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1. Introduction

1.1 Limpsfield Parish Council is developing a Neighbourhood Plan. As part of this process the Parish Council invited every household in Limpsfield to complete a questionnaire (see Appendix B, and on-line) designed to capture residents’, views on the future of the parish. The questionnaire collected views on a wide range of important issues for the Parish including local housing needs, the importance of local features, community assets and green spaces as well as travel infrastructure and local facilities.

1.2 Once approved, the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan will have the force of law in setting out what development is acceptable in the parish over the period 2018-38. Developers, landowners, residents, businesses and local planners will all have to take account of the Neighbourhood Plan which will need to be in conformity with Tandridge District Council’s Local Plan and the Government’s National Planning Policy Framework with its focus on sustainable development.

1.3 A total of 425 responses were received and Limpsfield Parish Council conducted the data entry of the paper questionnaires and merged these with the responses collected on-line. They also summarised the free text, open ended comments received. These data were passed to AECOM to compile a report on the questionnaire. This document contains the analysis of the responses to this survey and includes recommendations to Limpsfield Parish Council to support the production of the Neighbourhood Plan. The questionnaire was designed to be conducted at a household rather than individual level although some questionnaire returns may not reflect the views of everyone in a particular household.

2. Respondent Overview

Age

2.1 Limpsfield Parish Council provided 2011 Census data that indicated the parish has a population of 3569 of which 31% (n=1098) are aged over 60, 51% (n=1819) are between 16 and 59 and 18% (n=652) are under 16 years of age. The age bands on the questionnaire returns differed from the age breakdowns from the Census. However, the questionnaire data shows that 986 people live in the households that returned a questionnaire and 33% (n=325) of these contain residents over the age of 65. Fifty one percent of these households also contain people aged between 17 and 64 (n=498) suggesting that the sample is a good representation of the household makeup of Limpsfield. To further check the representativeness of the sample, AECOM reviewed the 2011 Census data and grouped them into bands allowing comparison between the sample and the 2011 Census. These data are shown in Figure 1 and show the achieved sample is a reasonable reflection of the age ranges within the parish which would rise to good if the 18-24 age group is excluded. This age group is perhaps the most challenging to reach as respondents are often away working, studying or travelling.
Housing Types

2.2 The majority of respondents live in privately owned accommodation. Of the respondents, fewer than 3% of households are privately rented and 2% of households are council rented (see Figure 2).
2.3 Of the 397 respondents that indicated the number of bedrooms in their household, 33% (n=131) live in properties with five or more bedrooms, 56% (n=224) live in three or four bedroom properties and 11% (n=42) live in 1 or 2 bedroom properties. The size and type of household of those completing the questionnaire is shown in Figure 3.

![Figure 3](image)

2.4 The 2011 Census data indicated that in Limpsfield Parish there were 1,430 households. These were put into categories of detached, semi-detached and terraced houses as well as apartments/flats and some other categories as shown in Table 1, top panel. The survey categories of house size was measured by number of bedrooms and so do not match well with the Census data. In Table 1 overleaf, middle panel the house sizes of the 394 survey respondents that answered this question are shown. These represent 27.6% of the Census number of households. To compare with the survey house sizes with the Census data, if it is assumed that of the 199 3-4 bedroom category, 110 are allocated to detached, 74 to semi-detached and 15 to terraced houses, then assuming with other survey categories logically allocated, the survey house sizes would replicate the Census data as shown in Table 1, bottom panel. Although we cannot be sure that this allocation is correct, it is a reasonable assumption and on this basis the survey household types would match well with the Census household data for the parish generally.
Table 1. Household size compared to 2011 Census Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011 Census categories</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Detached</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flats/Apartments</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravans/Temp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total household types</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey categories</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 or more bed Houses</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4 bed Houses</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 bed Houses</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments / Flats</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total household types</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey No. Households as % of Census 27.6%

Survey allocated to Census categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached (5 or more bed + 110 of 3-4 beds)</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Detached (74 of 3-4 beds)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraced (1-2 beds + 15 3-4 beds)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flats/Apartments</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravans/Temp (other)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total household types</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occupation and Location of work

2.5 Of the households that responded on household makeup, this provided information on 859 residents. Figure 4 below indicates that a third of households residents are retired with 38% commuting to work or school outside of the parish. A fifth of household residents work or attend school locally.
3. Vision Statement  (Online Survey Q5, Paper Copy 1.3)

“The vision for the Limpsfield Parish over the next 20 years is to promote a vibrant community and to protect and maintain the heritage, character and rural environment of Limpsfield, whilst responding in a sustainable way to future demographic, social, health, lifestyle, and economic changes.”

3.1 Respondents were asked to give their comments on the vision statement underpinning the Neighbourhood Plan set out in the survey. This was an open ended question allowing respondents to write freely. In total 43% (n=182) of respondents answered this question.

3.2 An analysis conducted by the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, under the Parish Council found that of the 182 respondents most were supportive of the Vision Statement with 57 respondents specifically agreeing to the wording. The responses were analysed into 16 categories for which there were 200 comments. These comments to the Vision Statement can be summarized as:

- The majority of responses (64 or 32%) were caveats on the Vision Statement, expressing concern about being able to retain the character, rural environment and sense of community in Limpsfield. In addition, the need to protect the Green Belt from development was a major concern for some (12 comments or 6%).
- The need for improved infrastructure and especially medical facilities, was highlighted as a pre-cursor to any significant new development (23 or 12%). Of these 11 mentioned improved medical facilities as very important.
- Problems of existing inadequate parking and of more traffic generated by development were negative factors (15 comments or 7%)
- The need for smaller homes and apartments, for both for starter homes as well as for downsizing for older residents, was an important factor for any new development (11 comments or 6%) and around half of these stated that these should be “affordable homes” (6 comments). A good point was made that any development in Limpsfield should take account of the change in demographics (8 comments or 4%) and half of these mentioned the need to attract younger families to balance the aging local population.

These comments are reiterated by data discussed below (see sections 4, 5 and 7).
4. Housing Requirements (Online Survey Q6-12, Paper Copy Part 2)

Households in Limpsfield with a need for housing

4.1 After being given crucial background information on the Local Plan proposals to develop housing sites in the nearby Green Belt and the history of infrastructure lag, respondents were asked to think about their own housing need. Respondents were asked whether any member of their household required new housing to be built in Limpsfield Parish or close by in the settlements of Oxted or Hurst Green. 410 or 96% of the 425 total survey respondents answered this question (this increases to 414 as 4 respondents answered the type of housing needed and so are assumed to have a need). Of the 399 responses to this question about the need in Limpsfield, only a sizeable minority - 22% (n=87) believed new homes were needed in the Parish and of the 381 responses to new housing being built close by in Oxted or Hurst Green (rather than Limpsfield parish itself) 28% (n=108) selected Oxted or Hurst Green. When these data are combined, 195 (25%) respondents responses from a total question response of 399 require housing for members of their household; 75% do not (See Table 2).

4.2 The above shows that the majority of respondents (75%) do not have a current housing need requiring new home to be built within or nearby the parish of Limpsfield. At the 95% confidence limit, this gives a confidence interval of +/- 3.04%. i.e. we can be 95% confident that the true percentage of people who do not currently require houses to be built for household members in the parish of Limpsfield or close by lies between 71.96 and 78.04%.

Table 2. Limpsfield households with either a need for housing in Limpsfield or nearby in Oxted and Hurst Green (some responded multiple times)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses on need for housing</th>
<th>“YES”</th>
<th>“NO”</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Limpsfield Parish</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to Limpsfield, in Oxted or Hurst Green</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages 25% 75% 100%

Analysing the housing need by location, the number of respondents answering this question was 410. Those indicating either a need or no need are shown in Figure 5 overleaf. Only 26 respondents (6%) had a need only in Limpsfield whereas a further 61 respondents (15%) had a need in Limpsfield and close to Limpsfield in Oxted or Hurst Green (together n=81 or 21%). Those shown with no need in Limpsfield (n= 323 or 79%) include 11% (n=47) with a housing need in Oxted and Hurst Green only.
There were 134 respondents that said they had an additional housing need (the 196 responses referred to above is because respondents indicated more than one location). However, a further 4 respondents indicated in the second part of the question that they needed a certain type of housing and so it is assumed they do have an additional need and are added resulting in the sample increasing to 138 respondents. In Limpsfield Parish only 26 respondents had a need, in Limpsfield Parish AND/OR close by in Oxted and Hurst Green 61 respondent had a need and those having no need in Limpsfield but a need nearby in Oxted or Hurst Green were 47 respondents. The Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan cannot have policies that directly influence development in Oxted or Hurst Green, but those parishes and the Tandridge Local Plan can and the housing need in these area from the neighbouring Limpsfield Parish is therefore relevant. The different locations where there is a housing need are shown in the Venn diagram in Figure 6 below.
Figure 6. Location of Housing Needs of 138 Respondents with Housing Needs in Limpsfield AND/OR in Oxted and Hurst Green

Types of Housing Need

4.4 All respondents who answered that they had a housing need either in Limpsfield Parish itself and/or in the nearby adjacent areas of Oxted and Hurst Green were then asked what type of housing was required. Some respondents to the first part of the question that indicated that they had a need did not answer this part of the question and of the 138 respondents that did answer, 6 had answered in the first part of the question that they did not have a need for housing and so the sample reduces to 132.

