and around Guildford. It is noted that a possible solution would be the provision of a Clay Lane link road and improvements to the A3 Burpham junction.
4. No decision should be taken on this planning application until road traffic modelling has been completed.
5. The changes to the access at the depot entrance introduce further problems and should warrant refusal. It will greatly increase queues and result in noise, disruption, air pollution and enjoyment of garden, as well as those using Riverside Nature Reserve.
6. Buses will be running in close proximity to residential properties.
7. The proposed pedestrian crossing will create an additional pinch point along Woking Road.
8. Loss of on-street car parking spaces.
9. Impact from construction noise, disturbance, dust etc

**Name: Mr Douglas Clare**

Summary below, full comments on Public Access

1. Object as this development offers minimal sustainable transport improvements for Guildford. The development should be contributing at least £1M in Section 106 payments.
2. This funding should go towards cycling infrastructure improvements to achieve a completed cycle network connecting the site to Guildford Upper High St, Guildford Station, Jacobs Well and Stoughton.

**Name: Mr David Wilson**

Summary below, full comments on Public Access

1. Development represents an opportunity to plan world class non-motorised transport options, such as are being achieved in Holland and Denmark. And yet no effort is being made to do this.
2. The traffic reports promote a ridiculous circular argument which will eternally result in only making provision for motorised traffic, and never strive to achieve improved active travel, such as walking and cycling.
3. The design changes being implemented should have the objective of improving active travel and significantly increasing the number of pedestrians and cyclists. The mitigations described in the TA do not adequately segregate cyclists, so it is possible that there will be an impact on the microsimulation model.
4. The proposals are woefully inadequate in this respect. For example, the Stoke Crossroads and A3 exit slip includes no fewer than five Toucan crossings in order to get from the north to the south sides. Whereas motorised traffic crossing is optimised with only a single stop.

**Name: Miss Laura Curtis**

Summary below, full comments on Public Access

1. There is a lack of parking on the site. Public transport is not adequate or cheap enough to encourage sustainable travel.
2. Access off the A320 is a concern in terms of highway safety and congestion.
3. Buildings too tall and out of keeping with the area.
4. Taller buildings will result in a loss of privacy.
5. Noise and disruption during construction and impact on amenity.
6. Increased flood risk.
7. Increased pressure on local infrastructure and facilities such as hospitals, GPs and schools. Increased pressure on River Wey towpath.
8. Increased noise, air and light pollution.

**Name: Nicola Harding.**

Summary below, full comments on public access.

1. the feature formerly identified as a possible branch of the Wey Navigation has now been confirmed as a section of the New Flowing River. This is tremendously important historically. It is the first such development in England and possibly in Europe. As such it is certainly nationally, and probably internationally, important.
2. This new information has resulted in it being reappraised as being high in terms of historic interest and rarity. Its current condition does not reduce its historical importance or significance; its loss would be considered Significantly Adverse, not a Minor Adverse loss.
3. Strongly urge the Planning Authority to protect this section of the New Flowing River as the historically important feature that it is. It is unique, adds character and makes the area distinctively different from others. It is a privilege and national responsibility to have it in our area and it should be preserved.

Name: Kirsten Rosslyn-Smith (Vicar), St Peter's Shared Church Stoke Hill Guildford  
St Peter's has no specific objections to the WUV development. We would like to ensure that people have access to Worship in their local community by easy access to St Peter's, their parish church, with regard to transport. We are in the process of developing our site to better serve the increased number of residents, providing worship and more community space, and would ask that planners ensure that the church would also be able to serve WUV by officially permitted use of community spaces to offer various worship and events on the development. The aim is to spiritually care for all in the area and foster integration with the existing community in this area.

**Historic England:** No further comments on the amended plans.

**Thames Water:** Thames Water confirms it is fully supportive of the planning application and is working to deliver the relocation of our existing works to enable the WUV housing development. In addition to their comments on (26th January 2021), Thames Water have suggested a condition which if imposed would require the submission of details which confirm that the proposed dwellings would not be impacted by odour from the existing sewage treatment works or that mitigation can be put in place if odours will be noticeable.

**Surrey County Council, Waste:** No further comments on the amended plans.

**Surrey County Council, County Archaeologist:** No objections, subject to condition.