<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIQ number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Cross reference to TLAG representations</th>
<th>TLAG response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6.1</td>
<td>Is the approach that the specific details of the proposed Garden Community would be determined through an Area Action Plan (APP) effective and is it clearly justified to address these matters in an additional development plan document?</td>
<td>Para 4.65</td>
<td>Certain matters of planning policy in relation to housing development - such as design, specific details of community facilities, open space, landscaping etc - are entirely appropriate to defer to a future Area Action Plan (AAP) – to provide specific policies or guidance which relate to a particular location. Strategic matters or those fundamental to the suitability of a site for development, however, cannot be deferred to a later date. An AAP should guide how something should be developed, not whether it is appropriate to develop it in the first place. For example, it is impossible to make a proper assessment of the deliverability of the South Godstone garden community without detailed consideration of whether ‘exceptional circumstances’ exist to fully justify Green Belt release. What happens if, five to ten years down the line, TDC fail to find, when preparing their AAP, that exceptional circumstances exist and that level of housing cannot be delivered? It would completely undermine the Local Plan and leave Tandridge with next to no planned housing delivery during the latter part of the plan period. As we noted in our response to Q2.16, the recent North Essex Authorities Strategic Plan Examination firmly established that, in specific relation to new garden communities, it is the role of the strategic plan to determine the soundness of the allocation and any future plans or guidance to deal only with matters of detail. As we also said in response to Q2.16, this cannot be resolved through new retrospective evidence. These are considerations that are central to the determination of the entire spatial strategy. TLAG consider that the inspector has no option but to conclude that the deferral of these strategic matters to a future AAP automatically means that the test of effectiveness has been failed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6.2</td>
<td>Was the broad location for the proposed Garden Community selected on a robust basis?</td>
<td>Paras 3.39 – 3.56 Paras 3.30 – 3.31 and 4.38-4.39</td>
<td>TLAG address, in our response to Q3.1 (and throughout our regulation 19 representations), the flawed spatial strategy, which relies on a garden community making more of a contribution to meeting housing needs than even the district’s main existing urban areas. If it is determined that a garden community is required - which</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
we do not accept - South Godstone is clearly not an appropriate location and has been selected through a flawed selection process. Flaws in the rationale behind the decision-making process include:

1. The Sustainability Appraisal process undertaken by TDC has not led to robust and informed decision making (see paras 3.39 – 3.56 of our regulation 19 representations);
2. The comparative analysis of alternative garden village locations in the SA applies an imbalanced scoring system which scores South Godstone higher than the Redhill Aerodrome site for no clear reason. South Godstone for example, is scored as a (+) for employment whereas Redhill Aerodrome scores a (-). This is evidently flawed given a) the conclusions of the Economic Needs Assessment which concluded that a garden village at Redhill Aerodrome would be the best from a commercial perspective and b) the conclusions of the Tandridge Strategic Economic Assessment (TSEA, Nov 2018) that there would be a high level of out commuting by residents at South Godstone. We consider this comparative analysis in detail at paragraph 4.112 of our representations.
3. The alternative location at Redhill Aerodrome contains previously developed and brownfield land. TDC is under a strong policy compulsion to prioritise development on such land – yet it was given very little weight (the SA scoring it ‘neutral’).
4. The garden community is not locally supported. Such support is one of the key requirements of new settlements to Garden Town principles. In addition to the very strong opposition at Reg 18 Stage (Garden Village consultation, as referred to in our Reg 19 rep’s) we have recently analyzed a large representative sample of the Reg 19 responses, which shows that over 95% of respondents think the local plan fails the various tests of soundness.
5. TDC place great emphasis on the role of the train station to demonstrate the sustainability of the South Godstone site, but it might as well not be there. Business workers (which the Council says will be most of the working residents) will drive to stations with direct links to London, such as Oxted, Hurst Green or Lingfield. TDC have been clear that they would only support South Godstone if there are considerable upgrades to the rail service but, as addressed in the attached paper by industry expert Mike Crane (Appendix 1), those are not going to happen.
6. The sustainability of the site also relies on significant amounts of employment going there. This will not be realised in any significant quantum, not least because office development there is not financially viable and even the council’s own documents acknowledge this.
7. TDC has failed to demonstrate any meaningful cooperation with neighbouring authorities, both in terms of the duty to seek to meet unmet need, and with Reigate & Banstead with regard to Redhill Aerodrome.

In the absence of a robust decision making process, or where unrealistic assumptions have been made about whether the location is sustainable, South Godstone fails all four tests of soundness.
Q6.3  Is the proposed broad location in a suitable location for housing development?

TLAG have, throughout our regulation 19 representations, and these responses, demonstrated why South Godstone is not a suitable location for large scale housing development. In summary:

1. Need for a garden community – TLAG do not consider that any garden community is needed. There are appropriate alternatives which direct development to the main existing urban settlements.
2. Presence of alternatives - even if it is considered that a garden community is necessary, there is a significantly more suitable location at Redhill Aerodrome, which has been discounted by TDC.
3. Sustainability – the choice of South Godstone for the garden community has been founded on a number of flawed assumptions, especially the role of Godstone train station, the ability to attract employment to the garden community and the delivery of key infrastructure.
4. Deliverability – the NPPF is clear that there must be a reasonable prospect that planned infrastructure is deliverable in a timely fashion. As demonstrated in our regulation 19 representations there must be huge doubt over the funding and delivery of the proposed infrastructure which mean that the plan cannot be considered sound.
5. Land availability – significant parts of the broad area may not be available for development – see Q6.6 below.
6. Viability – TDC’s estimates of infrastructure costs are not credible. TLAG have, through our representations and in response to Q6.7 below, highlighted numerous unfounded assumptions, variances and uncertainties.
7. Local support – a garden community at South Godstone does not have the support of the local community, which is crucial to the delivery of sustainable development and Garden Town principles.
8. Green Belt release – TDC have not sought to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist to modify the Green Belt boundary. TLAG have, through our representations, demonstrated that such an assessment would fail, because densities in urban areas have not been optimised, the spatial strategy is flawed and there has been no serious attempt to negotiate with neighbouring authorities.
9. Landscape value – the area of search at South Godstone contains an Area of Great Landscape Value and is in close proximity to the Surrey Hills AONB candidate area. The Council’s own LVIA from 2016 identified a high ridge of land within the area of search south of the railway, south of which there should be no development.
10. Cultural heritage – TDC have not taken into consideration important heritage assets at South Godstone (see below).

In summary, the proposed location at South Godstone is entirely unsuitable for large scale housing development. There are clearly preferable alternatives, primarily through a more appropriate spatial strategy, or at Redhill Aerodrome if a garden community were to be considered necessary.
| Q6.4 | How was the proposed broad location defined and is the defined extent justified? | TLAG have no particular comment with regard to the specific boundaries of the defined broad area as our objections are to the principle of a new garden community anywhere in the district. We do, however, have a major concern over Taylor Wimpey’s proposal to extend the Area of Search southwards to take in their Blindley Heath scheme. Blindley Heath has even more constraints to development than South Godstone, including a SSSI and lack of control over land ownership east of the A22. It is imperative that the Area of Search is not so extended should the Inspector agree that South Godstone cannot deliver the housing numbers proposed. |
| Q6.5 | How has the identification of the proposed broad location taken into account the significance of designated and non-designated historic heritage assets. Where is the evidence that the Council has identified and assessed the particular significance of heritage assets within or outwith the defined area of search where their significance may be harmed through development within their settings? | TDC have not taken into consideration important heritage assets at South Godstone. At the heart of the Area of Search is Lagham Manor, a scheduled ancient Monument, around which a significant exclusion zone will be needed.

