

**Comments: AS-H1**

6	I am concerned about the detailed planning for the future of Murray's Court when the present owner is still in residence.
8	This will encourage people to walk rather than drive
13	Needs to link the existing development at The Murrays with the footpath that takes you to The Street.
21	This area is ideal for improving the mix of housing, provided it is sympathetically done, of course, and would give the Barnett Wood Road shops a boost.
30	The area around Murreys Court has a variety of different styles of housing, built in different eras. We think that there is a potential conflict between this and the policy to have buildings in keeping with the area if that means always building in the style of existing housing. The policy should encourage a small proportion of good quality, individual, 21st century, architect designed houses as well, so that this variety continues for future generations.
34	Should we consider whether this land could be used as a "green space" rather than for housing? It is in a good position and is a rare opportunity to increase this type of public facility.
44	The path would need to be properly maintained.
45	I believe the footpath should be included. Poorly phrased question!
52	There is a serious lack of social housing, and at the same time far too many 4 bedroom houses. it would be good if the planners adopt a more over-arching attitude to housing. Few people who are low wage earners can afford to buy or rent in this area. So where do we find the carers, gardeners, mechanics, nurses and teachers etc., that we all need to be a coherent community?
75	As it is near me - do not want more traffic and noise etc.

82	<p>As it says at para 4.1.1, "There are many public rights of way around Ashted, which link residential areas to each other, to the main shopping areas, to transport facilities and to the open green space within and around the village. This network is a key asset that must be protected and enhanced". Footpaths such as this are an *essential* feature.</p>
84	<p>I strongly support the retention and enhancement of the footpath network and this policy is welcome as far as it goes. I would have preferred it to be more ambitious with the continuation of the footpath to link with The Murrays and Shires Close, and perhaps even through to West Farm Avenue to join the existing link to Harriotts Lane.</p>
87	<p>There is enormous amenity value from the system of connecting footpaths through the village and this must be preserved/extended in the event of development of the site at Murreys Court. Such footpaths allow many residents, particularly children to minimise exposure to traffic on the narrow lanes or the bussier roads. They provide a pleasant option to move through the village.</p>
96	<p>I am also concerned that there is a thorough ecological assessment of the site prior to development as it may well includes areas that are relicts of the ancient footprint of Barnet Wood and also veteran trees.</p>
99	<p>The delivery of the Mole Valley District Council's (MVDC) Plan quoted is a dependency on this policy being achievable. The evidence in the MVDC plan dates from 2000<sup>(1)</sup>. Additionally the Plan is stated on MVDC's website as "currently being reviewed"<sup>(1)</sup>. The plan in the Introduction at paragraph 1.5 of the section titled "Timescale of the Plan" explains that the plan covers the period up to 2006- ten years ago. It is accepted that the subsequent development of the MVDC Core Strategy 2009 includes reference policy HSG5, to which the Appendix refers, as "saved"<sup>(3)</sup>.</p> <p>The risk that arises with this policy is that the revised MVDC plan changes it's aspirations for the site that impacts on this policy.</p> <p>As a suggestion a different approach might have been to refer to the MVDC Core Strategy 2009 Policy CS18 which deals with Improved Transport Options and Accessibility. Paragraph 7.2 provides the discussion and includes reference to consideration of these aspects in development proposals<sup>(4)</sup>. This is a far wider ranging standalone policy that gives much more flexibility to influence any proposals that might arise for the site at The Murrays.</p> <p>It could be said that the site is already linked to the footpath between Agates Lane and Skinners Lane (and onwards to The Street) by virtue of</p>

	<p>the existing access from Agates Lane that is across the road from The Murrays.</p> <p>As an aside this site is, as far as is known, a privately owned site, making pontification for assume future redevelopment for housing that has gone on since at least 2000 inappropriate.</p> <p>Therefore this ANF NDP consultation document policy relies on other factors which include a policy that is under review for its successes, and could be considered as already being met by an existing footpath.</p> <p>This policy requires review to align the aspirations with current provision and MVDC policies.</p>
--	---

**Comments: AS-H2**

5	I might even be tougher and push for a higher % of 2 beds.
6	This will not prevent infill developments of 2 - 4 dwellings all with 4+ bedrooms.
7	Forcing the mix like this contradicts on page 3 'maintain the current mix of housing sizes'. So a builder could appeal and win because it's contradictory.
8	This goes some way to ensuring more of the type of properties needed in Ashtead are built
11	Unless flexibility is available to developers less rather than more dwellings will be built. In the private sector the investor takes 100% risk; without a return on capital there is no incentive for them. Unfortunately land is the most expensive part of a development in Ashtead and currently 4 & 5 bedroom dwellings provide the best return on capital employed. However I accept the need for starter homes but currently suitable sites are not available
17	The proportion of 1 and 2 bedroom properties should be higher. This will allow young people and starter families to buy their first homes.
19	I'm not happy if Ashtead starts to have a lot of communal of flat type buildings, for 1-2 bedroom dwellings as this would not encourage

	Ashtead as a place for families to live, plus would be out of keeping with local area.
21	Why increase the 4 bed stock at all?
22	I would reduce 4 plus to 10%. We need more younger skilled non-financial sector people
27	I do not have any issues with redevelopment of current sites, but I do feel the high level of retirement apartments being built excludes a large proportion of the local population from obtaining affordable housing.
29	We do not wish to increase the proportion of one bedroomed properties when the demand is for 2-3 bedroomed homes.
36	Need to restrict enlargement of current housing stock into multi-roomed mansions especially bungalows.
37	The housing mix should depend on the area the development is placed in. Small houses/flats should not be put in an area of large houses & gardens. There should positively be no building on the Green Belt or in or near a Conservation Area (and no alteration of Green Belt boundaries).
42	No, dwellings of 1 or 2 bedrooms required & stop alteration of existing small properties.
48	The village needs to retain its open character. 80%+ for 3 bedrooms or less housing will stress local services without meeting the village's needs. We should recognise that such housing will attract more people into the village rather than meeting the existing local needs.
49	This could attract commuters from inner London boroughs who could outbid local families.
51	Not totally. I understand that we need a mix of housing, however, discouraging less 4 bedroom houses may backfire in the long term. Families are getting bigger and the plan to not build any more detached 4 beds may well discourage people in the long term from moving to Ashtead. I also feel that the issue of % of social housing has not been addressed here.
52	

	We already have too many 4 bedroom houses, a more realistic plan would be 30% one bedroom, 35% two bedroom and 20% three bedroom - 0% four bedroom
59	Although I agree with proposal 2, it should be reflected in the proportions i.e. 20% 1 bedroom, 40% 2 bedroom, 35% 3 bedroom and only 5% 4 or more bedroom houses. There is also no mention of affordable housing or council/housing association rented housing.
67	I think Ashtead probably has enough 4+ bedroom houses. One problem is that many are occupied by only one or two people (my husband and I fall into this category). The solution proposed for older people when they might wish to move to a smaller property seems to be a flat. For many living in a house, having a garden is most important so moving to a flat while still reasonably active is not an option, but a smaller bungalow could well be an option. However there are not many bungalows in Ashtead and many of them have been turned into houses, therefore I think the building of reasonably small bungalows should be encouraged. There is also a need for affordable and social housing for single people, couples and families.
69	I also wonder if there is any way that we can discourage the alteration and extension of existing housing stock (particularly bungalows being converted into large family houses).
71	Although I do think that the proportion of one bedroom properties is too high and the four bedroom proportion is too low.
72	Agree that policy should be to maintain the balance of age groups and occupations within the community. The policy addresses new builds. Greater control of modifications to existing homes would be desirable as the availability of smaller homes including bungalows is being adversely affected by these being 'upgraded' to 4 or 5 bedroom expensive family homes.
73	The link between the ageing population and need to downsize is well made
76	However, if such developments are carried out in the two estates on the 'blind' side of the railway (Links Road etc.), I think they should be preceded by the installation of either a road bridge across the railway, or a road connection to the Wells area at the edge of Epsom which has been connected to the A24 by a road bridge for many years. Otherwise the inevitable increase to the road traffic to and from the 'blind' side of

	the railway will worsen the already bad traffic congestion at the present crossing next to the Ashtead railway station.
79	There is a strong need for much more low cost housing especially for key workers - health service and care workers, teachers, firemen etc. The need will continue to grow with more school places required, and an increasingly aged population requiring care and support. I was born and brought up in Surrey, but have lived in several different parts of England, and I have to say that I sometimes come across a rather unpleasant attitude in this area, a belief that owning a large detached house somehow makes you a better person than those on a low wage. I know that many builders prefer to build larger houses, but should builders be determining our housing stock? Maybe we should be looking at some innovative ideas for house building e.g. prospective owners/tenants helping with the build.
83	Statutory Consultee – please see response in Appendix 6.3 of the Consultation Statement.
84	However I am concerned that the emphasis on one and two bedroom properties will encourage developers to increase the proportion of blocks of flats, which will themselves change the character of Ashtead which is predominately separate or semi-detached dwellings in their own grounds.
85	I support the intention of the policy however I feel that it gives developers too much room to argue about what "should" means and that they will say it does not mean shall or must.
86	Developers know better than anyone what is going to sell - it is their business. Market forces should be left alone and developers will build what suits each area. By increasing the number of smaller bedroomed properties there will be more people moving to the area that will put a great strain on the already stretched amenities including schools and doctors surgery. The traffic situation is already awful and this would only get worse. Ashtead is a village lets not forget that.
87	Whilst not being able to comment on the analysis used to generate the percentages in part 1, it is very clear that the needs of younger people wishing to purchase their first property and older residents wishing to downsize will benefit from part 2 of the policy. Such a policy is important if planning policies are to be supported by existing residents and if Ashtead's community spirit is to be preserved into the future.
88	

