<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and address.</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Steering group Observation and Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Thompson</td>
<td>Tandridge District Council</td>
<td>See attached letter on pages 6-15</td>
<td>See responses entered in the attached letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Strategic Planning Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted, Surrey RH8 0BT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel: 01883 732 887 <a href="mailto:sthompson@tandridge.gov.uk">sthompson@tandridge.gov.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hammond</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>See attached letter on pages 16-17</td>
<td>We are grateful for your support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Development &amp; Regulation Thames Valley Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel: 0300 060 1373 <a href="mailto:david.hammond@naturalengland.org.uk">david.hammond@naturalengland.org.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We did not feel able to include the reference to the NPPF that you suggested in paragraph 1.2, since the NPPF has a different status from the other legislative sources mentioned there as governing the preparation of the Plan. As you noted, the NPPF is mentioned and quoted fairly extensively a little further on.

We have had useful contact with the Surrey Hills AONB Management Team. The Submission Plan that has now been submitted to Tandridge District Council includes references to the Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan both in the supporting text to the General Design Policy and in the list of evidence sources in Appendix A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lloyd- Sweet</td>
<td>Historic England</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Robert.LloydSweet@HistoricEngland.org.uk">Robert.LloydSweet@HistoricEngland.org.uk</a></td>
<td>01483 252028</td>
<td>We are grateful for your support and constructive comments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In the light of your comments and those of Tandridge District Council, the key design policies have been considerably amended in the Submission Plan that has now been submitted to Tandridge District Council. Policies 1-6 have been the reduced to three and their texts have been consolidated and simplified to avoid repetition. In particular, the requirement to protect views now refers out explicitly to views listed in the Woldingham Design Guidance SPD. The aim has been to improve clarity and effectiveness in application without losing essential parts of the detail in the existing SPDs, since elevating the guidance to policy status was one of the key purposes of the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Botcherby BA (HONS) MA MRTPI AIEMA</td>
<td>Planning Adviser National Trust</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rachel.botcherby@nationaltrust.org.uk">rachel.botcherby@nationaltrust.org.uk</a></td>
<td>01932 339472, Mobile: 07887 531619</td>
<td>We are grateful for your support. In the Submission Plan which has now been submitted to Tandridge District Council, Objective 1 has been amended to refer explicitly to the protection of the AONB and the AGLV in addition to the mention of the Green Belt, and specific references both to the North Downs and to the Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan have been included in the text supporting the design policies. The comment about the importance of setting has also been included in the main design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Susan Davidson  
Communications Assistant  
stakeholder@marinemanagement.org.uk

Marine Management Organisation  
See attached letter on page 23

Given our land-locked situation on chalk downland without even any normal rivers, we were not surprised that your organisation had no comments to make. But we are grateful to you for taking the trouble to respond.

Alison Murphy  
Regulations and Environmental Manager  
Sutton and East Surrey Water plc  
Tel: 01737 785878  
(DDI)Tel: 01737 772000  
Network_Services@waterplc.com

Dear Parish Clerk, Thank you for giving us the opportunity of commenting on the Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan: Consultation on the Pre-Submission Plan. We have some general comments which may already be covered by other planning documents:

1. We would like to see reference to new developments being as water efficient as possible; and

2. We think it would be appropriate to make some reference to drainage from new developments being designed to minimise the potential for flooding downstream.

3. Where homes are converted into multiple dwelling units, the developer applies for separately metered water connections in accordance with the Water Industry Act.

Your comments about water efficiency and design of drainage to minimise the potential for flooding are noted. The Submission Plan that has been submitted to Tandridge District Council includes a requirement that developments should comply with Design Principle SD1 of the Woldingham Design Guidance SPD, which encourages rainwater harvesting in the interests of optimum water efficiency and sustainable drainage systems wherever possible. The risk of flooding from accumulated water from the hillsides is also mentioned as one of the serious constraints on sustainable development in the village.

Since conversion of homes into multiple dwelling units is not specifically addressed in the Plan, the requirement for separately metered water connections is not mentioned. If it is a requirement of Water Industry Act as you indicate, we assume it may be covered in other instructions or

Woldingham Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan: Pre-Submission Plan Schedule of Comments Received  
3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Wilson</td>
<td>KSL - Kent</td>
<td>Thank you for consulting us on your draft Neighbourhood Plan. Having reviewed the document we have no concerns with its content. We note that you are responding on behalf of the Environment Agency and that you have no comments on the Plan. Thank you for taking the trouble to respond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Jones (Planning)</td>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td>We are glad that the reference to Tandridge District Council’s Core Strategy Policy CSP11 on infrastructure and services was satisfactory for you. Thank you for taking the trouble to respond to the consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot Stamp</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>We welcome your comment that Network Rail would look to support schemes to improve car parking at the station and your wish to be kept updated and involved. The points you make about development over or near railway tunnels, or close to railway assets or land, do not seem appropriate for us to include in our Neighbourhood Plan, but we are drawing them to the attention of Tandridge District Council as the Local Planning Authority so that they can take them into account as appropriate in any relevant cases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for taking the trouble to respond to the consultation.

Ginny Hall MRTPI
Mono Consultants Limited
48 St Vincent Street
Glasgow, G2 5TS
Direct Dial: 0141 270 2733
Mobile: 07796 995 843
Ginny.hall@monoconsultants.com

On behalf of The Mobile Operators Association (MOA) See attached letter on pages 30-32

We are grateful for the wording set out towards the end of your letter, which is included in the Submission Plan that has been submitted to Tandridge District Council. We have considered the earlier points you made with due care, but since the points you ask us to remove reflect genuine concern and dissatisfaction on the part of our residents, we have not felt able to remove them as you requested.

Thank you for taking the trouble to respond to the consultation.

Groups and Agents Representations

We are grateful for this response, and for the confirmation that the Trustees of The Glebe are content for The Glebe to be designated as a Local Green Space.

We note your concern about development appropriate for Green Belts. However Planning Practice Guidance makes clear that "Designating a green area as Local Green Space would give it protection consistent with that in respect of the Green Belt, but otherwise there are no new restrictions or obligations on landowners". This should allay your concern.

As regards Hedley Field's designation as
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a potential SNCI, we understand that that a professional ecological survey is scheduled to take place very shortly.

As regards the Woldingham BOA, this is a designation made by the South East England Biodiversity Forum. It focuses on landscapes rather than individual habitats and is intended to give an opportunity to connect individual areas of wildlife habitat. It is not clear to us that a professional ecological survey of individual habitats was considered by the Forum to be a prerequisite for such designations."

