Good morning, Inspector.

Thank you for allowing me to speak.
My name is Suzanne Morris.
I have lived on all sides of Epsom Downs for 30 years, and Langley Vale has been my home for the last six years.
So I am not speaking only from a planning report. I am speaking from 30 years of living here. I know these roads, the Downs, the traffic, the horses and Langley Vale.
I respectfully ask you to dismiss this appeal.

**THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION**

The developer will understandably point to the benefits of 110 homes: housing, affordable housing, transport measures, landscaping and biodiversity improvements.
But the fundamental question is simple:
Does putting 110 homes here actually make sense?

I believe the answer is no.

**TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY**

The suggestion that this is a sustainable location does not reflect the reality of living in Langley Vale.
We do not have the transport infrastructure of an urban community. For many residents, a car is not a luxury; it is a necessity.
I am registered disabled with an invisible disability. For people like me, simply saying that residents can walk or cycle instead of using a car is not a realistic alternative.
The same applies to older residents, disabled people, parents with young children and anyone with mobility difficulties who needs to reach shops, healthcare and essential services.
Accessibility must be considered in the real world, not just measured as distances on a map.
From living here, it is also clear that many households have three or even four vehicles. That reflects genuine car dependence. We should not think of 110 homes as simply 110 additional cars.
There may be considerably more vehicles, including visitors, deliveries, tradespeople, taxis, service vehicles and construction traffic.
The Inspector must consider how people will actually live, not merely what a transport model assumes.

**ROADS, HORSES AND THE LOCAL ECONOMY**

These are not ordinary suburban roads. They are shared every day with racehorses.

After 30 years around Epsom Downs, I know that racehorses are not an occasional inconvenience. They are part of Epsom's history, identity and, importantly, its economy.
The racing industry and the unique environment of Epsom Downs are established economic assets. Economic growth should build upon what makes Epsom distinctive, not gradually undermine the environment on which an existing industry depends.
Additional traffic creates more opportunities for conflict between vehicles, horses and riders. No planning condition can make those cars disappear, and no traffic model can fully replicate what happens when a nervous thoroughbred meets traffic on a constrained road.
That is a real-world safety issue.

**GREEN BELT, LANDSCAPE AND BIODIVERSITY**
We are told that development can be mitigated through design and landscaping. But mitigation cannot give us the open land back.
Once houses, roads, lighting, driveways and parked cars are built, the openness has gone. Planting trees around a housing development does not turn it back into countryside.
I have watched the area around Epsom Downs change over 30 years. Each individual loss may appear small, but eventually those small losses become one enormous permanent loss.

Once this field is built upon, we cannot come back in ten years and change our minds.
It is gone.
The same applies to biodiversity. Nature is already here. Wildlife moves through this landscape, and habitats connect with one another. Nature does not recognise the red boundary of a planning application.
Biodiversity net gain should not become an accounting exercise in which the loss of an established environment is accepted simply because mitigation is promised.

**INFRASTRUCTURE AND CUMULATIVE IMPACT**
Another 110 homes will not exist in isolation. They will create additional demand on roads, schools, healthcare, drainage, water and community services.
We must also consider the cumulative effect.
One development is described as manageable. Then another. Then another. All use the same roads, services and infrastructure.

At what point does "manageable" become too much?

**CONCLUSION**

I fully understand that we need new homes.
I am not against housing.
But planning must mean more than finding a field on which houses can physically be built. It must mean putting the right development in the right place.
Langley Vale Farm is not the right place for 110 homes.

Once countryside is gone, it is gone. Once the character of a village is fundamentally changed, it is extraordinarily difficult to recover.
I have had the privilege of living around Epsom Downs for 30 years, and Langley Vale has been my home for the last six.
I want future generations to recognise the Langley Vale we know today.

This is not simply about 110 houses. It is about what sort of place Langley Vale will be in another 10, 20 or 30 years.
This may be the final opportunity to protect Langley Vale from permanent and irreversible change.
So I respectfully ask you to recognise the reality of our roads and transport, the importance of our horses and racing industry, and the value of our countryside, wildlife and Green Belt.
Please do not allow a short-term housing proposal to create a permanent loss that can never be reversed.

Please dismiss this appeal.
Please protect Langley Vale.
Thank you.