

To: mwcd@surreycc.gov.uk
Subject: Planning Application SCC Ref 2017/0027

Dear Sir/Madam,

[Please supply some intro text stating that you wish to object to this planning application. Then raise those points from the list below (and/or any others!) which you feel most strongly about, rephrasing them in your own words - this is really important because the council will pay much more attention to all emails and letters which are individually authored]

1. The previous revision of this application section 1.12 stated a request to retain the option to construct a stone carriageway, an option which has now been removed. Instead section 17.1 claims "Aluminium trackway panels will be used to create the hardstanding area... This has now been accepted by SCC as a suitable alternative to the use of hardcore". In the minutes from the August 2nd PRC meeting, nowhere does it state that SCC accepted the viability of this approach. On what basis is this claim therefore being made? No additional evidence is presented that has come to light since August 2nd which could lead the applicant to believe they no longer need a stone carriageway option. Their new proposal lacks credibility as a result. The applicant needs to justify fully this new contention, otherwise it simply looks like a cynical attempt to avoid answering the most difficult questions about the viability of the required work in order to get the proposal past the planning committee. Can SCC please confirm that if the aluminium trackway proves unworkable then the applicant will be required to submit a new TMP application to cover the use of a stone carriageway instead? Given the worrying precedent set by recent events at Brockham (involving a party who are also a farmout partner in this development), can SCC categorically assert that no retrospective planning permission will be considered on this matter for any deviations from the proposal?

2. There is no reference to, or acknowledgement of, the recent Tree Preservation Order which pertains to twenty of the most vulnerable trees on Coldharbour Lane. In Appendix 2 Road Width Data, section 4.37 the applicant states their intention to drive the rig up Coldharbour Lane at up to 48kph. In the likely instance that such cavalier behaviour damages all twenty trees, then the applicant would be liable for a fine of £400,000. What additional steps are being taken to avoid violation of the TPO? Can the applicant confirm they have the cash reserves to pay such a fine in the instance that trees are damaged?

3. In section 7.27 and 7.28 the applicant states that they will look to the Police prevent unlawful activity from occurring. However their proposal fails in any way to consider the likely substantial impact from lawful, democratic protest (a right set out in Article 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights) resulting from the applicant's failure in any way to attempt to engage with the local community. They must accept responsibility for the arrogance of their decision not to attempt to secure social license for their plans. As a result of that decision, there are now likely to be substantial additional policing costs for this operation which would otherwise have been avoidable, and the applicant cannot simply be allowed to offload those costs onto the tax payer.

[Please supply some concluding text, emphasising why the application should be rejected.]

best regards

[Name]

[Full Address/Postcode - N.B. this must be included]