We note your client’s views about the proposed designation of Angell’s Field as a Local Green Space. In the light of local support for making the designation, however, we have not changed our proposals on this point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angell’s’ Field</th>
<th>Payne &amp; Co on behalf of the owner</th>
<th>Re: Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan Pre-submission Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Further to your letter dated 26 March addressed to [the owner] which I duly passed on to him and your e-mail of 19 May. I write to confirm [the owner] has telephoned me. [He] confirms he wishes the land to only be considered for possible future planning for development purposes and does not want his land included for any other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Letter from Tandridge District Council dated 28 May setting out representations on the Pre-sub version of the Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan

Woldingham Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan

Thank you for providing Tandridge District Council the opportunity to make comments on the pre-submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Council have the following comments to make:

General

The Council feel that the Plan contains a large amount of repetition, which can make it difficult to assess planning applications against.

Response: Noted. This point is addressed below under the comments on specific policies.

Maps

The Council recommend that the parish council need to include a licence number of the maps within their document under the OS agreement ‘presumption to publish’ approach. The Council are able to provide the licence number to the parish council when requested.

Response: Agreed.

Action: Licence number now obtained from TDC, thank you, and inserted in Submission Plan.

Paragraph 1.8

The Plan mentions the ‘seven’ basic conditions which the Plan should meet. For clarity it would have been helpful if the Plan mentioned all seven conditions. However, the Council recognises that a basic conditions statement will be submitted alongside the submission version of the plan to the Council under regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2015.

Response: On reviewing this we note that two of the seven basic conditions apply only to Local Development Orders, so only five basic conditions apply to Neighbourhood Plans.

Action: Basic condition e. (prescribed conditions are met in relation to the Plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the Plan) has been added to the text, and conditions are listed in the order in DCLG’s Planning Practice Guidance.

Paragraph 2.21

The Council recognise the comprehensive and detailed work that the parish council has done in preparing a pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan and three Supplementary Planning Documents. The Neighbourhood plan correctly states that greater weight will be given to the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan than the three Supplementary Documents that exist for the Woldingham area. The Neighbourhood Plan is an opportunity to attach greater weight to policies when planning applications are assessed, and could provide the parish council the ability to review the SPDs against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The Council would recommend that the SPDs would be more effective integrated into the Neighbourhood Plan.
Response: Following discussion and clarification with TDC, we believe that the purpose of the Plan in distilling the essence of the Supplementary Planning Documents and giving it policy status is more fully understood, as explained below.

The Plan does indeed seek to ensure greater weight for the policy provisions in the Plan. The detail distilled into those policies, and Policies 1-6 in particular, is needed to avoid loss of focus on important aspects of the existing guidance as the Plan is superimposed. We have, however, considerably amended the structure and detail of Policies 1-6, reducing them to 3. We hope that these amendments will make the task of applying the provisions of the guidance clearer for officers, helping to focus their attention on the points of greatest importance for our community.

The Supplementary Planning Documents remain as important sources of evidence for those policies. In some instances, clearly indicated in the Plan policies, there are references out to specific provisions of the SPDs. For example, Policy 2 makes specific references to tables in the Woldingham Design Guidance (WGD) which identify factors in the Character Areas defined in the Woldingham Character Assessment that will be given policy weight by the Plan. We therefore conclude that both Plan and SPDs should remain in force. But the latter will have less weight and the Plan policies will take precedence if there is any conflict that has been missed (a problem that our work has sought to avoid). The SPDs will thus play a supporting role to the Plan’s policies as sources of evidence and for certain specific provisions that are clearly signposted in the Plan policies.

Action: Policies 1-6 have been reduced to 3 and wordings substantially simplified to remove repetition.

Objectives and Progress Indicators
The Council support the use of objectives and progress indicators so that the plan can be effectively monitored.

Response: Noted.

Policy 1 – General Design Policy
The Council feel that Policy 1 could be strengthened through reducing the size of the policy. As previously mentioned, there is quite a lot of repetition and it would be difficult to assess a planning application against such a large number of criteria. As such the policy should be streamlined and the Council recommend the following amendments to policy 1.

Development proposals should will be permitted, provided that they comply with relevant policies in the Tandridge Local Plan and this Plan that they meet all the following criteria, where appropriate:

Response: Agreed. As noted above, the policy has been substantially amended to reduce repetition.

Action: text of renumbered Policy L1 amended as suggested.

Policy 1.A3
The council believe that it would be helpful if the views that should be respected and preserved are clarified.

Response: This provision seeks to encapsulate Design Principles V 1 and V 2 on pages 17-21 of the WDG. V 1 addresses views towards Woldingham and explanatory paragraph 1.8 on page 17 of the Pre-sub explains that the landscape designated areas are the Area of Outstanding Natural
Beauty and the Area of Great Landscape Value. Figure 5.7 on page 20 of the WDG gives “a representative sample” of the views concerned. V.2 addresses views towards the countryside from the roads within the village, and that aspect of the provision could be clarified by a reference out to Table 5.1 of the WDG.

The duplication in Policy 2.3 should also be removed.

Action: Renumbered Policy L1.A.2 has been amended by adding at the end: “..[the views] listed in Figure 5.7 and Table 5.1 of the Woldingham Design Guidance”, and the parallel provisions in former Policy 2.3 have been removed.

Policy 1.A4b

At present, this criterion is contrary to objective 6 to have safer and better access for residents.

Response: Noted. This is a design and character criterion, intended to avoid suburbanisation of the village where pavements do not at present exist, unless there are particular safety reasons otherwise. Safety aspects are more fully addressed in the supporting paragraphs C6 to C9 to proposed renumbered Community Policy C1. TDC’s comments further below indicate that they do not consider Policy C1 to be a land use policy. However, an amendment to note the safety dimension has been added to renumbered Policy L1.A4.

Action: Amend Policy 1.A4b to read: “b) not formalising road treatments: subject to considerations of safety, roads that do not currently have pavements are retained as such”.

Policy 1.A5a-e

There are a lot of sub criteria and would be more suitable if the criterion was one single line that required the new or replacement building to be appropriate to the existing layout and character of the street scene.

Response: Noted. As explained above, the point of elevating the SPD provisions to policy level will be lost if detail is dropped to too great an extent. However, in the interests of clarity and avoiding repetition these detailed points can be incorporated elsewhere in a merging of policies.

Action: Policy 1.A5a-e has been deleted and the points have been added in appropriate places in the merged Policy L1.