	<p>The above policy AS-H2 as written is more suitable for a large new town or suburb development, but not for the existing Ashtead environment that has evolved over many years. This policy must be rewritten to "reflect the ratio of dwelling types that already exist in the immediate locality" to any new development that would occur in Ashtead.</p>
95	<p>I would like to see a rise to 20% for 1 bed properties and a corresponding 10% reduction for 4 beds and more to 10%</p>
96	<p>This is still much too prescriptive. I wonder also how one can have 10% of five properties being one-bedroomed as that would be half of one of the properties, the minimum number to use for this to apply would have to be not 5 but 10 properties to enable 10% to equate to a one bedroomed one. I feel all developments should be directed to maintaining the existing character of the areas, and that that policy should override other aspirations.</p>
97	<p>Landowner Consultee - Please see letter sent under separate cover in Appendix 5.3 of the Consultation Statement.</p>
98	<p>The Plan and BSA show demand for smaller homes rather than 4+ beds, which already a/c for 40% of all homes, compared with 30% in MV as a whole. When 3 beds are included, this rises to 76% (MV 64%). In contrast, Ashtead has only 24% homes with 2 or fewer beds (MV 36%). Ashtead already has a bias towards larger homes. Yet occupancy levels show 60% have only 1 or 2 household members, Older people want to downsize, and younger need smaller affordable homes to rent or buy, so they can remain in Ashtead. The policy in pt. 1 seems to ignore the ACV's own findings. The bias is still towards larger properties, which we have plenty of already. My proposal would be: a min. 20% 1 bed; 40% 2 bed; 30% 3 bed; and a max. 10% 4 bed. Social housing should also form a % of all new developments to meet the needs of the Housing Register and provide homes for those on average earnings, who cannot afford to buy or rent in the private sector.</p>
99	<p>This ACV NDP consultation document policy (AS-H2) has the potential to further increase the volume of residential units within the Ashtead NDP area. Sufficient infrastructure whether in the area or accessible from the area is required to support the residents of these proposed units. This type of infrastructure is not provided by the MVDC as a planning authority- provision is by the Surrey County Council (SCC). The consultation document makes reference to infrastructure and that it is already at least "busy" e.g. schools, health care, and parking. A single dimensional policy of this type will impact on infrastructure- it should be a policy that has parallels that ensure sufficient infrastructure is provided,</p>

	<p>either as an extension to that which exists, or an accessible alternative e.g. expansion outside of the Ashtead NDP area.</p> <p>It is noted that there is no reference to MVDC's CS3 which deals with Balancing Housing Provision <sup>(5)</sup>. This policy appears to complement that strategy. It is also disappointing to note the lack of reference to "affordable housing" in support of MVDC's CS 4 <sup>(5)</sup>. That part of the Core Strategy gives guidelines on provision of affordable housing. This omission could suggest that the NDP consultation document for Ashtead is not encouraging provision of housing that that is accessible to all.</p> <p>(5) n/k. (2009). <i>Core Strategy 2009 Section 6.1 New Homes for Mole Valley</i> CS 3. Available: <a href="http://molevalley-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/cs/cs_-_adopted_oct_2009/core_strategy_-_adopted_october_2009_1?pointId=d1682747e221">http://molevalley-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/cs/cs_-_adopted_oct_2009/core_strategy_-_adopted_october_2009_1?pointId=d1682747e221</a>. Last accessed 20th February 2016</p>
--	---

**Comments: AS-H3**

7	This policy again contradicts 'maintain the current mix of housing sizes'.
11	We must allow market forces to dictate policy. The moment inflexible policies are employed nothing happens
19	Not keen on any flat or 1/2 bed dwellings as out of keeping with area, will not encourage families to live here. It could also for point 2 encourage lots of buildings, with little grass/garden on a plot of land,
21	Subject to previous comment about 4bed homes [Comment from AS-H2: Why increase the 4 bed stock at all?]
22	See earlier text [re HS2] [Comment from AS-H2: I would reduce 4 plus to 10%. We need more younger skilled non-financial sector people]
28	I agree with not building houses on Greenfield Land - but don't agree with the prescribed housing mix. Surely that is up to the developer who has acquired the land and the planning committee of the council?
29	

	Those in need of three bedroomed properties at present may, in the not-too-distant future require a four bedroomed home. We should not limit them to this extent.
37	<p>We have a similar comment here to that as for AS-H2.</p> <p>[Comment from AS-H2: The housing mix should depend on the area the development is placed in. Small houses/flats should not be put in an area of large houses &amp; gardens. There should positively be no building on the Green Belt or in or near a Conservation Area (and no alteration of Green Belt boundaries).]</p>
39	[Yes] but I haven't noticed any policy on affordable housing eg for the young doctors & nurses & teachers that we need.
48	The means in effect that NO four bed homes will be built.
49	I actually agree with the first point but not the second.
51	<p>As per my previous answer [to AS-H2]</p> <p>[Comment from AS-H2 : Not totally. I understand that we need a mix of housing, however, discouraging less 4 bedroom houses my backfire in the long term. Families are getting bigger and the plan to not build any more detached 4 beds may well discourage people in the long term from moving to Ashtead. I also feel that the issue of % of social housing has not been addressed here.</p>
56	I think that there should be no more 4+bedroom houses. Fewer bedroom houses, which are cheaper of course, need to be available for first -time and young buyers.
69	It is very important to the life of Ashtead to meet the housing needs of all sections of the local community, including young families and older people.
71	Most of the sites that come up for development in Ashtead will fall into this category. Ashtead has many areas that have very distinct characters - much older, smaller terraced properties, larger properties in substantial plots, newer build 1930s properties or even very new estates. We will dramatically change the character of all of these separate areas of

	<p>Ashtead by trying to impose the building of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom houses into developments in areas THAT DO NOT HAVE AND NEVER DID HAVE 1, 2 or 3 bedroom properties there previously. Maybe we should have a central area where we suggest this policy but not impose it so tightly that we will change the character of Ashtead. All developments should be in character with the surrounding area - if the surrounding area has large properties then large properties should be allowed. I also do NOT think that smaller properties should be disguised as flats in areas where no flats exist at the moment.</p>
76	<p>My comments on Housing Policy AS-H2 apply here also.</p> <p>[Comment on AS-H2: However, if such developments are carried out in the two estates on the 'blind' side of the railway (Links Road etc.), I think they should be preceded by the installation of either a road bridge across the railway, or a road connection to the Wells area at the edge of Epsom which has been connected to the A24 by a road bridge for many years. Otherwise the inevitable increase to the road traffic to and from the 'blind' side of the railway will worsen the already bad traffic congestion at the present crossing next to the Ashtead railway station.</p>
79	<p>Please see my previous comments on housing provision</p> <p>[Comment on AS-H2: There is a strong need for much more low cost housing especially for key workers - health service and care workers, teachers, firemen etc. The need will continue to grow with more school places required, and an increasingly aged population requiring care and support. I was born and brought up in Surrey, but have lived in several different parts of England, and I have to say that I sometimes come across a rather unpleasant attitude in this area, a belief that owning a large detached house somehow makes you a better person than those on a low wage. I know that many builders prefer to build larger houses, but should builders be determining our housing stock? Maybe we should be looking at some innovative ideas for house building e.g. prospective owners/tenants helping with the build.]</p>
83	<p>Statutory Consultee – please see response in Appendix 6.3 of the Consultation Statement.</p>
84	<p>Same comment as previous question.</p> <p>[Comment on AS-H2: However I am concerned that the emphasis on one and two bedroom properties will encourage developers to increase the proportion of blocks of flats, which will themselves change the character of Ashtead</p>

	which is predominately separate or semi-detached dwellings in their own grounds.]
86	This policy will serve to change the nature of Ashtead as a whole. Historically Ashtead has been a quiet and open area with homes on generous plots - it could be described as a generally affluent area in the main. This policy will undoubtedly undermine these desirable qualities.
87	This policy is consistent with AS-H2 and additionally would act as a brake against overdevelopment on smaller infill sites. The policy could be criticised as overly prescriptive as drafted and should leave more room for neighbouring residents affected by such future potential infills to influence a successful development outcome for them that they may be different from the policy direction. Adding the words "in general" after "will be sought" might be sufficient to overcome that criticism.
88	This proposed policy AS-H3 will destroy the Character of Ashtead by imposing out of character housing developments. The Bookham NDP policy BKH2 is more applicable and suitable for Ashtead and should replace the current Ashtead NDP wording. Bookham Policy BKH2 is stated in section 18 of this questionnaire, because of the limited space for comment in this box.
94	Does the policy have minimum room sizes? Also can the number of bathrooms be part of the provision?
96	Again, this is far too prescriptive, and any recommendation should, in my view, be subservient to maintaining the character of the area. That means recognizing that in some parts of Ashtead all developments should continue to be of 4+ bed roomed properties. At present, there is a trend for 3-and 4-bedroomed properties to be extended to 4+ and 5+ bedroomed ones; some of this would be within "permitted development", but perhaps that practice be discouraged in this or another policy (even though it would be most unpopular)
98	Your statistics show that much of the demand for smaller properties comes from older residents wishing to down size. If these are provided, larger properties of 4+ beds will be released for families to move into. So I do not see the need to maintain the number of 4+ bed as pre-existed on developed sites (pt.1), or to build an additional 4+ dwelling on an undeveloped site (pt.2). Land availability is constrained in Ashtead, which is already not meeting its target for house building. By

