COMMUNITY ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE TOPIC GROUP DOCUMENTS

These documents are presented in date order with the most document at the end.

LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – TOPIC GROUP OBJECTIVES

COMMUNITY ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE GROUP

(1) To gather evidence on the type, location and suitability of the community assets and ensure where improvements might be made.

(2) To consider the movement and connectivity of traffic to ensure it is free flowing, with ample parking including for commuters and those working locally.

(3) To sustain, reinforce or enhance transport (for example bus and train services, walking, cycling, electric vehicles).

(4) To ensure there is adequate Health and Social Care facilities.

(5) To review access and condition of all public spaces and ensure that there are adequate sports and leisure facilities (buildings and green spaces) for all ages.

(6) To ensure ease of access to local public services such as the Library, citizens advice and support groups and fast broadband access for individuals and businesses.

The issues to be addressed by this Topic group will have both desirable and undesirable trends requiring new development and active management.

Councillor John Thompson.
LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – COMMUNITY ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE TOPIC GROUP MTG 2PM - 4PM (Oxted Library)

Present:

Councillors: John Thompson (JT) - Chair
Topic Group Volunteers – Roger Oldfield (RO) Rodney Coulson (RC)
Clerk and NP coordinator – Geoff Dessent (GD)
Apologies - David Bell, David Sutherland

1. Community assets List

JT invited views on the current draft community assets list for Limpsfield Parish. A number of suggestions were made on assets not yet recorded and on assets missing but needed and the list revised (see Annex).

As well as trying to get a comprehensive list JT was keen to get some focus on what were felt to be the key assets and the rational for this, and where there were issues to be addressed.

The following was agreed:

- Assets which supported the attraction of tourists to the parish were felt to be valuable (e.g., Woods, War Memorials, St Peters Church)
Graveyard, Bomb Shelter) A lack of B and B’s was felt to be an issue in reducing the number of tourists choosing to visit the parish.

- Footpaths and pavements were felt to be valuable (with a case to improve generally for greater use and for pushchair, disabled access etc) to help reduce congestion and parking, and improve health and well-being

- Car Parking - St Peters Church Hall car park (under used during the middle of the day and not far from Limpsfield high street - but greater use would need to be agreed with the church) General parking problem causing congestion. The proposed second tier on the Ellice road car park which adjoins the parish may ease things a little should this go ahead.

- Allotments is an area of need (there is a waiting list of 20 people, 18 months to 2 years)

RC thought that there was a coffee shop in one of the shops on Limpsfield High Street.

**Action:** RC to check this.

Other assets include the Nat West Bank, and shops on the lower end of Oxted High Street (Chemist, Jewelers, Department/General Store, 2 Take aways’, estate agent, book shop, funeral parlor, 2 x hairdressers. It was agreed it was important to include these given Oxted are not developing a Neighbourhood Plan.

There was a discussion about the need for affordable housing. It was agreed this should be addressed by the Housing & Development Topic Group.

It was agreed it would be useful to put all the assets on a map of the Parish.

**Action** JT and RC
2. **Infrastructure**

It was agreed that the key focus should be on:

- Better managing traffic flows (e.g., vehicle weight and size restrictions, more speed activated signs, more yellow lines)

- Parking (need must be met by more provision)

- Improving network of paths, pavements, and cycle ways, which in turn can help to reduce traffic levels and ease parking needs

- With an ageing population it was agreed schools should be able to cope, but the health and social care services already under pressure is where the problems will arise – but the Neighbourhood Plan has few levers to help with this.