The types of houses need is set out in Appendix A and shown in Figure 7 overleaf where the multiple choice answers given by the 132 respondents are shown as a percentage of the 132 as well as a percentage of all 425 survey respondents. Whilst each housing type received at least 17% of responses (n=22), the largest proportion of homes required were smaller housing (3 bedrooms or fewer with a manageable garden) with 49% (n=65) and starter homes for first time buyers with 48% (n=63). The housing type which is least required is that of larger houses of 4 bedrooms or more with a good sized garden with 17% (n=22). Although the data suggests there is little demand for new housing amongst local residents, as 75% of respondents do not have a household members that requires housing, the Neighbourhood Plan does have an opportunity to address the specific needs of those requiring smaller properties both in Limpsfield and nearby in Oxted and Hurst Green.

4.5 As 44 of the 132 respondents specifically indicated a need in the Oxted and Hurst Green location and not in Limpsfield, a cross-tabulation was conducted between where respondents believed new housing was needed for members of their household and what type of housing was required. There was very little difference between the types of houses required in each location.
The needs for other types of housing

4.6 After smaller houses and starter homes, the next largest category of need was for sheltered housing for older people with 1-2 bedrooms with 41 respondents (31% of 132) and then for apartments (3 bedrooms or fewer) with 30 respondents (23% of 132). Counting those that choose both only once, the combined need here was from 58 respondents (44% of 132). This compares to 49% (of 132) of those needing smaller housing and 48% (of 132) needing starter homes. Only 17% of the 132 respondents wanted larger housing, but this still reflects the view of 22 respondents in Limpsfield parish. The large need for sheltered housing or apartments, as with the need for smaller housing, described in Section 4.4, probably reflects the aging population in Limpsfield and the desire of many to remain in the parish (or nearby in Oxted and Hurst Green) but in smaller properties.

Suitable and unsuitable development sites

4.7 Respondents were asked to identify sites in Limpsfield Parish that they thought would be suitable for development. They were also asked to specify sites unsuitable for development indicating the location and reason for the site to be protected. The choice of suitable and unsuitable sites is shown in Table 3. Of the total 425 respondents, 127 respondents answered as to suitable sites and identified 29 sites and 198 respondents answered as to unsuitable sites and identified 38 sites. Many respondents indicated several of each type of site and the numbers of responses on each site is shown in Table 3. The three sites suitable for development with most responses were the Old Allotment site at the top of Limpsfield High Street and south of the A25 (53 responses), the Moorhouse tiles works and warehouse site north of the A25 toward Westerham (14 responses) and the land to the south of the A25 between Wolfs Row and Brassey Road (9 responses). All of these sites are all in the Green Belt, although the Moorhouse site is designated as brown field. There were also five responses that suggested development of the Glebe Field / Meadow and Brook Field site that is not in the Green Belt. Unsuitable sites were considered by most respondents to be any in the Green Belt (44 responses), any in the High/Low Chart and Limpsfield Common (33 responses) but most responses considered the Glebe Field / Meadow and Brook Field as unsuitable (101 responses). Therefore, there is a contradiction between where some respondents support suitable sites for development that are in the Green Belt and respondents that oppose any development in the Green Belt, but perhaps this is because two of the Green Belt sites suggested for development are immediately adjacent to the Limpsfield built-up area and one is a brown field site. However, there is no contradiction about the Glebe Field / Meadow and Brook Field; a very large number of respondents rejected any development of that site. Other sites considered suitable or unsuitable for development are widely scattered throughout the Parish and have less support, one way or the other, as measured by the number of responses given.
4.8 The location of respondents has been compared to the sites proposed for either development ("yes") or for no development ("No") by post code and this is shown in Table 3. Around 40% of respondents proposed sites for development and 60% proposed sites that were not suitable. As may be expected, most respondents did not want development where or near to where they lived (76% and 83% respectively) with a minority proposing sites where they lived or close by (24% and 17% respectively).

Table 3: Suitable and Unsuitable Sites for Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suitable Sites for Development</th>
<th>No. Responses Q2.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Allotments</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorhouse</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A25 Wolfs Row to Brassey Rd</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Infill</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields between Limpsfield /Oxted &amp; M25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe Field &amp; Meadow &amp; Brook Field</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area around Church Hall</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sites</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites not Suitable for Development</th>
<th>No. Responses Q2.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glebe Field &amp; Meadow &amp; Brook Field</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Green Belt</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield High / Lower Chart &amp; Common</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield Village &amp; Conservation Area</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields around Hookwood Hs &amp; Hookwood</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of A25 between Wolfs Row &amp; Brassey</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified Green Spaces</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pains Hill Reservoir</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sites</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9 The questionnaire asked, “Would you support the development of any site(s) in the Green Belt in Limpsfield Parish for housing, under any circumstances.” Almost two thirds of respondents (65% n=254) were against any development within the green belt under any circumstances. At the 95% confidence limit, this gives a confidence interval of +/- 4.71%. i.e. we can be 95% confident that the true percentage of people who do not support Green Belt development lies between 59.79% and 69.21%.

Table 4. Location of new development sites compared to respondents location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of respondents by post code compared to proposing &quot;yes&quot; or &quot;no&quot; to new development in specified post code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Postcode (i.e. same location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Code Last Letter Different (i.e. very close)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Code Last 2 Letters Different (i.e. general area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development in the Green Belt

4.9 The questionnaire asked, “Would you support the development of any site(s) in the Green Belt in Limpsfield Parish for housing, under any circumstances.” Almost two thirds of respondents (65% n=254) were against any development within the green belt under any circumstances. At the 95% confidence limit, this gives a confidence interval of +/- 4.71%. i.e. we can be 95% confident that the true percentage of people who do not support Green Belt development lies between 59.79% and 69.21%.
5. Local Character Preservation (Online Survey Q13-15, Paper Copy Part 3)

Local Visual Character

5.1 Respondents were asked to select, from a given list, which features they considered to be important to the visual character of the parish and the responses are shown in Figure 8 overleaf and show that all features suggested on the questionnaire are considered important to the visual character of the parish by the majority of respondents. The majority of respondents indicated that “The Green Belt setting, tree lined/leafy roads and footpaths, rural surroundings, wooded hillsides, protected trees” is the most important feature with regards to the visual character of Limpsfield Parish with 93% of respondents selecting this option. The second most frequently picked features with around 80% of respondents selecting them were related to the appearance of housing and old buildings ensuring that they are in keeping with the village’s aesthetics. ‘Views around the parish’ were selected by 68% of respondents. Less popular responses (with around 60% of respondents selecting them) relate to the placement of houses and buildings and their use.
Respondents were asked what they thought was most important for protecting the character of the village. They were asked to select from a list their top three most important features when protecting the local character of the parish, however, many respondents ticked more than three options. Therefore, the data have been analysed in terms of frequency of selection, see Figure 9 overleaf. The most frequently selected reason was “Ensuring that all new development has adequate off-street parking” with 62% selecting it. The second most frequently selected option was “Avoiding excessive urbanisation” with 53% of people selecting it although ‘excessive’ was not defined. Restricting the size and density of development where a building is demolished to be replaced by a new one was cited by 45% of respondents.