The Park Pale, the best preserved example in Surrey of a medieval deer park, broadly encircles the Area of Search and there is a significant danger of irreparable damage to it if the GC went ahead.

Ancient woodland would also be threatened. All these concerns are covered in our Reg 19 rep's.

Failure to consider key heritage assets is another example of the lack of robustness in the decision-making process. |
| Q6.6 | Is there evidence that land within the proposed broad location would not be available for development? | Paras 4.89-4.90

Significant parts of the broad area may not be available for development. South of the railway line and east of the A22 there are over 350 small plots in fragmented ownership as a result of a land scam some 15 years ago. Use of CPO powers would be the only realistic way of assembling these, but this would be onerous and unusual.

Elsewhere, many landowners have indicated that their land is not for sale and they would resist any attempt to CPO them, and have written to say this. See selection of letters in Appendix 2.

To further complicate matters, there is no single promoter for the scheme and, as far as we are aware, no land equalisation agreements. The council’s own advice from Avison Young acknowledges that the multiple interests, options etc from different promoters would require significant resources to address.

Other constraints to development would preclude large parcels of land from being developed, including the two key heritage assets referred to in para 6.5. There are also several pockets of ancient woodland within the Area of Search which would need to be protected by exclusion zones. |
Furthermore, in the very south of the Area of Search there is a large tract of land that should not be built upon at all as it sits south of the high ridge beyond identified in the council’s own LVIA from 2016 makes it clear that development would not be appropriate. This should mean a large tract of land being removed from the Area of Search. See extracts from the LVIA below.

9.4 OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS FOR DEVELOPMENT

Opportunities for development
There is a substantial area of land contained by the railway and high ground to the south of the existing village. The high ground to the south, together with the large block of woodland on its south facing slopes, could provide a substantial and robust landscape feature which could form the basis of an extension boundary for future development.

The A22 corridor would provide a logical boundary to development to the west of the study area, the small scale and contained landscape beyond the road would not be suitable for further development. To the east, the trend character of Tandridge Down in association with the high ground around Lagham Lodge Farm, could provide a robust boundary to new development south of the railway line.

The landscape character area within the study area, south of the railway is undesignated landscape. It is well contained in the wider landscape, by high ground to the south and the wooded character of the railway line to the north. The internal landscape structure is limited with a poorly defined hedgerow structure. There are small blocks of woodland within the site (some Ancient Woodland) which along with the remaining hedgerows could form a basis for the structuring of land parcels for residential and open space land uses.

Land to the north of the study area is open and exposed and forms the setting to the village, to accommodate the required residential area south of the railway this land would be required for open space land uses. There could be pedestrian access to this land under the railway. Using the Park Pake as a northern boundary would assist the definition of Park Pake as a landscape feature providing a distinction between proposed land uses.

The land south of the railway is adjacent to a railway station and bus services. Tandridge Down provides an additional north-south link to the A22 corridor. A potential pedestrian link is available through the camp on the sea. There are existing services and infrastructure in South Godstone.

Constraints to development
The railway segregates the existing village from any proposed extension to the settlement to the south. Access to, and permeability with, the existing village would be limited to two or three points along the railway corridor. Services and retail opportunities would need to be developed in separate local centres.

Currently Lagham Manor and its Moat are set within a heavily wooded setting. However the buildings, moat and historic connections with the surrounding land are a significant constraint to development and the setting of these assets needs detailed consideration. The wider setting and the context of the Park Pake and historic deer park should be considered alongside the potential land uses.

There are areas of Ancient woodland within the potential development area which may become isolated. Linkage with outlying woodland would need further consideration.

The site frontage onto the A22 is constrained by the containing topography and the location of Lagham Manor to the south and the railway bridge to the north.
Q6.7 Is there sufficient evidence in regard to possible infrastructure requirements to suggest that there is a reasonable prospect that homes could be built at the proposed Garden Community in the Plan period as set out in the Paras 4.80-4.88

Paras 4.80-4.88 There are many question marks over the deliverability of key infrastructure requirements, with details remaining incredibly vague at this stage. For example:

- the lack of any certainty over upgrading Junction 6 given the very early stage of discussions with Highways England
- on completion of the delayed works to upgrade Junction 10 of the M25 (estimated to finish in 2022) there will then be a 5 year moratorium on any major works on this stretch of the M25, taking even a
Plan’s trajectory? Points to consider include:

- Any necessary improvements to Junction 6 of the M25;
- Any necessary improvements to the A22;
- Any necessary improvements to South Godstone Railway Station;
- Whether the infrastructure requirements have been sufficiently considered and costed so as to inform the high-level viability of the proposal?
- Whether there are any infrastructure requirements which would mean that the site could not be viably developed at the point envisaged?

start date for any works at Jn 6 to 2027 at the earliest

- the railway line (Redhill to Tonbridge) will not make this scheme viable.
- the level of employment land required to make the garden community anywhere near self-sustaining is completely unrealistic.
- the extensive land assembly required would inevitably lead to a complex and lengthy CPO process.

TLAG has already commented extensively on TDC's Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) dated July 2018 in our regulation 19 response. However, through subsequent consultation TDC made substantive changes to the IDP that was then submitted for Inspection. In addition, TDC have published an Infrastructure Map showing the major items of infrastructure required with further differences in costs from the January IDP submitted to the Inspector. These discrepancies are deeply worrying for a plan that is meant to be ‘infrastructure led’.

The Financial Viability Assessment for the proposed Garden Community at South Godstone submitted to the Inspector is completely dependent upon and sensitive to the projected infrastructure costs and yet, incredibly, it used different costings to either of the above documents. The level of change and uncertainty in TDC’s estimates for the infrastructure costs mean it would be unsound to rely on this viability assessment and this analysis simply isn’t credible.

Some examples:

- In the Viability assessment the 100 H green space is costed at £15M whereas it is £28.6M in the Jan 2019 IDP, nearly double the amount.
- In the Viability assessment the creation of high-quality green corridors throughout the broad location, with the aim to improve water quality is costed at £15M, whereas in the Jan 2019 IDP it shows as £30M, double the amount.
- In the Infrastructure Map the Copthorne Junction upgrade cost is increased from £1.25M to £6M and now allocated against the Garden Village. The internal “spine” road is now shown at £20M having previously been un-costed altogether.
- The Infrastructure Map omits £63M from the Jan 2019 IDP (including the 100 Hectares of green space and the green corridor). Yet it puts the total estimated cost of the Garden Village infrastructure in the range £185M - £200M. The council’s sums simply don’t add up.
- In the Jan 2019 IDP the J6 improvements costs have been dramatically reduced from £200M to £20M which is simply not credible. This huge decrease is based upon TDC’s consultant’s (DHA) recent report on M25 Junction 6 which carries the rider “At this early stage, and without the benefit of the topographical survey, utilities plans etc. it is not possible to provide a firm indication of the likely capital cost of the final scheme.”
The “sensitivity analysis” (p31 of GVA’s report) shows all but one scenario as viable. However, if the infrastructure costs are higher than the figures they have used then all the scenarios turn to red i.e. by their own methodology the Garden village becomes “not viable”. And this is with affordable housing at just 25%, not a higher, more aspirational target, as should be sought.

