



5 Woodlands Way  
Ashtead  
Surrey KT21 1LH  
Telephone: 01372 274925  
Email; [rbennett@dsl.pipex.com](mailto:rbennett@dsl.pipex.com)

11 January 2018  
The Planning Inspectorate  
Room 3/N  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol BS1 6PN

Dear Sir

**Site Address: 80a, 86 & 88 Woodfield Lane, Ashtead, Surrey,KT21 2BS**

**Planning Reference: MO/2016/1934**

**Appeal reference: APP/C3620/W/17/3187875**

I write on behalf of the Ashtead Residents' Association with reference to the above appeal.

We appreciate that our previous submissions have been forwarded to your office. However following the appellant's Appeal Statement prepared by ShrimplinBrown dated October 2017 there are assertions that we wish to challenge for the erection of 10 No. Flats following the removal of the existing buildings known as 80a, 86 & 88 Woodfield Lane.

- It is said that the appellant undertook an extensive public engagement on this proposal. If that was the case we ask why were there 201 letters of representation of which all but 28 were objecting to the planning application for a variety of reasons.
- In spite of superseded plans they still failed to enhance the design that represented overdevelopment with an overbearing impact and out of scale with the historic terrace of cottages on the southern boundary. The same can be said for the effect that the development would have upon residential dwellings on the opposite side of Woodfield Lane. Further we believe the plans showed the residential dwelling at the rear of the site to be out of scale and therefore the occupiers would be severely impacted upon if the development went ahead.
- The development does not harmonise with the immediate locality and fails to improve the character of the area. Therefore we consider the proposal is contrary to Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan policy AS-En3.



- We disagree with the appellant referring to the location as an urban setting. The site overlooks an extension of Ashtead Common and is in close proximity to the pond and open space alongside Barnett Wood Lane and the Queen Elizabeth 11 Playing Field

Turning now to parking, we are concerned by the way in which the appellant appears to have dismissed this subject through their surveys. In spite of a substantial car park attached to Ashtead Station, not only due to cost but also insufficient space, commuters take to using the few available roads in Lower Ashtead without restrictions for parking their vehicles during the day. The planning application had a contradiction of terms for potential occupants. It was said the dwellings would be suitable for young professionals and older people downsizing. Surely it is reasonable to assume that both sectors are vehicle owners and in the case of retirees probably with two cars per household. Therefore we consider the surveys undertaken between the hours of 00.30 – 05.30 (Wednesday/Thursday) and 08.00 – 18.00 (Saturday) are irrelevant and fail to identify where residents who have moved their vehicles during the day would be able to park on their return.

We note the consultants have referred to “The Lambeth Style Parking Beat Survey” that usually covers a cordon of 200m. We assume by expanding the cordon to 400m insufficient parking was found to be available under normal monitoring. Accordingly is it appropriate to undertake a development of this nature where the occupants have to park vehicles over 400m from their residence? Surely consideration needs to be given towards onsite parking for residents, visitors and carers in the case of elderly people.

The appellant is suggesting that once the development is concluded the parking restriction currently in force outside the site will be removed. As far as we are aware this will be far from the truth. The current arrangement is in place to support the retail businesses but if they ceased to exist we believe a minimum standard of single yellow lines would be installed to ensure free flow of traffic for the bus route at this very busy junction. In addition it must be said that there is the likelihood of further parking restrictions being applied by Surrey County Council in the future to several more roads in the vicinity of the site by way of single and or double yellow lines to ease the pressure from commuter parking. Therefore the 400 metre cordon referred to above would be inappropriate for the purpose of endeavouring to justify sufficient street parking for the convenience of residents of the development.

It is at this point we need to emphasize an essential aspect of the Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan (ANDP) that was approved through scrutiny and agreed by way of a referendum with an overwhelming majority. Inadequate parking spaces in Ashtead are probably similar to many other areas. More vehicles per household, Victorian dwellings without garages and owners of modern homes converting their garages to habitable accommodation as an economical means of increasing living space. The result is more on street parking and our Neighbourhood Plan has endeavoured to control the sprawl by way of policy AS-H6 demanding new developments to incorporate onsite parking which in this case would necessitate 10 parking spaces, namely one per unit.

In many respects it could be said that precedents have been established in Ashtead to augment the enforcement of (ANDP) policy AS-H6 in two locations. Firstly an office block at Ashworth House,



9 The Street, Ashtead was approved for conversion into 20 flats for which each had provision for a parking space. Secondly 53-55 The Street, Ashtead where a Marks & Spencer Plc store is nearing completion to include 9 flats on the upper floors, once again each with a parking space. Given the circumstances we do not see how the proposed development in Woodfield Lane justifies special consideration with regards to its failure to incorporate parking on site.

Given the exceptional circumstances of this application and the impact it could have upon Lower Ashtead we make a special request for you to undertake at your convenience a site visit in due course.

We are of the opinion that the appellant's case does not alter the correct decision made by Mole Valley District Council to refuse the planning application and therefore we recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Yours faithfully

Planning Officer for Ashtead Residents' Association





