

# Planning Comment submission on application 2025/771 at 10/09/2025 12:19:30

Thank you for your comments on application 2025/771, which have been received.

Please note that we do not send a separate acknowledgement.

CommentatorName	MS SUSAN M MATHIESON
Telephone No	
E-Mail Address	
Address	Flat 4, Suffolk House 90 Woodlands Road Redhill Surrey RH16HB
Planning App No	2025/771
Comment Reason	Object to this application
Comment	

Dear Sirs,  
Following the passing of our parents, probate has been granted and my sister and I are now the legal owners of 16 Mount Avenue Chaldon, Surrey CR35BA.  
I grew up in this property all throughout my life and continued visiting my parents and Sister who still resides there over many years.  
I wish to formally object to the proposed planning application that has been made for 30 dwellings by way of an extension to Mount Avenue on the following grounds:

#### Green Belt

The site is situated in the Green Belt, and the proposals involve inappropriate development, which is inherently harmful to the area. No exceptional circumstances have been shown to sufficiently outweigh the harm caused by the inappropriateness and other identified issues.

There is no justification for the sites release from the Green Belt.

The Green Belt remains relevant at this site, as it is still important as it meets the key Green Belt purposes as outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework, including

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns/villages merging into one another;
- c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns/villages;
- e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The application falls short of meeting the "Golden Rules" for development within the Green Belt, established for significant projects on newly released Green Belt land. There is minimal provision for essential upgrades to local infrastructure or the creation of new public green spaces, as well as improvements to existing ones.

The applicant suggested the site is bounded on three sides by residential properties, which is not the case.

The applicant's conclusion that the site is a non-functioning part of the Green belt" is incorrect.

#### Sustainability

Chaldon is not a sustainable location for development of the scale being proposed.

#### Harmful to Character of the Site

The proposed development, due to the increase in built structures and the intensified use of the site, is believed to harm the open rural character of the site and its surrounding area.

The design of the scheme, especially its density is against the Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2033 (adopted 2021).

#### Ecological Considerations

The site likely contains several fox earths, which the applicant has suggested destroying. Foxes are a common and valued presence in Chaldon, and this recommendation indicates a lack of consideration for the character of the area in the application.

Additionally, the site is used by bats for foraging and commuting, with several trees identified by the applicant as having roost potential. However, the applicant's reports overlooked the bat roosts in the shed building. The proposed development would negatively affect the local bat population.

The site contains a number of priority habitats (lowland mixed deciduous woodland and species rich hedgerows). The plans have no plans to control cat predation or light pollution, which would denude these habitats of their fauna diversity within 16 months.

#### Unsuitable Location for Development

The application site is also located in an unsustainable location, without suitable access to public transport, services or local amenities, with limited active travel opportunities and where the only realistic means of transport would be the private car due to the location and limited public transport services. This is contrary to the aims of the NPPF (2021), the Surrey Local Transport Plan 4 (2022) and policy CSP1 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy. The gradient of Church Hill leading to Caterham (the nearest station) at 16% means that cycling is not a feasible option, and the narrowness of the roads, with limited safe overtaking being possible, means it is dangerous (hence its infrequent use as a cycling route in a region that is popular with fit recreational cyclists who enjoy the challenge of the hills). There are pavements which mean walking is more feasible than cycling, but the gradient means that it is not particularly feasible.

The application does not adequately address the distance from the site to amenities such as local state schools or private schools and the ages catered for by them (rather than identifying more generically the number of schools in the area).

#### Flooding

Development on the site is unsuitable as it will lead to an increase in flooding in the surrounding areas. All new built areas have an adverse impact on local ground water retention and the proposed scheme would have a very serious impact. Insufficient work has been undertaken to assess whether mitigation is possible.

#### Traffic/pedestrian safety/traffic conditions

A police speed survey conducted in 2018 identified Rook Lane as hazardous, especially for vulnerable road users such as children, the elderly, and those with disabilities. The findings were discussed at the Tandridge Local Committee in March 2019, where it was noted that vehicle speeds were too high for a zebra crossing to be considered appropriate, and that a controlled crossing would be required to ensure pedestrian safety.

Any new development in this area will inevitably increase traffic volumes and intensify existing risks to pedestrian safety.

Sigma Homes' traffic statement claims that "Rook Lane adjacent to the site is currently subject to traffic calming measures. No deficiency has been identified." This assertion is deeply concerning and appears to overlook the findings of the 2018 police speed survey and subsequent discussions at the Tandridge Local Committee in March 2019. At that time, it was explicitly stated that vehicle speeds on Rook Lane were too high for a zebra crossing to be considered appropriate, and that only a controlled crossing would be suitable to ensure pedestrian safety.

As such, I object to this planning application.

Yours sincerely

UPRN