The next group of most popular selections are related to the aesthetics of the property and any changes being made to it including protecting views. The final group with the lowest frequency of selection includes reasons that mention specific building materials and techniques. It appears that methods of protecting the local character of the parish are more likely to be selected if they have the potential to directly impact the responder for example not building enough off street parking is likely to crowd local streets which may affect residents’ journeys. Protective measures were less likely to be selected if they did not directly affect the respondent such as the type of building material used for extensions.
Figure 9. Which of the following do you think protects the local character of Limpsfield? (Base:397)

Local Character Open Comments (Reviewed by Steering Group)

5.4 Respondents were able to comment further regarding the visual character of the Parish (123 responses analysed into 139 comments). The majority of these expressed a desire to protect the rural/green environment, conservation area and character of the parish (53 comments). Another large number of comments looked at on/off road parking and controlling traffic and congestion (28 comments). The good sense of community in the parish and the importance of community assets attracted 15 comments with the importance of good design receiving 14 comments and concerns relating to parking on roads and associated with new development receiving 19 comments. The comments below supplied by Limpsfield Parish Council’s Neighbourhood Plan Thematic Groups have been summarised and put under common issues with comparisons here drawn with the quantitative data from the survey.

The built-up area

5.5 Limpsfield Parish Council’s own analysis reported there being many references to the conservation area with the view down the High Street and other views also featuring. One comment went against this trend stating that the village should not be turned into a “chocolate box”. Two references made to the attractiveness of to the lamp posts in the High Street. Limpsfield in Bloom also gets several mentions together with the flower areas near the High Street. A number of comments appreciated the current character of the area (14 comments).

New Building

5.6 Only one comment supported new buildings with 6 stating that none should occur. This is consistent with 75% of respondents being against new building in or near the parish as shown in Table 2. Examples of such comments include:

- “why build if the population is going down.”
- “no to housing estates.”
- “the environment is clogged up with cars and people as it is.”

5.7 The need for good and in-character new house design attracted 14 comments whereas objection to infill development attracted 4 comments reflecting the concern about the density of development
where a building is demolished in *Figure 9*. One respondent commented that a recent new development “ugly” and “unsympathetic”.

5.8 Only one respondent showed any positive approach to new building suggesting that the focus should be on smaller housing for younger people. This supports the type of housing suggested by respondents who indicated that new housing is needed for members of their household. No comment supported affordable housing. One comment specifically opposed social housing.

**Shops**

5.9 Several respondents mentioned their support for the village store and the Post Office. One request was to revitalise shops in the village which is echoed in *Figure 12* with the majority of respondents (66.3%) saying that they wanted to strongly protect Limpsfield High Street and the retail environment there. There is little or no reference to commercial property other than one that says that Limpsfield is not appropriate for commercial development.

**The green and rural environment**

5.10 Respondents felt strongly that the green belt should be protected, and views and mature trees should be retained; these views further reinforce those in *Figure 9* and emphasise the importance of the local visual character. Other references were made to support the golf course, the protection of the National Trust area and wildlife and hedges and gardens as the “lungs” of Limpsfield.

**Footpaths roads and cycle tracks**

5.11 Comments further demonstrated strong support for footpaths, lanes, bridleways and cycle tracks both for recreation and to encourage walking to Oxted. This correlates with the data shown in *Figure 14* below where walking is the second most popular mode for social, leisure and medical trips for residents.

**Traffic and Parking**

5.12 Local traffic and parking issues are clearly a major cause of concern and reflects in the responses made in this section of the questionnaire, Section 7 below finds the same. According to respondents there is too much traffic in the High Street. Parking is generally seen as a problem and there are many references to speeding. There were also varying views on the subject; whilst most respondents wish to keep speeds down one asked for the removal of all unnecessary road signs and speed humps. There were demands for more off-street parking and road parking restrictions so that the streets are not littered with cars. Some felt better footpaths would reduce car use, particularly in winter when paths are impassable. The effect of the growth of Edenbridge on the Kent Hatch Road in was identified as a problem. Specifically 19 responses mentioned parking in one form or another.

A limited number of solutions to these problems were suggested for Limpsfield village including:

- The creation of a bypass
- The creation of a one-way system
Community Assets

5.13 The Parish Council identified, in Figure 13 below, twelve “Community Assets” which the Council believed that residents may wish to protect, although the nature of that protection wasn’t defined.

5.14 Respondents were asked whether they would ‘Strongly Protect’, ‘Protect if Possible’ or ‘Don’t Protect’ each of the assets (see Figure 11 overleaf).

5.15 Respondents wanted to strongly protect the Historic assets and attractions, Green Spaces, Major footpaths and local roads as well as Local Services/amenities in particular with 1.1% or fewer responses stating that these assets should not be protected.

5.16 The three main assets which were considered to be in least need for protection were “Bed and Breakfast Accommodation”, “Other Businesses” and “Allotments”. Bed and Breakfast was by far the least supported asset with fewer than 10% of respondents saying that they wanted to strongly protect it reflecting perhaps the more recent bad publicity around Air B&B and attitudes generally to more local tourism.
5.17 Respondents were also asked to comment on the community assets (75 responses analysed into 150 comments). Some of the comments were general observations (5) and some related to traffic issues (7) and car parking (16) that are better analysed and discussed in Section 7, Travel Infrastructure, and so are excluded here.

5.18 Three main themes emerged focusing on firstly protecting existing (33 comments) and proposals for new (24 comments) community assets, secondly the importance of shops, café, pubs to the community (25 comments) and thirdly facilities for visitors/tourists and special housing (11 comments). Below are comments collated by Limpsfield Parish Council Topic Group; these are split into themes below each section of the comments. AECOM have added a short analysis bringing in quantitative data from the survey.

Community Assets Open Comments (reviewed by Steering Group)

Community Assets – protecting existing assets

5.19 There were expressions of how important it is to preserve the character and heritage of the parish (11 comments), with particular references to Limpsfield village. Selected comments are:

- Keep the existing historical character
- Anything which is established should be respected
- Community assets make Limpsfield what it is. To lose these to development would be at the cost of Limpsfield's heart
- Balance between maintaining character and provision of local business needs consideration
- We should do all we can to maintain Limpsfield village as a vibrant community with shops, pub, restaurant, church and a range of private businesses and voluntary organisations
- The list of community assets provided on the website demonstrates the rich and varied history of the parish.

5.20 The need to protect health and school facilities attracted 8 comments. Selected comments are:

- medical and school facilities are of particular important if the parish is to grow in future.
- Some local services/amenities need to be protected but not necessarily all on the list. I would prioritise education and medical for example.
There should be another medical surgery in the area - but probably in Hurst Green.

5.21 There was some negativity about the Tandridge Council Offices that are based in the parish (5 comments), although these were not listed as “community assets” in the survey. Selected comments are:

- Council offices not important to protect this is not the same as medical, schools, library and sporting activities
- Although local services description includes ‘council offices’ I do not regard that as a community asset. The function is needed somewhere but that can be anywhere.
- No reason for all the council offices in Oxted to be in the centre of town. Use the building to extend the medical practice and thus provide more parking for people visiting Oxted and the doctors.

Community Assets – new proposals

5.22 There were some interesting suggestions as to what new community assets could be provided and the benefit (24 comments). Selected comments are:

- In 20 years - consider our future culture - Community Halls yes - Church Hall not necessarily
- encourage more visitors / tourists, preferably using public transport and walking.
- a Llama Park in the Glebe Fields or an arboretum of deciduous trees with owl boxes to encourage bird life. Some benches at either end of the fields, a weather station, a notice board of wildlife news.
- Create a better centre of the village, possibly in old allotments and surrounding area on Wolves Row.
- it is important to keep community areas indoor (e.g. Church Halls) and outdoor (green spaces) where people can meet and not feel isolated in their homes.
- Greater need for SAFE footpaths and better green spaces for communal play.
- This area is not great for families with young children to go for safe walks due to the traffic levels and speeds.

5.23 There were 2 comments specifically suggesting more sport and exercise provision, and older residents were mentioned as being under-provided for in this regard.

Provision and protection of shops, cafes, pubs, etc.

5.24 There were a large number of comments about the importance of shops and associated refreshment providers as community assets (25 comments). There was concern about the protection of shops in Limpsfield High Street and the lower end of Oxted Station Road East, with strong support for retail and also to stop the change of use of shops from retail to housing. There were comments for the need for a variety of shops, for shops selling local produce and for shops on Limpsfield Chart. There were negative comment about too many Charity shops in Oxted. Selected comments are:

- Maintain diversity of retail businesses and avoid domination by large national/international brands.
- When shop premises become available they should only be let to retail shops suitable for use by local residents.
- There is an imbalance of shops in Oxted High Street
- important to protect pubs, restaurants, shops and offices from all switching to residential
- concerned about shops being forced out of business due to excessive charges
- retail- improve appearance - avoid blindly thinking "if its new its good"
- Memorial Stores in Limpsfield High Street is excellent - run by the community for the community.

