Dear Mr Banks,

Thank you for your reply to our question, please see the following statements/comments for the attention of Mr Lewis with regard to the above mentioned subject. We hope that they meet with the requirement and we have endeavoured to be as concise as possible.

In response to:

Matter 1.1.7
Following on from Reg 18 and 19 consultations there remains massive local objection and lack of support to the proposal of a Garden Community at South Godstone, it is quite clear that the Council have chosen to ignore feedback objecting to the proposal from both consultations.

Matter 6.6.2
The proposal for a Garden Community at South Godstone does not meet the Government guideline of being a stand alone settlement. It is clearly an extension of an existing settlement. The Council consistently denied this until recently when it was admitted by the Chairman of the Council Planning Policy Committee to be true, looking to increase the size of the village of South Godstone by approximately 7 times.

Matter 6.6.7
The infrastructure delivery plan is inaccurate and flawed. With reference to proposed changes to Junction 6 of the M25 the Council somehow managed to get a revised costing down from 200 million pounds to 20 million pounds at the last Planning Policy Committee meeting it held before deciding to submit for inspection.

The Council had stated on many occasions that the proposal for a Garden Community at South Godstone was wholly reliant on upgrades to the existing railway station and the services running through it. None of these upgrades/changes are fully costed and/or agreed by contract with the necessary providers, and are highly unlikely to be, thereby negating the Councils proposal.

The Councils own road/traffic survey returned results stating that changes to certain major road junctions on the A22 put forward by the Council could result in a 1456% increase in traffic delays. This figure was obtained from a survey that neglected traffic from other significant roads joining the
A22 being considered, and as such makes false representation of the true traffic flows and congestion experienced daily.

We have numerous other concerns that we will not address in this response because we consider that these will be covered by representations made in person at the enquiry by objectors acting on our behalf.

We will send you paper copy as requested.

Regards
Colin and Linda Anderson.