

Planning Comment submission
on application 2023/1464 at 10/01/2024 13:30:18

Thank you for your comments on application 2023/1464, which have been received.

Please note that we do not send a separate acknowledgement.

CommentatorName	Donald James Bradley
Telephone No	
EMail Address	
Address	24, CAREYS WOOD SMALLFIELD
Planning App No	2023/1464
Comment Reason	Object to this application
Comment	

Sirs

I wish to object to this application on the grounds that it is totally inappropriate for this small village which already experiences a high degree of traffic congestion and pollution. The village is surrounded by green belt land which is a natural habitat for a variety of wildlife and the site that is the subject of this application is no different, it is a valuable open space and home for wildlife.

My main objections are:

1) The site for the proposal is GREEN BELT which should never be built on. The National Governments own policy (National Planning Policy Framework) Section 13. 'Protecting Green Belt land' states that: Paragraphs 142 to 156
142. The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land PERMANENTLY OPEN; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their PERMANANCE.
143. Green Belt serves 5 purposes:
(a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
(b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
(c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
(d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
(e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
Proposals affecting the Green Belt
152. INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT is, by definition, HARMFUL TO GREEN BELT and SHOULD NOT BE APPROVED except in very special circumstances.
153. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
154. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as INAPPROPRIATE IN THE GREEN BELT.

Further, Government Greenbelt guidance updated December 2023 states 'Assessing the impact of a proposal on the openness of the Green Belt, where it is relevant to do so, requires a judgment based on the circumstances of the case. By way of example, the courts have identified a number of matters which may need to be taken into account in making this assessment. These include, but are not limited to:

- openness is capable of having both spatial and visual aspects – in other words, the visual impact of the proposal may be relevant, as could its volume;
- the duration of the development, and its remediability – taking into account any provisions to return land to its original state or to an equivalent (or improved) state of openness; and
- the degree of activity likely to be generated, such as traffic generation.

Having set out above the national policy on Green Belt Land, which I am sure that you must be aware of, my personal objections are:

The openness of the entrance to the village from the North will be destroyed. The houses opposite the site on the East side of Chapel Road will be looking out on to a housing estate rather than open fields where they can view many forms of nature. Their whole aspect will be destroyed.

Chapel road already carries far to much traffic. It is only a country lane but already carries the traffic of a major highway. To allow access and egress to the highway of a further estimated 400-600 cars is absolutely ludicrous in my opinion.

Air (and noise) pollution from construction traffic and the eventual site occupants must also be a factor when considering this application as must be the impact on the traffic congestion that already exists. Light pollution from the completed construction will also be detrimental to the countryside and natural wildlife.

The village does not have adequate affordable, reliable public transport so any new residents will use cars. Commuters will drive to the nearest train stations of Horley or Redhill.

The proposal is fairly high density whereas most of the village is low density housing.

The existing doctors surgery is already overloaded with patients. How will it manage to accommodate an additional 700 (estimated) people. It is extremely difficult to obtain a doctor's appointment now and the proposed additional housing will only exacerbate the problem.

The village drainage system is already at full capacity and creaking under the strain! During periods of high rainfall our road floods and our sewage backs up and will not discharge. The system CANNOT ACCEPT ANY MORE DEVELOPMENT. Climate change, with an increase in storms and heavy rainfall will only serve to make tis problem worse.

Certain recent planning applications to expand the village have already been permitted. These developments will already have a detrimental affect on the issues stated above. If this development were to be permitted it would be disastrous.

I frequently walk my two dogs along the footpath to the West of the site. Early morning and evening I have seen a Barn Owl and Deer and during the day Buzzards and Red Kites circle overhead. There are rabbits and hares in the field and the habitat for all fauna and flora will be totally destroyed if the development were to be permitted.

Finally, I have heard that there may be archaeological artefacts on the site. If true, this should also be a consideration in your deliberations.

Don Bradley

UPRN