Provision for visitors/tourism, special housing and car parks

5.25 There were 5 comments supporting visitors/tourism resulting in a more vibrant high street/area. Selected comments are:

- ….we are missing an opportunity to encourage more visitors / tourists, preferably using public transport and walking.
- Develop and use the areas resources and encourage visitors / tourists.
- Hats off to the man that started “Peter Rabbit woods” (in Staffhurst Wood).
- How about a Llama Park in the Glebe Fields or an arboretum of deciduous trees with owl boxes to encourage bird life. Some benches at either end of the fields, a weather station, a notice board of…
wildlife news (repeated from above).

5.26 These comments appear to show some respondents' belief in the benefits that tourism has for the local economy. However, there is also awareness that increasing tourism in the village also has a downside with more respondents commenting negatively about any need for tourism and voicing concerns about signage and a need to ensure that any increase in tourism does not have any major impact on the village itself. As can be seen in Figure 11 where the majority of respondents wanted to “Strongly Protect” 9 out of the 12 community assets illustrating the strong will of respondents to keep the village as protected as possible.

5.27 There were 5 comments that called for housing to be addressed, apparently as part of community assets. The main focus was on houses for elderly people wishing to downsize and remain in the parish but also to house single residents. Selected comments are:

- Help older residents move out of family houses into nice retirement properties
- Housing for older people. Protect if possible Hookwood (a low rise, tucked away social housing scheme in the village owned by TDC), but not others.
- as the number of singles living in their own homes increase, so the housing stock should reflect that change

5.28 There were 16 comments related to car parks. Parking is another concern with worries about there not being enough parking provision in the parish, which leads to roads being clogged and an untidy street scene. Views on charging for parking are mixed, with some supporting and some against. Comments have been analysed and are discussed further in Section 7, Travel Infrastructure.

6. **Local Green Space** (Online Survey Q16, Paper Copy Part 4)

6.1 Limpsfield Parish Council sought opinion relating to areas that could be designated as ‘Local Green Spaces’ in the Neighbourhood Plan. Local Green Spaces are derived from the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which ensures these areas are protected from building development and make sure it is maintained for local enjoyment. The Topic Groups identified 7 sites which may qualify for the designation.

6.2 Figure 12 below shows the three most popular sites for designation are the Glebe Field and Meadow, the Brook Field and the land in front of the Carpenters Arms on the Limpsfield Chart. However, all seven areas showed a high degree of support.
Additional suggestions for Designated Green Spaces

6.3 There were 76 responses with suggestions for designated Green Spaces (analysed as 71 separate comments). These identified a total of 27 spaces but of these 4 were already listed in the survey (as shown in Figure 12) and 11 were Green Belt areas that although very important, would not qualify for Green Space designation. Of the remaining 12 spaces the following were stated for consideration to be designated as Green Spaces (number of comments in brackets):

- The Plumbers arms old allotment site on A 25 (6);
- Land around Hookwood bungalows and from the-High Street to the East up to the British Legion (part of Hookwood Park (5);
- the grassed area known as "The Square" in Padbrook adjacent to footpath/kissing gate leading into the Memorial stores and close to the Pond Area (5);
- Tennis club and the land on corner of the club and High Street.(5);
- The field to the back of Stanhopes, land east of the village and west of Hookwood House and back of churchyard (4); and
- Land on the A25 between Brassey road and Limpsfield lights (1).
- Area adjacent to the village shop (1)

Areas in the Green Belt and/or owned by the National Trust

6.4 These Green Belt areas may not technically qualify for designation as Local Green Spaces but respondents stated they were important areas to protect.

- Fields and woodland (some owned by Water Company) of Pastens Road and around Pains Hill. (10)
- The woodland area from Limpsfield High Street to the East up to the British Legion and community orchard and the open areas surrounding the British Legion including cricket pitch / air-raid shelters and school field (6).
- Limpsfield Common /Heaths, Itchingwood Common & Staffhurst Wood (5)
- The woodland in Limpsfield High and Low Chart (3)
- Oxted School playing fields (3)
- The cricket pitch and children’s playground on the Chart by the Chart Settlement (2)
- Land adjacent to Ridlands Grove / Ridlands Rise (2)
- New allotments site on A25 (2)
- All of the woodlands surrounding the golf course (1)
- Bluebell woodland between Wolfs Rest Home and St Michaels (1)

7. **Travel Infrastructure** *(Online Survey Q17-23, Paper Copy Part 5)*

7.1 The questionnaire made clear that the Limpsfield Parish Council is interested in helping residents travel around the area in an environmentally friendly manner. Transport has been mentioned frequently in previous sections of this report and has come out in open ended comments (for example in Section 5 on Community Assets) evidencing the Parish Council’s view that Transport related problems are a serious issue which the Neighbourhood Plan should seek to address.

**Mode of Travel**

7.2 Respondents were asked which transport modes they use for a range of trips in the event that all modes were available. The private car, as expected due to the rural location, is the most popular choice for “Shopping”, “Medical” and “Social” uses. The second most popular mode for these trips is walking. Interestingly however, for commuting “Public Transport” (most likely rail rather than bus) was the most popular mode followed by the “Private Car”. Walking and cycling, when taken together, are the most popular modes for social trips emphasising the need for high quality facilities to encourage use of these sustainable modes. See **Figure 13**.

![Figure 13. Preferred mode of travel (Bases - public transport 238, park and ride 54, mini bus/hopper 111, walking 310, cycling 106, private car 353)](image)
Parking

7.3 Respondents were asked their opinions on what measures, from a given list, could be used to combat the perceived parking issues in the Parish. The three most popular measures were:

“Ensuring that all new housing has adequate off-street parking”

“Pressing for more parking capacity, (e.g. additional parking at Ellice Road and the Tandridge council offices)”

“Ensuring employers in the parish provide adequate off-street parking for their employees”

7.4 The least popular option was charging for off-street parking as can be seen in (Figure 14).

Figure 14. Which options will help alleviate the parking problem (Base: 404)

7.5 Open ended comments were not requested under this heading but were provided by respondents when commenting upon Community Assets (17 comments). Comments indicate varying views on how to address the problem. Selected comments are:

- We need to ensure that parking controls are "Light Touch" and commensurate with usage.
- additional car parking around the village would be helpful
- Car parks - not in the parish.

7.6 Parking was a major issue raised under Traffic Volume and general comments on Transport Infrastructure and these have been analysed together in Section 7.14.
Traffic Volume, Walking and Cycling

Traffic Volume

7.7 The Parish Council asked residents whether they believed traffic congestion was an issue in the Parish. The findings are shown in Figure 15 indicating that 78% (n=311) of respondent agree that traffic volumes and congestion are a problem.

![Figure 15](image)

Figure 15. Is traffic Volume and Congestion a problem in the Parish? (Base:399)

7.8 Those respondents who believed there was an issue were then asked what measures, from a given list, should be considered to address the issue. Clearly the most popular of these was imposing restrictions on HGV traffic in the local area with 88% of respondents (n=285) supporting this. See Figure 16 overleaf.

7.9 There is also a large amount of support (45%) for improving cycling and walking routes.
Walking
7.10 The Neighbourhood Plan Topic Groups consulted with the East Surrey Walkers to gain their views on how best to improve the footpaths, bridleways and pavements in the parish. The group selected five footpaths which have the potential to be upgraded and asked respondents to identify which ones they support. The most popular route to be upgrade was between Detillens Lane and Granville Road with 47% (n=168) supporting this route. However, all routes had over 20% of respondents supporting upgrade, although slightly over a third of respondents were against any upgrade (33.8% n= 122), presumably on cost grounds. See Figure 17.

Cycling
7.11 Cycling is an environmentally friendly alternative to motor vehicles and increasing the number of cycle journeys would support the Parish Council’s vision for sustainable travel. Respondents were asked whether they supported the creation of new or improved cycle routes. The majority (53% n=208) of...
the respondents were in favour which suggests there is an appetite to improve cycle routes in the local area. However, at the 95% confidence limit this generates a confidence interval of +/- 4.93% so we cannot be confident that there is a clear majority view in response to this question. See Figure 18.