- If there are deficiencies in broadband and mobile phone signals in the parish, this should be addressed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY ASSETS IN LIMPSFIELD PARISH</th>
<th>MISSING ASSETS IN LIMPSFIELD PARISH - WANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Housing stock – flats for Older People</td>
<td>1. Affordable Housing (to be dealt with by Housing and Development Group if need demonstrated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pub Food</td>
<td>3. Specialist Restaurants, Cafes – need likely to be dependent on tourists - to date tourist numbers have not sustained such things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Churches: St Peters – C of E and Church Hall; St Andrews C of E and Church Hall; United Reform Church plus meeting room. St Peters Church does monthly community coffee mornings; St Andrews does summer afternoon teas once a week.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Shops – Memorial Stores, Post Office, Fancy Dress, Boutique, Bookshop, Funeral Directors, Ceramic Tiles, Beauty Clinic (2), Tea Room (Titsey) Oxted shops in Limpsfield – General Store, Bank, Jewelers, 2 Hairdressers, 2 take-aways, Funeral Parlor Estate Agent, Bookshop, Chemist, Travel Agent.</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. GPs – Health Centre is in Limpsfield but serves a broader community than Limpsfield residents</td>
<td>7. Satellite Surgery for Limpsfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong> Tandridge District Council offices – based in Limpsfield but serves the whole of Tandridge District (unused office space)</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong> Nursery School (PANDA)</td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> Church of England Infant School (180)</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> Special Needs School</td>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> Hazelwood private school (3 – 13, 400)</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> Oxted Comprehensive – serving a wider community than Limpsfield residents</td>
<td>13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.</strong> Tennis Club – Tennis, Squash, Badminton, Boules</td>
<td>14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.</strong> Oxted and Limpsfield Cricket Club – (2 pitches, Limpsfield and Limpsfield Chart)</td>
<td>15 All-weather pitch, Recreation ground, Bowling Green – is there a need?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.</strong> Open Spaces – Chart Village Green, Glebe field</td>
<td>16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17.</strong> British Legions (2) plus cafe</td>
<td>17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18.</strong> Limpsfield Golf Club</td>
<td>18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20.</strong> Transport Facilities – Oxted Railway Station (1 mile from Limpsfield village), Bus Services (limited), Cycle Lanes – patchy, Right of Way – strong Network, Crossing points – A25 (various)</td>
<td>20. Transport Facilities – Taxi Ranks, road without pavements, parking in the centre of Limpsfield village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21.</strong> Limpsfield High Street</td>
<td>21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22.</strong> Footpaths, rights of way across NT, private land.</td>
<td>22. Pushchair friendly footpaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23.</strong> Bomb Shelters (tourist attraction)</td>
<td>23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24.</strong> “Peter Rabbits “ wood on chart</td>
<td>24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25.</strong> Ancient Mile stone (Detillens Lane)</td>
<td>25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.</strong> Old Horse Trough (end of A 25)</td>
<td>26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.</strong> The Pound, Wolfs Row</td>
<td>27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28.</strong> Staffhurst Wood</td>
<td>28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29.</strong> War Memorials: Limpsfield Parishioners WW1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.B and B Accommodation</td>
<td>30. A dearth of B and B’s which reduces tourists likelihood to visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Access to Private School Swimming Pools (Hazelwood and Limpsfield Grange School)</td>
<td>31. No longer access to Hazelwood School pool to the public. Limpsfield Grange school pool regularly rented out to groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Car Parking - on road and St Peters Church Hall</td>
<td>32. Clear need for more Parking in the Parish. This may be eased if the proposal to put a second tier on Elice Road Car park goes ahead as this adjoins the Parish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Good Quality BroadBand</td>
<td>33. Need for this due to increasing numbers of Home Workers and for Local Businesses (this should be checked) : ACTION ; GD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Residential Care Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Chart Childrens’ Playground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table sets out the output from the discussions in the Community Assets and Infrastructure Group, on 21 July with later additions from Roger Oldfield and David Sutherland. And a Community Assets and Infrastructure Topic Group meeting on 30 August, and the NP SG held on 6th September.

Cllr John Thompson 7 September 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY ASSETS IN LIMPSFIELD PARISH</th>
<th>MISSING ASSETS IN LIMPSFIELD PARISH - WANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSING &amp; ACCOMMODATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing stock – flats for Older People. There are a few on Hookwood Park. NB Most of Stanhopes is 60+ but private</td>
<td>Affordable Housing (to be dealt with by Housing and Development Group if need demonstrated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Care Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B and B Accommodation</td>
<td>A dearth of B&amp;Bs which reduces tourists’ likelihood to visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EATING &amp; DRINKING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pubs / Pub Food x 3 – The Bull and Carpenters Arms, Limpsfield Chart; and The Royal Oak Staffhurst Wood. (British Legion – Grub St also a pub)</td>
<td>One or two local restaurants/cafés – need likely to be dependent on tourists (???) - to date tourist numbers have not sustained such things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Legions (2) plus café??</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café: New café coming in high street??</td>
<td>Community café, kiosk on Glebe playing field??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHURCHES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches: St Peters – C of E and Church Hall; St Andrews C of E and Church Hall; United Reform Church plus meeting room. St Peters Church does monthly community coffee mornings; St Andrews does summer afternoon teas once a week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RETAIL &amp; BUSINESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops – Memorial Stores, Post Office, Fancier Dress, Boutique, Bookshop, Funeral Directors, Ceramic Tiles, Beauty Clinic (2), Tea Room (Titsey - seasonal)</td>
<td>(owner of empty shop fronts next to laser clinic should be pressured to install bathroom so the spaces can be let out and not stay empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Oxted” shops in Limpsfield – General Store, Bank, Jewelers, 2 Hairdressers, 2 take-aways, Funeral Parlor Estate Agent, Bookshop, Chemist, Travel Agent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small businesses, Jewelry Making, Solicitor, Dog walking and grooming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
salon, those working from home, Builders, International Financial Services, Sustainable Energy Suppliers