	building smaller houses and small apartment blocks, we can maximise the limited space available and better meet demand.
99	<p>The same points are made as to AS-H2. This ANF NDP consultation document policy (AS-H3) has the potential to increase the volume of residential units within the Ashtead NDP area. Sufficient infrastructure whether in the area or accessible from the area is required to support the residents of these proposed units. This type of infrastructure is not provided by the MVDC as a planning authority- provision is by the Surrey County Council (SCC). The consultation document makes reference to infrastructure and that it is already at least "busy" e.g. schools, health care, and parking. A single dimensional policy of this type will impact on infrastructure- it should be a policy that has parallels that ensure sufficient infrastructure is provided, either as an extension to that which exists, or an accessible alternative e.g. expansion outside of the Ashtead NDP area.</p> <p>It is noted that there is no reference to MVDC`'s CS3 which deals with Balancing Housing Provision <sup>(5)</sup>. This policy appears to complement that strategy. It is also disappointing to note the lack of reference to "affordable housing" in support of MVDC`'s CS 4 <sup>(5)</sup>. That part of the Core Strategy gives guidelines on provision of affordable housing. This omission could suggest that the NDP consultation document for Ashtead is not encouraging provision of housing that that is accessible to all.</p> <p>(5) n/k. (2009). <i>Core Strategy 2009 Section 6.1 New Homes for Mole Valley</i> CS 3. Available: <a href="http://molevalley-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/cs/cs_-_adopted_oct_2009/core_strategy_-_adopted_october_2009_1?pointId=d1682747e221">http://molevalley-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/cs/cs_-_adopted_oct_2009/core_strategy_-_adopted_october_2009_1?pointId=d1682747e221</a>. Last accessed 20th February 2016</p>

**Comments: AS-H4**

2	Particular attention should be paid to the facades of the building to preserve the character of the area. Many recent developments in the borough have used cheap building materials and have prioritised density and profit at the expense of the public realm.
7	There seems little point in appearing to favour 'accessible' development in this area. Might not this lead to the other desired objective of 2/3 homes being unaffordable to develop? Besides, development by Churchill (and others?) outside this area is meeting this demand. Does it mean that 2/3 bedroom homes without good access should only be built outside this area?
8	

	The provision of such properties should enable older residents to remain in Ashtead
11	It would be helpful to attach appendix 3 to this page of the questionnaire. Unfortunately I have been unable to trace it on your website and therefore cannot comment
19	There are too Many houses here any way and I oppose more building work
21	but do not imagine that the elderly will be content to live on a main road, if they are coming from a quieter area
25	I think that there should be a mix of housing not just aimed at people who would like to down size. This should be aimed at a wider spectrum of age's to included young professional, family and person's looking to move with in the village.
37	<p>We agree, but see comments on AS-H6 re the need for sufficient parking. This area does not seem to be in the Green Belt - it is important not to have development of any tyoe in the Green Belt.</p> <p>[Comment on AS-H6: There is not enough off street parking provided by far. Everybody in Surrey practically now has (&amp; needs to have) their own car &amp; even a 2 bed flat needs 2 parking spaces - otherwise there will be parking on the pavements which looks a mess and is dangerous &amp; inconvenient for pedestrians.]</p>
45	This will cause too great a distortion in the age profiles. A better mix must be maintained.
49	Yes, elderly residents wishing to downsize would certainly want to be near shops, doctors, etc.
66	Ageing population wanting to stay in Ashtead need somewhere to live and so release the family homes they are often living in to new people, and so keep the balance of ages.
67	As well as those downsizing, younger people need accommodation in Ashtead to keep the village vibrant.
69	

	This is absolutely right. It will not only help older people to remain independent and fulfilled for longer but also the knock-on effect will be to free up housing for families.
82	My agreement to the two previous policy statements [AS-H2 & AS-H3] is predicated on acceptance of this one.
84	With the proviso that large blocks of flats be limited.
86	This seems sensible BUT again market forces should be allowed to determine what happens in the area and I would be very opposed to seeing housing that is restricted to the over 65s in the Central Area described in the policy. Make accommodation accessible and adaptable but without any restrictions as to who can buy.
96	Subject to the maintainance of the existing character of the area -- a phrase that could be introduced as the first sentence of this proposal.
98	The needs of people with disabilities for accessible and adaptable dwellings should also be taken into account.
99	<p>The map at Figure 9 and Appendix 3 in the ANF NDP consultation document shows a shaded area to represent "Central Ashtead". This includes the land that is bordered by Woodfield (west), Barnett Wood Lane (south), Woodfield Lane (east) and the railway line (north) which is part of the Metropolitan Greenbelt- this is shown in ACV's Greenbelt Boundary Review at Appendix 1 <sup>(6)</sup>. The QE2 playing fields are also included on the map in this consultation document. Separate national and local policies protect Greenbelt areas and the QE2 playing fields. Protection of the QE2 playing fields is also an aspiration of this ANF NDP at Policy AS-EN1. Neither of these areas should be considered as potential sites for development. The map supporting this proposed policy should be redrawn to reflect this.</p> <p>Therefore this policy as drafted is not agreeable.</p> <p>(6) n/k. (2014). <i>Ashtead Neighbourhood Forum Greenbelt Boundary Review Appendix 1</i>. Available: <a href="https://ashteadcommunityvision.files.wordpress.com/2012/10/gbbr-published-version-final.pdf">https://ashteadcommunityvision.files.wordpress.com/2012/10/gbbr-published-version-final.pdf</a>. Last accessed 20th February 2016</p>

**Comments: AS-H5**

5	
---	--

	But more importantly are the quality of the products used so their visual appearance is lasting. to often developments look good for a few years and very quickly deteriorate.
6	Two-storey dwellings should NOT be permitted in an area where existing housing is single-storey.
28	It should be a fully inclusive policy and should include fencing and greenery/gardens around housing. A lot of the new fencing around housing is just ugly - take a look at the house on Woodfield Lane that has ripped out their hedging in favour of wooden fencing.
30	We think that there is a potential conflict between this policy and continuing to have a variety of building styles reflecting the era in which they were built. The policy should encourage a small proportion of good quality, individual, 21st century, architect designed houses as well, so that this variety continues for future generations.
33	Recent developments seem to concentrate on 'family' size homes rather than 'starter' homes. Bungalows for easier living for retired are disappearing.
37	There should be no insertion of flats or smaller dwellings in areas with large houses & gardens.
66	Agree, although this cannot mean that all brand new styles should be ignored. Ashtead is a great mix of styles and age of buildings and this should not mean that we must always have buildings that are a pastiche of styles
69	Although I do agree with this recommendation, please don't let it mean that we end up pickled in aspic. Good modern design can look beautiful too.
71	Sadly by trying to build 1, 2 and 3 bedroom properties, whether they be houses or flats in areas where they do not and never have existed before we will change the character of Ashtead and its various areas forever and because of the earlier housing policies we will never be able to keep to this policy.
83	

	Statutory Consultee – please see response in Appendix 6.3 of the Consultation Statement.
86	Developments must not be restricted to what already exists. We should not shy away from the new, different and dare I say interesting!
87	Again whilst understanding the origins of and broad consistency of this policy with existing local plan policies and built up area character assessments, the policy would leave less room for debate with developers and retain a neighbourly focus if it were to read "...developments must be visually integrated with their immediate surroundings..." The word immediate is important to avoid broadening the options for developers to design once and build many wherever they want. The streetscene condition partly reduces this risk but only on the frontage where in many cases the rear streetscene may be far more important.
88	It is not acceptable to build a block of flats/apartments in an area of houses, just because it may be possible to simulate the overall outside design of the existing houses. A block of flats, (or enforced smaller houses), will generate out of character; Developments, On road parking, Traffic movements, Social mix, etc. Policy AS-H5 must be rewritten to strengthen the maintaining of "all aspects of the character of Ashtead" and not just built character. Additionally Policies AS-H2 and AS-H3 are in complete contradiction with policy AS-H5 as written in the NDP.
94	Visually integrated to me means different roof lines and angles, and not windows overlooking neighbours.
96	I think this should come before the preceding housing proposals as it overrides them.
98	Social housing in Bramley Way built in the post war period, is a good example of visually integrated housing, blending well with privately built homes. This was an era when the local council took seriously its responsibility to house people on low/average earnings, who could not afford to buy their own homes – a similar situation to today.
99	It is understood that this will strengthen existing MVDC policies to the benefit of Ashtead.

