

ROVIA

Nutfield Park Developments Limited

Former Laporte Works Site Nutfield Green Park, Nutfield

Summary Proof of Evidence

David Bird BSc CEng MICE

On Transport Matters (CD11.11)

TDC Planning Reference: 2023/1281

Planning Inspectorate Reference: APP/M3645/W/25/3374913

February 2026

Contents

1 Introduction 1

2 Existing Situation..... 2

3 Planning Policy 3

4 Development Proposals..... 4

5 Effects of Development 5

6 Analysis 6

7 Third Party Objections 7

8 Summary and Conclusion 8

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This is the Summary Proof of Evidence of David Bird. My qualifications and experience are set out in my main proof.
- 1.2 All figures and appendices referred to in this summary are within my main proof.

2 Existing Situation

- 2.1 The site is located close to the A25 in Nutfield and is accessible via walking and cycling to local services and to existing bus routes. There are regular bus services to a number of locations including Redhill along with access to Surrey County Council's existing Digital Demand Responsive Transport (DDRT) bus system.
- 2.2 There are a number of facilities in close proximity to the site including the Memorial Hall, a nursery school, church and the Queens Head public house.

3 Planning Policy

- 3.1 The thrust of relevant National and Local policy on transport is to create sustainable developments where residents can access the facilities they need in a sustainable way, for example by using walking, cycling and public transport modes.

4 Development Proposals

4.1 The transport measures that form part of the proposed development are as follows:

On Site

- New all-vehicle access onto A25;
- A spine road (The Drive) that provides vehicular access to the site development areas;
- A network of cycle and footpaths that provide connections within the site and connect externally – to the A25, Church Hill and to Chilmead Lane to the north of the site.

Off Site

- A signal controlled pedestrian crossing on the A25 to the west of the junction with Cooper's Hill Road and Church Hill;
- A signal controlled pedestrian crossing on the A25 to the east of the junction with Mid Street;
- A pedestrian crossing on the A25 to the west of the development;
- Alterations to the A25 junction to provide improved capacity on the Mid Street Arm;
- Extension of the existing speed limit to the west of the site access;
- A continuous cycle route, between the site and Redhill (NCR21 improvements).

Contributions

- A contribution of £4M towards extension of the existing Digital Demand Responsive Transport (DDRT) bus scheme operating within Tandridge to provide an additional bus within the area surrounding the appeal site.
- The DDRT service will operate within a 5 mile radius of the site and serve locations such as Redhill, Reigate, Godstone and Caterham.
- The service will operate Monday to Saturday between 6am and 11pm and on Sundays between 8am and 10pm hence giving an extensive coverage.

Travel Plan

- Introduction of a comprehensive Travel Plan.

4.2 These measures will facilitate access by sustainable modes to numerous facilities that residents of the proposed development will wish to use.

5 Effects of Development

- 5.1 A Scoping Note was agreed with SCC prior to submission of the planning application.
- 5.2 The traffic analysis was undertaken based on this Scoping Note and the agreed trip generation figures. Following some discussions and sensitivity testing, along with agreement to a small mitigation scheme at the Mid Street junction, SCC agreed the analysis and agreed that there were no capacity or safety concerns with the development.

6 Analysis

Access to Amenities

- 6.1 Based on the evidence I have presented in my main proof, I conclude that the great majority of destinations that people will wish to access in their daily lives can be accessed by sustainable modes from the proposed development. These are not convoluted journeys or journeys with significant friction since most can be undertaken by walking, a single bus journey or using the upgraded cycle route between the site and Redhill.

Policy Compliance

- 6.2 I have demonstrated in my proof of evidence that the proposed development accords with relevant, applicable national, regional and local policies and guidance on transport issues. In the main this is due to the vision for the development being a sustainable place to live and hence the emphasis on providing improvements to sustainable links to the amenities that people will wish to visit, thus reducing use of the private car.

TDC Reasons for Refusal

- 6.3 There are two strands to the TDC's transport related reason for refusal as follows:
- The settlement itself cannot meet the basic needs of its own residents; and
 - Sustainable transport measures provided and funded by the proposed development do not go far enough to satisfy the requirements of NPPF.
- 6.4 In relation to the first strand, there are a number of facilities in Nutfield and there will be additional facilities provided on site. Furthermore, there is no specific policy test on the level of amenities that should be provided within a settlement, especially in rural areas.
- 6.5 In relation to the second strand, I consider that there will be excellent sustainable links to key destinations via the enhanced NCR 21 cycle route (which can be used by conventional and e-bikes), existing bus services and the DDRT.

7 Third Party Objections

- 7.1 I have analysed the issues raised by the objectors and conclude that they raise no new issues that have not been dealt with in the submitted assessments and in my evidence.

8 Summary and Conclusion

8.1 I conclude my evidence in the paragraphs below.

Policy Compliance

- 8.2 I have demonstrated in my main proof that the proposed development accords well with national, regional and local policies and guidance on the transport aspects of development. This is due to the vision for the development being a sustainable place to live and hence the emphasis on improvements to sustainable links to the amenities that people will wish to visit, thus reducing use of the private car.
- 8.3 In particular, I have demonstrated that the proposals comply with the NPPF requirements for sustainable development from a transport perspective.
- 8.4 Paragraph 8 of NPPF sets out the sustainability objectives of NPPF and, in particular, the desire for developments to have “*accessible services and open spaces*”. Paragraph 9 sets out that the decision maker should “*take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area*”
- 8.5 As I have set out in this proof, the site has access to services needed by residents by sustainable modes and access to open space within the site.
- 8.6 Paragraph 110 of NPPF states that development should be focussed on “*locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes.....However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making” (my emphasis). I consider that the transport provision associated with the proposed development has a significant influence in making the site sustainable and offering a real choice of mode of transport, for example for journeys to Redhill where cycling or bus can be used.*

Reasons for Refusal

8.7 TDC’s objection on transport grounds is set out in their first Reason for Refusal with the relevant section of said Reason for Refusal being as follows:

The proposal would not comply with the requirements of paragraphs 155 and 156 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) as the development would not be in a sustainable location and necessary improvements would not be made to local infrastructure to cater for the needs of the occupiers of the new development

8.8 I have demonstrated in my evidence that, with the proposed transport improvements, the development would be in a sustainable location with access to amenities available using a choice of means of sustainable transport. I have also demonstrated that necessary improvements are proposed to the local infrastructure to cater for the needs of the occupiers of the new development ie footpath and cycle route improvements and a significant enhancement to the existing DDRT service.

- 8.9 It is noteworthy that the competent transport authority, Surrey County Council, raise no objection to the grant of planning permission assuming the agreed package of transport improvements is provided.

Overall Conclusions

- 8.10 I consider the proposed development to be in a sustainable location from a transport perspective due to the existing sustainable transport links that exist to local amenities along with the significant enhancements to transport provision that will be brought forward by the development and which will be available to existing residents as well as residents of and visitors to the proposed development.
- 8.11 Furthermore, I do not consider there are any transport related reasons why planning permission should not be granted.