

## **Objections**

**Ash Residents' Association** – any changes will have a negative impact on the local environment and community and may facilitate future changes leading to the loss of a local motor-free bridleway. The BOAT is narrow and unmade. The surface runoff has already made the remaining BOAT waterlogged. The reasons are unsound, in that the council will be allowing access to land they do not appear to own and impractical as no clear statement has been made over the adoption of the finished road. The design is purely for vehicles access to the new estate and disregards the needs and views of local residents, which is contrary to prevailing guidelines.

**Ash Parish Council** - the right of way should remain for amenity use and horse riding.

**Mrs S Johnson** - it is imperative that what paths are free from traffic remain so for the use of walkers.

**Mr L and Mrs M Garthwaite** - it is essential that this bridleway remains available in its current status for the pedestrian public to fully enjoy without vehicular traffic hazards.

**Mrs J Long** - protests against the proposal to allow the road to be installed. It seems unfair to local residents to have issues with land which allows quiet enjoyment for many families to enjoy exercise and possibly restricts access.

**Ms S Wyeth-Price** - the ownership is unclear and contradictory. The BOAT is a valued local amenity for local residents. It is a very narrow and unmade lane. There has been damage to the remaining BOAT by surface water runoff. The rationale for the recommendation is invalid and impractical and contradicts the Manual for Streets. Nothing gives Bewley Homes the right to access the road when building is completed. The BOAT is well used by the local residents, of all ages, as a safe place to relax, exercise and enjoy. I believe SCC has not adopted Ash Green Lane West.

**Mr B Cohen** - states the byway would in effect become a private road and therefore cease to exist. This has the effect of closing the remaining length of byway. Concerns about the cost to the County Council of moving the barrier. Requests the developer pays the Countryside Access team a large sum of money for repairs and maintenance elsewhere.

**Mr S Pedley** - vehemently opposes any changes to this ancient right of way. He has concerns about drainage and wants assurance that the right of way will be returned to its present tranquil state after the development is complete.

**Mr P Finning** – this will change the usage of a public thoroughfare between Ash Green and Tongham and disrupt walkers, horse riders, cyclists etc bringing them closer to traffic. He doesn't see the need to remove the green space and tranquillity for the sake of another housing development.

**Mr A Whitworth** – The right of way is a popular and safe route for walkers and cyclists, vehicle free, between Ash and Ash Green. I fear it would be the first stage to turning the track into a road to suit local developers.

**Ms K Heane** – the ownership is unclear and contradictory. It has been a local amenity for many years and is very narrow and unmade. It is an ancient right of way and should be kept as such.

**Mr P Dawkins** – any changes will have a negative impact on the local environment and community and could facilitate future changes leading to the loss of a local, motor free route.

There is uncertainty around ownership and SCC would be granting land, which may be common land that they do not own. It is narrow and unmade. The remainder of the BOAT is under water and impassable.

**Mr H Watson** – there is no clear reasoning to justify the changes. It seems the only beneficiaries would be the developers. The proposed increase in traffic would be to the detriment of the local residents.

**Mr N Bristow** – Bewley Homes do not own the land under Ash Green Lane West. The BOAT has historically been an amenity for walkers and dog walkers and this would be lost. The paving at the western end would set a dangerous precedent. The proposed revision contradicts the Manual for Streets.

**Ms F Samuel-Holmes** – the ownership is unclear and contradictory, the BOAT is a direct pathway for residents from Ash Green to Tongham and a valued local amenity. It is very narrow and unmade. There has been damage to the remaining BOAT. The rationale for the recommendation is invalid and impractical and contradicts the Manual for Streets.

**Ms L Carter** - the ownership is unclear and contradictory, the BOAT is a direct pathway for residents from Ash Green to Tongham and a valued local amenity. It is very narrow and unmade. There has been damage to the remaining BOAT. The rationale for the recommendation is invalid and impractical and could open up the whole of the BOAT to developers in the future.

**Ms S Wilsden** – horse riders, cyclists and dog walkers have been using the track for many years and the loss will force them onto the roads. If this is allowed developers will want more of the track for roadway.

**Mr D and Mrs I Weller** – object to this intrusion of the public owned right of way. Making it a surfaced road takes away the country setting making the area more urban.

**Ms J Guess** – the ownership is unclear and contradictory. The BOAT is a valued local amenity and is very narrow and unmade. There has been damage to the remaining BOAT. The rationale for the recommendation is invalid and impractical and contradicts the Manual for Streets. This could strengthen the argument for future development.

**Ms J Bland** - the ownership is unclear and contradictory. The BOAT is a valued local amenity and is very narrow and unmade. There has been damage to the remaining BOAT. The rationale for the recommendation is invalid and impractical and contradicts the Manual for Streets. These rural lanes are of great significance to the local community in providing safe walking access.

**Ms C Nulty** – objects to the removal of the BOAT. Bewley Homes wants to remove the land agreement to give them greater access in the future to destroy further countryside. The ownership is unclear and contradictory. The BOAT is a narrow, unmade lane and a valued local resource. The rationale is invalid and impractical and contradicts the Manual for Streets.

**Mr G Tyerman** - the ownership is unclear and contradictory. The BOAT is a valued local amenity and is very narrow and unmade. Damage to the remaining BOAT is likely if the restrictions are eased. The rationale for the recommendation is invalid and impractical and contradicts the Manual for Streets.

**Mr A and Mrs P Lepine** - the ownership is unclear and contradictory and is not registered with the land registry. The BOAT is very narrow and unmade and further alterations will

cause further damage and potential flooding. There has been damage to the remaining BOAT. The rationale for the recommendation is invalid and impractical and contradicts the Manual for Streets. It is wrong for a developer to be stopping the public using a public right of way.

**Mr R Phillips** - the ownership is unclear and contradictory. The BOAT is a valued local amenity and is very narrow and unmade. There has been damage to the remaining BOAT. The rationale for the recommendation is invalid and impractical and contradicts the Manual for Streets.

**Ms E Boyes** – the BOAT is an unmade lane and very narrow and is totally unsuitable for larger vehicles. Tarmac is not going to solve the water logging. The BOAT is an important and highly valued amenity for the local residents. The reasons for the recommendation are invalid and impractical.

### **Representations**

**Mr J W Stevens** - states there is not much point objecting as the road has already been constructed up to the road base. He raised concerns about the block paved surface and the cleaning out of the drainage ditches.

**Ms G Brownrigg** - worried that a permanent increase of traffic on the byway may have an adverse effect on other users. It is an opportunity to lift the restriction of horse drawn vehicles and ask the developers to pay for some more surfacing on the rest of the BOAT to offset the effect of shared use on part of the route.

**Mr J Ferns** - queried why the BOAT was closed when works not ongoing. Would object if there were any plans to extend the tarmac surface eastwards from the proposed section.

**Mr P Prakasam** - complained about gate put in by developer whilst works taking place and that the junction with the newly built road is a blind spot for traffic. He has suggested installing speed barriers.

### **Out of time objection**

**Mr R Rogers** – Bewley Homes do not own the land. This historic amenity for walkers and dog walkers would be lost. The paving would ruin a country footpath used for many years by local residents. It sets a dangerous precedent. This rural amenity needs to be preserved. It contradicts the Manual for Streets.

This page is intentionally left blank