**Comments: AS-H6**

7	I particularly like this policy!
---	----------------------------------

8	This is the minimum requirement that should be adopted for residential developments. A shortfall in this provision can lead to all sorts of discontent and disputes between neighbours.
11	I agree but it seems the Planning Inspector is at odds with the numbers. In this respect I refer to the Churchill development on the Leatherhead Road that was approved by MVDC in spite of objections to inadequate parking, namely less than one space per flat, some of two bedroom. The applicant put forward their developments approved on appeal elsewhere for which therefore a planning precedent had been established. Unfortunately the policy does not stand up.
22	I'd make all new properties 2 spaces to reduce frustration and congestion. Most people need two incomes and mobility to be able to live in Ashtead
33	Parking is increasingly difficult in Ashtead! Even 1 bed flats can have 2 occupants each with a car. This is a vital consideration.
37	There is not enough off street parking provided by far. Everybody in Surrey practically now has (& needs to have) their own car & even a 2 bed flat needs 2 parking spaces - otherwise there will be parking on the pavements which looks a mess and is dangerous & inconvenient for pedestrians.
40	1 & 2 bed flats require more than 1 space - what about carers/visitors?
43	Adequate parking should be provided in all circumstances.
45	New research shows parking provision encourages car ownership & use. You need to re-assess the parking provision policy.
47	It is essential on-street parking is restricted. Many garages, even in new houses, are too small for modern cars. There should be a minimum size for a garage.
48	It is highly likely that the occupants of 1/2 bed houses will own two vehicles as are the occupants of 3/4 bedrooms. Visitor parking will be

	used by residents as will any other space. You have to plan but this must lead to car sprawl.
53	I think that more parking space is needed to avoid overspill onto nearby streets etc
57	Only agree if there is also a set no of car spaces for visitors for all properties & there will be no overspill into surrounding roads.
58	This will not work in the real world
63	Ideally, more spaces ought to allocated per unit.
66	This may not be enough as many couples have a car each although may only live in a 1 or 2 bed property.
67	A reduction in these proposed spaces should not be allowed under any circumstances.
69	I completely understand that space is precious and in short supply and that we should all use our cars less. However, knowing the reality of how we all live our lives today, I suspect this is a recipe to a lot of on-road parking and more than a little aggravation.
71	Sadly another policy that I do not agree with. Firstly why should 1 and 2 bedroom flats be treated any differently to 1 and 2 bedroom houses? If anything they should have more parking space available to them because by default they are much more densely populated. However I do like the policy that Bookham have suggested and I think it would be much more suitable for Ashted and I think we should use this as our submission in the NDP for parking standards.
83	Statutory Consultee – please see response in Appendix 6.3 of the Consultation Statement.
84	I think that the NDP could be more ambitious as to further provision of of street parking to reduce the parking blight that is detrimental to many residential streets in the village. For example enhanced parking space at the station might be encouraged, perhaps with an underground level below the existing area or extending under The Woodfield.

86	I disagree only because I do not see what allowance has been made for sheltered housing or retirement housing where the residents may not need a space at all BUT they may have visitors. Also, parking for contractors should be taking into consideration e.g. garden maintenance contractors often have nowhere to park.
88	The car usage of residents of Flats (including Apartments) is no different to car users living in Houses, particularly when there is little public transport available as in Ashtead. Also as Flats are stacked vertically it is therefore important to ensure the same parking provision as Houses is established in a development. The policy developed for the Bookham NDP is preferred when compared to the one in the Ashtead NDP. The Ashtead NDP must adopt following minimum standards for off-street parking applying to all new homes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One off-street parking space for bedsits and one bedroom homes (Flats and Houses)</li> <li>• Two off-street parking spaces for two and three bedroom homes (Flats and Houses)</li> <li>• Three off-street parking spaces for four bedroom and larger homes (Flats and Houses)</li> </ul> The "Churchill" effect of the woefully under supply of parking must be curtailed by an NDP policy.
90	Is this intended to apply to all developments? Presumably it would only apply to those with shared parking arrangements & where there is no suitable on-street parking.
92	Any house should have a minimum of 2 off street parking places. Houses with 4 bedrooms or more should have 3 spaces. This should help the problems with visitor and workmen parking. Car sharing should not be relevant since the next owners may not wish to car share. DfT official forecasts are for a 40% increase in traffic/cars by 2040.
94	Encouragement should be given to undercover garage parking preferably beneath new developments.
95	The 3 examples listed that could offer consideration of varying aforesaid parking requirements will need to be resourced both for set up and ongoing running. I suggest specific mention is made of the need for such schemes to be credibly self resourcing or there is the risk of the local authority having to fund this. What happens if these

	schemes run out of money and residents are not able/ willing to fund?
96	I think these figures are too low and that two should be required for 1-2 bed flats, three for 1-2 bed houses, and four + for 3+bedroomed houses.
99	<p>It is noted that there is no provision in this policy for storage of other means of transport e.g. motor cycles, bicycles. It is also noted that the SCC policy <sup>(7)</sup> refers to includes reference to electric vehicle charging- something that is not mentioned here. Electric vehicles may well provide a viable alternative for local journeys without contribution to vehicle emission pollutions. Elsewhere the ANF NDP proposals discuss (para 4.3.2) cycle infrastructure provision so it is unclear why bicycle storage is not being promoted.</p> <p>The SCC policy <sup>(7)</sup> standard is unlikely to provide an adequate volume of parking for an area such as Ashtead. As discussed in the ANF NDP consultation document parking is an acknowledged issue. The number of households that have more than two vehicles is reported as around 14% <sup>(8)</sup>. Using the SCC guidance any new development would have to be a 3 and more bed dwelling to qualify for sufficient parking arrangements to be part of the design. This still leaves a problem for visitors` vehicles.</p> <p>It is noted that this policy echoes the SCC guidelines and care should be taken to avoid unnecessary bureaucratic duplication i.e. "red tape".</p> <p>(7) n/k. (2012). <i>Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance</i>. Available: <a href="https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/30041/Vehicular-and-Cycle-Parking-Guidance-January-2012.pdf">https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/30041/Vehicular-and-Cycle-Parking-Guidance-January-2012.pdf</a>. Last accessed 20ry 2016</p> <p>(8) n/k. (updated 2014). <i>Census: Household characteristics, Ashtead Village Wards in Mole Valley</i>. Available: <a href="http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/(F(Rj1bX3qOjZCasCgjk7EAxeOFZPMvPntnviQ6ee4VHLbGOYPhAXW-5A6O2GWLhaSq1OVR7slUyaw2VGDxD88a9bhqKIP6p0hhJnNSHJC04a4VE9YPfyrGUKHVM4sQp8gBJLLF6Q2))/DrillDownProfile.aspx?pid=35&amp;rt=3">http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/(F(Rj1bX3qOjZCasCgjk7EAxeOFZPMvPntnviQ6ee4VHLbGOYPhAXW-5A6O2GWLhaSq1OVR7slUyaw2VGDxD88a9bhqKIP6p0hhJnNSHJC04a4VE9YPfyrGUKHVM4sQp8gBJLLF6Q2))/DrillDownProfile.aspx?pid=35&amp;rt=3</a>. Last accessed 21st February 2016</p>

**Comments: AS-Ec1**

5	I would be happy for this space to be converted to residential usage. These shops eek out a living and if they didn't exist would provide a better level of demand in the 2 other shopping areas and provide much needed residential development land in a highly accessible area.
15	

	I think this is vitally important. The shops are the lifeblood of this area of Ashtead and bring real character and life to it. They should not be allowed to be converted to housing. The shops are highly useful to residents.
18	Strongly agree
28	The parade of shops on Barnett Wood Lane needs to be designated a LSC and the paving and roads around it needs to be upgraded and improved - particularly the paving. Cars should not be allowed to park outside these shops, especially given the close proximity the shops are to the infant school on BWLane. Makes walking very difficult and not fair on those with visual impairments.
29	We cannot predict what changes of use might be and, surely, a change of use is better than an empty, useless building? Also, increase of floor space may be necessary to sustain a thriving business/shopping area.
31	None of these shops should be used as offices
37	More parking off street is needed in this area & also at Craddocks Parade.
39	The big problem in that area is the lack of a car park. Other than concreting over the pond (joke!), the only alternatives are use of green-belt land (unacceptable too) or the replacement of some existing houses by a car park. Expensive, but what would be the long-term economic benefit vs the (very large) initial cost? Probably impractical, as it would be difficult to get the necessary contiguous area.
43	This only makes sense if adequate short term parking is provided and enforced. These shops are cursed currently by this lack.
45	This will increase the traffic and parking problems by Barnett Wood School.
59	I feel that all changes of use and proposals to increase floorspace should be considered on an individual basis and that we should not just ban them outright.
64	

	This policy is important so as to allow shop owners/tenants to raise the profile of these shops
69	Good idea. This is the nearest shopping area to a large number of homes, and includes our only post office in lower Ashtead.
72	These shops are an important asset for this part of Ashtead. They include the only Post Office in the Woodfield/Ashtead Common area, a particularly important facility.
74	The big difficulty here is parking.
84	The NDP could also indicate a desire that this area should have a facelift or improvement including for example a parking lay-by and improvements to the shop frontage area to give it a better quality surface and more consistent look.
86	The Street in Ashtead is no longer an appealing place to shop. There is far too much heavy traffic. Residents may prefer to shop or have a coffee on Craddocks and also Barnett Wood Lane rather than The Street so in my opinion Barnett Wood Lane parade should be allowed to grow organically.
95	How about reducing the pavement area at Barnet Wood Lane for parking to make the flow of traffic along the road far safer. 1-2 metres would work and provide sufficient safe pavement space for pedestrians. Not sure what pavement frontage ownership by shops could restrict such consideration. But it would benefit all shops as it would make the area more welcoming
99	Support this proposal but would note that the question refers to the "map at Figure 12", whereas the correct reference should be to the "map at Figure 11".