| SERVICES |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| GPs – Health Centre is in Limpsfield but serves a broader community than Limpsfield residents | Satellite Surgery for Limpsfield ?? don’t think there’s real need. |
| Tandridge District Council offices – based in Limpsfield but serves the whole of Tandridge District (unused office space) | |
| Allotments | Waiting list of 20. |
| Transport Facilities – Oxted Railway Station (1 mile from Limpsfield village), Bus Services (limited), Cycle Lanes – patchy, Right of Way – strong Network, Crossing points – A25 (various) | Transport Facilities – Taxi Ranks, safer pedestrian walkways/pavemented roads, additional parking in the centre of Limpsfield village?? |
| Car Parking - on road and St Peters Church Hall | Clear need for more Parking in the Parish. This may be eased if the proposal to put a second tier on Ellice Road Car park goes ahead as this adjoins the Parish. |
| Good Quality BroadBand | Need for this due to increasing numbers of Home Workers and for Local Businesses (this should be checked) : ACTION ; GD |
| Green at Stanhopes | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOLS / CHILD CARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursery School (PANDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of England Infant School (180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Limpsfield Grange – school for girls with autism and other learning difficulties/special needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood prep school (3 – 13, 400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted School (Academy) – sits just outside border, but serves Limpsfield and a wider community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECREATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Club – Tennis, Squash, Badminton (members); Boules (at The British Legion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted and Limpsfield Cricket Club – (2 pitches, Limpsfield and Limpsfield Chart)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limpsfield Golf Club (private members)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Private School Swimming Pools (Hazelwood and Limpsfield Grange School)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glebe field recreation / football pitch (un-managed)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children’s Playground on Limpsfield Chart</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Spaces – Chart Village Green, Glebe fields; Woodland walk/education area (Limpsfield Common); Forest walks and carparks on Chart.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Footpaths, rights of way across NT, private land.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orchard by allotments</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HISTORICAL ASSETS/ATTRACTIONS**

<p>| <strong>Limpsfield High Street (particularly in Spring/Summer – Britain in Bloom) &amp; heritage houses</strong> | |
| <strong>Bomb Shelters (tourist attraction)</strong> | |
| “Peter Rabbits” wood on chart (local and visitors’ families with small children) | |
| <strong>Ancient Mile stone (Detillens Lane)</strong> | |
| <strong>Old Horse Trough (end of A25)</strong> | |
| <strong>The Pound, Wolfs Row</strong> | |
| <strong>Staffhurst Wood (Bluebells April/May)</strong> | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>War Memorials:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield Parishioners WW1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter High Street Limpsfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURREY RH8 0DR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW1 and WW2 Calvary Cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter's Church High Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield RH8 0DG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Memorial outside Memorial Stores.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Memorial at the Limpsfield British Legion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table sets out the output from the discussions in the Community Assets and Infrastructure Group, on 21 July with later additions from Roger Oldfield, David Sutherland, Anthony Turner and a Community Assets and Infrastructure Topic Group meeting on 30 August, as well as the NP SG held on 6th September.

Cllr John Thompson                      21 September 2016
LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - COMMUNITY ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE TOPIC GROUP

INFRASTRUCTURES ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION

As well as updating on the work on Community Assets at our meeting on 29th September, I believe it will also be useful to consider the following key questions on infrastructure:

Parking

- Is there adequate off road and on road parking?
- If not how can either or both be expanded?
- How can short car journeys be reduced. These are expensive, poor for cars and poor the health and well-being, as well as the environment.

