

# WOKINGHAM TOWN COUNCIL

## Comments on Carnival Pool Planning Application O/2015/1056

WTC welcomes this application, and is in favour of a MSCP in this location, and the other outline proposals for this area.

### Overall Design

WTC does not consider that the car park as proposed conforms with Core Strategy Policy CP3a on two points:

1. It is not of an appropriate scale, mass and height; and
2. It will be to the detriment of adjoining landowners, particularly those in Oakey Drive, because of its overbearing size and light pollution.

**The top storey should be removed** – this means the loss of 132 car spaces.

The design of this car park is too large, and architecturally at odds with the town as admitted by the consultants in the Design and Access Statement – see pages 59, 61 and 65.

Two questions arise:

**1. Is there a need for these 132 spaces?**

The Town Centre Master Plan SPD identifies Carnival Pool as a site for a medium stay car parking and para 7.4.4. states that at least 300 spaces should be provided south of Wellington Road. Add this to the loss of 165 spaces through demolition, the total requirement means a minimum 465 spaces. This was in 2010. What does WBC current car parking strategy show? Has this been updated from the 2014 draft which was withdrawn as inaccurate and incorrect?

**2. If so, can they be accommodated elsewhere?**

Have WBC examined all other options for alternative edge of town car parking?

Only if WBC can adequately demonstrate satisfaction to points 1 and 2 above would WTC consider supporting such a large car park, and **only then** if there was a redesign of the top storey to **soften the mass** and to **mitigate light pollution** thereby conforming to WBC Borough Design Guide, Non Residential 7.3, Building Design:

- NR5 - building height, bulk and massing should be designed to relate well to the local context
- NR6 - where there are significant differences in height/bulk between immediately neighbouring buildings, the design approach must moderate its impact
- NR7 - roofs and roofscapes need to be carefully designed in relation to the context, and should respond to their visibility.

### **Cadet facilities**

This application also fails on Core Strategy CP3a because it is to the detriment of a current occupier – i.e. the Cadet Force. Core Strategy CP3, section J, General Principles for Development, state “any proposal should not lead to a loss of community or recreational facilities/land unless suitable alternative provision is available”, “Development proposals will be required to demonstrate how they have responded to the above criteria”, - which has not been done.

If MSCP permission were to be eventually granted, no demolition or eviction of the Cadet Facility should be undertaken until planning permission is granted and construction complete for an alternative facility.

### **User Car Parking**

CP4, The Travel Plan 3.4.1 section 46, bullet point 1 states “There will be nine parent and child spaces”. We think this is inadequate but do not know what the standard should be in an MSCP of this size, particularly one providing for leisure facilities. What standard has been used?

CP4, Transport Assessment Part 1 section 3.6.2.4 states “there will be 27 residential parking spaces behind flats with 22 within the Multi Storey and 10 unallocated” (making in total 59 spaces). This is we believe inadequate as the application is for 69 residential units and does not conform to the MDD Car Parking Standard.

### **Coach parking**

The whole of the coach parking needs to be re thought. Only one coach drop-off space is being shown, and this is right outside the building near the entrance. This does not allow for any further coaches to queue to drop off without impeding all other vehicular entrance to the site. Currently there are often a number of coaches when there are galas, school parties etc. The coach drop off enters and parks such that the children are disgorged on the road side! There is nowhere shown for the coaches then to park.

There are currently existing 3 coach parking spaces which are often all in daily use. We believe that a minimum of three coach spaces should be provided as there is no other allocated coach parking in the town.

### **Tactile paving**

The Travel Plan 2.5, pedestrian facilities, sections 27 and 29, say there is no tactile paving currently on these crossings. Nowhere do we see that tactile paving will be included to satisfy Borough Design Guide section 5.5 which requires design and layout to make provisions for all users.