In addition to these uncertainties over costings there are a number of critical Garden Village infrastructure items not even costed in the Jan 19 IDP or the earlier viability analysis, including flood risk assessment and alleviation. These alone could kill the viability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6.8</th>
<th><strong>When would the proposed Garden Community realistically deliver the first homes? What is the realistic rate of delivery which should be assumed?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Para 4.75 | TLAG are concerned that the proposed Garden Community at South Godstone is based on a number of flawed or un-evidenced assumptions with regard to deliverability and viability, with most meaningful details deferred to a later Area Action Plan. It is therefore neither sound nor realistic to include this proposal as a key element of the Council’s future housing delivery strategy.

TLAG do not consider the South Godstone Garden Community to be deliverable in the plan period as there is no commercial interest or a promoter/developer, there is a significant gap between the envisaged costs and the residual land value and there is no certainty when the required upgrades to junction 6 of the M25 can be delivered. There is significant doubt regarding how the infrastructure for the site is to be financed.

Further, the Neame Sutton and Lichfield reports referred to in our other rep’s conclude that housing delivery cannot start at South Godstone before 2027 at the earliest and that the rate of building will be much lower than TDC estimate. They conclude that at best it can provide 683 homes during the plan period, not the 1400 proposed. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6.9</th>
<th><strong>Given the affordable housing need identified for the HMA, is it effective to leave the definition of a target for affordable housing to the AAP?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Para 4.87</td>
<td>It is not appropriate to leave definition of an affordable housing target until an AAP. The level of affordable housing that can be provided is entirely dependent on viability and this is far from certain. Without absolute clarity on viability, affordable levels cannot be determined, and this must not be left to sometime in the future. And as it stands, TDC are only targeting a very disappointing 25% affordable provision whereas the competing scheme at Redhill Aerodrome would provide a higher level of affordable, as well as keyworker housing and PRS units as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1

Expert evidence and correspondence from Mike Crane regarding Godstone Station and the Redhill-Tonbridge railway line
Introduction

The Redhill to Tonbridge railway line was opened in 1836 and electrified in 1993. Passenger train services are currently operated by GTR (Govia Thameslink Railway). The line runs from Redhill via stations at Nutfield, Godstone, Edenbridge, Penshurst and Leigh to Tonbridge. It is 19 miles long and after an initial curve just outside Redhill station runs completely straight to Tonbridge with no spurs from it to any other line.

Rail Services

GTR use Class 377 Electrostar rolling stock on this line which are predominately 4 car units although it should be noted that very occasionally 8 car units are also be used. Although 8 car units are longer than the platforms at several stations on the route (including Godstone) they can be used safely because the Electrostars are fitted with a device called “Selective Door Opening” which means the driver can isolate the door opening mechanism on those carriages not aligned with the platform. In such cases it is necessary for the guard to make prior announcements such that passengers know which carriages to avoid when joining the train.

The line has seen a gradual but steady decline in both reliability and availability of services over the last 20 years or so. These may be summarised as:-

- Cessation of all direct services to both London Victoria and London Bridge following the May 2018 timetable changes.
- Removal of Nutfield, Godstone, Penshurst and Leigh from the last evening train between Redhill and Tonbridge in 2017.
- Direct stopping services from Kent to Gatwick Airport via this line were removed altogether in 2008 when franchise responsibility switched from Southeastern to what was then Southern.
• Although specific punctuality figures for this route are not readily available, it is widely considered to be the worst performing route within the worst performing franchise in the south of England.

• In January 2019, Tom Tugendhat (MP for Tonbridge) raised in the House of Commons why, on December 30th 2018, of the 36 trains advertised to run, only 12 actually did so.

• Throughout 2018, the still largely unresolved “role of the guard” dispute between GTR and the RMT Union meant that GTR sacrificed many services on this route in order to keep the more lucrative Brighton main line services running.

Following the removal of direct services to London last year, the train paths north of Redhill previously occupied by those services, have been swallowed up by the more commercially viable main line services running from Brighton, Horsham and Reigate. It is highly unlikely that either the train operator (whoever that is) or Network Rail would wish to see direct London services introduced on this route again because of the negative knock-on effect upon services on the Brighton main line, particularly at East Croydon. The Government has made a massive multi billion pound investment in providing a fast and reliable Thameslink service from Brighton as far north as Bedford and it is inconceivable that they would put that investment at risk in allowing trains originating on the Tonbridge – Redhill line to potentially block the main line.

Liaison between Tandridge District Council and the Rail Industry

According to some leading members of Tandridge District Council, the primary reason for selecting South Godstone as the site for a garden village was the availability of the railway station. Keith Jecks (Chairman of the Planning Policy Committee at TDC) has gone on record that “he could not support the garden village being built in South Godstone if it meant people in that settlement having to get into their cars and driving to another station”. Since those statements were made by him and other senior Councillors, the line has seen further service deterioration leading to the conclusion that, should the garden village go ahead, commuters will be forced into their cars and will lead to the sustainability issues that Councillors maintain they did not wish to create.

TDC’s original developer for the garden village, Bonnar Allan and their planning (Lichfields) and transport (Stilwell) consultants attended a meeting with GTR on 3rd May 2017 on behalf of TDC to discuss the possibility of them improving rail services in the light of the garden village. At that meeting the Bonnar Allan representatives conjured up an entirely spurious figure of 25,000 new homes (9,000 at Leigh, 11,000 at Edenbridge and 5,000 at South Godstone) over the entire route in order to tempt GTR. Even so, GTR made it quite clear that they could see no commercial case for improving the service on this route or for re-introducing direct services to London. They also made it clear in their written response that “Network Rail had no medium or long term plans to introduce infrastructure interventions over the route”.

It would appear that senior members of TDC have had meetings with Network Rail but given the lack of any positive messages emanating from them and the fact that Network Rail have no provision either within their current or future financial control periods to provide any meaningful infrastructure upgrades on this line, one can only assume that Network Rail have provided a similar non-committal response to them as that offered by GTR. Indeed, there are no planned infrastructure improvements referred to in their Route Development Strategy which addresses their current Control Period 6 (to 2023) and 7 (to 2027).
Commercial viability of the route

In 2008, as Commercial Development Manager at Southeastern, I played a key and successful role in persuading the Department for Transport that the Redhill to Tonbridge line would be better placed within what was then the Southern franchise. This was a decision made on purely commercial grounds as there simply was not enough patronage on this route to make it viable for us to continue operating. At that time, both the Department for Transport and the train operator were seriously thinking of stopping ALL non-peak services on the line such was this poor level of patronage. The fact that the line remains open has perhaps more to do with its value as a diversionary route when the Southeastern main line between Tonbridge and London is undergoing maintenance works than any place it may have in future rail development strategy.