Figure 18. Do you support the creation of new or improved cycle routes for example to connect Limpsfield Village and Limpsfield Chart?

7.12 Improving cycle routes particularly physically segregating them from other road users, including pedestrians is a proven method in which an area can improve participation and physical activity amongst residents. For cycling and walking a feeling a safety and security during their trip is essential and should be factored in to any designs. Other important considerations when looking at new routes are:

- Directness – ensuring that cyclists and pedestrians do not have to take excessive detours or convoluted routes especially compared with other modes. (Does not necessarily apply to leisure cyclists/walkers as long as the route is aesthetically pleasing)
- Continuity – maintaining the same standard of cycle route provision along an entire route with minimal variation, makes the route more appealing and professional looking than a piece meal approach.

7.13 These factors should be considered during the design stage of any cycle or walking route.

Traffic Infrastructure Open Comments (reviewed by Steering Group)

7.14 Open ended comments were specifically requested to explain the reason why respondents had completed the traffic volume question and generally about transport issues in the parish. More comments were received on traffic issues than for any other issue raised in the survey. We have combined the comments to Online Survey Q39/Paper Copy 5.3.5/5.6 and in total 271 separate respondents made comments, that reduced to 252 (59% of the total respondents to the survey) after removing non-coded (typically very general) answers. These respondents’ answers were analysed into 462 comments. Although tangential to the Neighbourhood Plan development focus, the importance of these traffic issues to residents need to be considered in any comprehensive plan for the parish. A summary of the principal comments made are shown in Table 4 overleaf.
Table 5. Traffic Infrastructure - frequency of comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments regarding:</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Of which relate to Limpsfield High Street</th>
<th>Positive to change</th>
<th>Negative to change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for by-pass / one-way / traffic lights / other traffic control in Limpsfield High Street</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion and volume</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking issues</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of HGVs</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling issues</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking issues</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic speed issues</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More buses</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other transport issues</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Volume of Traffic and Related Congestion

7.15 This issue attracted most comments (206 out of the 462 comments). These focused on the need for traffic control (106 comments), the volume and congestion of traffic (32 comments) and the type of traffic (HGVs in particular - 68 comments). Nearly all comments in this regard related to the historic Limpsfield High Street with some also referring to the residential roads feeding into Oxted from Limpsfield. The solutions for the High Street that attracted most comments were either a by-pass or a traffic control system. Of the 106 comments, a one-way system was the most popular with 34% positive comments and only 6% negative. Conversely, a traffic light solution had least support with 11% supportive comments but with 26% being negative. A by-pass to some was the ideal solution with 15% of comments but 3% were still negative and the cost and location implied this to be the least likely to happen. Selected comments are:

- … High Street is becoming impossible to navigate for most of each weekday between 8am/6pm.
- Traffic in the High Street is a real problem. Volume, speed, size of large trucks.
- …traffic frequently becomes grid locked - particularly in late afternoon (5-6). Consider making Limpsfield high street one way in rush hour and change it from am and pm each day.
- Limpsfield High Street not made for the type and volume of vehicles now using it….. Some type of traffic control is needed before an accident happens. Maybe traffic lights would be a good idea.
- Object to traffic lights or a one way system as it would inevitably affect adversely traffic flow in Detillens Lane. - Both volume and speed.
- There is not room to allow traffic to queue for traffic lights in the High Street - particularly at the top end - without unacceptable modifications.
- Yes to by-pass for lorries / trades people coming south from London.
- By-pass is an obvious improvement, especially as traffic numbers are always increasing.

7.16 These comments support information provided in this section where 78% of respondents believed that Limpsfield has a problem with traffic volume (see Figure 15) and over 88% supported the restriction of HGV’s in Limpsfield (see Figure 16).
Parking

7.17 This issue attracted the second most frequent open comments (72), of which 31 comments related to parking in Limpsfield High Street. On-road parking was a major issue identified as contributing to congestion and the lack of parking facilities negatively impacting local retail use and endangering future retail provision. Expanding Oxted car parks, off-road parking in Limpsfield village and Park & Ride solutions were all mentioned. Removing parking in local streets by commuters and the use of double – yellow lines were suggested. There were concerns about accidents occurring due to on-road parking. Selected comments are:

- Restrict the illegal parking of all sorts, statutory fines for parking on double yellow lines.
- Rethink school bus - park and ride?
- Residents (do not) have a "right" to park on the road and there should be residents bays that are charged for.
- Park and ride for commuters, to stop them converging on Oxted station and filling our roads with their cars.
- It is very important that parking is free in both Limpsfield and Oxted, otherwise we will lose our shops.
- Considering that most of the people parking in the road are employed at the council offices…additional parking must be made available for both them, commuters and visitors to the town.

Large Vehicles

7.18 This issue attracted the third most comments (68). There is a great deal of concern about the quantity of through traffic HGVs, large local delivery vehicles and large buses using the narrow roads with particular concern on Limpsfield High Street (49 comments). The damage to historic buildings and the pollution caused, especially by the congestion, were mentioned. Selected comments are:

- HGVs must shake the foundations of the cottages etc. and more!! Banning HGVs from High Street BUT where would they go?
- Would be good to keep HGVs out of the village. Frequently drive at high speed making house shake on Detillens Lane.
- Too much heavy goods vehicles/buses/coaches go down Limpsfield high street and restrictions should be considered.
- Large trucks and vans should not be allowed to pass down small, narrow roads such as Limpsfield high street. Passing vehicles in opposite directions is problematic and sometimes results in a stand-off.

Walking and Cycling

7.19 There was general support for walking and cycling and less car use particularly for short journeys.

7.20 There were 41 comments about walking and these expanded into 44 comments when comments on pavements and footpaths were added. Of these 22% were about the general benefit of exercise and reducing traffic, 23% about pavement provision and 55% about footpaths. There were many cases of complaint on safety grounds of inadequate or no pavements, especially along part of Bluehouse Lane (that joins Oxted to Limpsfield), and of poorly maintained foot paths, especially those that can flood (e.g. leading to Titsey Place) or are difficult for push/wheel chair users (e.g. across the Glebe /Brook fields linking Limpsfield to Oxted). Interestingly, there were several comments about why footpaths should not be upgraded. Selected comments are:

- Walking should be promoted for school run and for shopping.
- In order to encourage walking, pavements will need to be improved and maintained.
- [No pavement partly along Bluehouse Lane]..... represents a danger to anyone walking - particularly to children walking to school.
- It is important that people know about …footpaths and bridleways.[and] cycleway provision (maps etc.).
- I cycle and walk regularly - there are plenty of routes to choose to get to Oxted and the Chart without “urbanising” and over-organising routes.
- No paved footpaths.
- If there is demand for disabled/pushchair access for any of these paths then do upgrade them if you can do it without destroying the rural character of the paths.
There were 48 comments about cycling, 29 (60%) being supportive but 19 (40%) being somewhat critical. As with walking, cycling is seen as a healthy means of transport that improves health and reduces traffic. However, the area is recognized as “hilly”, cyclists complain about inadequate provision of cycle lanes and that there are safety issues. Therefore, opinions vary about the encouragement of more cycling in the parish. Selected comments are:

Supportive:

- I would like there to be a promotion of cycling - currently it seems to be quite risky to cycle in Limpsfield
- Encourage cycling to school - but need better cycle lanes first.
- Over use of cars, but quite hilly for cycling.
- If it was safer to cycle, less fast traffic and lorries/vans, perhaps more people would (cycle)
- Cycle routes on roads tend to be variable - not always possible to have them the entire route.

Not-supportive:

- Bikes just cause traffic chaos…a network of cycle lanes… would be fantastic…but there is no room.
- Roads too narrow and fast for cycle lanes.
- Whilst cycling would help congestion I don't think too many locals would start cycling as a method of getting around
- Whilst in favour of people cycling sometimes cyclists make travelling on roads more difficult.
- Cycle routes are a good idea but very expensive and may have only a limited appeal.