Footpaths and Pavements

- Is the current network of footpaths and pavement kept in a fully serviceable and accessible condition?
- Can we list areas of concern about access or upkeep?
- Are there gaps in the network of pavements or footpaths which should be filled
- Are there pavemnets and footpaths which are never used?

Cycling

- Are there adequate safe cycle ways or should these be expanded and/or improved?

Bus and Train Services

- Are bus and rail services easy to access in the Parish – and do they connect up?
- Are the bus and rail services frequent enough and linking through the best routes serving the needs of the community?

Leisure and Sport Facilities
- Are there any gaps in provision and how could these be filled?

Other
Other major parts of the community infrastructure are the provision of services for health, education, social care, business, broadband and information services. Before doing significant work in these areas, it would make sense to prioritise areas of concerns, and areas of greatest leverage/influence.

Councillor John Thompson, 26th October 2016.
LIMPSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk to Parish Council: Geoff Dessent
Tel No: 01883 722400
Address: 8 Hurst Green Close

LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
3rd COMMUNITY ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE TOPIC GROUP MEETING
3TH NOVEMBER 2016 – 6.00pm – 7.30pm OXTED LIBRARY

Present:

Topic Group Volunteers: John Tolley (JTY)
Rodney Coulson (RC)
William Pratt (WP)
David Sutherland (DS)
David Bell (DB)

Councillors: John Thompson (JT) – interim chair

Clerk and NP co-ordinator: Geoff Dessent (GD)

Apologies: Rev James Percival
Roger Oldfield

1. Introduction

JT welcomed everyone, and briefed brought all up to speed with latest development son the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan, namely that:

- AECOM interim report on the Heritage and Character study now available – JT has a hard copy for people to see and the full report is on dropbox

- rCOH report on the NP Steering Group visioning exercise will be discussed at the next NP steering group on 9 November.

- The Wheelie Bin/Suggestion Box project has delivered over 30 responses, and the parallel survey monkey being promoted through social media has delivered 55 replies. (GD explained that this will give a very good insight into resident’s views on the NP)

RC reported that he had asked whether the new Limpsfield coffee shop on the high street might help in handing out NPO suggestion leaflets. The café felt that they would not wish to house a wheelie bin, but might be happy to host a suggestion box.
**Action:** GD to seek to move the SB from St Peters Church to the Limpsfield Coffee shop.

GD also explained that the way to boost WB and SB replies was to spend time at the various locations. He had been to Oxted Library, PANDA nursery (to which he was planning a second visit) and going to Oxted School to speak to the staff on 4 November.

JT felt that the NP should now be seeking to commission a formal household survey, given the responses to date have demonstrated what the key issues are.

### 2. Community Assets List and Map

All felt that the current map produced by RC was a very good record, and that it was right for the map to include some assets just over the Parish border which were important to the Parish (eg Oxted School) The only gaps were perhaps whether there were any further assets on Limpsfield Chart.

**Action:** JT to speak to Cllr Bob Harvey to seek his views on Limpsfield Chart assets.

JT asked the group to consider whether we should be adding to the existing 4 proposals from LPC to be considered by TDC as being registered as assets of community value (the existing 4 are the Bull Inn, the Brook Field, Limpsfield Village Stores, and Padboork Green and LPC is in discussion with parties concerned).

The Group came up with the following proposed additions:

- Carpenters Arms – Limpsfield Chart
- Limpsfield Tennis Club
- Oxted Library
- St Peters Church Hall, Limpsfield
- St Andrews Church Hall, Limpsfield Chart
- Core Shops in Limpsfield High Street
- Old Court Cottage, Limpsfield (not eligible as a house)
- British Legion, Limpsfield
- Frontage of Paydens on the Limpsfield part of Oxted high street (checking eligibility)
- Limpsfield Chart Allotments

### 3. Key issues about Community Infrastructure

**Traffic Flows**

A number of suggestions were made about how to improve traffic flows through Limpsfield village

- Bypass for Limpsfield high street (and Detillens lane) from A25 to road going up Titsey Hill (a radical option which might well be cost prohibitive)

- A new M25 Junction to the A25 around the Clackets Lane service station (again likely to be cost prohibitive)
- Declassifying of Limpsfield High Street as a B road (to get it off sat navs), and or more yellow lines and HGV/weight restriction (GD in conversation with Surrey CC about such possibilities.)