The GTR franchise is scheduled to terminate in September 2021 whilst the long running debacle over what will happen with the Southeastern franchise which was due to cease 18 months ago goes on. The reality is that the Government, along with most of the companies involved in the industry recognise that the current rail franchising model is not fit for purpose. Last year the Government commissioned Keith Williams to look into this and a white paper is expected in the Autumn. At the same time the Commons Public Accounts Committee have stated that the Department for Transport’s management of GTR through their franchise has been “completely inadequate”.

There will therefore be changes to the way train services are managed in future. One of the key changes that Keith Williams has alluded to prior to the white paper being issued is that there has to be a higher level of commercial sustainability in future arrangements. All of this tends to suggest that there is likely to be more, not less pressure on the Tonbridge to Redhill line such that it could ultimately be fortunate to survive intact.

The table below shows the footfall figures issued by the ORR (Office of Rail and Road) for most stations, irrespective of their line of route, within a 12 mile radius of the proposed garden village site. Figures for 2016-17 and 2017-18 are shown. It can be seen that in the year 2017/18 a total of 484,414 passengers used the 5 stations between Tonbridge and Redhill. This is the equivalent of 663 a day. A four carriage 377 Electrostar has a total capacity for 393 passengers so it can be seen that of the 64 trains that are programmed to run on this route each weekday, there are less than 2 full train’s worth of passengers. Even with a garden village at South Godstone, these figures will not come anywhere near to generating a sufficiently robust business case for either service or infrastructure improvements. It should also be remembered that of the 663 passengers using these services on average each day, a high proportion will be schoolchildren accessing the excellent schools at Tonbridge. These scholars will be travelling on heavily discounted fares thus further eroding any business case for the line.

Sustainability Issues

The very low footfall figures shown in the table below for stations on the Tonbridge to Redhill line are primarily a result of passengers wishing to access the fast, reliable service elsewhere. The footfall levels for the five stations on this route are simply commercially unsustainable against the 64 trains that are scheduled to run daily and with a new commercial emphasis being brought to the future rail franchising model, the line may well struggle to survive let alone have its services expanded.
Why for example does Lingfield station (on a different route) have a footfall level almost eight times higher than Godstone station when the surrounding population is 1,500 less than that at Godstone? Again, Woldingham station is another case in point as it has over 4 times the footfall of Godstone station with only a third of the population. The numbers are obviously superficially inflated by commuters living in the surrounding villages such as Godstone who in most cases travel to the station of their choice by car.

### TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>2016/17 Footfall</th>
<th>2017/18 Footfall</th>
<th>Ratio of Population</th>
<th>Direct Services</th>
<th>Journey Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>2,673</td>
<td>78,296 (107)</td>
<td>84,096 (115)</td>
<td>1 : 4.3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>59 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>5,949</td>
<td>58,346 (79)</td>
<td>66,190 (91)</td>
<td>1 : 1.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>65 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>8,907</td>
<td>241,344 (331)</td>
<td>257,530 (353)</td>
<td>1 : 3.9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>71 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penshurst</td>
<td>1,628</td>
<td>31,894 (43)</td>
<td>34,854 (48)</td>
<td>1 : 2.9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>78 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>44,358 (61)</td>
<td>41,744 (57)</td>
<td>1 : 3.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>82 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Grinstead</td>
<td>26,383</td>
<td>1,437,882 (1,969)</td>
<td>1,514,562 (2,074)</td>
<td>1 : 7.9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormans</td>
<td>1,931</td>
<td>111,430 (153)</td>
<td>111,060 (152)</td>
<td>1 : 7.9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>4,467</td>
<td>573,218 (785)</td>
<td>546,656 (749)</td>
<td>1 : 16.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>11,314</td>
<td>1,533,336 (2,100)</td>
<td>1,571,614 (2,152)</td>
<td>1 : 19.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woldingham</td>
<td>2,141</td>
<td>289,339 (396)</td>
<td>306,498 (420)</td>
<td>1 : 19.6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge Town</td>
<td>8,907</td>
<td>253,354 (347)</td>
<td>270,344 (370)</td>
<td>1 : 4.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55 mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

- **Population:** Figures provided from 2011 Government census (Godstone includes South Godstone)
- **Footfall 2016/17:** Annual and daily passenger numbers for the year 2016/17 provided by the ORR.
- **Footfall 2017/18:** Annual and daily passenger numbers for the year 2017/18 provided by the ORR.
- **Ratio of Population:** Ratio of daily passengers against population.
- **Direct Services:** Whether station has a direct line service to London (no changes)
- **Journey Time:** Average peak journey time to London Bridge (incl changes). In the case of Redhill to Tonbridge line stations, journey times are all via Redhill.
I have checked with GTR’s car parking consultants, Saba Parking who confirm that the majority of car parks operating in this area including those at Oxted and Lingfield operate at full capacity most weekdays. Interestingly, Godstone station which has a small car park and is free always has spaces available further demonstrating that passengers are not interested in using this rail service.

The unavoidable result demonstrated by these figures is that large numbers of commuters are already traveling in their cars to access railway stations away from their homes. Construction of a garden village in South Godstone will further exacerbate this situation to an unmanageable level.

**Conclusion**

The line between Tonbridge and Redhill which now operates as little more than a shuttle service is in terminal decline. The exceptionally low levels of patronage mean that hard fought for funding will be targeted by Network Rail and future train operators at other key routes in the South East in order to protect investment that has already been made.

Even aspirations to run services from Kent (possibly Ashford) through to Gatwick are unlikely to yield the route upgrade that passengers would need to attract them back to the line. Any such upgrade (which is not even on the radar currently) would in all likelihood see trains leave Tonbridge on this line but branch off toward Gatwick once past Edenbridge to achieve a faster route to the airport that bypasses Redhill (this was in fact the preferred route of the ill-fated HS4AIR proposal that the Government rejected earlier this year). Such a project would leave Godstone and Nutfield stations even more isolated.

I believe the above evidence demonstrates that Godstone station will never be capable of generating a sufficiently robust train service to London to attract travellers and commuters in reasonable numbers. The result will undoubtedly be that other local stations and the roads leading to them will become inundated with traffic resulting in an infrastructure nightmare.

Mike Crane
David Hughes

From: Michael Crane
Sent: 02 September
To: David Hughes
Subject: FW: Local Plan

David

An interesting exchange of views between myself and Keith Jeck’s lackey on the Council, Mark Bristow. I particularly like Mr Bristow’s assertion that a Travel Inn over the top of Godstone station within its air rights is a workable idea (I’d love to see that business case). This and reference to other stations that have no relevance to the Godstone scenario I believe, show how flawed TDC’s thinking has been in respect of the railway.

