

25 Burghfield
Epsom
KT17 4ND

17 February 2021

Ms Ruth Ormella, Head of Planning
Mr John Robinson, Planning Officer
Epsom & Ewell B.C.
Town Hall
The Parade
Epsom
KT18 5BY

**Planning Application at South Hatch Stables Burgh Heath Road, Epsom.
Proposed amendments to S106 Agreement, attached to planning permission
18/00308/FUL under new planning application 21/00120/S106A**

I refer to my previous letter on this matter specifically the objection letter dated 7 November 2018 and I reiterate my objections to the application for the same reasons detailed in that letter, that in short this application is nothing other than an attempt by a developer who has purchased the land for speculative development to build residential housing in green belt land using the RTE as a front to obtain planning consent.

In addition and in respect of this new application I wish to object to the proposed amendments to the s106 Agreement in particular with respect to the phasing.

It is a fundamental principle of enabling developments that the underlying development is completed entirely or at least to a substantial degree before allowing the enabling development to be completed. This is to ensure that the underlying development actually takes place. This application seeks to undermine the safeguards that the original phasing provided. If these amendments were to be agreed then there would be a significant risk that the RTE will not get built in the size and scale as originally proposed which was used as justification for the enabling development element of the original application.

Developers will look at the economics of a project continuously throughout its life. If a point is reached where it is materially uneconomic to finish the project then most likely the developers will either look to amend or if sufficient profit has already been extracted abandon the project. These amendments would allow over 90% of the enabling development to be completed before the RTE is anywhere near complete. At this point there would be a clear incentive for the developer to apply to reduce the size of the RTE and if permission is not forthcoming walk away. Therefore there is a significant risk that if these amendments were approved then the original RTE will not be built as originally planned. It will be either scaled down or abandoned part complete.

Approval by the planning committee of these amendments would be grossly negligent. The only reason the original application was granted permission was that the RTE as proposed would be built. That is unlikely to happen if these amendments are approved.

Therefore members of the planning committee are requested to refuse these amendments.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Bowcott FCT, MBA