Policy 1.B – Layout

The Council understand the neighbourhood plan’s ambition to protect the character and appearance of Woldingham. However, the Council feel that Policy 1.A has covered the points made in Policy 1.B. As such, this can be cumbersome and not as effective in policy. The Council would recommend that remove all of Policy 1.B. Further, as mentioned by the neighbourhood plan in supporting text, paragraph 1.4, Tandridge District Council had a prescriptive minimum plot size.

Since preparation of the Detailed Policies Development Plan Document (DPD), the Council have removed reference to a minimum plot size figure and instead have taken a more flexible policy stance, referencing that development should be in line with the existing street scene, character and layout of the area. Not only did the Council find that the prescriptive figure of 0.2 ha was not defendable at
appeal on a number of occasions as it did not comply with the flexibility required by the NPPF, the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State supported the more flexible policy approach in the Detailed Policies DPD.

Whilst the Council recognises that the majority of the resident’s survey supports the 0.2ha policy, the Council believe there is limited justification to reinstate the 0.2ha.

Response: As the Council notes, the residents’ consultation in January indicated strong support for the reinstatement of the 0.2ha policy which applied in Woldingham from 1992 to 2014. Since it ceased to apply, a planning application proposing subdivision into smaller plots has been made, challenging the effectiveness of TDC’s Policy DP8 and demonstrating the vulnerability of Woldingham’s character without an objectively quantified protection. It attracted an unprecedented number of objections, confirming the view of many residents that the 0.2ha requirement has been and should remain a significant part of the requirements needed to protect Woldingham’s character. We do not agree that Policy 1.A as previously drafted covers the relevant issue.

The claim that “the prescriptive figure of 0.2ha was not defendable at appeal on a number of occasions” is not borne out by the evidence available to us. We are aware of one specific case in the centre of the village in 2012, influenced by proximity to other smaller units permitted under an exceptional provision in 1993, mentioned specifically in the Council’s comments on Policy 7 below; and

a. by the appeal Inspector’s noting that Woldingham Parish Council’s strategy paper indicated that the Parish Council might consider the question of smaller units.

In another case near the centre of the village the question of sub-division of the curtilage was not a key issue in the appeal. Apart from these two appeals, exceptions have been allowed near the centre of the village in two cases, first when the former Roman Catholic Church site was redeveloped with 4 smaller houses not dissimilar to neighbouring properties and later on one other adjacent site. But those cases were not appeals, and we are not aware of any general problem about applying the 0.2ha requirement in Woldingham.

Renumbered Policy L1.A.6 uses the wording of the Woldingham Village Design Statement (WVDS - para. 5.2g) with clearer effect than DP8.B in LP2, which failed to prevent a decision in favour of a development involving partial in depth development of garden land in another part of the District after a Public Inquiry in 2014.

Renumbered Policy L1.A.7 clarifies a point touched on in LP2 DP8.A4 and covered in the WVDS (para. 5.2f), making it clear that the frontage width in question is the frontage of the plot, not the building. There has been confusion about this in the past.

Action: The position of these provisions is changed in the merging of Pre-sub Policies 1 and 2, but no change of substance has been made.

Policy 1.C - Relationship of built form to site and D - Built form
The Council would also recommend that Policy 1.C and 1.D are removed as they are repeated in 1.A.

Response: As already noted, it is part of the objective of the Plan to distil the main points of the guidance and give them policy status. That objective would be lost if too much detail is lost. It is therefore proposed to retain the detail in previously numbered Policy 1.C and 1.D, while inserting some detail from Policy 1.A5 in a way that seeks to avoid repetition.

Action: Retain the substance of these provisions in a revised and merged structure of Pre-sub Policies 1 and 2.

Policy 1.F – Parking and garaging
The Council think that both these points could be merged as they overlap. The Council would recommend that the policy sets out the design issues and removes reference to “there is no need for
residents and visitors to park regularly in the road”. This is unenforceable and raises expectation that the Council can police what happens outside the site. As such the Council suggests this text is removed or amended.

Response: We agree, and have made amendments to merge and shorten the text and remove the reference to avoiding regular parking in the road, which is explained adequately in supporting renumbered paragraph L1.28 on page 15.

Action: Amend Policy 1.F to read:

“F. Parking, Garaging and Ancillary Buildings

“Where planning permission is required, parking, garaging and ancillary buildings should be well integrated into the plot and its landscaping. They should not obscure or dominate the house frontage or approach, and should be softened with adjacent planting. The number of spaces should be appropriate for the number of bedrooms in the dwelling and spaces should be designed for convenient use.”

Policy 2 – Residential Character Areas

The Council recognise the objective of the neighbourhood plan to protect the character of Woldingham and the work that has been undertaken to prepare the policies. However, the Council feel that the policy is a repetition of Policy 1. As such, the Council would recommend that the policy is combined with Policy 1. Further, the policy should not be this prescriptive, as there may be circumstances where an offset drive would not be the right design solution for the site. If the parish council want to and allow for it not to happen would be more appropriate.

The Council would normally only impose a condition restricting the use of a garage to parking where the garage forms part of the parking required under the parking standards, which would only happen when a new dwelling is being formed, and where there isn’t other off street parking to meet the requirement. This is because conditions should only be applied in order to make unacceptable development acceptable and as such a condition should only be imposed to overcome a policy issue. Each scheme and any conditions considered must be treated on their own merits in accordance with the tests set out in the Planning Practice Guidance. Furthermore, the Council wouldn’t normally impose the condition where a new garage is being provided for an existing dwelling. Where this may be possible, there would have to clear justification in regard to highway safety. As worded this policy does not make any provision for the need for the condition to be assessed and a condition cannot be imposed without it being necessary.

The Council would also point out that it cannot control domestic lighting. Therefore under 2.10 it may be better to say ‘where planning permission is required...’

Response: As already noted, the objective of giving policy weight to the essence of the SPDs requires the retention of a considerable amount of detail, although the work of drafting Policies 1-6 has sought to concentrate on more significant points from the guidance and shorten the provisions where possible.

In the case of this policy (and Policies 3-5) the Pre-sub proposals sought to preserve and make best use of the Character Areas defined in the Woldingham Character Assessment, to ensure that the main points selectively related to them that emerge from the Woldingham Design Guidance can be given due weight. The work started with 10 separate Character Area Policies, so the Pre-sub version was already considerably reduced.

Having reviewed the provisions thoroughly, however, we agree that a merging of Policy 1 and most of Policy 2, and a further merging of the remainder of Policy 2 with Policies 3, 4 and 5, will remove duplication and make the provisions clearer. The Policies will be amended accordingly.