**Comments: AS-Ec2**

5	How can we be a village without a pub!
15	I am not convinced that the existence of 2 pubs (Leg of Mutton and Brewery) in very close proximity should be inviolable. It may be that

	demolition of the Brewery would allow improvements to be made to a dangerous junction.
9	The Brewery Inn is an obstacle to safe improvements of the junction of Woodfield Lane and The Street and should be demolished providing more public parking for the shops and the APMH and allowing traffic lights on the resulting cross-shaped junction.
19	Both are strongly community driven
28	More needs to be done to make each of them more child friendly and therefore accessible by the whole community they are seeking to serve.
33	Loss of these amenities would mean travelling to Epsom or Dorking or Leatherhead.
37	The pubs should be kept but if possible enhanced with modern dining facilities.
45	We need pubs as meeting places. Again [as said re AS-H1] this is poorly worded.
58	They are not especially nice places to visit apart from the "Leg" We need to keep a bank in the Street and develop Tesco site
64	The Leg and Woodman should raise their game to justify this status.
69	I'm not much of a pub-goer myself but it would be a terrible shame if there were no pubs in the area for people to go to.
76	Also I think that any proposals to reduce the car parking space around any of these three Public Houses should be resisted.
95	The loss of one or more these public houses could arise in the future from business considerations - i.e. Change in public's habits leading to reduced custom. I would suggest policy consideration of retention of the buildings ideally as some form of licensed activities. Or failing that retention of building for other commercial uses eg spread eagle in Epsom ?

99	<p>This policy risks delivering a situation where a site is not redeveloped following cessation of current use. Any business at these sites needs to be successful- if customers do not support the business it will cease in the same way as retail banking has left the village. If a business chooses to withdraw from the one of sites and there is no other interest in provision of a public house, the site will become unused (and possible derelict) as this policy potentially prevents any change of use.</p> <p>Suggest the policy is revised to support the provision of public houses at the existing locations, recognising their value as assets, but acknowledging that a situation might arise where there is a need for an alternative community facility at that site.</p> <p>This policy requires review and representation.</p>
----	---

**Comments: Ec3**

5	<p>Whilst I am happy with limiting the size of the store I don't have a view on comparison goods. and so long as the parking and access is good it should boost the Street.</p>
7	<p>A totally different planning application could be made- which we might welcome, but the policy will prevent it. It just makes no sense. Planning applications should be consider one by one on their merits. Not addressed in a NDP.</p>
8	<p>This is essential to encourage people to use as many of the shops in The Street as possible</p>
9	<p>If the retail store cannot provide its own parking spaces within its own boundaries (i.e. not relying on using the APMH spaces) then it should only be permitted in conjunction with demolition of The Brewery Inn (see previous question) and that releasing more public parking spaces.</p>
11	<p>You are quoting the conditions attached to the existing planning application submitted by Tesco and approved. Prior to expiry last November Tesco undertook sufficient work to ensure a renewal application was not required, at the same time being in a position to sell the site with planning approval. It was a pity there were so many unjustified objections to earlier applications otherwise the store would now be up and running. A lesson to be learnt for the future.</p>
12	<p>In saying Yes, I am assuming that the Sales/Floor areas quoted are those permitted in the final agreed Tesco application. Not larger - but not</p>

	smaller either so that the planning battle doesn't have to be fought again.
17	I would rather that this whole site be devoted to housing. A block of 1 or 2 bedroom flats?
18	I do not agree. I feel a convenience store is not required and will negatively affect the character of the street and possibly the sales of the current shops there but also in craddocks and Barnet wood. the current convenience store serves sufficient to encourage my increased footfall to the street. If this is agreed I agree that the entrance should only be through the street only and I agree with the net sales area suggestion.
21	This is unrealistic. No retail outlet will want to be restricted in its sale of eg, bread and meat. If the 'Co-op' were to be encouraged to move to the new site, its present premise might be useful for small homes. The present Street buildings are a ramshackle lot and not very attractive
22	I am against shopping facilities that compete with small traders already in Ashtead
28	The land is already an eye sore and has stood empty since I moved to Ashtead over 8 years ago. Stop being so prescriptive please. This is why The Street is dying and nobody under 60 actually shops there!!
29	I think this is too restrictive. Elderly and disabled customers and those with young children would benefit from access directly from the carpark.
33	This site has been empty far too long. A different store to Tesco would be very welcome eg Sainsbury Local / Waitrose / M&S Food Store.
37	Not a SECOND Tesco - preferably Waitrose!
40	As far as it goes. There is still the problem of customer and delivery car parking!
43	The problems this would cause are well known - excessive pressure on parking - the Woodfield Lane/Street junction would be completely inadequate to cope with passing traffic trying to access the store. Use the space for housing.

45	This question confused everybody on this question - what does 682 sqm look like??!
47	Does this mean only 10% of the sales area can be devoted to vegetables, groceries, meat, flowers all of which can be bought in the village. What is the other 90%, drink?
51	I believe that there s already a Tesco on Woodfield lane and a coop on the street. Why do we need more convenience stores? Would it not be more pertinent to encourage a selection of smaller retail spaces to entice independent shops - much more in keeping with the character of Ashtead's The Street. There a several markets that are not provided by Ashtead which would improve the shopping experience for the residents. For example, there are no decent clothes (of an affordable nature) and no footwear retailers, certainly not for children, which you state is a growing population of those moving to the area. This means we need to travel to find these and as such end up doing the rest of the shopping elsewhere. A further convenience store would just not cut it, would over flood the market. There are too many estate agents on the street.
59	I feel that we should stick with the original planning proposals that were agreed for Tesco unless the new developer proposes something different i.e. 750 sqm of net sales area, 1500 Gross floor area with access from the car park. I am not sure what the 10% of the Net Sales Area should be for the sale of comparison goods means.
61	The development should also include some accommodation.
66	This should also include a minimum number of dwellings so that it is a mixed development not just retail
67	I think an exit from the store to the car park should be allowed. This development should include some accommodation.
69	I would really like to be able to do my weekly shop in Ashtead, rather than going to Leatherhead as I do now. I am also sure that a larger food store would bring more trade to the rest of The Street.
72	Agree in principle with desire to develop this site in a way which supports existing shops in The Street however can not comment on the detail of this policy - the square metres and area for the "sale of comparison goods". What are "comparison goods"?

76	Also, since the establishment of such a retail store (with which I agree) would be likely to increase the need for car parking nearby, I think consideration should be given to the possibility of adding either under-floor or overhead car parking facilities to the building.
83	Statutory Consultee – please see response in Appendix 6.3 of the Consultation Statement.
86	Why on earth would a convenient entrance from the back car park not be allowed? The policy even describes it as a "convenience retail store" so please make it actually convenient. There is rarely parking on The Street and the car park at the back is under-utilised. If we allow business premises on The Street lets try and help them succeed.
88	Due to the loss of retail banking in Ashtead, this development should have a mandatory ATM facility included.
92	The interlink with parking has not been fully thought through. We do want more footfall in The Street. A later policy encourages more signing to the car parks – excellent. But even if the new store is basket only the passageway between the cleaners and the electrical shop is just insufficient. It is probably difficult if not impossible to improve that. Why not insist that a new passageway is built at the side of the new store going straight from the car park to The Street. Customers may turn straight into the store, but they will also have an opportunity to visit other shops.
94	If no company wished to develop this site for retail, I feel that homes/offices should be agreed (instead of the unsightly mess there for so long in the village centre).
95	I would suggest a degree of flexibility on metrics. It may deter a business that would be highly attractive to ashtead
96	Also propose that at least one ATM machine be provided in the design.
98	Given the limited availability of land in Ashtead, would it not be better to build housing here, subject to the spacing limits outlined above? This would also protect the other retailers in the Street from unnecessary competition and preserve the character of the Street.
99	The apparently existing MVDC planning permission includes provision of additional parking spaces. The provision of additional parking, particularly in view of comments elsewhere in this consultation

	<p>documents, should be reflected here. The SCC guidance indicates that 9 parking spaces should be provided for the 9 flats and in the region of 27 parking spaces for users of any store<sup>(7)</sup>. Provision should also be made for bicycle parking.</p> <p>Any development at the site should complement the surrounding area, not attract a large volume of vehicles in the same way as the Tesco store in Craddocks Parade. This produces congestion with resulting delays and on occasion vehicles blocking the road waiting for parking space to become available.</p> <p>Any store may well attract business from beyond the Ashtead NDP area and the infrastructure (including parking) should support the incoming business to Ashtead.</p> <p>This policy should be revisited to include at least the points above and then re-consulted on.</p>
--	--

**Comments: AS-En1**

5	We need bigger schools as there are not enough spaces. this is too sweeping a generalisation... the concept of infants schools is ridiculous... St G and BWI should both become primary schools which will mean some dev't on their playing fields.
9	There should be no reduction in the total school playing field land within Ashtead
11	Realistically there is no land available in Ashtead for alternative sites. If they come on to the market the land would be used for housing.
15	This is extremely important.
18	I agree with the first two sentences. Not the third. The playing fields should not be distanced from the school. Schools should be able to provide this space for access at break and lunch times and not just for sports. It is detrimental to the physical and mental health of children for these spaces to be reduced and has long term effects into adulthood as it develops poor knowledge and skills and expectations about the use of outdoor space, activity and nature. Compromising this therefore therefore major potential detrimental effects on health and wellbeing and also therefore the long term economy of the nation and for society.
19	Ashtead Schools should have playing fields on or adjacent to their site. If not this would only serve to increase traffic around the playing field sites.