Best regards

Mike

From: Michael Crane
Sent: 23 September 2018 14:20
To: Mark Bristow <mbristow@tandridge.gov.uk>
Cc: Cllr Keith Jecks <Cllr.keith.jecks@tandridgedc.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Local Plan

Mark

Many thanks for your detailed response outlining current Council thinking behind rail services at Godstone which was much appreciated.

I am sure that it will come as no surprise to you when I say that although I can understand some of the underlying logic of your reasoning, I fundamentally disagree with the conclusions you have reached. The problem that the vast majority of Tandridge residents have is that nearly all of the Council’s infrastructure plans within the local plan are aspirational but they are being presented by Councillors through the media as facts and this is a very misleading and dangerous strategy. Other people have more knowledge than myself when it comes to addressing the flawed road infrastructure elements of the local plan so I will not comment upon these here but I do have considerable experience in the rail industry having worked as Director for First Great Western Link and for eight years before I retired in 2016 as Commercial Development Manager at SouthEastern Trains where I was responsible for securing funding for and delivering very large station development schemes.

I would therefore comment on the points raised in your email as follows:-

- You are probably correct in saying that the decline in patronage at Godstone station will be attributable in some measure to the "role of the guard" strikes that took place at this time. The decline in patronage at other affected GTR stations however was not so acutely felt. For example, Horsham (-10.1%), Reigate (-9.5%) and Redhill (-4.8%) did not come anywhere near the 25% decline that Godstone experienced. The combined effect of losing the last stopping service of the day, the TOCs habit of cutting Nutfield, Godstone and Penshurst out of its stopping pattern when the service was running late (to avoid DfT fines for arriving at its destination more than 5 minutes
late) and the general appalling punctuality of the service were much more influential factors and further show how the line is not prioritised within the industry. It must be remembered that the figures we are discussing were all recorded prior to the direct London services being withdrawn so patronage at Godstone station is now likely to be significantly below the 80 passengers a day recorded in 2017.

- I disagree that development of the line would be based upon 25,000 new homes throughout the line of route. Any new homes built east of Edenbridge, ie at Penshurst or Leigh would result in commuters taking the train to Tonbridge for direct London services to London Bridge, Waterloo and Charing Cross and additional housing at Edenbridge would result in the majority of commuters using the faster direct services from Edenbridge Town station. So, in reality it would only be homes constructed at Godstone and Nutfield that would contribute to the argument for upgrading the line from its current shuttle service status and I can tell you categorically that 4,000 homes would not do this.
- Like you I am aware of the constraints imposed by the rail network at Windmill Junction and indeed the entire area around East Croydon station. There is no doubt that Network Rail will seek funding to help address this within their Financial Control Period 6 so any such improvements are probably six years away at best. Irrespective of the timing, do you honestly believe that any new train paths opened up as a result of that expenditure will be allocated to services originating on the Tonbridge to Redhill line with its level of footfall? Those paths will be swallowed up by services from Brighton, Horsham, Reigate, Gatwick Airport and Haywards Heath which have genuine growth potential.
- As you have alluded to, Network Rail’s role in the rail industry put simply is to provide rail track and stations to the train operators for them to provide train services. No-one knows who the train operator over this route will be post 2021 so the strategy of approaching the DfT to include additional services into a new franchise agreement is the sensible approach but the DfT will be mindful of the constraints involved and for the reasons described under the previous bullet point are highly likely to exclude them.
- I am not sure of the relevance of the two stations you have referred to in your response, particularly if you feel they somehow justify your plans for Godstone station. It is true that Cranbrook station has been placed reasonably close to a new housing development but its primary purpose is to serve the development of Exeter Airport which is only two miles away and the numbers shown reflect that. Aylesbury Vale Parkway station is, as its name implies a parkway station facility outside of any town but serving the ancient settlement of Aylesbury on what is the highest performing train operator route in the country. I cannot see how the rationale for these two constructions can in any way be used to justify a new station at Godstone and neither will any developer.
- Are you honestly telling me that it is your intention to "flip" the station and construct either offices or a travel inn in the space above it. This is a semi rural location with 80 passengers a day (a quarter of which are school users travelling to Tonbridge). For the reasons expressed above, even with a garden community in its midst, Godstone station could never generate a sufficiently robust business case for this to happen. Again, it is aspirational nonsense dressed up as fact - I am sorry Mark but it really is. The industry couldn't generate a business case for a travel inn at Tonbridge when I built the decked car park extension there four years ago so how do you imagine they could so for Godstone.

I am sure that you are a very busy man at the moment so I won’t ask you to respond to the points I have raised here but I would ask that you look at the points I have raised very seriously and have the courage to tell your political masters that their plans are deeply flawed and will not work. This is not just my view but the views of industry professionals who have looked at the local plan with a degree of bewilderment in that such a document could have been generated to address what we all feel is a very serious issue.
Dear Mr Crane,

Thank you for your email to Cllr Jecks who has asked me to respond to you on his behalf, I apologise for the delay in providing you with a considered response and thank you for your understanding.

You are correct in that in 2016/17 the station usage figures for Godstone Railway station were estimated to be 58,346. For the previous year (2015/16), however, the station usage figures were 76,942. The falloff in 2016/17 is in part attributed to the strike days that were experienced on the southern network and a TOC decision was made to prioritise other destinations when it came to deciding which services to run.

We are aware that as part of timetable changes in May of this year, direct services to London have ceased along this line and instead replaced with a shuttle service, we did make representations at the time that we wished for direct services to remain, however, understood that additional capacity was prioritised for the Brighton Mainline as part of the Thameslink initiative.

We are further aware of the constraints on the line from East Croydon and in particular at the Windmill Junction just to the south of Selhurst Depot. We have had discussions with Network Rail in relation to this constraints and expressed support for their work in devising a feasibility study to submit to Government for a funding package. As part of the proposals it is envisaged that further capacity could be created with an additional platform at East Croydon and viaduct and signalling improvements at the Windmill Junction. We have further indicated that our support is based on the allocation of some of the additional train flow paths at peak times in order to enable a reinstatement of a direct services at the very least during these peak times along the Tonbridge to Redhill route. We will continue to lobby very hard for this and to make our position known with DfT and Government.

In addition it is our understanding, based on discussions we have had, that the GTR franchise will be up for renewal in 2021 and the Council will be making strong representations to the DfT in order to have direct services reinstated as part of the awarding of any new franchise agreement.

In relation to an estimate 25,000 additional homes being required at South Godstone in order to gain traction for reinstatement of direct services, discussions we have had indicate a similar figure across the length of the Tonbridge to Redhill line and not focused in one location. The Garden Community will assist in some part towards this.

In relation to station enhancements this is to be finalised as part of an Area Action Plan for the proposed Garden Community, however, current thinking is similar to provision at Cranbrook near Exeter or that of Aylesbury Vale Parkway which is now a bit more established than that of Cranbrook. Both of these comparators are relatively new stations that have come about as part of development proposals/new communities. Details of passenger usage at these stations is provided below.
Whilst the station proposals will come forward in more detail as part of the Area Action Plan and Master-planning process, it is current thinking that the station can be “flipped” so that access will be predominantly from the south as opposed to the north as is current which it is acknowledged is limited in space and capacity for upgrading. This will provide the necessary room for the provision of facilities and mobility impaired access as well as a potential station forecut to serve as part of an integrated transport hub for improved bus services, taxi rank and car parking. Part of the costs of this provision can be offset by development of the air rights over a new station ticket hall, for example by provision of hotel, office space and/or residential thus creating a “gateway/destination marker” for the proposed new community.