We have retained the approach of referring out to specific tables in the Woldingham Design Guidance which are clearly identified in the text of the Policy. We hope that clearly marked
signposts of this kind will assist officers to apply the relevant points without having to undertake an unfocused search through the SPDs. Any other approach would require more separate policies or more detail in the Plan itself.

The 4th sentence of TDC’s comment on Policy 2 appears to relate specifically to Policy 2.8. We accept that comment and will insert the words “where possible” to indicate that cases where the prescription is not observed should be exceptional and justified.

Policy 2.9: We note the comment that a condition on the use of a garage for parking cannot be used unless it is necessary. This requirement has been removed.

Policy 2.10: We note TDC’s comment about lack of power to control domestic lighting and have changed the wording.

Action: Pre-sub Policies 1-5 have been restructured considerably to improve clarity and remove duplication without loss of substance. Amendments have also been made as indicated to the text of the Pre-sub Policies 2.8, 2.9 and 2.10.

Paragraph 2.16 – 2.30 - Character Areas
The Council would like to provide some assistance in strengthening the policies. In some parts of the detailed notes about the character areas, there is a mix between policy and justification. The justification should state why the policy has been prepared. The policy should set out the strategy and criteria the planning application will be assessed against to overcome the issue.

Response: We welcome the offer of help. We take the point that the supporting text should not appear to contain policy wordings, and have made efforts to remove any such references. In many cases this has been a matter of indicating that the related policy provision is intended to achieve a particular effect, rather than using “should” or “must” wordings without that context.

Action: The wording of all supporting paragraphs has been amended to ensure that they explain the intended effect of the relevant policy provision and do not appear to contain policy wording.

Policy 4 – Historic Core Character Area
The Council appreciate the historic core character of Woldingham and agree that it should be protected. However, the Council feel it is too prescriptive to state under 4.1 that there can be no enforced if someone decided to convert a loft of an existing dwelling and as such feel that this may be acceptable dependant on the individual circumstances.

Policy 4.6 states ‘many development frontages are bounded by low hedges, shrub planting and trees’. The Council are unclear what this means and recommend that if the aim of the neighbourhood plan is to encourage this type of boundary treatment, this is what the policy should say. Paragraph 4.1 recognises that the southern gateway to Woldingham is very important to the overall character of the village, yet it is not included within a policy. The Council would suggest that this may need to be considered to ensure its preservation.

Response:
Policy 4.1: The Council’s point will be met by inserting the word “normally” so that exceptions are accommodated where a case can be made for them.
Policy 4.6: restate: “frontages should normally.....”
Para. 4.1: The recognition of the importance of southern gateway to Woldingham is welcome, but we believe renumbered Policies L1 and L2.3 in combination should be adequate to provide the required protection.
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Action: Policies 4.1 and 4.6 have been amended as indicated. They will appear within a much amended merged Policy 2.

Policy 5 – Core Fringe Character Area

Policy 5.3 states ‘...avoid unsympathetic cut and fill to the landform’. The Council are unclear what that means and as such would recommend that the wording is amended.

Response: This provision will be removed and the Plan will rely on a policy reference out to Table 6.1 on page of the Woldingham Design Guidance, where this form of words appears in respect of selected Character Areas.

Action: These words have been deleted from Policy 5.3.

Policy 6 – Landscape

The Council are glad to see that the neighbourhood plan recognises that the importance of the local landscape rather than a generic policy about Green Belt, which is a strategic matter that is set out and dealt by policies within the wider Development Plan.

However, the Council are concerned about points 6.2 and 6.3. These requirements are not part of the local validation list and therefore the Council could not insist on this. Further, the trigger is too vague (‘steeply sloping’). As the policy is currently worded it could be a requirement for very minor forms of development, which would place an unreasonable and disproportionate financial burden on applicants. The Council would suggest that a more appropriate wording would request that this information could be required by officers if they need it, which is a measure that the Council already do.

Response: We are grateful for the welcome for the general approach in this policy.

We are reluctant to lose the force of the provisions in Policy 6.2 and 6.3. An unhappy experience in a case in which these issues have arisen has given us further reason to wish to include these protective provisions in cases where proposed replacements or extensions will have a much more prominent effect on the landscape than what is already in place. In the light of the Council’s reservations, however, we will change the wording so that it applies in appropriate cases rather than more generally.

Action: Policy 6.2 and 6.3 (now renumbered as Policy L3.2 and 3) have been amended as noted above.

Policy 7 – Downsizing

Whilst the Council do not see any problem with a policy which is permissive towards providing smaller dwellings within the central core of the village and support the neighbourhood plan for doing this, the policy itself has a number of issues. The Council would like to bring the parish council’s attention to a particular policy within the North of the Downs Local Plan. Policy 11b stated that ‘redevelopment opposite the crescent at a density not exceeding 15 habitable rooms per acre will be allowed, subject to new general policies for housing development, to the restriction of development to 2 storeys of retirement or sheltered housing and to the preservation of an appropriate setting’.

Tandridge District Council granted planning permission for application TA/93/P/108 – the erection of three detached retirement bungalows with detached double garages and new access road at land to the rear of Mimosa and Ridgeway, Station Road, Woldingham, CR3 7DA. Condition 8 of the permission stated ‘the bungalows hereby permitted shall be occupied only by persons of pensionable age (60+)’ and the reason for this condition was to comply with Policy 11B of the North of the Downs Local Plan.
On 17 October 1995, Tandridge District Council refused planning permission for ‘amendment to condition 8 for three retirement bungalows to reduce age restriction from 60 to 55 years and to waive condition for dependent relative or nurse at land to rear of, Mimosa and Ridgeway’. This decision was appealed where the Inspector determined that the main planning issue was to consider whether the development would be reasonable without the restrictive condition. The original proposal (TA/93/P/108) stemmed from views by the local community that there was a lack of accommodation for elderly local residents to move to. This point was also acknowledged by the Inspector who presided over the Public Inquiry into objections to the North of the Downs Local Plan. As such, the reason for refusal was that the removal of the condition would be contrary to Policy 11B of the North of the Downs Local Plan.

