

**NON PARTICIPANT STATEMENT**

**FOR 8Hiv & 8jiv**

**BY**

**THE PLANNING BUREAU LTD**

**ON BEHALF OF**

**McCARTHY & STONE (DEVS) LTD**

# **APPENDIX 5**

55  
Copy SG

Your ref:  
Our ref: LB/HOR/ADV/05-06/32

15 JAN 2007

ENGLAND

Eastern Area Team  
Phoenix House  
33 North Street  
Lewes  
BN7 2PH

T +44(0)1273 476595  
F +44(0)1273 483063

Mr Gian Bendinelli  
Principal Planning Associate  
The Planning Bureau Limited  
Homelife House  
26-32 Oxford Road  
Bournemouth  
BH8 8EZ

9 January 2007

Dear Gian

**Proposed sheltered development for the elderly at 2 - 6 Addlestone Park, Addlestone, Surrey on behalf of McCarthy and Stone (Developments)**  
**Planning Reference: RU/06/0195**  
**Appeal Reference: APP/Q3630/A/06/1199145**

Thank you for your letter of 8<sup>th</sup> January and subsequent email of 9<sup>th</sup> January 2007 relating to the above proposals. Natural England has considered the points you have made and proposes a revised avoidance package which would enable the decision maker to conclude that the development would have no effect on the SPA. While the detail of the avoidance package has changed, this letter should be read in conjunction with our letter to you dated 5<sup>th</sup> January 2007.

You will note that the package below still includes the 'conditions' relating to the total number of parking spaces (10) and the minimum entry age (65+). Natural England no longer insists on the restrictions on car ownership made in our previous letter. This is because there is evidence relating to the long term average of car ownership at this type of development in Surrey that indicates car ownership here is likely to be less than 10 vehicles. The impact of this number of vehicles is not considered to have a greater effect on the SPA than the existing unrestricted dwellings (due to restrictions on all dog ownership). As you confirm in your evidence, any potential short term peak will be dealt with as the development takes time to become full and new residents start the process of giving up vehicles.

**A proposed avoidance package**

1. A potential long term avoidance package for this development would therefore constitute a two pronged adaptation of the proposals:
  - a) Reduce the total number of parking spaces to 10 to allow for resident and visitor parking;
  - b) Maintain the minimum entry age at 65+ in the long term (to enable confident prediction that over the lifetime of the development, the impact of car ownership does not rise above current levels)

Natural England  
Head Office  
1 East Parade  
Sheffield S1 2ET

E Mail Received 11-1-06

2. These limitations would be consistent with the profile of entry lessees, would be a reasonable restriction bearing in mind likely car ownership characteristics and would enable the decision maker to conclude that the development would have no effect on the SPA.
3. All the restrictions could be achieved by a S106 unilateral obligation. If such an obligation was agreed with Natural England, and then submitted to the Council and PINS, Natural England could withdraw its objection to the appeal proposals. It is likely that similar restrictions on other, similar proposals in the TBH Planning Zone by the appellants, adapted as necessary to suit different circumstances in terms of parking spaces and car-owning flat numbers, would also allow Natural England to confirm no effects on the SPA.

Yours sincerely



Nick Radford  
Conservation Officer

CC: Heather Langridge, The Planning Inspectorate