Kind Regards
Mark Bristow

From: Michael Cran
Subject: Re: Local
Date: 14 September 2018 at 12:04:08 BST
To: Cllr Keith Jecks <Cllr.keith.jecks@tandridge.gov.uk>

Hello Keith

It is some three weeks since you asked a member of your Planning Policy team to respond to me but I regret to say I have heard nothing from them. Given that the points I have made put into jeopardy a key area upon which the Council's local plan is based, namely its ability to qualify as sustainable development, I would have thought some urgent consideration would have been directed toward them. Maybe you would be kind enough to jolly them along a bit as their lack of response could be interpreted as them not being on top of their game.

Many thanks

Mike
Michael

Very interesting points. I won’t attempt to answer them as I don’t have the technical knowledge needed. I have asked one of the Planning Policy team to do so, though it may take a while as they are very heavily loaded at the moment.

Regards

Cllr Keith Jecks

Woldingham Ward
Tandridge District Council
8 Station Road East
Oxted
RH8 0 BT

Email: cllr.keith.jecks@tandridgedc.gov.uk

On 21 Aug 2018, at 11:25, Michael Crane

Cllr Jecks

Many thanks for coming back to me so promptly yesterday - it really was appreciated.

I apologise if you feel I had misquoted you - I genuinely had understood you to say what I quoted but thanks for clearing that up. I’m afraid though that your email offers no comfort or clarity as to what will happen with the railway should the garden community proceed at South Godstone, partly because as you have said, improvements are not guaranteed.

The four stations that you mention DO all have direct services into central London (London Victoria - the same destination that the majority of Godstone trains went to prior to May 2018) so I don’t really understand the point you are making there. Taking just one of the four stations you refer to, namely Woldingham (which I believe you represent). The 2011 census gives a population of 2141 whereas the same census gives the population of South Godstone as 5949. Here is the rub though - 2016/17 footfall figures for Godstone station were 58,346 whereas the same for Woldingham was 301,244. The figures are supplied by the Association of Train Operating Companies (ATOC). So, despite having three times the population of Woldingham, Godstone station has broadly only one sixth of the patronage. You must bear in mind also that these footfall figures are for a period when Godstone DID have direct London services. The picture is very clear to anyone who is prepared to see it, namely that commuters do not want to use the Redhill to Tonbridge line as their preferred route into London now and will not do so in the future and will use other stations creating mayhem at those stations and gridlock on the roads to them. The act of placing a garden community in South Godstone cannot therefore be considered to be sustainable development.

As an industry professional who was in charge of commercial development at Southeastern Railway until two years ago when I retired, I can tell you that 4,000 homes at South Godstone would not come anywhere near creating sufficient impetus for the rail industry to rethink its policy of reinstalling direct London services. Neither will the 2,000 homes you refer to in Edenbridge (actually, I could only find proposals for 1,295) make any difference because Edenbridge already has a station providing direct trains to London and commuters will opt for that which in turn will weaken any case put before the train companies. For clarity, I estimate it would require something like 25,000
homes to be built in South Godstone before the train companies would start looking to do something meaningful with the Tonbridge to Redhill line so I am afraid that you are quite wrong in saying that 4,000 homes will make it easy to generate a business case for line enhancements. The minutes I have seen of meetings between TDC officers and GTR provide only vague, polite assurances that they will look at the problem and as I have said, the chances are that GTR won't even be operating on that route in a few years.

I am also fascinated to know what you have in mind for station enhancements at Godstone station. With only 80 passengers a day (and a large proportion of these schoolchildren), it is difficult to see what can be done as lengthening the platforms would not achieve anything (8 car trains having been stopping there for years) and facilities such as waiting rooms, kiosks, ticket offices and accessibility lifts simply do not form part of small rural stations in today's railway environment. So, what are you going to do?

I really do appreciate your time in answering my questions. I have loads more about the road infrastructure of your plan which is decidedly dodgy to say the least but as railways are my area of expertise I will stick with that.

Best regards

Mike Crane

From: Cllr Keith Jecks <Cllr.keith.jecks@tandridge.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 August 2018 18:18
To: Michael Crane
Cc: Cllr Keith Jecks
Subject: Re: Local Plan

Dear Michael

Many thanks for contacting me direct.

First, just to correct a misquote. I have never commented on the resurrection of direct services to London from Godstone station. That would be great, but in the same way as those living in Woldingham, Warlingham, Riddlesdown and Sanderstead travelling to London Bridge, it will I am sure, be necessary to change (at Redhill or Tonbridge) on some services. What I have said is that we need to ensure that it would be illogical for the residents of the new extended South Godstone settlement to get in their cars to drive to another station. I have consistently said that I wouldn't support South Godstone unless that can be delivered and that remains my position.

The TDC officers have had conversations with Thameslink and Network Rail and tell me that the upgrades are a realistic expectation. Guaranteed? No - because we haven't yet defined exactly what is required, but before we go beyond the point of no return, they must be pretty close to guaranteed. We (via developer contributions) will pay for the station upgrade, so the only issue is timetabling improvements and capacity increases. As an industry professional, I am sure you will see that these are pretty easy to justify. 4,000 extra homes in Godstone alone would justify more capacity, but in addition, Sevenoaks DC are planning an additional 2,000 homes in Edenbridge on the same line. The business case for providing adequate rail capacity to those homes is not difficult to make.

Regards

Keith Jecks

Cllr Keith Jecks
Hi Mr Jecks

I was passing through Oxted this morning and happened to pick up one of your "Get the facts" leaflets from the Council's reception area which I have now read.

As a retired Director of the rail industry who also worked until 2016 for the Go-Ahead Group (Govia) I was intrigued to read about how the Council intended to develop rail services at Godstone station. As a 1st class ticket holder for life and resident of South Godstone I naturally have a healthy interest in this.

It does seem more than slightly curious to me that your plan claims that direct London trains will be re-instated and that Godstone station will be redeveloped. With only 80 passengers a day using the service surely this is being a little economical with the truth isn't it? The reality that I suspect we both know is that the Redhill to Tonbridge line is in terminal decline and that there will be no rail led investment on either the station or on services.

GTR as you may or may not know, are operating on a seven year franchise and whilst they are a decent company, issues such as the role of guard which continue to be a thorn in their side may work against them when the franchise is up for renewal in a few years. As such they could not possibly commit to either expenditure or service upgrades because there is a possibility they will not be in post.

I have also made several enquiries within Network Rail (old acquaintances etc) but cannot find anyone at a high level who has committed to the development you describe either. Significantly, when I raised the possibility of the Crowhurst chord, my query was met with laughter. Any chance you could share with me the name of the person who has made such commitments - I just wonder if they were empowered to do so!