The appeal raises a few helpful points to consider. The appeal site was an extensive area of garden land to the rear of 3 large properties, located close to the centre of the village. Although the Inspector noted that the proposed dwellings cannot be described as sheltered accommodation, the layout and size of the bungalows would appeal to a much wider age group than that envisaged by Policy 11B. However, the Inspector found that condition 8 was necessary in order to ensure that the scheme remains as a small scale retirement development, in accordance with Policy 11B, rather than the provision of general housing. Without the condition the proposed development would fail to meet the requirements of the Local Plan and, in the Inspector’s opinion, would not be acceptable on this site. The Inspector also felt that these are clear and specific circumstances that would justify the imposition of an occupancy condition in this case. Notably the fact the North of the Downs Local Plan Policy 11B was adopted. The appeal notes that the applicants felt the condition was unreasonable as there had been difficulties in marketing the proposed dwellings and that it was encumbrance on the prospective occupants of a freehold dwelling as opposed to sheltered accommodation.

From this, the Council have learnt a number of lessons and would recommend the parish council consider the following. Firstly, the Council do not see how we could ensure that point 2 is met. This criterion is likely to relate to internal layouts, which unless listed, is unlikely to be a planning matter. Secondly, the introduction of the NPPF and the PPG have meant that it is unlikely that conditions could be imposed which secure point 3 and 7. The PPG (see paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 21a-015-20140306) sets out how to use conditions. The Council are not convinced a condition of this nature would meet the 6 tests. A s106 is also unlikely to be appropriate as it is difficult to enforce from a planning perspective. The Council would recommend that a mechanism for delivery the objectives of this policy would need to be fully considered and be workable / enforceable before proceeding with it. For example, consideration about the design and layout of the property to encourage this particular age group to accommodate the dwelling could provide for a more positive policy. The appeal referred to above clearly demonstrates that the properties were difficult to market with the restrictive condition and the Council are concerned this would still be applicable and therefore the policy would not be effective.

Finally, in terms of the Equality Act 2010, plans and policies should treat everyone equally. Whilst the Council recognise the need for downsizing units and would support the policy to encourage smaller units designed appropriately for that use, the policy should also be more widespread to allow people with disabilities and younger couples, for example, to be located close to local amenities and the central core of the village. This would also help to create and maintain a sustainable mixed community, in accordance with the NPPF.

Response: Following extensive discussions with the District Council, this policy has been very considerably revised as an exceptions policy to increase the level of control on development and ensure that it is not misused to allow a greater extent of denser development than is justified or intended to meet the wishes of older residents who have shown interest in smaller dwellings for Woldingham Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan: Pre-Submission Plan Schedule of Comments Received
downsizing from their larger houses and gardens. The proposed area is still carefully defined, but the policy would now apply to three character areas that typically have lower plot sizes and are close to the village centre. The total number of dwellings allowed by the policy over fifteen years has a low cap of ten, the cap per plot is three and the net increase per plot is two. There is also a ban on adjacent plots being subdivided for smaller dwellings. To limit use of the dwellings to older residents, any development would have to be justified by a register of older residents wishing to occupy such dwellings and planning approval would be subject to a legally binding Section 106 agreement specifying who could occupy them. The Parish Council would have the leading role in establishing the required level of residents’ needs in order to justify a development, in identifying possible sites and in establishing design briefs that would ensure that any development was compatible with its character area.

Action: Former Policy 7 has been amended accordingly, and renumbered L4.

**Policy 10 – Parking at Woldingham Station**
The Council understand the aims and ambitions of the parish council to improve parking at the station. However, the Council would recommend that reference to the parish council seeking to establish a car parking area in the vicinity of the station for the use of the Woldingham residents, is both not enforceable and not appropriate as a policy.
Consequently, the reference to the car park should be moved to the supporting text, and the parish council should give consideration to how a car park only available for residents is enforceable and reasonable.

Response: the opinions that a car park for residents is ‘not enforceable and not appropriate as a policy’ or may not be ‘enforceable and reasonable’ has not yet been clarified by TDC. It may be based on an assumption that the car park would be established on publicly owned land. This is not the only option to be explored. However, the practice of reservation of parking for residents is well established, being evidently regarded as reasonable and enforceable by public authorities, although the practice is not directly applicable in this case as there are few nearby residents.

Action: The second sentence of the Policy ‘The Parish Council...residents’ had been deleted. The first sentence has been amended to read: ‘Proposals to improve the accessibility of Woldingham Station to residents, including by increased provision for residents’ car parking, will be supported, provided that ... etc.’

**Policy 12 – Local Green Spaces**
The purpose of a Local Green Space is not to restrict development but to recognise the importance of the areas to the local community. Therefore, the Council would recommend that the wording is amended to this policy.

Response: agreed.

Action: The first paragraph of Policy 12 (renumbered as Policy L9) has been amended by deleting the words after ‘Spaces’: ‘for the purpose of...operator.’

**Policy 13 – Promoting residents’ safety around the village and Policy 14 – Improving local transport**
The Council do not feel that these should be set out as policies but could be included in an Annex as commitments or actions that the parish Council aim to achieve.

Response: it is recognised that these are not land use policies. However they are important community policies supported by the 2013 Residents Survey. Such content already appears in approved Neighbourhood Plans.
Action: The land use policies have been grouped together as Policies L1-L9. Community policies have been placed in the separate Part 4 of the Plan. The role of land use policies in determining planning applications is explained.

Policy 16 – Networking
The parish council may want to consider changing the name of the policy to notice boards as this would be more appropriate.

Response: noted but the content of this policy is not confined to noticeboards. The title suits the range of ways that residents can be better engaged in village life.

Monitoring
The Council agree that a neighbourhood plan should have regular reviews and reports to ensure that progress is being made and support this within the neighbourhood plan. However, it is not clear who will assist in the monitoring of any of the policies and where the reports will be published.

Response: Noted

Action: Para. 5.1 now follows up the reference to annual reviews by stating that progress reports will be made available to residents. Further details of the monitoring process will be determined by the Parish Council as required.

Tandridge District Council
28 May 2015
Date: 15 April 2015
Our ref: 9325/150502 Your ref:

Mr Frank Myers
Chairman
Woldingham Parish Council
Chairman Steering Group Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan

Sent be E Mail only: parish.clerk@woldingham.com

Dear Mr Myers,

Planning consultation: Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan – Pre Submission Draft

Thank you for your consultation on the above Plan dated 02 April 2015 which was received by Natural England on 02 April 2015.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

The pre submission document identifies the issues and concerns affecting Woldingham together with identifying potential relevant and appropriate legislation and plans.

Introduction
We are pleased to see reference to the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and would encourage dialogue with the Unit and consideration and reference to their Management Plan, especially with regards for Landscape and Visual Impacts to be considered as part of any development.