- Parking on high-street on one side only and limited to 2 hours (whilst this may well improve traffic flows it would give local residents and businesses some significant parking problems)

Parking

The group also considered some options to help with parking, namely:

- An underground car park (eg under Tennis Club) – this was felt to be prohibitively expensive

- Possible use of some of the tennis club land/Glebe field for extra parking (likely to be controversial)

- Protection and extension to Elis Road Car Park (outside Parish but very important to it as on the border)

The group agreed that either more parking should be provided, but that the promotion of sustainable travel (walking and cycling) may help reduce traffic and parking flow pressures.

4. Next Steps

JT thanked all for attending and the next meeting was a greed at the same time (6pm – 7.30pm) and place (TVSC meeting room over Oxted Library) for Tuesday 29 November, 2016.

The focus on future meetings would be on specific infrastructure proposals, bearing in mind that there will be Community Infrastructure Levy funding to support future capital projects on infrastructure.

The key issues would be to identify specific proposals on:

- Options to improve parking

- A better understanding on what local bus service/public transport s should be offering to meet local need

- Ways to promote a shift to a greater proportion of sustainable travel

- Footpaths/pavements for enhancement/extension

- Cycle ways for enhancement/extension
**Action:** All to come to next meeting with specific proposals on the above.
1) Limpsfield High Street.

a) 20 MPH restriction from Dellinens Lane up to A25 Traffic Lights. Cars & Cyclists exceed the speed limit even although there are speed humps.

b) Parking is allowed on certain sections up the High Street controlled by single & yellow lines. Parking is mainly on the West side of the High Street but the middle section is on the East side leaving only a single track for vehicles travelling up & down the High Street. This restriction causes severe traffic congestion especially when buses, coaches or heavy lorries are involved due to their limited ability to manoeuvre. Farm vehicles cause similar problems. Bends in the road combined by the staggered parking cause blind sections on a road that is only single track in many places causing further congestion, as parking is a 24-hour problem. No Disabled Parking Bays available in High Street. Many of the Shops, Residential & Office Buildings do not have their own off-road parking & rely on Street Parking leaving limited parking for passing trade & tourists. The positioning of parking is controlled to some extent by which side the pavement is situated.

c) Off Street Parking. There is no land available adjacent within walking distance of the High Street to form off street parking other than possibly Glebe Meadow at the Northern end.

d) Limpsfield High Street is classified as a ‘B’ class road with no restrictions for Heavy Vehicles. The High Street is totally unsuitable for Heavy Vehicles & in the long term could damage historic buildings in this Conservation Area. With the present parking layout the road does not have adequate width for Heavy Vehicles. Controlling heavy lorry movements up & down the High Street with width restrictors is not practical, as shops & commercial premises need deliveries.

e) St Peter’s Church & St Peter’s Community Hall. The church does not have its own off street parking other than in the Community Hall car park, which has limited spaces. This Hall runs many activities including a Nursery School during the week. Parking for the church & overflow from the Community Hall park on the West side of the High Street generally the road is wide enough for two cars to pass each other with the parking but the South end by Stanhopes turning is only wide enough for one car. A car cannot pass a heavy vehicle on this section of road.
Parking when it extends down towards the sharp bend of the B269 (at the Northern end of the High Street) leading to Titsey Hill forms a dangerous junction with Blue House Lane, as cars travelling in a Southerly direction tend to swing outwards around the blind bend to meet Northern traffic that are on the wrong side of the road as they pass parked vehicles. The Church’s congregation are forced to park in Stanhopes, Detillens, & Blue House Lane as there is inadequate parking in the lower end of the High Street when attending funerals, weddings, & when attending Sunday’s Services. Parents delivering & picking up children to the Community Hall Nursery School during weekdays generally park in the Northern end of the High Street. Parking in the High Street opposite to the Stanhope turning is also dangerous as the High Street is only wide enough for one vehicle when cars are parked opposite.

2) Detellens Lane.

