

[REDACTED]

From: Chris Gardner [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 March 2020 10:12
To: comaps
Subject: Re: Comments on 2019/2247
Attachments: 2019_2247 Objection Chartfield.docx; Rendering Chartfield 2019_2247.docx

Hi

Further to the below, please use the attached documents rather than the ones on the email below.

Best regards

Chris Gardner

From: Chris Gardner
Sent: 16 March 2020 08:10
To: comaps@tandridge.gov.uk <comaps@tandridge.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments on 2019/2247

Hi

Please find attached comments on 2019/2247.

Best regards

Chris Gardner

Reference: planning application 2019/2247 site address Atherfield, Park View Road, Woldingham, CR3 7DJ

Dear Ms Betts

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application. I would like to object in the strongest possible terms for the below reasons.

Summary

The application is contrary to the Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan 2016.2 and the policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) and policies DP7 and DP8 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014 due to:

- a. Overdevelopment & unacceptable intensification of the site
- b. Inappropriate subdivision
- c. Tandem development
- d. Significant harm to the spacious, sylvan character of Woldingham and its setting
- e. Significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties including my own due to overbearance, overlooking and noise intrusion
- f. Failure to recognise the constraints imposed by the existing trees & mature planting, or to adequately provide against harm given their significance within the local landscape
- g. Adverse impact on highway safety

I have put the further detail against all of these grounds for objection below.

1. This is an overdevelopment and unacceptable intensification of the site with 4 very large, bulky and tall houses densely sited relative to their neighbours and incongruous in scale with surrounding houses. Tandridge Local Plan DP7.2 says that development shouldn't result in 'overdevelopment or unacceptable intensification by reason of scale, form, bulk, height, spacing, density and design'. The previous application to build 4 houses on this site (2019/762) was refused because, amongst other reasons, it would 'cause harm to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area by reason of overdevelopment, intensity of use and inappropriate subdivision'. In this new application the ridge heights of the houses have actually increased from 7.5m in the original application to an even taller approx. 10.1m for House Type 1 (drawing WEC-LHC-XX-ZZ-DR-AR-04.10) and approx. 9.6m for House Type 2 (drawing WEC-LHC-XX-ZZ-DR-AR-04.11) based on the scale on the drawings, amplifying the reasons for refusal of the previous application.
2. Detailed Policy 8 of the Tandridge Local Plan specifies that 'Within Woldingham the further subdivision of part of an already subdivided curtilage will normally be considered inappropriate'. The curtilage of Atherfield has already been subdivided previously when Chartfield was built so further subdivision on this basis is inappropriate. L1.A of the adopted Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan also says that 'subdivision will be inappropriatewhere it involves the further subdivision of an already subdivided curtilage'.
3. This is tandem development. Detailed Policy 8 of the Tandridge Local Plan says that 'proposals that would result in the piecemeal or 'tandem' development of residential garden land...will

normally be resisted' and the adopted Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan policy L1.A.6 requires that this 'should not' occur in Woldingham.

4. Woldingham is a planned settlement laid out by William Gilford with the vision of creating a village with a spacious and sylvan character where buildings would be subservient to the landscape and little has changed since then. This distinctive character of Woldingham has been recognised at District level and formal policy protection for it in the Development Plan (the Core Strategy, TLP Part 2 and the Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan) as long ago as the 1992 North of the Downs Local Plan. DP8 and the WNP include objective layout parameters to ensure that new development is congruent to the original patterns of development as set out by Gilford, thereby ensuring that the distinctive character of Woldingham continues to be maintained. Specifically, as Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan policy L1.A.1 and L1.A.3, proposals for development 'should retain or enhance the spacious, sylvan character of Woldingham and its setting' and 'should allow the landscape to remain as the dominant feature, in which buildings should be subservient in terms of visual prominence'. This application does not meet this criteria.
5. The development would result in significant harm to the amenities of existing properties around the site due to overbearance and potential noise intrusion contrary to policy DP7. As the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment concedes on p.42 the "effects on specific residential properties are not included ... as they are not accessible to enable a considered assessment of potential visual impact". Even with the existing trees and boundary cover in place the fact that the proposed houses are significantly closer to the boundary than the existing Atherfield house means that there will be significant overbearance and overlooking.
6. The assertion in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment on p.46 that "it has been demonstrated that the nature of the view from these properties will not change (as the scale and materiality of the proposed dwellings is similar to the existing Atherfield House) and the nearest proposed elevation is a minimum of 20m from the closest existing property" does not hold as the new houses are significantly closer to the boundary than the existing house and alongside this, as detailed above, the new houses increase significantly in height from the approx. 7.5m of the existing Atherfield house to approx. 10.1m for House Type 1 and approx. 9.6m for House Type 2 so the assertion that the scale is similar to the existing Atherfield house is incorrect. In addition to this, House Type 2 has a slot window on the 2nd floor, which can be seen on the elevation drawing WEC-LHC-XX-ZZ-DR-AR-04.11 and the artist's illustration, which makes these 3 storey houses versus the 2 storey existing Atherfield house, again contradicting the statement that the 'scale and materiality of the proposed dwellings is similar to the existing Atherfield House'. This also is an additional storey to the already refused previous application 2019/762. It can be seen in drawing WEC-LHC-XX-ZZ-DR-AR-04.10 that House Type 1 also has an exceptionally, and very unusually, tall roof space which could easily become another storey with the addition of a window.
7. I have included a rendering which demonstrates the very significant overbearance and overlooking the application would have to our property Chartfield. It should be noted that the ground at Atherfield is raised approximately 2m above that of Chartfield, further increasing the impact of these already very tall houses. There is no topographical information on the plans demonstrating this, contrary to Woldingham Policy L3, which requires that plans on sloping sites include topographical information and the relationship of the proposal with neighbouring properties. On p.12 of the Planning Statement it says 'Due to the design of the proposed

dwelling coupled with the distance of the dwellings from the boundaries, the proposal would not create any harm with regards to overshadowing, visual intrusion and overlooking to the neighbouring property'. You can see from this rendering that this is simply not true.

