

Appendix One

LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REGULATION 16 SUBMISSIONS

SUMMARY

The following table provides a very brief summary of the Regulation 16 submissions received with Parish Council comments.

The submissions from the Diocese of Southwark and Limpsfield Parochial Church Council are addressed separately in Appendix 2.

REPRESENTATION	COMMENT
CLH Pipeline System Limited Map of pipeline crossing Parish	For information only. Not affected directly by the Neighbourhood Plan.
Surrey Hills AONB Support for the Plan including LNP 6	Noted. The support from Surrey Hills AONB is welcomed.
Diocese of Southwark Objection to LNP8 and Glebe Field and Meadow designations as LGS. Based on the supportive approach adopted by the Diocese in managing the land and making it available for informal community uses, and the need to keep options open for community or other (housing) development on what is a highly sustainable location within the built-up area of a Tier 1 settlement.	See Appendix 2.
Dr Sutherland Particular support for LNP2 (4) and LNP 4 (3 and 6)	Noted and welcomed.

<p>LGS 1.2.3 supported</p> <p>LNP14. Footways etc., Limpsfield High Street.</p>	<p>Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>The Parish Council is happy to consider this in the context of its proposed projects, in particular the Conservation Area appraisal and the project on traffic speed, pedestrian safety, congestion and parking.</p>
<p>Gatwick Airport Notify of wind turbines</p>	<p>Noted. No turbines are proposed - this is considered an issue for Tandridge District Council.</p>
<p>Gerald Davies Objection – loss of green belt.</p>	<p>This is considered to be an issue for Tandridge District Council not the neighbourhood plan.</p>
<p>Jacqueline Taylor Wilson Support Neighbourhood Plan, particularly referenced Local Green Spaces.</p>	<p>Noted and welcomed.</p>
<p>Julie Clarke Support for LNP3 small dwellings and approach to protecting views</p> <p>Suggested improvements for LGS in LNP8 including cycle and footpaths, tidying up the Brook and children's play area</p>	<p>Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>The Parish Council is happy to consider this in the context of its proposed projects, in particular the improvement of footpaths and cycleways, and when looking at the St Peter's Hall and surrounding areas. The Parish Council's response to comment 80 from Tandridge District Council</p>

<p>Support for LNP 14 car parking in Limpsfield Village</p> <p>LNP 13 or an annex could consider future of Limpsfield School</p>	<p>indicates that it is happy to incorporate the possible provision of a play area into the Plan.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Plan already allows for the extension of community facilities across the Parish. It does not have sufficient detail to separate out Limpsfield School for particular consideration.</p>
<p>Juliet Murray</p> <p>Support for LNP14 and specific reference to Bluehouse Lane and need for safety and pedestrian improvements</p>	<p>Noted. The Parish Council is happy to consider this in the context of its proposed projects, in particular the project on traffic speed, pedestrian safety, congestion and parking.</p>
<p>Kristine Willett</p> <p>Section 6, implementation (traffic etc.) could do more to address issues outside the built-up area where vehicles crossing the Parish can create problems</p>	<p>The Parish Council is happy to consider this in the context of its proposed projects on traffic speed, pedestrian safety, congestion and parking and would add a clause "Review highways and traffic issues outside the built-up area".</p>
<p>Len Roberts</p> <p>Parish Council should take a more active approach to use for Glebe Fields etc. The area should be 'bursting with community life'.</p>	<p>The Parish Council is happy to consider this in the context of its proposed projects for St Peters Hall and the surrounding area.</p>

<p>Surrey Wildlife Trust/Surrey Nature Partnership LNP7 – welcome inclusion of veteran trees and hedgerows</p> <p>LNP8 – welcome LGS where biodiversity is an issue, particularly LGS 1, 2, 4,6</p> <p>LNP9 Drafting amendments</p>	<p>Noted and support welcomed.</p> <p>Noted and support welcomed.</p> <p>Noted. Amendments agreed.</p>
<p>Mrs Morgan-Clist Support for LNP3 in context of there being no major development</p> <p>In the context of LNP6, character areas LCA04 and LCA05 should be in the Surrey Hills AONB</p> <p>LNP6 No definition of heritage; pleased that archaeology is to be considered</p> <p>LNP9 An assessment of protected species in areas LCA04 and LCA05 should be undertaken as part of a proposal to include these areas as AONB</p> <p>LNP14 Given particularly proposed housing growth at Westerham, it is Important to retain a gap with Westerham (and Crockham Hill)</p> <p>Seek to prevent increases in traffic above 2018 levels</p>	<p>Noted and welcomed</p> <p>Noted. The Parish Council will consider what representations it can and should make.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. The Parish Council will discuss the issue with the relevant bodies.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. This is considered a strategic issue beyond the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan but could appear in 'context' section of the Plan. The Parish Council will</p>