This road runs in an East-West direction from the mini round about in Limpsfield High Street & has a 30 MPH speed limit. The residents in this road consider speeding a problem & carry out speed checks in conjunction with Surrey Police. Surrey Police have carried a speed survey in this road finding the average speed to be 35 MPH with a top speed of 75 MPH recorded. New flashing excessive speed signs have been recently erected each end of this road following the survey & residents speed checks. Yellow lines control parking along this road with the majority of residential properties having adequate parking off road. The row of residential properties the Eastern end of Detillens Lane situated opposite The Limpsfield Club have no off street parking & park in the road the Southern side. The Limpsfield Club is situated at the Eastern end of Detillens Lane on the North side. This club has a very extensive membership travelling mainly by car. The club has inadequate off road parking for all those attending resulting in cars parked in the road on the Northern side that on occasions reduce the road to single track by the mini round about. The junction of Detillens Lane with the High Street has a mini round about. This round about has inadequate size to allow large vehicles to turn safely from a Southerly direction into Detillens Lane. Coaches make this turn on a regular basis having to swing onto the wrong side of Detillens Lane. This is a blind turning & made more dangerous by the parked cars. The Western end of Detillens Lane is used by commuters travelling from Oxted Station restricting the road width at its junction with the A25. The speed of vehicles leaving the A25 into Detillens Lane combined with the parking local to the junction forms a dangerous point as they can meet vehicles coming the other way in the centre of the road.

3) Granville Road.

This road also runs in an East-West direction parallel to Detillens Road & the River Eden but one street further North, from Bluehouse Lane to Gresham Road in the West. Parking is controlled by yellow lines, allowing parking on the Southern side of the road for the majority of its length. To ensure commuters do not park all day in this road there is an hour, early in the morning, that no cars are allowed to park.
This road has a 30MPH speed restriction, with the majority of houses having off street parking other than the Eastern end where there are no parking restrictions & cars park on the Northern side adjacent to the junction with Bluehouse Lane. Cars turning into this road travelling from Limpsfield are liable to meet cars on the wrong side of the road due to the cars, vans & trailers parked close to the junction. This can be dangerous. Due to the parking, the road is a single track with occasional gaps in the parking to allow two-way traffic. Traffic travelling in a Westerly direction has to drive on the wrong side of the road the width being too narrow for two cars to pass. About half way along this road it bends sufficiently to cause a blind spot so that is dangerous. Buses travel & stop in this road.

4) **Bluehouse Lane.**

This road has a 30MPH limit & runs from Limpsfield to Oxted passing Oxted Academy where speed is further controlled by speed humps. The road past & beyond the school is not within the Limpsfield Parish boundaries. There are no parking problems on this road within the Parish.
The main problem is that there is not a raised pavement for pedestrians to use for long stretches the Eastern end. The only facility for pedestrians & the disabled to use are areas of road that are defined by a white dotted line to divide cars from pedestrians. Cars can park across this pedestrian zone forcing them into the road. Due to the proximity of the school, students walking from Limpsfield to the Academy have no safe paved route to access the school. This is dangerous.

5) **Stanhopes.**

This road is a cul-de-cac & only has pavements at its bottom end adjacent to the Manor House. The road runs around ‘The Village Green’ with all houses having off street parking other than the flats in the Manor House. Parking on the road is not restricted other than adjacent to the High Street. The residents living in the Manor House park in Stanhopes on the Northern side of the road. This road when parking is present is single track for two-way traffic. This is generally not a problem other than when used as an over flow parking area when the St Peters has a wedding, funeral, or on Sundays during services. Unfortunately individuals visiting the Church for these special occasions park their cars on the outside of the sharp right angle bend in the road as it reaches the Green. This creates a dangerous situation, as the corner is blind, which combined with the parking, only leaves a single track left for two way traffic & pedestrians.

6) **Gresham Road.**

The parking of section between Granville Road & Bluehouse Lane is controlled by yellow lines with restrictions similar to Granville Road to ensure that commuters do not park all day long. Parking on the lower section of this road between Granville Road & Station Road East is controlled during the week & Saturdays with only the only parking allowed being outside the Library. The top end of the road gets congested with school traffic at certain times of the day.

7) **Ellis Road Car Park**
Although this large car park is outside the Limpsfield Parish boundaries, any proposal to build flats on it would have a considerable effect on parking in the surrounding roads that are within the Parish boundary. Similarly the proposal to add another car storey to this car park would be very beneficial to parking on surrounding roads that are within the Parish boundary.

A) DISCUSSION

a) Limpsfield High Street.

From the above it can be seen that the main critical area in the Parish that has unacceptable parking problems combined with heavy traffic movements is the High Street. This street will be further affected when the Redland Tile Quarry planning application for a large Distribution Centre obtains approval, which will result in many more commercial vehicles using this already overloaded village road. This proposed development only covers part of the Quarry site & it can be anticipated that once approval is given it will be followed a few years later by further applications for commercial development.