Reference to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) could be made under paragraph 1.2 – although Natural England acknowledges its reference in paragraph 1.7. Reference here would link into other relevant legislation, already identified, and help strengthen the document further.

The Planning Framework Policy
The Parish has identified appropriate and relevant links to the NPPF and the Tandridge Core Strategy which is to be welcomed and encouraged.

Vision and Objectives
Objectives and Progress Indicators:
The six objectives listed here can be broadly supported, and especially Objective (1) in relation to the "Preservation of the unique built heritage of the village, the special character of each area, retention of
greenery within the built environment, protection of the local Green Belt and formal designation of local green spaces”.

**Policies**

**Policy 1: General Design (E)**
This refers to trees and landscaping and has the potential to increase biodiversity and ecology in respect of new development and is to be encouraged and would be compliant with paragraph 109 of the NPPF.

Paragraph 1.8 refers to the Surrey Hills AONB and it would be useful for the document to make reference to the Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan, especially in relation to the potential for Landscape and Visual Impacts in relation new build.

**Policy 6: Landscape**
The inclusion of the Surrey Hills AONB here is welcomed and the reference to Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, where appropriate and necessary, is encouraged and supported. Again reference to the Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan would be of assistance in this document, strengthening it further.

**Policy 12: Local Green Spaces**
This policy is broadly supported.

**Appendix A: List of Evidence Sources**
The Parish may wish to consider reference to the Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan, especially in relation to Landscape and Visual Impacts of any new developments within the Parish.

Subject to the above, Natural England has no further substantive comments to make in respect of the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Plan pre submission document.

For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter only please contact David Hammond on 0300 060 1373. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

We really value your feedback to help us improve the service we offer. We have attached a feedback form to this letter and welcome any comments you might have about our service.

Yours sincerely

**David Hammond (Lead Advisor)**
Sustainable Development and Regulation. Thames Valley Team
Dear Woldingham Parish Clerk

Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan

Thank you for consulting Historic England on the Pre-submission draft of the Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan. We are very pleased to see the strong focus that the present draft places on sustaining the value of the Parish’s heritage assets and historic landscape and would like to commend the strong links to the existing evidence base of the Character Assessment, Design Guidance and Village Design Statement. In these respects we consider it presents an excellent approach to planning for the area’s future, supporting future development to achieve a sensitive integration with the area’s historic environment.

We would, however, suggest that in its present form the document presents too much detail of the evidence of the area’s character, whilst some of the policies may be too complex to be feasibly implemented by the District Council’s planning department. We would recommend judiciously removing statements that describe the area’s character but retaining these in the evidence base documents, allowing them to fulfil the roles of evidence and Supplementary Planning Documents, whilst referring to them clearly in the policies to guide decisions making and the preparation of proposals and to ensure they remain influential.

The draft plan provides a useful set of considerations for the Quality of Design in Policy 1 although we found the wording of the policy rather repetitive and confusing. Where a later policy in the plan will adds detail, such as policies 2 – 6 it would be helpful to consider whether this makes the earlier policy superfluous. indicate this within the policy and to avoid duplicating policy guidance. This should also help to reduce the number and length of each policy.

The plan and policies have been developed with the present Character Assessment, Design Guidance and Village Design Statement, which are referred to explicitly in the document. However, in implementing the plan there is potential to review how effective these documents are. It is conceivable that during the life of the plan the Parish and District Council may wish to update...
these documents. As such we suggest it may be prudent to refer to these as the ‘adopted’ or ‘endorsed’ Woldingham Character Assessment, etc. in order to ensure the policies remain current.

A specific comment on policy 1 is that the requirement to protect views may not be enforceable without further refinement. In its present form the policy is too general. Not all views, even in Woldingham, are of a value worthy of preservation, whilst indeed, not all features in a high value view contribute equally to its quality. Later policies in the plan are more specific and provide references to the views identified in the evidence base documents as having particular features of positive character and visual amenity. We would recommend giving consideration to whether this part of the policy should be refined to make specific reference to the positive views identified in the evidence base, or whether the detail in the later policies makes it unnecessary.

Whilst these comments may come across as a little negative, I would nevertheless restate that we consider the approach being taken in the policies relating to the residential character areas, to represent a very positive use of the evidence base and a proactive approach to ensuring the design of new development is appropriate to the character of this unique settlement. I hope these comments are of assistance in considering how to progress the Neighbourhood Plan and would be happy to answer any queries or provide further information if it can help you in this endeavour.

Yours faithfully

Robert Lloyd-Sweet
Historic Places Adviser (South East England)
Historic England
Guildford
Tel. 01483 252028

E-mail: Robert.lloyd@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Dear Sirs,

**WOLDINGHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN: PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION**

Thank you for notifying us of the pre-submission consultation of the Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan. As you are aware the National Trust own and manage Oxted Downs to the south of the Woldingham Parish boundary.

Oxted Downs occupies a dramatic location on the scarp slope of the North Downs. The property lies within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the North Downs Way National Trail runs through the site. Part of the site lies within the Woldingham and Oxted Downs Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). There are also a number of old chalk quarries, providing evidence of a local industrial heritage.

The main significance of Oxted Downs lies in the nature conservation value of the chalk downland and it’s position on the scarp, providing magnificent views southwards – albeit blighted by the M25 as it winds it’s way at the bottom – and the views northwards from the M25, to a natural and typical chalk landscape.

As set out in the Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan areas such as Oxted Downs are a key contributor to the sylvan, semi-rural character of Woldingham and views towards and from these areas require special protection. The National Trust has a statutory obligation to

> permanently protect places of natural beauty or historic interest for the benefit of the nation’.

Therefore, any proposals which affect or could affect Oxted Downs will need to have regard to these statutory obligations.

**Vision and Objectives**

The draft Vision is brief and concise and we support this approach. The environmental and historic assets of Woldingham are in large part, the foundation of its success. We support the need to balance
demand for new development with the preservation of its heritage and character. However, we consider that greater emphasis should be placed on the preservation of the surrounding landscape which contributes to the sylvan semi-rural character that is so cherished. We believe that protecting and enhancing the environmental and landscape assets surrounding Woldingham should be made explicit as a fundamental part of the Vision.

We note that Objective 1 refers to the protection of the local Green Belt which the Trust is wholly supportive of. However, again Objective 1 could be expanded to also reference the continued protection and enhancement of the habitats and landscape within the AONB, AGLV and SSSI.

Policy 1: General Design Policy

Although Oxted Downs is one of the least visited sections of the North Downs, a reflection of a combination of factors including difficulty of access, the noise and visual intrusion of the M25 at the base of the scarp and the lack of facilities, the views into and out from Oxted Downs are important.

