

Below is a structured summary of the objection letter, broken into clear sections that residents can use to draft their own individual objections.

Residents should stick to material planning issues because planning decisions are made strictly within planning law and policy. If objections focus on matters the Council is legally allowed to consider, they carry weight. If they don't, they can be disregarded entirely.

When objections are:

- Calm
- Evidence-based
- Policy-focused

They are taken more seriously by:

- Planning officers
- Councillors
- Inspectors

Large numbers of well-reasoned objections are far more influential than large numbers of emotional or repetitive complaints.

You can copy the headings and personalise the points most relevant to you and I would also recommend reading the full objection report in conjunction with this.

1. Green Belt – Inappropriate Development

- The site is designated **Green Belt** under the Development Management Plan.
- Residential development of circa 130 dwellings is **inappropriate development in the Green Belt**.
- The proposal would:
 - Permanently reduce openness.
 - Undermine the strategic purpose of preventing settlement coalescence (Kingswood and Burgh Heath).
- The land is also subject to multiple constraints including:
 - Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV)
 - Ancient woodland buffer
 - Residential Area of Special Character
 - Historic Parks and Gardens (Copt Hill)

Key Objection Point: The proposal conflicts with national Green Belt policy and local policy (Core Strategy & DMP). No “very special circumstances” have been demonstrated.

2. Loss of Grade 2 Agricultural Land (Best and Most Versatile – BMV)

- The site is **Grade 2 agricultural land**, classified as “Best and Most Versatile.”

This land:

- Is capable of high crop yields.
- Is a finite national resource.
- Cannot realistically be restored once built on.
- National policy requires poorer quality land to be used in preference.

Key Objection Point: This would permanently remove highly productive farmland, harming food security and rural sustainability, contrary to national planning policy.

3. Landscape Harm & AONB Boundary Review

- The site lies within a sensitive landscape area.
- Natural England is currently progressing a formal boundary variation process to extend the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

- The Kingswood area forms part of land under active consideration for inclusion.

Key Objection Point: Granting permission now risks irreversible harm during an active national landscape designation review. A precautionary approach should be taken.

4. Ecology & Biodiversity Harm

a) Red-Listed and Protected Birds

The Canons Farm & Banstead Woods Bird Group has recorded:

- ~90 species annually
- Nearly 60,000 bird records since 2009
- UK Red-Listed breeding species including:
 - Skylark (12 breeding pairs recorded 2025)
 - Yellowhammer (6 breeding pairs 2025)
 - Linnet
- Barn Owls (Schedule 1 protected)

Farmland itself is a UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Priority Habitat.

b) Mitigation & Biodiversity Net Gain Concerns

- 10% Biodiversity Net Gain is unlikely to be achievable in practice because:
 - Species are site-faithful.
 - Large, contiguous farmland cannot easily be replicated.
 - Migratory routes depend on established feeding areas.
 - Replacement habitat would need to be nearby and equivalent in scale.

Key Objection Point: The application understates ecological value and overstates the ability to mitigate harm. Loss of open farmland would cause irreversible damage to priority species.

5. Transport & Road Safety

- Primary access proposed from Canons Lane.
- Likely to embed car dependency (2+ spaces per dwelling).
- Increased peak-hour vehicle movements.
- Concerns over:

- Road safety
- Pedestrian safety
- School traffic
- Junction capacity
- Severance effects

Surrey transport policy prioritises pedestrians and cyclists over private vehicles.

Key Objection Point: The development is not in a genuinely sustainable location and would increase traffic pressures and safety risks.

6. Chalk Dissolution & Ground Stability Risk

- Kingswood is known for chalk dissolution risk (voids/sinkholes).
- Applicant's own assessment identifies high-risk bands across the site.
- Development could:
 - Alter groundwater flows.
 - Increase subsidence risk.
 - Affect neighbouring existing homes (which were not designed with mitigation).

Key Objection Point: There is insufficient reassurance that both new and existing properties can be protected from long-term structural risk.

7. Flooding & Drainage Uncertainty

- Although in Flood Zone 1, the scheme relies on:
 - Infiltration-based SuDS.
 - Connection to Thames Water network.
- Full evidence (ground conditions, infiltration testing, climate allowances, exceedance routes) is not clearly demonstrated at outline stage.

Key Objection Point: Drainage and flood mitigation have not been proven to a decision-ready standard.

8. Housing Land Supply Arguments Do Not Justify Green Belt Release

- The Council has previously demonstrated a five-year housing supply.

- The Development Management Plan provides a plan-led mechanism for housing delivery.
- Affordable housing (45% proposed) does not override Green Belt protections.

Key Objection Point: Housing need does not automatically justify inappropriate Green Belt development, particularly on high-grade farmland with significant constraints.

9. Infrastructure & Developer Contributions

- Reliance on generic CIL payments is not a substitute for:
 - Site-specific highway works
 - Ecological mitigation
 - Open space maintenance
 - School/healthcare capacity

Key Objection Point: Infrastructure impacts are not adequately resolved or secured at outline stage.