32	Any reduction in existing school playing fields should be avoided at ALL costs.
33	Schools should not be allowed to sell off land for development!
47	It is most important sports facilities are preserved.
51	However, I have concerns that this will ultimately stifle any expansion and result in the local children not being able to attend a good local school. As an educational advisor for two other boroughs I can see ways around this. I work for inner city LAs and can see how this can be done sensitively. I would love to be part of the discussions around school/playing field sustainability in the long term of this project.
69	Absolutely right.
86	This is a tricky one as we will need the schools to expand and there may not be the space apart from the playing fields. However, having to move children around to do sports offsite is counterproductive and logistically challenging especially when children are younger. It is such a waste of curriculum time and school resources apart from anything else. Buildings may need to go up - unpalatable of course but sensible.
94	How much is the Recreation Ground used by local schools?
98	There seems to be masses of green space in Ashted, some of which, if necessary could be made available for additional playing fields, given that, as you state 'outdoor sports pitches are already acceptable in the Green Belt in principle, depending on design issues.' I don't know if independent schools make their playing fields available, when free, to other schools and the community, but that would make sense.
99	It is noted that the ANF NDP consultation document has omitted to mention St Giles' school and Barnett Wood Playing fields that are used by St John's school. These should be included for completeness.

**Comments: AS-En2**

7	I would like to see more playing fields in Ashted for organised games. I understand we're short of pitches of most kind. And I'd like to explore
---	--

	how the Pony field might be utilised as it's a valuable flat land which is currently only used by Pony's.
8	This will continue and add to the "Village Feel" of Ashtead
9	The grass, trees and hedgerows are significant parts of Ashtead's pleasant character
21	But!... I have just reminded MVDC of their responsibility to maintain footpaths' safety (leaf clearance and surface condition is generally poor. If you wish people to walk you must also enforce the 'creeping hedge syndrome' which seems to afflict so many residents!
28	We should be planting more trees and bushes and not removing them. Craddock's Road would benefit hugely from further tree planting to make it prettier.
31	But they must be maintained
33	Friends often comment on the beauty of Ashtead - the tree lined roads soften developments and attract wildlife adding to the amenities of the area.
36	It's amazing how these verges are being damaged by vehicles parking on them even though the council does its best to stop it with posts.
40	Recent anti-open developments: - house in Woodfield Lane has been allowed to build high fence to front of property - ditto Greville Park Road
42	Stop parking on verges.
51	However, I have concerns that as a homeowner I will not be able to rid any problem hedges such as a destructive Ivy hedge I have inherited from my property and as such it will cause structural damage to the property
84	It is essential to retain green space of all sorts as this is integral to the character of Ashtead.
94	

	Retains MANY trees and MOST hedges would describe my views. A24 is poorly maintained - the pathway is half the width previously. Greville side, bushes cut back low down and out of control higher up.
98	Although some flexibility should surely be possible within reason e.g. if one tree is affecting development proposals in one area.
99	This policy may impact on or be impacted by Policy AS-Inf2: Pedestrian Access. Protecting the areas described in this (AS-En2) policy may well prevent any boundary adjustment. This policy is considered the more important policy and should take precedent.

**Comments: As-En3**

5	Design needs to be good and of high quality but the span house on the Marld (sp?) are excellent if alternative to the conservation area nearby. focus should be on quality and longevity not replication. embrace good design not poor quality copycats.
9	Two storey buildings should not be permitted in those areas that are currently all or largely bungalows. Our close has had its pleasant character significantly reduced by dominating two storey buildings allowed in a neighbouring back garden development.
30	We think that there is a potential conflict between this policy and continuing to have a variety of building styles reflecting the era in which they were built. The policy should encourage a small proportion of good quality, individual, 21st century, architect designed houses as well, so that this variety continues for future generations.
48	This will provide the parking space that is lacking in AS-H6.
49	I agree strongly with this.
67	I believe gardens are very important.
69	

	I strongly agree.
71	Yet again we are saying that we want to retain the character of Ashtead but our housing policy goes against this.
83	Statutory Consultee – please see response in Appendix 6.3 of the Consultation Statement.
86	Caveat - lets not only restrict to what is "appropriate" architecture.
87	My sense is that the first sentence of this policy is loosely drafted and presents a risk of gradual deterioration in character. "...should take account of the character of the surrounding area" leaves far too much room for non-innovative design by developers whilst it could be argued that a larger development is defined as one that is simply larger than the buildin on an existing site - in which case virtually every infill development in Ashtead would be characterised as a larger development !! If I were a developer I would see this particular policy as offering hitherto unavailable flexibility to "design one and build many wherever I want".
88	Policy AS-En3 must be rewritten to strengthen the maintaining of "all the current aspects of the character of Ashtead". The word "should" must be replaced with the word "must" in the policy wording, otherwise everything is optional. Policies AS-H2 and AS-H3 are in complete contradiction with policy AS-En3.
92	Careful about the trees. They are nice but need controlling which does not always happen. A few less would be no harm.
96	I would, however, replace "character of the surrounding area" phrase by in the opening sentence to "existing character of the area".
99	The second part of this policy seems to suggest that by developments including the amenities described (gardens etc.) the policy could be met by retaining existing areas that meet the requirement. This should be made clear. This is not fully explained in the discussion in paragraph 4.4.3 of the ANF NDP consultation document.

**Comments: AS-Inf1**

11	Sounds good BUT
----	-----------------

18	Yes subject to the ability to retain sports and green space accessible to the primary care facilities see comment on sports field provision
22	But, private provision only if public options are legally exhausted. Ashtead needs to become more not less privileged
31	They must have a car park
33	There are still only 2 doctors surgeries in Ashtead yet the population has increased dramatically in the 35 years I have lived here.
37	We agree so long as the expanded provision is close to existing primary care provision.
42	Central care area with plenty of parking. eg use of Esso site.
45	I agree with the proposal to expand primary care but automatic acceptance of all private medical services will create problems in the future.
46	Agree with change of use of commercial but not residential properties.
51	I feel it should be promoted and supported regardless of look. The fact remains Ashtead is a growing population. And even though the increase is small at the moment, there are not enough facilities for existing residents. I myself couldn't find a surgery taking NHS patients when I moved in last May, I am still with my previous surgery in Epsom as a result. I do however, agree that they should be accessible and within perhaps brownfield sites or derelict existing building locations around the residential areas.
52	Please remember parking spaces
71	Retaining character once again that our housing policies go against.
95	Add - sufficient patient parking - as well as part of any considerations
98	

	Given the limited availability of land for housing and the fact that Ashtead is not meeting its target in this area, I am not in favour of permitting change of use of residential premises to support primary care provision and certainly not for private medical services.
99	The implementation of this policy needs to take into account of where the demand is arising from and deciding what "local demand" means. A risk here is Ashtead becomes a world class Centre of excellence for health and social care, but ceases to exist as a community.

**Comments: AS-Inf2**

8	This is crucial for pedestrian safety and should have been considered in many existing developments!
9	This should include grass verges where at all possible and should have entirely off-road parking provisions.
22	Note, wood field lane currently does not comply with Accessibility needs
28	Barnett Wood Lane needs to be improved first!! it is a major school route.
37	It is important that there should be no parking on the pavements & that sufficient off street parking is provided as well.
39	Usually very difficult - eg Rectory / Dene Road.
44	Also consider speed restrictions i.e. 20mph in Lanes area. This would be cheaper than footpaths & would retain the appearance.
51	But it would be a shame if the 'old' listed character of the village were diminished because of this.
71	There are a lot of areas in Ashtead that do not have footpaths with no prospect of there ever being one because of the width of the road and

	to add just add a short length of footpath outside a new development would be very out of keeping with the area.
72	Maintain or improve existing pedestrian access including retaining the Green Lane railway foot crossing.
76	Also I think this policy is particularly important in those existing roads which are narrow and at present have sections with no pedestrian footpaths and trees and bushes immediately border the road.
82	Yes, very important to enhance pedestrian access capabilities.
84	I would put much emphasis on the need for such footpath provision to be in keeping with the area. In The Lanes for example, footpaths are unlikely to be in keeping. I also think the NDP should be more aspirational in its ambition to improve both pedestrian linking footpaths and cycle routes.
86	Fewer and fewer people walk - that is a fact. Why would we demand that people go to the expense and inconvenience is providing for the above policy.
95	Why only 'encourage ' make it a condition
99	<p>This policy impacts on Policy AS-En2: Amenity Space as if implemented will on occasion require removal of hedges e.g. northern end of Skinners Lane to allow the improvement to pedestrian footpaths to be made. Para 4.5.2 of the ANF NDP consultation document uses the words "many narrow roads". Reference to the supporting document finds nine roads are mentioned specifically. A few more can be considered to require this sort of improvement. Even with those added the word "many" is not correct; the words "There are a number of narrow roads" would be considered adequate.</p> <p>This policy requires redrafting and representing.</p>