Traffic speed, buses and other issues

There were 35 comments about speeding traffic. Generally, it is of traffic not conforming to the 30 mph residential roads speed limit but also that some local roads, especially those without pavements, should have 20mph limits. Although this is the limit in the High Street it is often disregarded, perhaps due to inadequate speed signage. Solutions suggested were speed alert cameras, traffic calming and police/speed watch enforcements. Selected comments are:

- Cars go faster than the speed limit in Limpsfield High Street, Bluehouse Lane and surrounding roads. It's very dangerous, especially in areas with no pavement.
- I honestly fear for my life at times when walking along Bluehouse Lane.
- "Speeding" along Granville, Detillens, Bluehouse Road is so common! One day there will be an accident.

There were 29 comments about buses, mostly wanting an increased service and more routes. Smaller buses more frequently and better use of the Link volunteer bus scheme were mentioned. Selected comments are:

- Buses not frequent enough to / from Limpsfield Chart.
- More frequent buses circling the parish.
- I would rather catch a bus to the station rather than park in a local road or car park.

Other transport issues (31 comments) covered a variety of issues including the benefit of park and ride schemes (12 comments) and concerns about the pollution caused by traffic congestion (10 comments).
8. Local Facilities (Online Survey Q24 – Q29, Paper Copy Part 6)

Community Facilities

8.1 Respondents were asked to rank a list of community facilities in the questionnaire depending on their importance. Figure 19 shows the number of times each facility was ranked number 1 for importance by the respondents. As can be seen, ‘More health facilities’ is the most important facility by a large margin followed by ‘Fast Broadband’ and then ‘More Shops’.

![Frequency of number 1 ranks](image)

Figure 19. Facilities Ranked first

8.2 Figure 20 outlines the number of times each facility was ranked in the top three. ‘More Health Facilities’ (215) and ‘Fast Broadband’ (175) are still the most popular responses as was in Figure 21 however, there has been a change for the next slot with Day Care for Older People (115), More Shops (118) and Children’s Playground (97) all having around 100 responses. This shows that although not the top priority these facilities still hold a high importance for a large proportion of residents.
When asked, 60% (n=109) of the 183 respondents who answered the question, believed that the Parish already had sufficient community facilities. See Figure 21.
Community Facilities Open Comments (reviewed by Steering Group)

8.4 Open ended comments were received from 65 respondents on the need for “other” community assets (in addition to those listed in the question responded to in Figure 20). However, most simply elaborated on those already listed. Additional facilities highlighted were the need for parking (11 comments) but this is addressed in Section 7. Tourism received 5 supportive comments, most regarding the provision of a Hotel or B&B, and this is discussed in Section 8. Other additional facilities were for more policing and more buses (3 comments each).

Tourism

8.5 Respondents were asked whether they believed the Parish Council should support the sustainable growth of tourism in the parish. As can be seen in Figure 22 the majority (53%) of respondents believe that the continued growth of tourism should be supported. Using the 95% confidence limit generates a confidence interval of +/- 5.02% so we cannot be confident this is a majority view.

8.6 Those respondents who agreed that tourism should be supported were then asked in what form this support should take. Figure 23 shows that “Observation points - providing information about nature and wildlife” (66% n=165) and “More Eco-friendly dog waste bins and litter bins” (62.9% n=158) were the most supported options while “Gates and/or signs that highlight all entry points to the parish” (25% n=62) and “More bed and breakfast accommodation” (23% n=57) were the least supported improvements. Tourist Trails and information points were also supported by over 50% of respondents (55% each).
Tourism Open Comments (reviewed by Steering Group)

8.7 Open ended comments were received from 66 respondents on the need for “other” Tourism activities (in addition to those listed in Figure 23). In contrast to the closed question responses, there was a more positive opinion as to whether to support tourism (46 comments positive support, and 11 were negative or against tourism).

8.8 Those in favour of tourism suggested local guides, maps and more signage to assist tourists/visitors (in total 21 comments) and this reflects the answers shown in Figure 23 and there were some suggestions that there is not enough hotel or B&B accommodation (5 comments). The absence of a local hotel was highlighted more than the need for B&B as shown in Figure 23. The importance of more waste/dog litter bins (6 comments) repeated that indicated in Figure 23 and there were 4 comments suggesting more benches/picnic areas were desirable. Arguments against tourism were varied; waste of money, Limpsfield is already too busy and the county area is “over-used”.

8.9 Parking for tourists was seen as a problem (8 comments) and is one of the most contentious issues in Limpsfield Parish as discussed in Section 7. There is also scepticism with regards to the provision of additional car parking due to a lack of perceived space in which to do so. Selected comments are:

- Limpsfield High Street is the main parking problem.
- Increased car parking - where? no space!
- Current road infrastructure insufficient.
- How could cycle routes be accommodated given what the roads are like?

8.10 Suggestions were also made on how to improve the traffic and parking issues in the parish. These were either suggestions on locations for additional parking or suggestions to improve public transport. Selected comments are:

- Promote the High Street as a tourist attraction by excluding traffic. This would encourage an extended shopping facility. Create parking on Glebe fields behind Detillens.
- Think about park and bus ride facilities for seeing the parish, buses which can drop people off anywhere and pick up anywhere.
- Encouraging more visitors should increase use of local shops and local transport significantly - but
don't just provide more car parks but rather publicise and even extend local public transport.

9. Local Economy (Online Survey Q30 – Q32, Paper Copy Part 7)

9.1 Limpsfield Parish Council is keen to encourage a sustainable, prosperous, more vibrant, local and small business economy. The questionnaire states that businesses form a vital part of the local community by providing goods and services and employing people which helps ensure that the parish continues to thrive and prosper.

9.2 The questionnaire asked whether residents would support the use of land for business purposes; the findings are shown in Figure 24. A confidence interval of +/-4.96 is generated meaning a majority of at least 51.84% support the use of land for business purposes.

Figure 24. Support for the use of land for business purposes (Base: 383)

Types of businesses

9.3 If the respondent supported the use of land for business use, they were asked to select, from a given list, which they would support. The findings are shown in Figure 25. The most popular supported business is ‘food and restaurants (61% n=148) with the creation of a small business centre (55% n=134) and shops and retail (55% n=133) also gathering support of more than half. Factory and manufacturing units received the lowest level of support of those listed at 11% (n=26).
9.4 Open ended comments were received from 70 respondents on the need for “other” business (in addition to those listed in Figure 25). Of these 74% comments were positive about land being used to support business, although 2/3rds of these were conditional, such as not being in the Green Belt, only developed on open land or for small businesses or local shops. The support however is not universal with negative comments from 20% of respondents who are worried that any development of businesses may lead to the local area losing some of its character and heritage.

9.5 Home businesses were supported (9 comments) as long as the business does not impact on their neighbours and that better broadband would be most helpful. Which correlates with Figure 25 which shows that more than 55% support the creation of a business centre. The most favoured site for the business centre would be on the Moorhouse site (4 comments) but, some respondents feel that other parts of TDC would be more appropriate for a business centre. There have been concerns raised about the business centre using Green Belt land (4 comments) and there are suggestions about using vacant farm buildings and part of the library).

9.6 There were many comments about preserving and increasing the shops locally but also of the challenges of doing so such as poor parking and high business rates (in total 13 comments). There is a view that Limpsfield should be retained as a shopping area and this might be in doubt with current shops closing. Respondents were asked to provide any additional areas which they thought would be suitable for the area. These included traditional and stylish shops, market/farm shop style shops as well as several specific more niche shops including artists, studios and a private gym.

9.7 Selected comments are:

Supportive:
- Traditional shops are required - Oxted/Limpsfield in recent years has seen growth in cafes, restaurants, hairdressers and charity shops with the loss of grocers, butchers, bakers, etc.
• Improved broadband and mobile phone reception would help home based businesses.
• A drive to get more small business owners operating in the Parish. Might work from home using hi-speed broadband with a local business centre for support. Many retired experienced business people in the Parish.
• We need to try to minimize the need to commute, so maybe we should find ways of encouraging small businesses to start and prosper.
• Would support offices/small business centre by use of vacant farm buildings.
• I run a business from home, I would be very interested in this business centre.
• A lot of people work from home. Could the library be used somehow? To save money being spent on new buildings.

Conditional
• Local/independent commercial outlets only - no chains (e.g. coffee shops) Aim at a variety of retail offering and a limit on the number of similar businesses.
• If workshops can enable people to work from home and they do not spoil the view for other people then I support this idea.
• As long as businesses are in a location, where it doesn’t become a "traffic" problem
• We would prefer no new businesses in actual village, but OK in countryside

10. **Other Priorities** *(Online Survey Q33–Q35, Paper Copy Part 8)*

**Law and Order**

10.1 Respondents were asked to rank nine Law and Order concerns in order of priority. Looking at the first choice priority, burglaries were given the highest priority followed by fly tipping (see Figure 26). However, when the top three priorities relating to law and order are combined, there is a change in priorities with Fly tipping being more of a concern than burglaries with Litter emerging as a clear third priority (see Figure 27).

