



WEST CLANDON PARISH COUNCIL

Chairman: Mr Terence Patrick , Stoney Royd, Woodstock, West Clandon, Guildford, GU4 7UJ

Clerk: Mr John Stone, Hunters End, Lime Grove, West Clandon, Guildford GU4 7UT
01483 385187: westclandon@talktalk.net : www.westclandon.org.uk

Mr Alan Stones
Planning Development Team Manager
Planning & Development Group
Surrey County Council
County Hall
Kingston upon Thames
Surrey KT1 2DY

30 October 2014

Dear Mr Stones

Proposed development at the Drift Golf Club, East Horsley, Surrey, KT24 5HD GU14/P/0171847

West Clandon Parish Council OBJECTS to the application at the Drift Golf Club.

1. A particular concern is the very significant volume of heavy traffic proposed to be routed through West Clandon as well as through other rural and residential roads in the local area. This will be harmful to the amenity of residents in West Clandon as well as to residents on other parts of the proposed traffic routes. Residents will have to suffer noise, vibration and air pollution. At the same time road safety is likely to be compromised particularly for cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders. The A247 section of the proposed route is an A road unlike some other sections of the route. However it is already heavily trafficked and challenging for cyclists and uncomfortable for pedestrians. The A247 has a narrow pinch point close to the Village School where two heavy goods vehicles cannot pass without one mounting the pavement. Additional heavy traffic will make the A247 less safe for parents with young children and pushchairs going to and from the Village School. All in all the proposed level of heavy traffic will impose intolerable burdens on local residents.
2. There are a large number of listed buildings within a few metres of the proposed traffic route, including some 20 such buildings along the relevant stretch of the A247. Additional traffic vibration will risk damage to these buildings.
3. The applicant will be accepting waste deliveries from third parties in their own vehicles rather than delivering the waste in transport controlled by the applicant. Accordingly it is unlikely in practice that the applicant will be able to control the movements of the independent contractors' vehicles except possibly along the Drift itself. Accordingly little weight can be given to assurances offered as to traffic routing. In practice contractors will take whatever routes are cheapest and most convenient for them.
4. The average of 50 deliveries per day stated in the application is just an average and no limit on the number of deliveries per day is proposed. Numbers on any particular day could be much higher increasing disruption and risk to other road users particularly at rush hours. It will be impossible to time deliveries accurately and lorries will bunch up causing even greater inconvenience to residents and risk to road safety. If more lorries are in the Drift at any one time than there are passing places then total

grid lock could result. We are told that non-conforming loads of waste will be rejected. Under the transport proposals these will have to leave by the "exit" route and thus will be fully laden when passing over the weak culvert, thus risking damage to it.

5. There is no evidence in the Transport Scoping Report that the applicant will legally be able to cut back vegetation and create/enlarge the passing places which it says is key to its proposal for traffic management. To do this it will need the permission of the relevant landowners or will need assistance of an authority willing to exercise relevant statutory powers.

6. The proposed working hours of 07.30 to 18.30 are excessive and should be restricted to a normal eight hour day.

7. The environmental impact assessment is seriously deficient in that it focusses on the site itself and fails to consider the impact of the proposal on the surrounding area during construction, including likely effects on amenity for local residents and on wildlife in areas bordering the Drift. In particular as pointed out by the Surrey Amphibian and Reptile Group the report underestimates the populations of local amphibians and does not address issues to do with the nearby toad tunnel under the Drift and the safety of toad wardens.

8. The proposal will be harmful to the green belt in introducing a more man-made and developed form, introducing new buildings and the likelihood it will harm biodiversity. The proposed building is of significant size - as big a floor area as eight average size family homes (average family home of 96.8 sq m.) It constitutes inappropriate development which should only be allowed in very special circumstances. No very special circumstances have been shown. Whilst it is true the applicant wishes to develop the land for commercial reasons this is not a special reason. There is no shortage of golfing facilities in the area which would justify such a development.

9. Even if some development of the golf facilities would be acceptable the application does not show why it is necessary to import the proposed quantities of waste onto the site. The commercial desire to pay for the development (or indeed generate additional revenue) by allowing waste disposal on site should not override the need to preserve the green belt. To the extent any development is acceptable it should be accomplished in the most sustainable way and with minimum impact on the green belt. There is no case here for allowing waste disposal on this site as a form of enabling development to fund the commercial golf development. The scheme is intended to benefit only a few people – the site owners and its customers – but will disrupt the everyday lives of many others for a significant period. The proposal fails to show how it can be considered sustainable development to import unnecessarily such a large quantity of waste onto the site much of which will have to be brought considerable distances.

Yours sincerely,

John Stone
Clerk
For West Clandon Parish Council