

**Our reference:** COM593482501

**Application number:** 2024/0189

**Application address:** Heath Buildings, High Street, Oxshott, Leatherhead, KT22 0JW

**Name:** Mrs Krause

**Address:** Vale Cottage Oakshade Road, Oxshott, Leatherhead, Surrey, KT22 0LE

**Comment type:** You object to the planning application

**Date of comment:** 07 Mar 2024

**Comment:** I thought that I had been struck by a severe case of 'deja vu' upon reading the proposal filed under 2024/0189. I was sure I had seen these before and believed that the council had rejected the proposal at the previous time of asking. A review of the portal confirmed that I was not mistaken. See 2023/1026.

Here is my position on the current proposal: Whilst I am supportive of efforts to upgrade the appearance of the current building, I object to the recent proposals on the following grounds:

1. The modern style of the proposed development will significantly disrupt the residential character of the village, which many in the area are keen to maintain;
2. The planned encroachment on the existing open space in front of the buildings will impair pedestrian safety even more than is currently the case, particularly for wheelchair and pushchair users;
3. The scale of the proposed development is excessive and will dwarf the surrounding buildings. Extending the height of the building will turn the high street into a wind tunnel, even more than it is at the moment. This despite the recent designation - but not enforcement of - the road as a 20mph zone.
4. Preserving the trees and plants which surround the existing building should be a priority, especially due to the known flood risks down Oakshade road, caused by numerous recent developments. The council will have reams of paperwork and bills to confirm this;
5. Increasing the residential capacity of the property will lead to an increase in road traffic and cars associated with the property. The proposed parking arrangements will remain insufficient, which will lead to additional traffic chaos in Oakshade and Silverdale roads. These areas are already congested - read dangerous - due to the location of three schools in the area, none of which are served by buses, given the age of the children. Since the last time this proposal was raised, a speed limit of 20mph has been introduced in the area – further proof of the risk to death/injury on the local road.
6. The likelihood of the basement development causing subsidence and other threats to the structural integrity of surrounding buildings must not be underestimated.
7. Losing the three car spaces in front of the current building will have a negative impact on the shops in the village, with passing cars much more likely to drive on through to either Cobham or Ashted for a coffee break, to pick up a prescription or to visit a deli.
8. The scale of the proposed development (e.g. groundwork and subsequent construction) is likely to disrupt traffic on the A244, Oakshade Road and Steels Lane not just significantly, but also for an extended period of time. The council holds extensive evidence of the level of through-traffic resulting from incidents on the M25. A problem which does not need further exacerbation.
- 9 The council also has evidence of vermin infestations caused by similar developments at the top of Oakshade Road. A phenomenon which is likely to occur again, should a development of this

scale proceed.

As I said above, fixing up the existing building will certainly showcase the developer and his team's commitment to uphold Oxshott's character in a way in which the residents will appreciate. The proposed development does not serve the community and, I dare say, the comments above provide significant evidence of this sentiment.

I am also concerned that the lack of public consultation, and the key stakeholders' efforts to resort to obfuscation in the face of questions regarding the development, do not speak favourable of the team's intentions to work alongside the residents on the development of this proposal.

One more thing....how many times would a developer be allowed to waste public funds by spuriously recycling previously rejected proposals and applications i.e. paying no heed to any of the recommendations made by the planning officers in earlier rounds?

Surely, with council finances in the state they are in all over the country, there comes a point where the officer's "no" means "no". The developer would showcase its credentials as a responsible citizen by stop abusing council resources - time and money and expertise which could rather be spent on outcomes which meet the needs and wants of the community, not line the pockets of the few.