**Comments: AS-Inf3**

7	In section 4.5.3 was the school City of London missed - who also has busy traffic at drop off/ pick up times? In section 4.6 isn't the Shell Petrol Station a valued community asset. If that were to close for
---	---

	housing, the village would have no petrol station. Could it be added? Can't remember the rules for adding things privately owned.
45	The thrust of this is good but pre-approval of policies will backfire - keep Part 1, scrap Part 2.
90	In the first line, the word 'communities' should I think read 'community'.
98	Yes - but expansion of existing facilities should not be at the expense of new affordable housing.
99	Consideration should be made in adding the Ashtead Village Club <sup>(9)</sup> to the list supplied in the consultation document at paragraph 4.6. Also omitted is that there is public parking available on a pay for use basis at The Brewery Inn- this should also be included.  (9) n/a. (n/k). n/a. Available: <a href="http://www.ashteadvc.co.uk/">http://www.ashteadvc.co.uk/</a> . Last accessed 20th February 2016

**Comments: AS-Inf4**

6	There is a danger that additional pedestrian crossings on through routes will increase congestion at peak times.
9	Ashtead's narrower lanes do not have room for pavements so some 20MPH speed limits should be considered to make them safer for pedestrians.
11	I am aware of the pressure to provide a pedestrian crossing on the A24 near the junctions of farm Lane and Bramley Way.. When you say "over" I assume you mean at ground level otherwise I would be totally against a bridge. However I am concerned about any crossing on grounds of road safety unless the A24 has a 20 mph speed limit.
18	Additionally commission routes between the wells estate and ashtead. Connections between ashtead and the wells is increasing either the increased primary provision at primary schools in ashtead which increases the use of ashtead facilities and transport routes to and from wells. To avoid increased road traffic attention needs to be given to speed limit and gates at lady Margaret rail crossing to support greener transport uptake. This will also reduce congestion and parking.

19	Particularly pedestrian crossing with island on busy a24 where traffic is far too fast and way over 40 mph. Also would like to see speed bump going into/out of village by the marld/Howard memorial. With school and nursery on a24, lots of families and children crossing, the traffic is far too fast
21	I support some of these proposals but by no means all of them; these should all have their own questionnaire format
22	Support traffic calming measures for safety reasons for the St Stephend Avenue 'racetrack'
23	We have cycle routes in Barney Wood Lane and Epsom Road. The only problem is that the majority of cyclists still cycle on the roads. Seems an awful waste of money to have provided cycle routes that cyclists ignore.
29	I would also like to see a pedestrian crossing on Ottways Lane near the top of Agates Lane
31	These should have been set out at separate items Based on the last cycle path which is hardly used Not convinced additional cycle paths would be money well spent The pedestrian crossings need to be rethought, put in new one as stated take out crossing by Post Office put traffic lights with pedestrian crossing at top of woodfield Lane (blind junction) remove crossing by Shell garage leave last one near Otways Lane
32	How about toilet facilities near the children's playground area. This would stop children using the hedge adjacent to the tennis courts!! This would be much more use than at the Old Pavilion.
33	With the exception of safe cycling routes. The recent Ashtead-Leatherhead route is not much used!
35	A public toilet near the Youth Centre would probably be used more than a toilet at the other end of the Playing Field.
38	Water supplies should be considered. We suffer low water pressure particularly early morning, mainly, since the Parsons Mead development. Sutton & E. Surrey Water at last accept there is a problem. This needs to be addressed.

43	Cycle lanes will only work if they are properly designed. The Leatherhead-Ashted route is a perfect example of how NOT to do it. If cyclists are forced to stop every few yards they won't use it. Witness that virtually none of the cyclists who use the road use the cycle route.
44	[Comment on: toilet facilities ..... near the Youth Centre] would be preferable. [Comment on: Improvements to pedestrian access .....] - as previously noted - consider speed restrictions. [Comment on safe cycling routes] - Encourage cyclists to use them.
45	Generally approve but the crossing [on the A24] could be in an unsighted area on a 40mph road and INCREASE hazards not decrease them.
46	Do not agree with this proposal [projects to promote and improve cycling routes, etc.], as the new cycle route on the A24 is hardly used. Cyclists choose to cycle on the road rather than use the cycle path, so it would appear to be a complete waste of money.
51	<p>I do and don't agree with this. I think it may have been most beneficial to ask for comments on each of the separate proposals within this question.</p> <p>I personally believe the CIL should be spent on increasing the school places, sewage and energy supplies in the area. With regard to public toilets, this is really out of date as a need. Towns nationwide are actually closing and demolishing their public toilets as they have been proven to encourage increases in Anti-Social Behaviour, underage drinking, drug dealing and sexual offence. I am sure that this is something that the village and local community do not want on their door step. With a decreasing police presence and lack of maintenance from SCC and MVDC I feel this would be a waste of the CIL when school places are at a premium for local children.</p> <p>Regarding the real time bus information, this is not necessary, however, and increase in public transport routes is needed.</p> <p>As long as public is consulted on the road and pavement improvements this will be ok.</p> <p>Agreed that cycling routes need to be improved, cyclists really do add to the congestion in this busy town, especially on narrow side roads.</p> <p>Pedestrian crossing? Do we not have too many of these along the A24 already, slowing flow and adding to congestion times.</p> <p>Signage - not sure in the grand scheme of things if this is the best use of the CIL when there are other more pressing pressures on sustainability of the village and lifestyles for residents.</p>
53	Yes, but I do not see the need for a pedestrian crossing at the Farm Lane/ Bramley Way part of the A24

54	Real time passenger information is a significant positive development. Surrey County Council needs to drive the success of the scheme.
57	Agree with all except for A24 crossing. There is no evidence that this is a PRIORITY, it may be "a nice to have" for a limited no of people but this has to be offset against another set of traffic lights on a busy main road & the air pollution caused by stopping & starting of vehicles, particularly lorries & buses.
59	I agree with most of the proposals but I do not feel that a pedestrian crossing at Farm Lane and Bramley Way are needed since there are islands in the road to make crossing the road easy. I do not agree with spending vast amounts on cycling lanes which are normally ignored by cyclists or to the narrowing of roads for cars which makes congestion worse.
62	An island crossing adjacent to the alley way near the A24 and Greville School which leads to Berry Meade Close and Stonny Croft could be considered.
64	I oppose paved footpaths on our narrow lanes otherwise I agree especially with the crossing for A24 near Bramley Way
67	I would like to see further improvement in bus services, if possible going nearer schools and the railway station.
69	I think all these ideas are great, particularly the idea of better cycling links, safer crossings over the A24 and some public loos!
71	However I cannot see why we are not asking for real time bus information on both sides of The Street. Surely people travel both ways towards Guildford and also towards Epsom from the bus stop in The Street and would welcome information as to how many hours they may need to wait for the next bus on both sides of the road. With the new proposals for Leatherhead I would imagine that more people will want to take the bus to Leatherhead and we should be thinking forward towards this.
74	Re footpaths - presumably people have in mind such roads as Agates and Harriott Lanes. Although dangerous for pedestrians, we cannot see that footpaths along these roads would be practicable. All other suggestions are good.

77	The council has spent thousands on a so called cycleway between Ashted and Leatherhead, but nobody uses it and people continue to cycle on whatever pedestrian footpath is convenient to them
82	I would add: "Resist attempts by Network Rail to close or adversely alter any of the pedestrian rail crossings that presently exist", as these, particularly that at Green Lane, are under threat by the Health & Safety Executive but they provide essential links for the local communities.
84	I suggest that the NDP should be more specific as to the cycle routes and enhanced pedestrian routes that are required, so that future developments can be assessed relative to these specifications.
87	This is an excellent policy addition - whilst so much of the focus is on housing style and character this policy demonstrates the true value of a Neighbourhood Development Plan as it speaks clearly to infrastructure issues (such as pedestrian and cyclist safety) that dominate concerns of Ashted residents.
89	i feel very strongly that there needs to be a crossing over the A24 near Bramley way. I walk my two children to and from school and have to cross this road which is quite frankly dangerous. I have a scooter and pushchair as well. the speed limit should also be slowed to 30 mph along this part of A24. the greville is expanding and we now have the burrow so there are more and more children crossing this very busy road.
93	My preferred location for the much needed pedestrian crossing is opposite the pathway from the A24 to Stonnycroft and the entrance to Ashted Park. The speed limit at this point needs to be reduced to 30 mph.
94	Re pedestrian crossing with traffic lights for A24. Traffic should be 30mph and any crossing should be near Bramley Way and should include extension of of pathway beside bus stop as no space for a group of children to wait or reach in safety.
95	With safe cycling proposal include consideration of safety for pedestrians. Consider development of concept of separation of vehicles and cycles to separation of cycle ways and pedestrians in high volume locations. Also enhance signage of existing cycleways to encourage more usage
98	

