



23 February 2026

The Chief Planning Officer  
Mole Valley District Council  
Pippbrook  
Dorking  
RH14 1SJ

Dear Sir

**Application No: MO/2026/00151**  
**Location: Arlington, Rookery Hill, Ashtead**

On behalf of the Ashtead Residents' Association, I refer to the above planning application. to provide a dropped vehicle crossover on to the A24 to provide rear access.

We note the applicant is replicating, with minor alterations, planning application MO/2021/1016 that was refused and dismissed on appeal.

We remain adamant that the proposed location for a rear access on to the A24 is inappropriate and a potential hazard for other road users. In this respect we should like to highlight Para 5 of the Planning Inspector's Appeal decision: -  
"Given the status of Epsom Road, a degree of caution should be applied to the acceptance of individual access points. There is a dispute between the parties about how busy this part of the A24 is. The appellant's survey from 2020 showed hourly flows of 515 vehicles northbound and 533 southbound. However, these figures may have been affected by the consequences of the pandemic"  
From our experience traffic flow on this section of the A24 trunk road has increased significantly since the survey and we agree with the Planning Inspector's assessment. We disagree with the "Analysis of the Proposal" supporting the application stating, "no significant changes have occurred to traffic levels since the analysis was made". Therefore, if this planning application is to be considered seriously a new Traffic Survey must be requested.

Furthermore, the Planning Inspector stated Para 11 "no provision is made for turning vehicles raising the possibility that they would need to reverse out onto the A24". He went on Para 12 "In theory there is space to turn a vehicle round within the extensive garden. However, no hard standing is proposed. The land just outside the grounds of

Arlington is uneven and there were the remnants of tree stumps. As such, it is difficult to see that this would be a realistic proposition”.

Whilst on this occasion the applicant has incorporated hard standing within their curtilage to allow vehicles to exit in forward gear, land outside the boundary is being assumed as available for levelling. We should like to assume this land is under the jurisdiction of either Surrey CC Highways or MVDC being within the boundary of Ashtead Park, whose authority must be sought.

We would take issue with the Planning Inspector’s assessment of Ashtead Park Para 17. “The small amount of development involved in creating the crossover would have no detrimental impact on the significance of this heritage asset”. The Historic Environment Officer reported on 23 July 2021 the impact upon Ashtead Park by stating “the proposal is considered to result in harm to the character of this part of the Grade11 Registered Historic Park & Garden”. We endorse such a statement, and it should be noted that volunteers have been involved in enhancing the environment of Ashtead Park for the benefit of residents and visitors.

The applicant is attempting to demonstrate that the crossover will have minimum usage, in which case why is it necessary? Access, on to the A24 at the proposed location is a risk to highway safety and potential grounds for unnecessary delays.

We are of the opinion the application as submitted should be refused. The impact upon Ashtead Park has been understated and there can be no justification in applying the traffic flows taken at the time of the pandemic to support this application.

Yours faithfully

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the Planning Officer.

Planning Officer