![Figure 26. Number 1 law and order priorities (base 364)](image-url)
Educational Facilities

10.2 The questionnaire asked respondents to indicate how well they think the parish is served for a given list of facilities. The findings are shown in Figure 28. Adult learning is the only facility not deemed to be well served within the parish.
10.3 Open ended comments were received from 112 respondents (i.e. 26% of total respondents made comments here), many of which were long dissertations expressing a range of opinions. These have been coded into 125 different comments, many repeating points made in the more detailed part of the survey. The additional benefit of comments given in the “Anything Else” section is an indication of the depth of feeling for the parish, in all its forms. This is reflected below although the real value of the comments are in the detail and this can be used by the Parish Council to guide and inspire it when considering its plans in the future.

10.4 The main thrust of the comments were to express preservation of the character and the beauty of the parish (26 comments mentioned character and 17 how beautiful the parish was, a total of 43 comments). There were many concerns expressed about development with 14 comments strongly against development and only 4 comments being in favour. Having said this, most comments seem to accept development was inevitable in some form; it was how to integrate into the parish without spoiling and also addressing the infrastructure necessary to not only support new development but to address over stretching of existing resources that was mentioned (6 comments). Affordable housing, typically for young local families and small houses to assist older people wishing to downsize were both equally important with 11 comments.

10.5 Rather than repeat comments on specific issues that are addressed elsewhere in the survey, a few selected (and more detailed) comments providing strong points for the direction of the Neighbourhood Plan are:

- “We must not think that Limpsfield can be all things to all people. It is a mistake to think that a small, lovely village in the shadow of the North downs can fulfill the needs of rich, poor, old, young, entrepreneurs, developers, millennials all alike, and we should not aim to make it do this otherwise it will simply become a bland soulless suburb inhabited only by consumers not contributors”.

- “In view of the changes that have taken place in the whole Oxted area over the 46 years I have lived here, which have affected the Limpsfield parish, it is difficult to know quite what the plan is trying to achieve. All the changes have been brought about by housing planning discussions which have been made without any discernable reference to infrastructure. The only identifiable "community" decisions seem to have been the Oxted supermarket and the council building. The plan seems to seek to legitimise more of the same without making any binding link between housing development and amenity provision which could preserve the quality of life of inhabitants. I hope some means can be found to make development of housing and infrastructure legally interdependent”.

- “I would like to stress that my neighbourhood, although closer to Oxted town centre, is in Limpsfield Parish and ask that any future planning applications are dealt with that in mind. Large houses are constantly being targeted by developers to be knocked down and turned into blocks of flats. This is totally out of keeping with the area, where less dense housing would be more appropriate. This would enable families to have a long term home, instead of building flats for short term occupiers. We have also lost two nursing homes which have been demolished to become flats”.

- “We should not be encouraging people from outside the TDC area to come and live in Limpsfield. If social housing is to be built it should be for those such as GPs, nurses, teachers etc. and tied to those professions which are needed and cannot afford to live here. If they become vacant it should then be for those younger/children of people who live with parents who need their own homes. Finally decent sized flats should be built for older people in the area who live in the larger houses in which to downsize and not the “rabbit hutchs” deemed appropriate for OAPs”.

- “We must not think that Limpsfield can be all things to all people. It is a mistake to think that a small, lovely village in the shadow of the North downs can fulfill the needs of rich, poor, old, young, entrepreneurs, developers, millennials all alike, and we should not aim to make it do this otherwise it will simply become a bland soulless suburb inhabited only by consumers not contributors”.

- “In view of the changes that have taken place in the whole Oxted area over the 46 years I have lived here, which have affected the Limpsfield parish, it is difficult to know quite what the plan is trying to achieve. All the changes have been brought about by housing planning discussions which have been made without any discernable reference to infrastructure. The only identifiable "community" decisions seem to have been the Oxted supermarket and the council building. The plan seems to seek to legitimise more of the same without making any binding link between housing development and amenity provision which could preserve the quality of life of inhabitants. I hope some means can be found to make development of housing and infrastructure legally interdependent”.

- “I would like to stress that my neighbourhood, although closer to Oxted town centre, is in Limpsfield Parish and ask that any future planning applications are dealt with that in mind. Large houses are constantly being targeted by developers to be knocked down and turned into blocks of flats. This is totally out of keeping with the area, where less dense housing would be more appropriate. This would enable families to have a long term home, instead of building flats for short term occupiers. We have also lost two nursing homes which have been demolished to become flats”.

- “We should not be encouraging people from outside the TDC area to come and live in Limpsfield. If social housing is to be built it should be for those such as GPs, nurses, teachers etc. and tied to those professions which are needed and cannot afford to live here. If they become vacant it should then be for those younger/children of people who live with parents who need their own homes. Finally decent sized flats should be built for older people in the area who live in the larger houses in which to downsize and not the “rabbit hutchs” deemed appropriate for OAPs”.
“Stop wasting money on unwanted development which destroys the character of Oxted. Preserve it before it is too late and it get completely overdeveloped like a city suburb”.

11. Conclusions and Recommendations

11.1 The Limpsfield Parish Council’s household survey has gathered a great deal of unique and useful information about the views and needs of its local residents. It is an historic snapshot in time and shows how much people value living in the Parish - and what they resist and worry about in terms of any change that is perceived as a threat to the character and uniqueness of the Parish. The survey clearly shows the concerns and position of residents at this point in their lives. The forward challenge for the Parish Council is two-fold:

- to contextualise the survey findings in order to address the fundamental demographic shift that will occur over the neighbourhood plan period in terms of the needs of an ageing population; and,

- In common with so many rural parishes, understand how to maintain a balanced and sustainable village over time in order to thrive and to maintain & grow the vital services and infrastructure residents expect.

11.2 The returns suggest the Parish Council has a delicate path to tread in relation to housing, transport, tourism and economic development. To take the evident concerns around traffic as an example. The nature of the traffic generated was beyond the survey’s scope but will include, daily trips by care workers, cleaners and other household support, builders, teachers and health staff who chose not to or cannot afford to live in the parish although could live nearby) together with parcel deliveries and the school run. The thrust of sustainable development is towards reducing vehicle journeys and encouraging modal shift, whereas the majority of respondents saw the solution as more parking and fewer HGVs – and in some cases not encouraging tourists.

11.3 The survey responses do not anticipate in any tangible way some of the fundamental shifts that are expected to occur over the plan period, but they do provide an important glimpse into how residents might react to such changes. For example, in some areas of the UK and Europe the electric bike is having a significant impact on the local movement habits in middle and older age groups. Similarly over the plan period, the delivery of small parcels by drones is likely to become a reality as well as electric car-share schemes and incentives, particularly for local journeys. Although it is not yet clear if the shift to electric vehicles will lead to lower or increased car ownership & journeys.

11.4 Whilst cycling in hilly Limpsfield is a challenge, there appears to be some scope in terms of the responses to encourage more local cycling, walking and public transport as viable modes for getting around locally. The Parish Council might therefore consider focusing on a few specific journeys such as the initial commute journey where it takes place in a car, the journey to the local shops and amenities & local social visits. The aim being to reduce casual and local car use. In other words to take, through the neighbourhood plan, an integrated approach to creative traffic management & modal shift through public realm, environmental & safety improvements in the form of wider & additional pavements, HGV access restrictions, fast charging & priority parking points for bikes, mobility scooters & electric vehicles, more covered cycle parking at Oxted station, local shops and key bus stops - all under the banner of ‘encouragement of the walking-cycling neighbourhood’.