The Trust is supportive of Policy 1 and agree that development should respect and preserve views from the landscape designated areas and retain and enhance the AONB and Green Belt.

Policy 6: Landscape

The Trust is supportive of the intention of this policy to preserve the rural character of Woldingham through the continued protection of the openness of the Green Belt and the status of the AONB and AGLV. We consider that the policy (6.1(b)) could be strengthened further by making it explicit that “the AONB will be protected in accordance with the Surrey Hills Management Plan”.

Neither Policy 1 nor Policy 6 makes reference to ‘setting’. We consider that the setting of Oxted Downs is important and a fundamental consideration in the context of new development proposals. English Heritage provides guidance on setting, acknowledging that “Setting is separate from the concepts of curtilage, character and context”. The Trust considers that the Neighbourhood Plan should include reference to settings within the wording of the draft policies.

We note that the remaining policies of the Neighbourhood Plan largely relate to the built up area of Woldingham and, therefore, The Trust has no further comments to make.

I trust that the above comments will be given consideration as the Neighbourhood Plan is finalised. In the meantime, please would you confirm safe receipt of this letter.

Yours faithfully

Rachel Botcherby  
Planning Adviser  
The National Trust - London and South East
Ms Karen Newman, Parish Clerk
Woldingham Parish Council
114 Farleigh Road, Warlingham
Surrey, CR3 9ED
Also by e-mail to parish.clerk@woldingham.com

9th May 2015

Dear Ms Newman,

Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan: Designation of Green Spaces

Thank you for your letter of 26th March 2015 on the above subject.

The Council of Craigmyle Glebe Ltd considered the proposed designation of the Glebe as a “Green Space”, as defined at §77 of the National Planning Policy framework (2012), at its quarterly meeting held on 14th April 2015. In addition, at the suggestion of your Chairman Mr Frank Myers, who kindly attended part of that meeting, a sub-committee of the Glebe Council met with Mr Andrew Barton, a former Parish Councillor who has worked on the Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan with the current councillors, to discuss the matter in greater depth.

As we understand the issues, the proposal – if adopted – will further buttress the existing strong presumption against development on the Glebe, but without compromising our flexibility to relocate and enlarge existing facilities and structures within the life of the Neighbourhood Plan, if doing so were to be viewed as enabling Craigmyle Glebe Ltd to pursue its charitable objects.

I am now able therefore to confirm that the Glebe Council does not object to the inclusion of the Glebe in the Plan, as a “Green Space.”

Yours sincerely,

Mark Tapley, Hon Chairman

cc Mr Robin Tozer, Mr Andrew Barton
9 April 2015

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Woldingham Parish Council - Neighbourhood Plan - Pre-submission plan

Thank you for inviting the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) to comment on the above consultation. I can confirm that the MMO has no comments to submit in relation to this consultation as Woldingham is not within our remit.

If you have any questions or need any further information please just let me know. More information on the role of the MMO can be found on our website www.gov.uk/mmo

Yours sincerely

Susan Davidson
Communications Assistant

Email: stakeholder@marinemanagement.org.uk
‘Hedley’

High Drive,

Woldingham, CR3 7ED

May 2015

Dear Ms. Newman,

Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan: Hedley Field

You wrote to me at ‘Hedley’ in High Drive inviting me to comment on the Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan, in particular a proposed designation of ‘Hedley Field’ which is in my ownership.

In Map E relating to Policy 12- ‘Green Spaces Policy Areas’ site 5 ‘Hedley Field’ is proposed to be designated as both a Potential Site of Nature Conservation Interest and a Biodiversity Opportunity Area.

As para. 12.8 of the Plan comments Hedley Field is privately owned agricultural land. Being within the Metropolitan Green Belt it is subject to green belt policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Development Plan.

National policy on green belts as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework which advises that ‘The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green or open space’ (para. 77). Further the NPPF says:

‘Local policy for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts.’ (para. 78). NPPF para. 89 sets out policy on new buildings and para. 90 on ‘certain other forms of development.’ Proposed Policy 12 of the Pre-Submission Plan seeks to introduce policy prescriptions that go some way beyond national policy and are not consistent with it. An adopted Neighbourhood Plan would constitute ‘local policy’ in terms of the NPPF and policy 12 would militate against development considered appropriate for green belts in national policy. Hedley Field has previously housed agricultural buildings- the attached 1945 aerial photograph shows what we believe were chicken coops. Policy 12 should be re-drafted to include those forms of development, for example sports facilities, cemeteries etc., set out in NPPF paras. 89 and 90 that it currently precludes.

In para. 12.8 of the Pre-Submission Plan it is proposed that Hedley Field become a Site of Nature Conservation Importance. It is usual practice that such designation be based on a professional ecological survey, often by the local wildlife trust. None of the evidence sources in Appendix A appear to refer to such a survey. Although Map E of the Green Spaces Policy Areas also allocates Hedley Field as a ‘Biodiversity Opportunity Area’ there is no further reference elsewhere to the meaning of the designation, the policy implications of such a
designation or why Hedley Field has been considered appropriate for the designation. In my view any such designation should only be based on a professional ecological survey.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Aqwar Ansari
Dear Sir / Madam

RE: WOLDINGHAM PRE SUBMISSION DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – COMMENTS ON BEHALF OF THAMES WATER UTILITIES LTD.

Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Thames Water) Property Services function is now being delivered by Savills (UK) Limited as Thames Water’s appointed supplier. Savills are therefore pleased to respond to the above consultation on behalf of Thames Water.

Thank you for consulting Thames Water on the above document. Thames Water is the statutory water and sewerage undertaker for part of Tandridge and are hence a “specific consultation body” in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2012.

Thames Water would like to support paragraph 2.7 and its reference to the Core Strategy Policy CSP11 infrastructure and Services.

We trust the above is satisfactory, but please do not hesitate to contact Thames Water if you have any queries.

Yours sincerely,

Carmelle Bell BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI
Planner

Offices and associates throughout the Americas, Europe, Asia Pacific, Africa and the Middle East.
Dear Sir / Madam,

**Network Rail Consultation – Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan - Pre-Submission Plan**

Thank you for consulting with Network Rail in relation to the Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan - PreSubmission Plan (WNP). This letter will present Network Rail’s consultation response in relation to the WNP.

**Policy 10: Parking at Woldingham Station**

Southern currently operate Woldingham Station through a lease agreement with Network Rail. The Parish Council may be aware that the Southern franchise will be coming to an end and on July 26th this year it will be merged with the current GTR franchise to make the franchise TSGN.