The centre of the village is a conservation area with many historic buildings & these need to be preserved & tourism attracted. We are lucky that the businesses & shops in the High Street are present & access to them must be considered carefully to ensure that they continue to be commercially viable & traffic restrictions do not make it a no go area with the loss of trade & inevitable closing of businesses.

The High Street is classified as a ‘B’ class road suitable for heavy commercial vehicles, double decker buses, & coaches which it clearly it is not. Pavements are not present on both sides of the road leaving pedestrians having to walk in the road or having to cross over to the other side to have the benefit of a pavement. Generally pavements are provided outside the shops, but the lack of a pavement by the Bull Public House is particularly dangerous as the road narrows with parking allowed on the Western side combined with the bend leaving pedestrians & cars little space to pass safely.

The layout of the parking staggering from one side of the road to the other forms blind spots where drivers cannot see if vehicles are coming in the opposite direction until they are on top of each other. There is a speed limit of 20MPH in the High Street plus road humps to further control speed. Vehicles speed up & down the road on occasions, even cyclists speed in groups when travelling down from the traffic lights. The 20MPH limit should be enforced.

To preserve the Village assets for the future the following should be considered:

i) De-classify the High Street from being a ‘B’ class road will encourage through traffic using sat-nav directions to find other routes once maps are updated.

ii) Ban all heavy vehicles by signage top & bottom of the High Street, directing heavy vehicles down Detillens.

iii) Only allow cars to park on one side of the High Street & investigate whether it would be possible to introduce traffic lights to control the flow of cars up or down, thus removing the likelihood of a traffic jam.

iv) Introduce a 2-hour maximum parking period with a 20-minute period outside the Memorial Stores.

v) Enlarge the mini round about at the end of Detillens Lane.
vi) Extend the double yellow lines in the High Street on the Western side so no cars can park opposite Stanhopes.

vii) Investigate the possibility of providing off street parking in Glebe Meadows that could serve the High Street & also provide additional parking for the Limpsfield Club as this has inadequate on site parking.

viii) Introduce double yellow lines locally on the sharp bend in Stanhopes as this road is likely to be used more often for casual visitor parking when other restrictions are put in place such as the 2 hour limit in the High Street.

ix) Consider extending the double yellow lines slightly further South in the High Street by its junction with Titsey Road as this a blind corner with cars travelling North down the bottom end of the High Street travelling on the wrong side of the road meeting cars travelling South as they round the sharp bend.

x) Consider the introduction of average speed cameras covering the 20MPH zone as the proposals will provide a clear single track for cars cyclists to travel up or down & could encourage speeding.

xi) Consider banning heavy lorries travelling down Titsey Hill, as this will resolve many of the issues in the High Street.

xii) Encourage Tandridge DC Planning Department to make it a condition for any future development on the Redland Tile Quarry site for a new M25 junction to be formed prior to any further industrial development in the site to ensure heavy vehicles associated with any new building & future traffic movements can access directly onto the M25 ensuring that the historic town of Westerham & village of Limpsfield do not suffer from additional commercial traffic.

xii) Consider making the top end of the High Street above Detillens Lane round about up to the traffic lights on the A25 one way for all vehicles.

b) **Detillens Lane.**

From the above it can be seen that there are two critical traffic problems to solve, speeding & the Limpsfield Club’s inadequate parking off site. The parking issue could be solved by the introduction of additional parking for the club at Glebe Meadows but there could be financial & planning issues to resolve.

Speeding is an issue for the Police, who are already involved together with the Residents who carry out speeding checks on a regular basis.

The diversion of heavy vehicles from Limpsfield High Street into Detillens Lane will require further investigations regarding parking in this road as it will require two lorries to pass safely past a parked car to allow this diversion to occur.

If the High Street is made one way further consideration regarding parking will be required.

**Public Transport for the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan**

1. **INTRODUCTION.** I was asked to consider what changes to public transport would be desirable for the neighbourhood Plan. My observations are that public transport is not well used at the moment. This situation is likely to become worse in the future as funds for the County Council, which funds part of public transport are further reduced.

2. **MAIN SERVICES.** Public transport has to be divided into main services, linking towns, and feeder services linking into main services. In this area there are two main services – the East Grinstead and Uckfield railway line with stations at Hurst Green and Oxted, linking with services to East Grinstead
and Edenbridge in one direction, and to East Croydon, London and rail services elsewhere in the other direction. The 410 bus service from Hurst Green links to Redhill from which other services to East Surrey Hospital and by rail and bus to the west and south (including Gatwick Airport) can be accessed. The 410 service is supported by Surrey County Council for a limited service on Sundays and does not access the area after 7pm or so on weekdays.