Without evidence to the contrary I am therefore forced to believe that the statements you are making in your leaflet as far as the railway is concerned are, how shall we say, a little exaggerated to say the least.

Hope you don't mind me writing to you in this way but it is an important subject and as you yourself have said in the past "unless rail services at Godstone station can be improved, I can see no reason for locating the garden community at South Godstone".

Appreciate your views but please stick to facts as I have done.

Regards

Mike Crane

Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to. Save paper.
Visit [http://www.tandridge.gov.uk](http://www.tandridge.gov.uk) for information about services, online forms, payments and much more.

___________________________

IMPORTANT: The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential. They are intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you have received this email in error, please inform the sender immediately and do not disclose the contents to anyone or make copies thereof.

This message has been scanned for viruses.
APPENDIX 2

Letters from landowners
The Inspector, Philip Lewis  
c/o Programme Officer, Chris Banks  
banksolutionsuk@gmail.com  

06/09/2019

Dear Mr Lewis,

Re. Tandridge Local Plan & Availability of land for the 'Garden Community'

I farm some 60 hectares (150 acres) of the land within the Area of Search for the proposed 'garden community' development at South Godstone. I am the second generation of a three generation tenancy, my daughter is farming here with the intention of succeeding me.

I have had no notification, in any form, from Tandridge DC. No correspondence whatsoever.

Despite occupying this land for over sixty years, my fears that my business will be decimated appears to be of no concern or consideration.

This harvest (2019) produced over 450 tonnes of wheat from the proposed site. Together with grazing and straw and hay, the site provides us with the main proportion of our income. Arable land is an asset that cannot be created, only lost. And my family will lose its livelihood if this land is developed upon.

Tandridge DC have totally disregarded the impact on the local environment, any development affects the wildlife over a much greater area than just the proposed site.

Unfortunately the Council appear to regard violating the Green Belt as an easy option to solving their planning logjam. I am vehemently opposed to their destructive proposals.

Yours sincerely,

John Nicholas. Brook Farm
Philip Lewis, Inspector.
c/o Banks Solutions
bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com

Dear Mr Lewis,

Re: Tandridge Local Plan

I would like to take this opportunity to write to you and make clear my position on the proposed South Godstone Garden Village development and my farm in particular, which lies within the Area of Search.

Please be aware that TDC have no control over the land and or buildings that form King’s Farm. I would fight any attempt to sell this land or any compulsory purchase order. I have seen my land on some of maps for the proposed SGGV, I have never agreed to this and I do not wish for you to be mislead as to its availability.

I believe that TDC’s decision to try to build on the Greenbelt is ill thought through. The plan is deeply flawed. The effects of this development would be detrimental and far reaching.

I believe passionately that the Greenbelt should be protected.

The houses required could be better achieved in a way far less damaging to our environment.

I would like to conclude my letter at the point where my personal journey with the TDC proposed development began:

In the farm drive, on a cold February morning a luxury car swerved into the gateway, two suited men stepped out. They told me they wanted to meet with John King, my father.

I pointed out that I was his daughter and perhaps I could help?

“Yes” they replied. “We’ve been speaking to Mr King about selling us the farm for development”.

I knew categorically that this was not the case.

“This doesn’t sound right” I said, “Have you spoken much? And how recently”?

Mr Coyle, of Bonnar Allan then confidently replied “Yes he’s very much onboard. We’ve spoken several times, most recently I’d say a couple of weeks ago”
I knew this to be viciously untrue. My Dad would never have entertained building on his beloved family farm. I was very close to my father, I would have known of any such phone calls. Furthermore, this could not have been the case as my father had died some twelve weeks before my very upsetting encounter with Bonnar Allan (who have now gone bust).

As my late father used to say, “You never get a second chance to make a first impression”.

This was my personal introduction to the now disreputable and liquidated developer originally endorsed by TDC, to produce a heavily flawed and somewhat dishonest plan for a council that I feel I can no longer trust.

I hope that I have been able to provide some understanding of my position and insight into my personal experience of this situation and why I believe the whole process to be corrupt and the council, and its supposed promoters, are not to be trusted. I very much hope that you will see through the façade that TDC have created to try to justify their hugely unpopular and unwanted ‘garden community’ and you will find the plan to be unsound.

Yours sincerely,

[Name]

Shelley King
03 September 2019

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Mr Lewis,

Re. Tandridge Local Plan & Availability of land for the Garden Community

We are writing in respect of the Tandridge Local Plan and the proposals for the garden village at South Godstone in particular.

We are residents of Tandridge and we own land within the Area of Search for the proposed ‘Garden Community’. We wish to formally notify you that we are thoroughly opposed to this terrible and unsustainable proposal and we do not wish to sell our home or land for development. We would also fight any attempt by Tandridge DC to compulsorily acquire the land from us if this was attempted.

The quiet rural area in which we live would be destroyed if the garden community went ahead, substantially reducing the value of our home and destroying our peaceful lives.

We are aware that many other landowners feel the same way and we hope that you will take this into consideration when deliberating over the soundness of the plan and the deliverability of the garden village in particular.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Daniell
To the Inspector
Mr Philip Lewis
C/o Programme Officer, Chris Banks

2nd September 2019

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Mr Lewis,

Tandridge Local Plan & Land Availability

I am writing in respect of the Tandridge Local Plan and the proposals for the Garden Village at South Godstone in particular.

I am a resident of Tandridge, and own land potentially within the Area of Search for the ‘Garden Community’. My property is situated on Tandridge Lane and has a garden and fields that backs onto the proposed Garden Village. Tandridge Council placed my land within the scope of the Area of Search in its 2018 Local Plan and designated it as available despite my continued requests for them to remove it.

I wish to formally notify you that we are thoroughly opposed to this unacceptable, unrealistic and unsustainable proposal and I do not wish to sell my land for development. I would also fight any attempt by Tandridge DC to compulsorily acquire the land from me.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs L.M. Cannings Knight
3rd August 2019

To the Inspector, Mr Philip Lewis
c/o Programme Officer, Chris Banks

Dear Mr Lewis

Re. Tandridge Local Plan & Availability of land for the Garden Community

We are writing in respect of the Tandridge Local Plan and the proposals for the garden village at South Godstone.

We are residents of Tandridge and we own land within the Area of Search for the ‘Garden Community’. This land comprises fields adjacent to Tandridge Lane. We wish to notify you formally that we are thoroughly opposed to this terrible and unsustainable proposal and we do not wish to sell our land for development. Some of our land also holds covenants that would prevent such development. We would also fight any attempt by Tandridge DC to compulsorily acquire the land from us.

We are aware that many other landowners feel the same way and we hope that you will take this into consideration when deliberating over the soundness of the plan and the deliverability of the garden village in particular.

Yours sincerely,

Richard & Lucilla Berliand
To the Inspector, Mr Philip Lewis  
c/o Programme Officer, Chris Banks  
bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com

7th August 2019

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Mr Lewis,

**Re. Tandridge Local Plan & Availability of land for the Garden Community**

We are writing in respect of the Tandridge Local Plan and the proposals for the garden village at South Godstone in particular.

