

Planning Comment submission
on application 2023/1281 at 14/12/2023 22:20:33

Thank you for your comments on application 2023/1281, which have been received.

Please note that we do not send a separate acknowledgement.

CommentatorName	Heather Callaghan
Telephone No	
EMail Address	
Address	32 High Street, Nutfield, Redhill, RH1 4HQ
Planning App No	2023/1281
Comment Reason	Object to this application
Comment	I have many objections about the proposed plan for Nutfield Green Park. These are detailed below but in summary they cover the following points: The traffic plan is not very thorough and lacks details on key junctions. The development is not sustainable given the destruction of the green belt, the issue of draining water into an already flooding water course, the issues around toxisicty and finally the lack of sustainability when in comes to amenities. My personal feeling in that things are som vague in the Community engagement- the plan gained 29 responses to their questionnaire which addresses the issues of the site in very vague terms. Out of a population of 2000 people in the Nutfield area. This does not represent support or meaningful engagement with the community. I believe that the proposed development fails every category of the Surrey transport plan thus must be rejected. Environmental The development was rejected categorically at last application although there are some changes to the proposed development, the development is still the same in scope, scale and with the same planning issues. Given the previous application was rejected there is precedent for this application to be rejected. The site is for 164 houses plus elderly living and a care home. As such it would be bigger than the village known as 'Top Nutfield'. This would be a disproportionate development and would bully the existing settlement. Therefore, it would not be in keeping with the scale and needs of the local population. The development is not sustainable. There is no firm planning for schools and GP and other amenities. This would create a zombie development with no centre, no soul- this would naturally encourage a disproportionate level of car travel due to the sites isolation. The developer has suggested that they might build such facilities but we need to see those plans in full- these are not thriving communities as set out in the travel plan. Nutfield has not been selected development by Tandridge and is not down for development. Developments in the Nutfield area have been small and sympathetic and often infilling within the boundary. This development is non of those things and therefore is not suitable for the village site. The analysis of the school provision is ridiculous- suggesting that parents will evenly distribute themselves to the various schools is nonsense. Parents base their primary decisions on proximity band quality. However, in the local context those decisions are taken away from parents due to the over subscribed nature of the local schools. The village school is small (1 form entry) and currently full. The arrival of lots of families into the area would need to see the school enlarged- on what is already a small site- there is no planning for this. Give the school will not be increased in size this would leave the parents of children to drive to Earlswood school which is 2 miles away or Bletchingly school which is 1.9 miles away. This would increase car journeys as due to them be equidistant there is no say which parents would get places in which school. This might lead to parents driving in one direction to drop their children at school before driving back the other way to work. Having checked with both Earlswood and Bletchingly schools they are both full. One then questions where the children on this new development are supposed to go to school. Again this fails on the issue of thriving communities but also pollution. The site itself was an old tip site. When the site was closed it had to return to its original state (trees and greenery) which it has done. It is not a brownfield site and therefore not suited to development. It has become part of a site for nature and should, in no way be developed. There is an issue over the site. Although the site of the construction has changed it would still result in 500,000 tones of weight being applied to the earth. Given the nature of the site being an old tip with anything allowed to be put there, there is no saying what the impact of that weight will be on that site. The pollution that could leak into water courses is unknown- I don't know of anyone who wants to take that responsibility moving forward. In addition to this there is a nationally important sand deposite to the north of the site. If that gets contaminated then there will be serious, national implications. By the developers own study "The groundwater and leachate at the site has been shown to routinely possess concentrations of inorganic determinands in excess of Freshwater Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) concentrations (see Appendix I). 8.5.6 The groundwater and leachate at the study site is generally characterised by elevated concentrations of arsenic, chromium, lead, selenium, copper, nickel and zinc and ammoniacal nitrogen from Area A and Area B, as would be expected in landfill areas possessing putrescible wastes. However, the groundwater quality from Area F is generally characterised by lower concentrations of these determinands, albeit that concentrations of arsenic, selenium, chromium, lead, copper, zinc, nickel and ammoniacal-nitrogen have been detected to be in excess of freshwater EQS values, on occasion" In addition to this "8.5.12 Gasoline, Diesel and Lubricating Oil Range Organic Petroleum Hydrocarbons (GRO C6- Church Hill Area, Nutfield Road, Redhill, Surrey Summary Environmental Risk Report Report No 20096/6F 27 Encia Regeneration Limited C10, DRO C10-C20 and LRO C20-C40) have been detected in excess of UK Drinking Water Standards in the majority of groundwater/leachate samples from within Area B as well as locally within Areas A and F. The highest recorded concentrations of total petroleum hydrocarbons have been