

**Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan
Regulation 16 consultation (24th June 2016 – 6th August 2016): Summary of Responses**

This document summarises representations received in response to the publication of the Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan (ANDP)

Each representation has a reference number (column 1). Column 2 provides the name of the individual responding, with the organisation they represent, where relevant. Column 3 is a summary of the key points raised. Full copies of each representation will be made available to the Independent Examiner.

Table 1 summarises statutory consultees as set out in Planning Policy Guidance. Table 2 summarises representations from local residents, local groups and other interested parties.

TABLE 1: RESPONSES FROM STATUTORY CONSULTATION BODIES		
ANDP_stat1	Andrew Pommells Surrey CC	<i>“We are pleased that our previous representations have been taken into consideration and that we have no further comments to make at this stage.”</i>
ANDP_stat2	Zoe Belton Elmbridge BC	<i>“..I can confirm that we have no comments to make on the content but do request that Elmbridge Borough Council is kept informed of progress with regards to the plan.”</i>
ANDP_stat3	Kath Harrison Surrey CC	<i>“Surrey County Council has no comments to make on the Ashtead Neighbourhood Plan. Thank you for consulting us”</i>

Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 16 consultation (24th June 2016 – 6th August 2016): Summary of Responses

ANDP_stat4	David Wilson Thames Water	<p>Section 4.5 Infrastructure does not take into account what the demand of wastewater (and water supply) will be on Thames Water’s existing infrastructure, and the impact on this resulting from any future developments.</p> <p>Strategies for limiting surface water through SUDs should also be considered.</p> <p>A further paragraph (4.5.5 Wastewater and Sewerage Infrastructure) is recommended as an addition to the NHP.</p>
ANDP_stat5	Janice Burgees Highways England	<p><i>‘Having examined the above documents, we do not offer any comment to this proposal. We stand ready to work with you on transport evidence base re impact of level, location, form and timing of any development.’</i></p>
ANDP_stat6	Elliot Stamp Network Rail	<p><i>“At this stage Network Rail has no specific comments to make however I would be very grateful if you could keep Network Rail updated in relation to the NDP.”</i></p>
ANDP_stat7	Charles Muriithi Environment Agency	<p>General support.</p> <p>Chapter 4 – concerned regarding minimal reference to flooding/drainage issues and would encourage early consultation to ensure development is built away from the flood plain and to provide mechanisms</p>

Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 16 consultation (24th June 2016 – 6th August 2016): Summary of Responses

		<p>for reducing surface water.</p> <p>Flood risk-An inclusion of Rye Brook in the NHP will raise its profile and help attract further funding for its restoration. Any works within 8m of the top of the bank of Rye Brook requires written consent from the EA</p> <p>Climate Change Allowances – Refers to Environment Agency and National Policy Guidance regarding the use of site specific flood risk assessments.</p> <p>Surface Water Flooding – proposals for development must not increase, and where practicable reduce the rate of water runoff from a site.</p> <p>River Basin Management Plans – https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/river-basin-management-plans-accessing-data-and-information-guide Data to support river basin management.</p>
ANDP_stat8	Robert Lloyd-Sweet Historic England	AS-H1 – Would ask that the policy be more focused in order to highlight that development should protect the listed building and its setting. Would also seek to identify whether any other structures on the site are heritage assets in their own right.
ANDP_stat9	Sally Harries Natural England	<p>NB. Late Response received 15/08/16</p> <p>No detailed comments to make on the plan, but encourages opportunities to improve the natural environment.</p>

Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 16 consultation (24th June 2016 – 6th August 2016): Summary of Responses

TABLE 2: RESPONSES FROM RESIDENTS, LOCAL GROUPS, LANDOWNERS AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES		
ANDP1	David Buxton	Section 4.1.3 policy AS-H1 (Murreys Court): This makes no reference to MVDC's Built Up Areas Character Appraisal (Section 12.0) which states large scale development would <i>'be particularly difficult to accommodate successfully along Harriotts, Agates and Skinners Lanes without substantially changing the character.'</i>
ANDP2	Alison Eaton	<i>'No to building'</i>
ANDP3	Victoria Gange-Parry	<i>'No to building on Green Belt area'</i>
ANDP4	Jacqueline Moore	<i>'The NDP is a fantastic piece of work'</i> Paragraph 4.2.2 specifically improving availability of short term parking. Suggests a 20 minute time limit for short term parking and that this area needs to be patrolled by a traffic warden to prevent local residents parking all day.
ANDP5	Barrie Mould	General agreement with NDP, however it does not address access problems created by the level crossing for those in the north of the village. Infill development north of the crossing will exacerbate this infrastructure issue and will lead to more congestion/highways safety issues.

Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 16 consultation (24th June 2016 – 6th August 2016): Summary of Responses

ANDP6	Taymore Tabbah	The NDP should plan for preventative maintenance issues regarding roadside gullies/sewage run off for properties to prevent repeating the waster water flooding that occurred on Barnett Wood Lane 22 nd -25 th June 2016. There is a concern that waste water flooding will worsen given that further residential development is proposed.
ANDP7	Mark Ransom	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Would like to see Tesco/Esso site used for new library development including café/crèche to bring together community and form central village hub. Current library to be converted to residential (social housing or warden assisted flats) 2) Removal of speed bumps in Barnett Wood Lane as these cause drainage/flooding problems.
ANDP8	Mr and Mrs J Whitmarsh	<p>Generally approve of plan.</p> <p>Policy AS-Ec1 (Barnet Wood Lane Shops): Particularly in support of this as it would be of use to older members of community. Agree parking needs to be improved, and additionally the pavement is dangerous as it is in poor condition.</p>
ANDP9	Craig Beresford	<p>Pleased that NHP conforms with existing MVDC policy and no changes will be made to Green Belt</p> <p>Agreement with policies AH2, AH3, AH4, AH5 as these will provide for 2 bed accommodation which is needed in Ashtead. Recommends a review of brownfield land should be carried out as these sites would be more suitable for development.</p> <p>In support of AH6 (parking provisions in new development) and supports the need to maintain green verges/spaces which contribute to village character.</p>

Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 16 consultation (24th June 2016 – 6th August 2016): Summary of Responses

ANDP10	James Irvine	<p>Policy AS-H1 Murreys Court: Advises strengthening of this policy regarding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Ensuring that the sole vehicular access to all new buildings on the site must be from the Murreys and not Agates Lane, both during the construction phase and after it. 2) Specifically require that the listed barn and the entire brick wall along the Agates Road frontage must be retained and provision made for their long term maintenance.
ANDP11	Ian Rankin	<p>Para. 4.1.4: Agrees with principle of smaller properties but is concerned on the strain on the roads, and whether or not developments at Churchill Properties will be given to local residents as they are advertised nationally.</p> <p>Policy AS-H1: Concerns regarding the impact of the Murreys development on rural lanes.</p>
ANDP12	G.R. Howard	<p>Objects in total. The plan has not been put together democratically. The Ashtead Resident's Association and Ashtead MVDC Independent Councillors are the same individuals.</p> <p>The statistics used for the evidence base are unsound.</p> <p>The views of residents living on the edge of the village have been overlooked with the focus of the plan protecting the area around Barnett Wood Lane, Craddock's Lane and Woodfield Lane.</p>
ANDP13	Mrs Alison May	<p>Policy AS-H1: Would like the Forum to be aware of the potential conflict between cars/pedestrians/bikes due to the footpath joining the road. Recommends a speed check may be appropriate, and asks that access to any development around the listed barn should be prohibited from the yard in Agates Lane.</p>

Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 16 consultation (24th June 2016 – 6th August 2016): Summary of Responses

<p>ANDP14</p>	<p>Mr and Mrs Harbott</p>	<p>The NHP should take care not to repeat policies held elsewhere. A detailed response to individual policies was submitted and this has been summarised below.</p> <p>AS-H2 – Concerns the policy does not do enough to provide infrastructure and that it implies no provision for affordable housing.</p> <p>AS-H3 - (as above)</p> <p>AS-H4 - The area identified in Fig.9 shows Green Belt Areas as part of central Ashtead and therefore would not comply with national policy and would result in a loss of green space.</p> <p>AS-H6 - No reference to motor bikes, bicycles or electric charging points. Feels parking provision should be made more robust as SCC standards do not provide adequate parking for a village like Ashtead.</p> <p>AS-Ec2 - Concerned that if the public house use ceases the policy will encourage the site to become derelict as no other use will be considered acceptable.</p> <p>AS-En1 – The policy has omitted St Giles school and Barnett Wood Playing fields</p> <p>AS-Inf1- Seeks clarification on the meaning of ‘local demand’ and ‘private’ in the context of the policy</p> <p>AS-Inf2 - No reference made to St Giles School where congestion is also an issue.</p> <p>AS-Inf4 - All except point one are subject to SCCs process and are aspirational only. Questions whether CIL can be used for providing real time bus passenger information and safe cycling routes.</p>

Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 16 consultation (24th June 2016 – 6th August 2016): Summary of Responses

ANDP15	Susan Gilchrist	<p>Generally supportive;</p> <p>AS-H2 and AS-H3: Concerned that most of the smaller units being built are for retired/older people and would like these to be available for younger Ashtead residents to promote mixed communities.</p> <p>4.3.3 Would like a bus going to the train station explored as this would encourage the use of public transport</p> <p>AS-Ec1: Supports the pavements being widened, but also supports off street parking outside Barnett Wood which would involve the narrowing of pavements.</p> <p>Would also like to see the extension of cycle path along Barnett Wood Lane to the pond.</p>
ANDP16	Sue Stanstead	<p>Member of AVC and does not agree on certain points,</p> <p>AS-H2 and AS-H3 : By imposing 2-3 bedroom houses in areas of Ashtead where there are larger houses (especially in the south where there is more scope for infill) will change the character of the areas.</p> <p>AS-H6 : The building of flats in the village will increase the need for off street parking as they have lower parking standards but would serve as many people. Feels this has been demonstrated in developments like Parsons Mead and Howard Close. Suggests that the number of parking spaces required for flats should reflect the number of bedrooms being provided.</p>
ANDP17	Les Thorpe	<p>General endorsement with the following observations:</p> <p>AS-H1: Due to fast moving traffic and would urge the need for suitable footpaths along the length of Agates Lane and an 'on road' car parking restriction as at Grange Lane.</p>

Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 16 consultation (24th June 2016 – 6th August 2016): Summary of Responses

		Refers to Appendix 11 of the MVDC Local Plan and states there needs to be clarity over which brick wall is being referred to as Agates Lane has two, one of which is the boundary of his property (8 Agates Lane) and within his property. Asks therefore that both walls be retained.
ANDP18	G Stanfield	<p>AS-H2 – disagrees. Housing policy more suitable for large town or suburb development. Should be worded to reflect character of Ashtead.</p> <p>AS-H3 – disagrees. It will ruin the character of Ashtead and advises something similar to Bookham NHP re preserving gaps between dwellings, blanket removal of permitted development rights from smaller dwellings.</p> <p>AS-H5-disgarees. It will allow blocks of flats to be built in gardens</p> <p>AS-H6 disagrees- Parking standards for flats should reflect those of dwellings (ie. A space for every bedroom)</p> <p>AS-EN3 – disagrees. Wording needs strengthening (ie. ‘should’ changed to ‘must’). Opportunities have been missed to minimise the building of retirement blocks, and forbid highly visible telephone masts.</p>
ANDP19	G Stanfield (commenting as Ashtead Resident’s Association)	<p>Unless noted otherwise ARA is in agreement with the policies.</p> <p>AS-H2- disagrees. Housing policy more suitable for large town or suburb development. Should be worded to reflect character of Ashtead.</p> <p>AS-H3 – disagrees. It will ruin the character of Ashtead and advises something similar to Bookham NHP re preserving gaps between dwellings, blanket removal of permitted development rights from smaller dwellings.</p>

Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 16 consultation (24th June 2016 – 6th August 2016): Summary of Responses

		<p>AS-H5- agrees and suggests it should be amended to say that blocks of flats aren't acceptable.</p> <p>AS-H6 – disagrees – (as above) and prefers Bookham's NHP policy and that a parking space should be provided for each bedroom in the block of flats.</p> <p>AS-Ec3 – agrees – ATM facility should be included</p> <p>AS-EN3 –agrees – Although it's in contradiction to AS-H2 and AS-H3. Blocks of flats or enforced smaller housing are not appropriate. Opportunities have been missed to minimise the building of retirement blocks, and forbid highly visible telephone masts.</p>
ANDP20	Patricia Allen	<p>Housing policies will not meet needs of local residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis should be on smaller homes for young people/elderly looking to downsize. • The NHP should contain a policy about affordable/social housing <p>In addition the local bus service should be extended to Ashtead station. The Community Infrastructure Levy should be spent on a crossing over the A24 near junction of Farms Lane and Bramley Way to improve safety for the Burrow Nursery.</p>
ANDP21	Wakako Hirose (Rapleys on behalf of Jockey Club Estates and Jockey Club Racecourse)	<p>Sets out the context of the race horse training industry and that high house prices have led to a decline in the number of people using the Epsom Downs Racecourse. They are concerned that the racecourse will be put under pressure to be developed for other uses and have requested a policy that safeguards the use of the site.</p> <p>They have also requested additional wording to safeguard the race horse use in AS-H3.</p>

Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 16 consultation (24th June 2016 – 6th August 2016): Summary of Responses

<p>ANDP22</p>	<p>Mike Waite (Surrey Wildlife Trust)</p>	<p>Section 2.1 – suggests expansion to include reference to National Planning Policy Framework and associated guidance. Introducing sustainability here would then link to later paragraphs (i.e 3.4) In addition would suggest that Local Green Space (para 76) of NPPF is explored.</p> <p>Section 4.4 – change open space to Green Infrastructure and the necessity of planning for this. Concerned that only Sites of Special Scientific Interest are mentioned, and that there are other environmental designations that should be set out, and that Biodiversity Opportunity Areas should be included.</p> <p>Section 4.4 line 4 - “<i>..in order to reintroduce wildlife [one word] and help to address local flooding..</i>”; line 6 “<i>..development away from floodplains. [one word]</i>”</p> <p>AS-EN2 and 3 lack purpose with regards to protecting and enhancing the natural environment.</p> <p>Environment Report – observes that very few of the results findings are included in the plan itself.</p> <p>p.8, Area A4 (and throughout). <i>‘We have always referred to these two SNCI as ‘Wood Field’, ie. two words (and OS mapping concurs).’</i></p> <p><i>‘Area B (and throughout). Species names should either be consistently capitalised (as in Great Crested Newt), or not (as in frogbit, fringed water-lily, pipistrelles, tawny owls etc.).’</i></p> <p><i>‘Areas D & E. Contextual reference to UK Biodiversity Plan Priority Habitat is somewhat misplaced here; it is not incorrect (although the Priority habitat in question is properly known as ‘Lowland calcareous grassland’), but there are several mentions of further Priority habitats elsewhere in the report that are not so recognised (inc. Floodplain grazing marsh, Lowland meadows, Wood-pasture and parkland, Hedgerows etc.). We suggest it is left out, or re-drafted with clearer/more accurate referencing.’</i></p> <p>p.12, 4.0 The Improvement of Local Habitats. The Surrey Biodiversity Partnership was formally</p>
---------------	---	--

Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 16 consultation (24th June 2016 – 6th August 2016): Summary of Responses

		<p>replaced by the Surrey Nature Partnership in 2012. The former Habitat Action Plans are no longer being actively implemented; rather county-wide biodiversity enhancement action is now coordinated through BOAs (see above).</p> <p>4.1.2 The Rye Brook and Meadows. We welcome reference to this important local biodiversity enhancement project. Its relationship to the role of the wider River Mole Catchment Partnership, and the Defra/Environment Agency's Catchment-based Approach to achievement of the Water Framework Directive, might also be articulated here.</p>
ANDP23	Steve Butler (Bidwells on behalf of Trinity College)	<p>Supports general preparation of the NHP but objects to content. The NHP will be ineffective in delivering sustainable development. It does not successfully seek to address the need for a mix of housing in the village.</p> <p>The NHP cannot be accepted because although it conforms with the MVDC Local Plan, this is out of date. Therefore the NHP cannot identify Land south of Ermyn Way (within the Green Belt and owned by the college) as a site for housing.</p> <p>The NHP locates no specific sites except Murreys Court and therefore AS-H2 does not go far enough in delivering a mix of housing.</p>
ANDP24	Bill Thomson	<p>NB. Late Response received 6/08/16</p> <p>The plan is a very good description of the key issues regarding development in Ashtead.</p> <p>However, nothing is said regarding how the lack of housing and the need to release Green Belt land will be resolved.</p>

Ashted Neighbourhood Development Plan**Regulation 16 consultation (24th June 2016 – 6th August 2016): Summary of Responses**

		With a consultation exercise of this extent and effort from so many people it is a pity there are not more practical proposals emerging from it.
--	--	--