	consider this in the context of ongoing representations with the relevant bodies.
Natural England No specific comments	
St Peters Church PCC Object to designation of Glebe Meadow as Local Green Space. Designation would restrict their ability to make best use of the area for the community. Proposals for the Nursery were objected to by the PCC and there are plans to develop the Pavilion for more varied uses.	See Appendix Two.
Piers White Fully supportive of the Plan Strengthen LNP2. Additional clause to control ancillary living accommodation in back gardens rather than legally splitting the property as a way of overcoming policy LNP2 (suggested wording included)	Noted and welcomed. Noted. The Parish Council would not object to an additional clause should the Examiner consider it appropriate
R.W. Pickering Unqualified support for LNP8 (Glebe Field, Meadow and Brook Field). Reference to possible building on the old allotments site.	Noted and welcomed. Noted.
Richard Morris Strong objections to Tandridge-wide proposals for extra housing	Noted. This is not an issue which the Neighbourhood Plan addresses, although the plan does seek to support the sustainable development of housing where appropriate.
Thames Water Strategic response advising amongst other things that the NP should seek to ensure that there is adequate	Noted. The NP does not propose any significant development and the representations do not indicate a

<p>water and waste water infrastructure to support sustainable development</p>	<p>particular need for infrastructure for development outside the area.</p>
<p>TFL No comments</p>	
<p>Environment Agency Groundwater protection. Updated reference documents plus proposed update to the SEA</p> <p>Flood Risk. Ensure Tandridge's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is cross referenced</p> <p>Biodiversity. Support for objectives and policies relating to biodiversity. Reflect the new NPPF by removing the clause 'where possible' when referring to biodiversity gains</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The Environment Agency's support is welcomed. The Parish Council would be happy to accept the change if the Examiner considers it is needed to comply with the NPPF. See also the Parish Council's response to Tandridge District Council comment 73.</p>
<p>Kent County Council LNP1 and LNP2. As no sites allocated, KCC will monitor Tandridge Local Plan and individual planning applications to address cross border service issues</p> <p>LNP12 and 13 Community Services. Supported</p> <p>Transport etc. KCC would want to work with LPC, TDC and SCC on local highway and public transport issues</p> <p>Minerals and Waste. No reference is made to minerals and waste safeguarding. Surrey CC should be consulted to ensure compliance with NPPF</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>'Minerals and Waste' is excluded development for NP purposes and the Local Plan and Minerals and Waste Plan adequately address these matters. A reference inserted in</p>

	<p>section 3 after the paragraph on Tandridge Local Plan Part 2 (should the examiner welcome this) would acknowledge that the Minerals and Waste Plan is part of the development plan and this additional text could also cite the minerals safeguarding area at Moorhouse (SCC), although this is already picked up on the Tandridge District Council Policies Map.</p>
<p>Historic England NP provides an appropriate framework for protecting and enhancing the historic environment and heritage assets. Policies LNP4-7 supported.</p>	<p>Noted. The support from Historic England is welcomed.</p>
<p>Rodney Coulson Business and Economy/Limpsfield High Street. Need for a detailed plan for Limpsfield High Street covering a range of traffic and parking issues.</p> <p>Misuse of pavements/cycle ways for parking. Plan to recommend extension of parking warden powers.</p> <p>LNP7 Consider including Old Court Cottage, 12th c house (Titsey Road) on local heritage assets.</p> <p>Local Green Spaces. Incorrect referencing of photographs.</p>	<p>The Parish Council is happy to consider this in the context of its proposed projects, in particular the Conservation Area appraisal and the project on traffic speed, pedestrian safety, congestion and parking</p> <p>Noted. Parking warden powers goes beyond the remit of the neighbourhood plan but the issue will be taken up separately by the Parish Council.</p> <p>Old Court Cottage is already identified as a Grade 1 Listed Building and is covered by the last para of LNP7.</p> <p>Noted. Referencing to be corrected.</p>
<p>Surrey County Council Refer to the soft sand minerals safeguarding area and Moorhouse Sandpits complex in the context section of</p>	<p>Agreed. Reference can be made in the context section as per Surrey County Council comment.</p>

<p>the Plan (although plan itself appears not to have an impact)</p> <p>LNP14 Bullet point 1. Control of HGVs difficult to achieve through implementation of the plan and 'surrounding roads' would need to be specifically defined. However, routing restrictions for construction vehicles could be implemented. Modification proposed accordingly.</p> <p>LNP 14 Supporting text re sheltered housing not considered appropriate.</p> <p>Implementation - park and ride. Park and ride could have local benefits but generate extra trips elsewhere. SCC suggests inclusion of alternative options (working with employers on car share/modal shift/other initiatives through implementation of travel plans)</p> <p>Schedule of evidence. Include TDC Parking Standards and SCC Electric Vehicle Parking Strategy</p>	<p>The Parish Council notes the comments from Surrey County Council but would not wish to see changes which could result in HGVs diverted from Limpsfield High Street to neighbouring residential roads. If the examiner considers it appropriate to modify the policy, The Parish Council would ask that this principle be retained.</p> <p>Noted. The Parish Council considers this piece of text important in addressing future sheltered housing developments.</p> <p>Noted. The Parish Council is happy to add this to the wording of the project.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>
---	--