	In particular I would support provision of a pedestrian crossing over the A24 at or near the junction of Farm Lane and Bramley Way. You take your life on your hands trying to cross the A24 to access Ashtead Park. Another use of the CIL could be the provision of a bus service to Ashtead station, which might help alleviate the problem of commuter parking in residential streets close to the station.
99	<p>Responded in support with the following negatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Real time bus passenger information- why would this not be on both sides of The Street: this suggestion is made in view of the variety of destinations buses travelling away from Epsom serve. Which authority is responsible for this provision and can CIL receipts be used for this purpose?</li> <li>-Safe cycling routes, provision of A24 pedestrian crossings and signage improvements- are these a Surrey County Council highways responsibility? If so can CIL receipts be directed towards this proposal?</li> </ul> <p>ANF needs to ensure that they, through this plan, are attempting to influence the correct local authority when proposing infrastructure changes.</p>

### Comments on NDP Overall

2	There should be more focus on the higher end of the housing market, similar to the large, high quality houses built in the High Warren development.
5	In the round an excellent piece of work. I commend the team for their efforts and welcome discussion on my comments. neighbourhood committee work is essential and whilst i dont have time to commit myself i applaude those who do. keep up the good work.
6	Developers must not be allowed to ignore conditions attached to planning permission because enforcement is too difficult.
7	Lots of hard work and sweat. Highlights are parking and green space protection. Lowlights are the contradictions of housing policies and vision statement. Is there any room at this stage to consider use of land to south for exercise?
9	This is a very valuable contribution to Ashtead's future and I congratulate those who have made time for and the effort to prepare this plan.
11	I am against any incursion of development into the Green Belt.

12	A thorough piece of work worthy of support.
17	A very well thought through document, my compliments go to the group that constructed it.
18	Please give attention to boundary issues with the wells estate as there is increased link between Ashted community and the wells as the social centre closes on the wells and children attend schools and other facilities in Ashted
21	Very impressed but not surprised; no harm in aspiring to 'paradise' but may be unreachable.
22	I'd have liked an indication at the start of the survey about the number of questions and whether I would be able to access an e copy of my answers
27	I would say that the A24 continues to be a major problem since the cycle lane was built and the level of traffic queuing remains very high in the rush hour.
30	Congratulations and thanks to everyone involved.
32	A great effort.
33	Very detailed plan well thought out.
35	Bus services in the area need improvement but local people need to be persuaded to leave their cars at home. The increasing number of older people in the area could be stranded if they are no longer fit enough to drive and have few bus services available. This makes it important to retain the existing shopping facilities.
36	You have collectively done a lot of work on this, congratulations and thanks.
37	1) Keep all development out of the Green Belt & do not alter Green Belt boundaries. 2) Demand that Surrey CC improve/upgrade road surfaces particularly on Rookery Hill.
38	

	Parking in Ashtead is terrible, People come in from outside areas because it is cheaper to travel from Ashtead, surely a multistorey car park or prices for areas at lower cost to discourage on street parking.
39	Thank you all those who gave up their time to this.
40	Retaining character of Ashtead: 1) Commuter parking is spoiling the character. Many roads (Culverhay, Overdale, Broadhurst, Cray Avenue, Woodfield, Woodfield Close, Meadow Road, part of Links Road, etc.) suffer from this on a daily basis. 2) After April, Ashtead will not have a bank. Not everyone has a computer to bank online, so will need to travel to Epsom/Leatherhead (using a car?). Only 2 ATMs (when they're working).
41	An excellent presentation.
44	Thank you to those involved for their efforts in preparation & communication.
45	With an ageing population and increasing traffic congestion, thought needs to be given to better public transport systems accessible to the elderly.
47	1. There has obviously been a lot of time and effort gone into the plan, which is much appreciated by my wife and I. 2. We realise that everything is likely to change if Britain remains in Europe and the population continues to increase by millions as is happening at present. 3. Paving over of front gardens by non-permeable surfaces should be discouraged to avoid surface flooding.
48	I have learnt a great deal about Ashtead from reading your NDP. May I congratulate you on its production.
51	Yes plenty but the form won't let me say them I will be emailing them today on a word attachment
53	Brilliant job done by the team. Congratulations and thank you for all the hard work. Much appreciated. This is a good plan.
57	Thanks to all involved for their hard work.
58	

	The priority, in my opinion, is to get the Tesco site developed. We've put up with that eyesore too long. The Street will become more downgraded as we will have no banks after April
59	Schools in Ashtead, particularly the Greville Primary school with no consideration for parking for parents cars. Just restricting parking in the region of the school just moves the cars elsewhere and makes it difficult for local residents. There should be temporary parking for parents.
61	Transport related issues do not seem to have been addressed as a priority _ they have the potential to seriously impact other areas of community importance.
62	I agree with more footpaths, as was commented on. some roads in Ashtead don't have paths and makes walking dangerous ie Farm Lane. Many more people would walk to Epsom Downs if there was safe paths for example.
65	You seem to have devised an excellent plan - I hope it goes through.
66	A great start - will be good to see this plan being applied and the results seen on the ground over the coming years
67	Generally I think it is good.
68	Although DFH is new to the area, we both believe that the Draft NDP, as proposed, will enhance the Ashtead area significantly.
69	I think this is a very well thought out and researched document, which I am happy to support. Thank you to everyone who prepared it for their hard work.
71	There is a word limit on each of the comment boxes and if you go over this limit you can carry on typing but you are unable to move on to the next question because you get an error.
72	A very good document - thank you to all who have contributed.
75	Good work!

76	<p>In recent years increases in the number of trains using the railway through Ashtead, and increases in the number of residents living on the 'blind' side of the railway, have substantially increased the road traffic congestion on both sides of the railway crossing. Therefore I think an alternative way should be found, and implemented, for cars to cross the railway without other than via a level-crossing. Consideration could perhaps be given to the following alternatives: a) The installation of a road bridge near the Ashtead railway station; b) The construction of a road connection to the Wells area, which already has a road bridge across the railway.</p>
82	<p>None but to congratulate and thank those who put it together.</p>
83	<p>Statutory Consultee – please see response in Appendix 6.3 of the Consultation Statement.</p>
84	<p>The NDP makes no comment on the status of the various sites that were put forward for possible development in the Green Belt Review. It also does not indicate what might happen if it turns out to be incompatible with the new MV Local Plan when it is developed in 2018 or later.</p>
86	<p>In completing this survey I feel that it is rather biased towards the ageing Ashtead population i.e. the over 65s. I appreciate that it is an incredibly difficult process however and definitely appreciate the time and effort that will have gone in to preparing the NDP - thank you to all those involved. In addition to the policies covered and as this is such a long term plan, I would have liked to have seen more focus on the younger generations requirements and policies that would deal with issues like parking and traffic management in a more detailed way.</p>
87	<p>Except in perhaps a couple of areas mentioned this draft NDP is a testament to the fantastic effort and care taken by those developing it.</p>
88	<p>The aspirations of many living in Ashtead and those who wish to move to Ashtead because of what it is today – will be destroyed by this current NDP proposal. Ashtead going forward under this proposed NDP will evolve to nothing more than a typical rundown suburb of a major city, with associated problems. A Policy in the NDP to cease the loss of existing 1/2/3 bedroom homes by building of extensions would keep the housing needed for downsizing and low paid families available in the village, without resorting to forcing home owners with large gardens to accept out of character homes, etc. The NDP must include a policy to stop the spread of Retirement Homes/Blocks particularly when the Character of Ashtead is visibly degraded, e.g. along Leatherhead Road/A24 which is at risk of being renamed "Death Valley". Similarly a</p>

	<p>NDP policy to stop highly visible Telecommunication Masts destroying the Character of Ashtead must be considered. Bookham Policy BKH2: Infill and garden development. Infill and garden development must respect its context and the green and open character of its surroundings and reflect the prevailing character of the immediate locality. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gaps, between new or extended buildings and each side boundary, should be a minimum of 1 metre or, if gaps in the locality are generally larger, should reflect the existing gaps. Courtyard and terraced development will, however, be permitted where they are consistent with the character of the immediate area.</li> <li>• Provision must be made for the convenient and accessible storage of wheelie bins and cycles.</li> <li>• The height of new homes should be comparable to those in the locality or, where adjacent heights themselves vary, the height of the new homes should not dominate their surroundings. Garden developments will need to demonstrate that the proposals will not cause unacceptable overlooking of neighbouring properties or be overbearing.</li> <li>• In developments where a new access road is to be constructed it must be capable of allowing service and emergency vehicle access to all buildings, with provision of a footway. Access arrangements should not be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring homes or to the character of the area.</li> </ul>
90	An excellent piece of work.
91	It is clear that much hard work has gone into formulating this document and I commend those involved for their efforts.
92	A lot of good work well done.
93	I am very happy for the plan as drafted to go forward to the next stage
96	It has been a tremendous achievement! Also, make clear that Ashtead is opposed to any change in the Green Belt around Ashtead. n the
97	Landowner Consultee – please see letter sent under separate cover in Appendix 5.3 of the Consultation Statement.
98	Ashtead provides less social housing than av. in MV- 8.5% v 13%. Given the housing crisis, it needs to contribute as much as others - not opt out.