We are residents of Tandridge and we own land within the Area of Search for the 'Garden Community'. [Our land comprises fields adjacent to Tandridge Lane]. We wish to formally notify you that we are thoroughly opposed to this terrible and unsustainable proposal and we do not wish to sell our land for development. We would also fight any attempt by Tandridge DC to compulsorily acquire the land from us.

We are aware that many other landowners feel the same way and we hope that you will take this into consideration when deliberating over the soundness of the plan and the deliverability of the garden village in particular.

Yours sincerely,

K G Watson
To the Inspector, Mr Philip Lewis

c/o Programme Officer, Chris Banks

Via Email

12th August 2019

Dear Mr Lewis,

Re. Tandridge Local Plan & Availability of land for the Garden Community

We are writing in respect of the Tandridge Local Plan and the proposals for the garden village at South Godstone in particular.

We are residents of Tandridge and we own land adjacent to Tandridge Lane within the Area of Search for the ‘Garden Community’. We wish to formally notify you that we are thoroughly opposed to this totally unprepared and unsustainable proposal and we do not wish to sell our land for development. We would also fight any attempt by Tandridge DC to compulsorily acquire the land from us.

We hope that you will take this into consideration when deliberating over the soundness of the plan and the deliverability of the garden village in particular.

Yours sincerely,

Nigel and Suzanne Francis
To the Inspector
Mr Philip Lewis
c/o Programme Officer, Chris Banks
bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com

19th August 2019
BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Mr Lewis,

Re. Tandridge Local Plan & Availability of land for the Garden Community

We are writing in respect of the Tandridge Local Plan and the proposals for the Garden Village at South Godstone in particular.

We are residents of Tandridge, and we own land within the Area of Search for the ‘Garden Community’. Our property is accessed onto Tandridge Lane and has a garden that backs onto a property that owns a field between us and the proposed Garden Village. The proposed ‘Garden Village’ will be all around us and will adversely affect us in every way.

We wish to formally notify you that we are thoroughly opposed to this unacceptable, unrealistic and unsustainable proposal and we do not wish to sell our land for development. We would also fight any attempt by Tandridge DC to compulsorily acquire the land from us.

We are aware that many other landowners feel the same way and we hope that you will take this into consideration when deliberating over the soundness of the plan and the deliverability of the garden village.

Yours sincerely,

Julie and Ian

Julie Rogers
Ian Cheeseman
To the Inspector, Mr Philip Lewis  
c/o Programme Officer, Chris Banks  
bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com

19 August 2019

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Mr Lewis,

Re. Tandridge Local Plan & Availability of land for the Garden Community

I am writing in respect of the Tandridge Local Plan and the proposals for the garden village at South Godstone in particular.

I am a resident of Tandridge and own land within the Area of Search for the ‘Garden Community’. My land is adjacent to farmland south of the railway line in South Godstone. I wish to formally notify you that I am thoroughly opposed to this terrible and unsustainable proposal and I do not wish to sell my land for development. I would also fight any attempt by Tandridge DC to compulsorily acquire the land from me.

I am aware that many other landowners feel the same way and I hope that you will take this into consideration when deliberating over the soundness of the plan and the deliverability of the garden village in particular.

Yours sincerely,

Margaret C A Barton Wilby (Mrs)
From: Mr & Mrs Prater
Sent: 19 August 2019 21:40
To: bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com
Subject: Tandridge Local Plan & Availability of land for the Garden Community - 9 Chathill Cottages

9 Chathill Cottages
Miles Lane
Tandridge
Surrey
RH8 9NR

To the Inspector, Mr Philip Lewis
c/o Programme Officer, Chris Banks
bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com

19th August 2019

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Mr Lewis,

Re. Tandridge Local Plan & Availability of land for the Garden Community

We are writing in respect of the Tandridge Local Plan and the proposals for the garden village at South Godstone in particular.

We are residents of Tandridge and we own land within the Area of Search for the ‘Garden Community’. Our land comprises of a private house and gardens in the “additional area of search” at Chathill on Miles Lane. We wish to formally notify you that we are thoroughly opposed to this terrible and unsustainable proposal and we do not wish to sell our land for development. We would also fight any attempt by Tandridge DC to compulsorily acquire the land from us.

We are aware that many other landowners feel the same way and we hope that you will take this into consideration when deliberating over the soundness of the plan and the deliverability of the garden village in particular.

Yours sincerely,

Mr and Mrs P Prater.
To the Inspector, Mr Philip Lewis  
c/o Programme Officer, Chris Banks  
bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com

30th August 2019
BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Mr Lewis,

Re. Tandridge Local Plan & Availability of land for the Garden Community

We are writing in respect of the Tandridge Local Plan and the proposals for the garden village at South Godstone in particular.

We are residents of Tandridge and we own land within the Area of Search for the ‘Garden Community’. Our land comprises a house, garden and field of approximately 5 acres immediately adjacent to Tandridge Lane. We wish to formally notify you that we are thoroughly opposed to this terrible and unsustainable proposal and we do not wish to sell our land for development. We would also fight any attempt by Tandridge DC to compulsorily acquire the land from us. Question 6.6 of your MIQ’s is relevant in this regard.

We bought our house in 2010, partly because it was surrounded by fields and untouched Green Belt, so we felt it would safe for the rest of our lives. Since then we have invested heavily in modernising it, putting a lot of money into the local economy, but if the so called ‘garden community’ was to go ahead it would destroy the value of our home. It would also ruin the peaceful, rural existence that so many people in this area currently enjoy.

We are aware that many other landowners feel the same way and we hope that you will take this into consideration when deliberating over the soundness of the plan and the deliverability of the garden village in particular.

Yours sincerely,

David & Annie Hughes
To the Inspector, Mr Philip Lewis
C/o Programme Officer, Chris Banks
bankssolutionsuk@gmail.com

2nd September 2019

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Mr Lewis,

Re. Tandridge Local Plan & Availability of land for the Garden Community

We are writing in respect of the Tandridge Local Plan and the proposals for the garden village at South Godstone in particular.

We are longstanding residents of Tandridge and we own land within the Area of Search for the proposed 'Garden Community'. We consider the proposal to be deeply flawed and propped up by unsustainable assertions. It would damage an area of green belt and would create chaos and disruption to traffic and community. The claimed benefit to housing would in reality create a community with no significant local employment and would thereby aggravate traffic problems and increase further strains on existing bottlenecks.

Consequently we wish to formally notify you that we are thoroughly opposed to this proposal. In addition, we wish to make clear that we do not wish to sell our home or land for development. We would also fight any attempt by Tandridge DC to compulsorily acquire the land from us if this was attempted.

From our personal position, as committed residents who have lived here for four decades, the damage to our situation would be extreme. We value greatly the distinctive home in which we live and the setting and the view which form an integral part of what we so greatly value. This would be destroyed if the garden community went ahead, and it would undoubtedly also result in a substantial reduction in the value of our home as well as destroying what we treasure.

We are aware that many other landowners feel the same way and we hope that you will take this into consideration when deliberating over the soundness of the plan and the deliverability of the garden village in particular.

Yours sincerely,