11.5 However, in this one policy area alone, the more open comments suggest a sizeable minority (40%) were negative or critical of more cycle routes and provision. Even moderate neighbourhood planning policy proposals may therefore be resisted and it would be prudent to get the detail right by modelling any potential policy and design options by enlisting the advice of transport planners and urban designers, particularly with regard to the spatial implications (for example junction-remodelling and best-practice in regard to cycle lane provision, the pros and cons of a one-way system) and to prepare for discussions with the Highways Authority.
11.6 Whilst additional housing was not sought after by a clear majority of residents (75% of respondents did not need new housing), the results indicate some household need or support for new housing, particularly smaller houses and apartments. The emerging Local Plan sets the broad housing target for the area, but a neighbourhood plan can put forward realistic alternative sites to those proposed at District level. This is clearly a crucial as well as contentious policy area, but identifying more clearly would help to understand further and justify Limpsfield’s allocation (if any) in the Tandridge District Council plan. This would enable the Parish Council to move forward more confidently with sites for developments of small homes and flats for local people and key workers currently priced out together with younger families with local connections, wishing to settle down in the parish and crucially those needing to downsize/retire in order to more stretch equity release or lower incomes in retirement and also live in homes more suitable for older age.

11.7 The ability of the draft neighbourhood plan to 'join the dots' and show a deep, longer term sustainable Limpsfield strategy behind the headline vision and objectives will therefore be vital going forward. There was considerable support for the vision statement, although comments suggest there could be more reference to the need for more local community infrastructure going forward. This survey analysis also shows that some spatial solutions will be much more popular than others – an important consideration with the referendum at the end of the process. A follow-up focus group might therefore be useful to test more specific proposals before they are published.

11.8 There is general, although not universal, support for the improvement of the business environment of Limpsfield and recognition of how improving this would provide benefits to the local economy and the wider parish. Both the open comments and quantitative analysis shows the types of businesses which are welcomed in the Parish, including strong support for a small business centre & with over 50% of respondents wanting (more) food, a greater variety of shops (but no chains) and restaurants. The most favoured site for the business centre would be on the Moorhouse site and there have been concerns raised about the business centre using Green Belt land.

11.9 Finally, there was considerable support for Limpsfield's Green Belt and a core of Local Green spaces specifically tested in the survey and many suggestions for other green assets that might be designated. Clear criteria will need to be applied to finalise which of the 27 sites identified in the survey (excluding National Trust owned land) should be put forward in the plan. The National Planning Policy Framework is very specific on the criteria that will need to meet, both the current version and the new draft now being consulted upon.

Specific Recommendations

1. To take an integrated approach to creative traffic management and modal shift through public realm, environmental and safety improvements in the form of wider and additional pavements, a more pedestrian first environment in the High Street and other key routes (e.g. down to the Oxted Station), HGV access restrictions, fast charging & priority parking points for bikes, mobility scooters & electric vehicles, more covered cycle parking at Oxted station, local shops and key bus stops - all under the banner of 'encouragement of a healthy, pedestrian and environmentally friendly neighbourhood'.

2. To model any potential policy and design options by enlisting the advice of transport planners and urban designers, particularly with regard to the spatial implications (for example junction-remodeling and best-practice in regard to cycle lane provision and the pros and cons of a one-way system).

3. To recognize the need of some residents in the parish for smaller houses and apartments for downsizing and starter homes for young persons with a view to either moving forward with alternative (to the Green Belt), available and viable sites for developments or to develop policy to influence the type and range of homes being proposed within the Tandridge Local Plan including a small number of homes at sub-market rents and purchase levels.

4. Encourage local bus companies to provide better information at bus stops perhaps providing real time information. This could be via provision of sites for new all-weather bus-stops, complete with cycle & mobility scooter cover.
5. To develop policy for the vernacular and materials for new development to ensure they are in keeping with the existing properties in the area, maintaining green leafy appearance of the parish and maintaining views, together with expectations in regard to infill development.

6. To develop generic policy to encourage the use of existing farm buildings for workshops and small business.

7. To develop practical and detailed policy to evidence sustainable development Limpsfield style. For example focusing on the healthy, pedestrian and environmentally friendly neighbourhood.

8. A policy to support and further protect the maintenance and provision of green spaces. With particular support to designate Glebe Field and Meadow, Brook Field and land near to the Carpenters Arms as Green Space provision in the plan.

9. To discuss with the Clinical Commissioning Group and nearby doctors the concerns regarding a lack of medical facilities in the Parish with a view to identifying possible solutions.

10. To work with a play advisor to look at the existing children's play areas and the type of equipment required to cover a range of age groups.

11. To continue to push for faster broadband, although there is no specific spatial implication here. CR3 Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group has had significant success in this regard and contact should be made with them if not already.
# Appendix A: Housing need by location & type

## Total Number of Responses to Question on Respondents' Own Housing Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Larger housing (4+ bedrooms)</th>
<th>Smaller housing (3 bedrooms or less)</th>
<th>Apartment (3 bedrooms or less) with communal garden &amp; good off-road parking facilities</th>
<th>Sheltered housing with 1 - 2 bedrooms for older people with an on-site manager</th>
<th>Extra care housing for frailer older people with on-site support</th>
<th>Starter homes for first-time buyers</th>
<th>Question Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Those that ticked "YES" to a Housing Need in Limpsfield and ticked "NO" to a need in Oxted or Hurst Green

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Larger housing (4+ bedrooms)</th>
<th>Smaller housing (3 bedrooms or less)</th>
<th>Apartment (3 bedrooms or less) with communal garden &amp; good off-road parking facilities</th>
<th>Sheltered housing with 1 - 2 bedrooms for older people with an on-site manager</th>
<th>Extra care housing for frailer older people with on-site support</th>
<th>Starter homes for first-time buyers</th>
<th>Question Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Those that ticked "YES" to a housing need in Limpsfield and ticked "YES" to a need in Oxted or Hurst Green

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Larger housing (4+ bedrooms)</th>
<th>Smaller housing (3 bedrooms or less)</th>
<th>Apartment (3 bedrooms or less) with communal garden &amp; good off-road parking facilities</th>
<th>Sheltered housing with 1 - 2 bedrooms for older people with an on-site manager</th>
<th>Extra care housing for frailer older people with on-site support</th>
<th>Starter homes for first-time buyers</th>
<th>Question Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>7.29%</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
<td>8.71%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Those that ticked "NO" to a housing need in Limpsfield and ticked "YES" to a need in Oxted or Hurst Green

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Larger housing (4+ bedrooms)</th>
<th>Smaller housing (3 bedrooms or less)</th>
<th>Apartment (3 bedrooms or less) with communal garden &amp; good off-road parking facilities</th>
<th>Sheltered housing with 1 - 2 bedrooms for older people with an on-site manager</th>
<th>Extra care housing for frailer older people with on-site support</th>
<th>Starter homes for first-time buyers</th>
<th>Question Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>51.67%</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>21.67%</td>
<td>61.67%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>8.71%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Those that did not tick a location but ticked a type of housing (Therefore assumed they would have ticked a location)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Larger housing (4+ bedrooms)</th>
<th>Smaller housing (3 bedrooms or less)</th>
<th>Apartment (3 bedrooms or less) with communal garden &amp; good off-road parking facilities</th>
<th>Sheltered housing with 1 - 2 bedrooms for older people with an on-site manager</th>
<th>Extra care housing for frailer older people with on-site support</th>
<th>Starter homes for first-time buyers</th>
<th>Question Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
<td>6.71%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Total by Location

| Total Respondents     | 22                           | 65                           | 30                           | 41                           | 27                           | 63                           | 132                           |

## Sub-total that ticked "YES" to a housing need in Limpsfield and in Limpsfield, Oxted and Hurst Green

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Larger housing (4+ bedrooms)</th>
<th>Smaller housing (3 bedrooms or less)</th>
<th>Apartment (3 bedrooms or less) with communal garden &amp; good off-road parking facilities</th>
<th>Sheltered housing with 1 - 2 bedrooms for older people with an on-site manager</th>
<th>Extra care housing for frailer older people with on-site support</th>
<th>Starter homes for first-time buyers</th>
<th>Question Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Household Survey, front page

For a full copy of the Paper Survey please refer on line to: http://limpsfieldnp.org/downloads and under Household Survey Reference Document open the PDF file.

DID YOU KNOW THAT DELIUS, THE COMPOSER, IS BURIED IN ST PETER’S CHURCH, LIMPSFIELD?

DID YOU KNOW THERE IS A ROMAN ROAD IN LIMPSFIELD PARISH?

There are over 70 Grade 1 & 2 listed buildings in Limpsfield, most in the village

YOU ALL HAVE THE CHANCE TO INFLUENCE FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS AND YOUR OPINION COUNTS SO PLEASE COMPLETE THIS SURVEY AND RETURN IT BY 30TH MAY