detected in BH31 drilled within putrescible wastes within Area B (1457ug/l TPH C6-C40 in Round 2" In addition the proposal also state "10.1.1 The Church Hill area has had a relatively complex history of mineral extraction, industrial use and waste disposal." Quiet why anyone would have any confidence in disruption the soil of this site- I have no idea the environmental implications are potentially disastrous. The implications of drainage are huge. There with so much hard surfacing building on a steep slope with the natural drainage down hill leads to huge issues for the Nutfield Marsh area and the Watercolour development. The loss of interception and infiltration on the site will lead to greater run off and greater risk of flooding. Given the increase of 'exceptional rainfall incidents' due to climate change. The implications of allowing the development on the people down hill of the development are serious and should not be trivialised. Transport- all aspects below show that the plan fails on the isse of well connected communities as well as pollution, social mobility, health and active travel. In the document the A25 was characterised as "rural" the A25 is a major trunk road and aside from the M25 is the major route East/West in Surrey. It is either disingenuous or shows a lack of knowledge to describe the road as 'rural'. Either explanation suggests a lack of understanding of the site and the transport implications or an attempt to underplay the impact of the development. This should make us all wary about the work carried out at this site for this development. The travel document suggests "No wait time at T junction" to leave the proposed development. I wonder how this is possible given that so many cars use the A25 during peak hours which suggests limited time to cross and therefore a wait time- this simply cannot be correct. This fits a common pattern of poor data or lack of data in the traffic survey. The proposal suggests that Cycling numbers will increase on the A25. This is wishful thinking, cycling numbers only increase only due to high quality cycling infrastructure. Nothing of that nature will be provided and therefore it is highly unlikely they will increase. Finally, as the development will increase traffic this is more likely to put cyclists off rather than encourage them. -failure of active travel aspect of the Surrey plan. The developer does suggest that they will contribute to hard surface the national cycle route to the north. The cost is £200,000 but the developer makes no comment on the actual figure they will contribute- this is unhelpful and suggests greater goodwill than might be forthcoming. The inclusion of high speed broadband is unlikely to impact on working from home and discourage trips. Given that high speed broadband is present everywhere it is unlikely to have a different impact on this development and reduce numbers of car journeys. In fact, there is a progressive tread for less homeworking which suggests that in a couple of years high speed broadband would have limited impact of the reduction of car journeys. The proposal of the crossing near the junction of Mid street and the A25 will substantially impact traffic flows in the area. Most notably Sandy Lane (omitted from the traffic survey) which already backs up to Priory garden centre at peak hours. Any further restrictions to right turning traffic will only compound the situation. At peak hours with the crossing being used a couple of times the tail backs could go back as far as Priory farm shop- thus a failure to manage pollution and traffic management. Although there is traffic analysis at two key junctions and Redhill this does not show a true picture of the issues faced at these junctions. For example, in peak hours the traffic travelling into Redhill from Nutfield is backed up Redstone Hill- almost to the top of the hill. The proposed development plan states that 65% of journeys from the development will be to redhill and therefore will only add to this- already serious- congestion- failure on the issue of traffic management. The analysis of the junctions of Midstreet and A25, along with Church Lane, Coopers hill lane and the A25 only look at the traffic on the A25 but not the impact on the side roads. For example, in peak hours traffic can stretch back on mid street, then onto Sandy lane all the way back to Nutfield Garden center. This traffic is often stationary. More traffic from this development will only exasserbate the problems of traffic joining the A25. This problem has not been explored at Coopers hill lane or Church Lane- it will no doubt make traffic worse there. Therefore the traffic survey is incomplete and does not give a fair representation of the current traffic situation in the village- failure of traffic management and pollution Further to this, all the traffic analysis points to journeys only going to Redhill. However, given the location of the development is it likely that people who commute will drive to Godstone and junction 6. No traffic analysis has been completed on the impact to Godstone village and the already congested junction 6. In the past five years there have been five accidents in Nutfield 2 of which have been categorised as serious. Increased traffic only gives rise to greater risk of accidents. In addition to this the plan states that at peak hours there are four busses per hour. However, these go in various directions and do not represent a realistic option to resistance- having minimal impact of the reduction of traffic. Furthermore, the plan mentions the services at Redhill Station- however the only way to access these will be through journeys by car. It is clear that the travel plan fails to meet every aspect of the Surrey travel plan. In addition to this the plan is incomplete and optimistic to the point of dillusion which it comes to active travel. In summary the developers are trying to build on a site which is hazardous, with no community engagement or support, which is green belt, has no reason to be developed on, would fail on drainage, fail the traffic plan and create an area of housing with no community.
UPRN	100061588195