

**Our reference:** COM599453412

**Application number:** 2024/0189

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

**Name:** Mrs Reeves

**Address:** Crooklets Main Road Munden Malden, Essex CM9 6PB

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

**Date of comment:** 25 Mar 2024

**Comment:** Re: Objection to planning application 2024/0189 at Heath Buildings High Street Oxshott Leatherhead Surrey KT22 0JP

As a frequent visitor to Oxshott, and knowing the High street very well, I am objecting to planning application 2024/0189, This objection follows a previous objection to the first submission. This is my bullet point summary of objections to the new proposal.

1. The only significant difference between the previously proposed scheme and this new scheme is a different roof form, a very minor change in height, and a slight reduction to the proposed third floor. In essence, there are no major changes to the proposal within the amended scheme (2024/0189) when compared to the previous submission (2023/1026).
2. There is still a loss of net 1 retail unit with no justification provided to support this loss. This is in conflict with Policy CS18, CS10, CS18.
3. The fall-back position (Part 20 Class AB) is NOT A VALID fallback position. If a prior approval PD application was made under Class AB for the drawings proposed it would be refused of amenity, character, parking, and tree impacts as should this submission. This PD fallback position is subject to "prior approval" and, thus, is only a valid fallback if permission has been granted.
4. As there is no PD fall-back position, there is no justification for the proposed size/scale/height. It exceeds the height of the neighbouring building and is a storey larger than the surrounding area/street scene/town centre.
5. The size of trees and drawings are inaccurate with their elevations / relationship misrepresented by ca. 5 metres on the submitted drawings. It is asked that the Council investigate these issues and view letters of support in line with this.
6. Due to the size, scale, height, terraces, and windows proposed; there is still a significant impact on neighbouring amenity which is not overcome by this amended submission