It is therefore difficult at this stage to get definitive feedback from the Train Operating Company who will operate Woldingham Station in relation to the proposed plans contained within Policy 10.

From Network Rail’s perspective we would look to support schemes to improve car parking at the station and would like to be kept updated and involved in how the scheme progresses.

**Railway Tunnels**

A Network Rail railway tunnel is located within the Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan area. Network Rail can be concerned by development over or near to tunnels. Many tunnels have ‘hidden shafts’ which are not all documented. These shafts can be in various states of repair and harm the structural integrity of the tunnel.

As a result when consulting on 3rd party planning applications for development near tunnels Network Rail can recommend that the following condition and informative is attached to planning permissions.

(Condition) - Network Rail’s Engineer is to approve details of any development works within 15m, measured horizontally, from the outside face of the tunnel extrados with special reference to:

- **The type and method of construction of foundations**

Any increase/decrease of loading on the tunnel both temporary and permanent. Certified proof that the proposals shall have no detrimental effect upon the tunnel will be necessary.
Any proposal must not interfere with Network Rail’s operational railway not jeopardise the structural integrity of the tunnel. The above details should be submitted to the Council and only approved in conjunction with Network Rail.

(Informative) - Network Rail will not accept any liability for any settlement, disturbance or damage caused to any development by failure of the tunnel structures nor for any noise or vibration arising from the normal use and/or maintenance of the tunnel. No right of support is given or can be claimed from Network Rails tunnels or railway land.

Developments adjacent to the Operational Railway Land and Infrastructure

In relation to Development sites that have the potential to impact on Network Rail’s land, assets and operational railway infrastructure, the Woldingham Parish Council and potential developers should be aware of and consider Network Rail’s standard guidelines and requirements when developing sites located adjacent or in close proximity to Network Rail’s land, assets and operational railway infrastructure. For this information please visit www.networkrail.co.uk/asp.aspx/1538.aspx. Please let me know if would like more specific information on these standard guidelines and requirements.

Thank you for giving Network Rail the opportunity to comment on the Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan - Pre-Submission Plan. I would be grateful if the Woldingham Parish Council could consider the comments made within this letter.

If you require any further information or have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us on 0207 9047247.

Yours sincerely,

Elliot Stamp
Town Planner
1 Eversholt Street London, NW1 2DN
29 May 2015

Dear Sir or Madam,

WOLDINGHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN: PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

Thank you for your recent consultation and taking the time to seek the Mobile Operators Associations’ views on the Pre-Submission Draft of the Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan. We consider this a very proactive approach to forward planning and welcome the opportunity to have input in the process.

It is recognised that telecommunications plays a vital role in both the economic and social fabric of communities. National guidance recognises this through Section 5: “Supporting high quality communications infrastructure” of National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) which provides clear guidance as to the main issues surrounding telecommunications development.

Paragraph 42 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) confirms that; “advanced, high quality communications infrastructure is essential for sustainable economic growth” and that it “plays a vital role in enhancing the provision of local community facilities and services.”

While we support the inclusion of a telecommunications policy within the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, we have the following minor concern about the draft wording of Policy 11 – Broadband and mobile communications and the supporting paragraphs:

Policy 11

Policy 11 states that proposals for mobile communications will be supported subject to various criteria including it being, “acceptable to the community.” The requirement for proposals to be considered ‘acceptable to the community’ is considered to be ambiguous and would be difficult to evaluate on a case by case basis. While we accept that telecommunications developments can be controversial at times, each development should be considered on its merits and there may be instances where the justification for a telecommunications development will outweigh community concern. In order to provide additional clarity to the policy and bring it in accordance with national policy, we request that the wording “and is acceptable to the community” is removed from the policy.
Paragraph 11.3

We would question the benefit of including paragraph 11.3 within the Neighbourhood Plan. While the paragraph may provide a snapshot of the current status of telecommunications developments within the Neighbourhood Plan area, this information will quickly become outdated as telecommunications developments progress following the formal adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan. On that basis, we recommend that paragraph 11.3 of the Neighbourhood Plan is deleted.

Paragraph 11.4

We do not agree with the contents of Paragraph 11.4 of the Neighbourhood Plan which states that “There are few restraints on the rights of electronic communications providers to introduce and site equipment under ‘deemed planning permission’ on public or private land.” While we accept that the mobile operators benefit from a limited level of Permitted Development Rights, we would disagree that ‘there are few restraints’ in place to control such development and we would therefore request that this paragraph is removed from the Neighbourhood Plan.

Paragraph 11.6

Paragraph 11.6 states that the Parish Council will continue to press providers to demonstrate the ‘need’ for telecommunications developments in the Neighbourhood Plan Area. Paragraph 46 of NPPF states that Planning Authorities should not, ‘question the need for the telecommunications system.” On that basis, we request that this requirement to justify ‘need’ is deleted from Paragraph 11.6.

Summary

In summary, while we support the inclusion of Policy 11 and the supporting paragraph within the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, we consider that the sections detailed above are overly restrictive to telecommunications developments and contrary to the provisions of NPPF.

There are numerous documents which will affect the formulation of any telecommunications policy, the most important of these being NPPF. On this basis we would suggest that a concise and flexible telecommunications policy should be included within the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Such a policy should give all stakeholders a clear indication of the issues that telecommunications development will be assessed against. As an alternative to the amendments suggested above, another option would be to substitute the existing wording of Policy 11 with the following wording:

“Proposals for telecommunications development will be permitted provided that the following criteria are met: -

(i) the siting and appearance of the proposed apparatus and associated structures should seek to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area;

(ii) if on a building, apparatus and associated structures should be sited and designed in order to seek to minimise impact to the external appearance of the host building;

(iii) if proposing a new mast, it should be demonstrated that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting apparatus on existing buildings, masts or other
structures. Such evidence should accompany any application made to the (local) planning authority.

(iv) If proposing development in a sensitive area, the development should not have an unacceptable effect on areas of ecological interest, areas of landscape importance, archaeological sites, conservation areas or buildings of architectural or historic interest.

When considering applications for telecommunications development, the (local) planning authority will have regard to the operational requirements of telecommunications networks and the technical limitations of the technology."

We trust you find the above comments of assistance. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any queries relating to the above matters.

Yours faithfully

Ginny Hall MRTPi
SENIOR PLANNER
Direct dial: 0141 270 2733
E-mail: ginny.hall@monoconsultants.com