8. In the refusal of the previous application 2019/762 it states on p.5 that 'contrary to policy DP7, the positioning of plot 1 would have an overbearing impact on the amenity of the occupiers of Chartfield'. In this new application the house closest to Chartfield has re-orientated from the original application so that the full rear elevation now faces Chartfield rather than the side elevation in the original application. This has very significantly increased the number of windows overlooking our property, which can be seen in the rendering, with the addition of a third storey with the slot window as above that also overlooks our property. The house closest to ours has moved 5m further away in the new application but has increased in height by 2.1m, actually increasing overbearance and overlooking and therefore amplifying the reasons for the refusal of the original application.
9. Also relevant to this are several incorrect statements regarding our property in the application. P.27 of the Planning Statement says that 'Chartfield has been designed to have minimal windows facing into the site – with the few windows that face east serving utility rooms that are set back from the boundary.' This is incorrect, we in fact have 7 windows facing east towards the site and only 1 of these is for a utility room - 3 are from bedrooms, 2 are from the kitchen and 1 from a bathroom. P.33 of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment says 'Chartfield has a blank elevation facing the site, with significant boundary planting within Chartfield and Atherfield limiting inter-visibility'. We do not have significant boundary planting within Chartfield and as detailed above we do not have a blank elevation facing the site. Any assertions in the application regarding the impact on our property are nullified by the fact that they are based on incorrect information.
10. The ground source heat pumps proposed will damage our amenity in terms of the noise they make, in particular the persistent hum I have experienced these as having on other properties I have visited that have them. The location of the pumps has not been shown on any submitted plans and there are no details of the noise they would cause. As Tandridge's refusal of the previous application 2019/762 'it is considered that on the basis of insufficient information, the potential impact of the ground source heat pumps upon the acoustic environment of neighbouring occupiers is contrary to local policy regarding neighbouring amenity'. This is also the case for the new application as there are no more details in the new application than the previous one.
11. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report states on p.6 that "Trees which make a positive contribution to the layout have been retained wherever possible" yet at least 10 trees are being removed to make way for the new buildings and it says, also on p.6, that "The most significant tree is the sweet gum (T514) but whilst this is a reasonable quality tree it was planted in a raised bed that is intimately linked to the existing layout" and "The removal of tree T5332, a horse chestnut is required to provide a connection to the existing eastern access point". As p.6 of the Tandridge refusal document for the previous application 2019/762 this is "reactive to the development rather than the policy required approach which should demonstrate how the development of a site responds to its topographical and arboricultural value". All of this is in addition to, as also noted on the same page of that document, that "At the time of the site visit, a number of trees within the site had already been felled" and "their loss has been to the detriment of the character of the site".

12. The Planning Statement on p.28 states that 'the distances between the neighbourhood properties at a minimum of 20m distance and separated by dense mature planting and the fact that the development proposed is dwellinghouses, the Council's previous concerns going to significant harm to the amenities of existing properties around the site, due to overbearance and potential noise intrusion are not justified'. I have addressed the harm to amenity of the distances between the neighbouring properties above and there are also absolutely no guarantees that this 'dense mature planting' that the applicant states is important to there not being harm to the amenities of existing properties around the site will be maintained.
13. For the previous application 2019/762 the Surrey County Council Highway Officer commented "A site visit has been carried out to assess the proposed development egress onto Station Road and due to the substandard visibility splays, the Highway Authority would raise a highway safety objection to any intensification of use of this access". The new application is the same as 2019/762 therefore the reasons for the Surrey County Council Highway Officer's objection remain the case.
14. The proposal of having an entrance at Park View Road and exit at Station Road is not workable for five reasons:
 - i. The exit at Station Road is dangerous, as is also the view of the Surrey County Council Highway Officer
 - ii. It involves the use of a shared private drive at the Station Road side, the Atherfield end of which emerges on the wrong side of and against the flow of traffic – this is not addressed anywhere in the application
 - iii. There is nothing to prevent the entrance from Park View Road being used as a two way road by vehicles such as delivery vans and it is only a single track drive that can't be widened due to the existing boundaries with Buckland Cottage and Atherfield Lodge.
 - iv. Cars will be exiting from the four houses on the site but Redwood will need to continue to enter and exit from this same narrow driveway which is both dangerous and unworkable
 - v. The danger of essential vehicles like refuse collection lorries and emergency vehicles not being able to access these properties safely through the very narrow entrance
15. It should also be pointed out that the application is confusing and ambiguous. There are no dimensions on any of the plans, only a scale, which means that important development parameters such as ridge height and scale of houses, as well as land levels, are ambiguous.

Yours sincerely

Chris Gardner



➔ Current photo next page

Current