3. FEEDER SERVICES. Feeder services in Limpsfield are the 594 which accesses Limpsfield Chart and Limpsfield on its way to and from Westerham, the 595 which travels to Westerham via Tatsfield and thus only accesses the northern part of Limpsfield and the 236 travelling via Limpsfield and Moorhouse to Westerham, Edenbridge, Lingfield and East Grinstead. The 594 and 595 services are performed by one vehicle for the most part and together operate on an hourly timetable. So it is important for users to remember the times at which services operate. The service is co-ordinated with the 410 service to enable a seamless service to Redhill with only one ticket. The 236 service which serves the A25 is a roughly 2 hourly service but is not co-ordinated with other services in this area, probably because it serves mainly the villages and towns in other areas.

4. DEMAND BASED SERVICES. In addition there are a number of door to door services. Buses for You operates largely in the Tandridge area and provides for a fixed price a service door to door. However, there are some destinations outside the Tandridge area including East Surrey Hospital, Horley, Redhill and Reigate and Addington tramlink. In order to order this service, a phone number is given and fares depend on distance covered. The issue is the extent to which buses can be ordered for particular times and the amount of notice that needs to be given. On Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays, buses will run in the evening – on other days they finish at 17.30 (16.30 on Saturdays). Buses do not run on Sundays or Public Holidays. The East Surrey dial-a-ride also runs an on demand service, with buses providing for disabled or wheelchair passengers though it is restricted to the area of Tandridge to the north of the Redhill-Tonbridge railway line and allowing visits to other areas in the vicinity including Croydon. It operates on Mon-Fri until 17.30. The Oxted and District Link Association provides transport for people who live in Oxted and its surrounding villages and have no access to transport. Link is carried out by volunteers using their own cars. Mainly Link takes people to visit hospitals and other health facilities but does not rule out other essential journeys.

5. PAYMENT FOR SERVICES. Public bus services (including Buses for You) allows the Surrey County Council free fares card to be used on their services. This card is important because it makes the marginal cost of bus services for the elderly or those on benefits free. There is much talk of the withdrawal of the card in order to save County Councils cash. It is true that some elderly people could well pay for fares. However, in the short term the cost of buses is fixed. It makes sense for the costs to be funded not by a variable income depending on the number of people using the buses but by an annual contribution by people who might want to use them. Such a process would keep marginal costs free and thus increase use of buses.

6. SCHOOLS. The periods at the beginning and end of the school day are important to bus companies. Special services are run in order to enable the large schools in the area to make use of the buses. This is the main reason for the size of the buses. For example, the 594 service, running through Limpsfield High Street, is too large for the road and sometimes causes congestion. The number of passengers carried is very small in comparison with the size of bus. The minibuses used by Buses for You would be far more suitable but would be insufficient to meet the demand of schools. On the other hand other full sized buses for companies such as Skinners of Oxted might well be employed for schools services.

7. USERS OF BUSES. Most people have access to cars or taxis. The benefits of bus transport are not great compared to the door to door convenience of those modes of transport. However cars require parking space and taxis are expensive. Buses are beneficial for those who cannot afford these other modes of transport. In particular buses are useful for those who are unable to have cars because
they are disabled, elderly or unable to drive. Many people see buses as services they need to be able to use if cars are no longer available to them. In my own case I recently suffered a small stroke and was forbidden a car for a month. I used the bus in order to visit friends in hospital and for shopping. I would be prepared to pay a small sum to maintain this facility.

8. **AN IDEA.** Feeder buses are not greatly used but are wanted by people who might need them. Large buses contribute to congestion in restricted areas. Some years ago the 410 bus was routed to exclude Limpsfield village by diverting it via Detillens Lane (where there are existing bus shelters) and its current replacement also avoids the village centre. Smaller buses would be far more manoeuvrable. One idea for feeder buses is the “Wrigglybus”. This is a small bus which runs along a standard route at a standard time but can be asked to divert to houses up to ¼ mile off the route in order to pick up passengers off the route. The small Buses for You vehicle would be the most suitable for this purpose. Use of text messages or phones would be used to access this service and an app would be devised to tell the passengers (both those on the standard route and off route) how long the bus would take to arrive. Such a bus would get the maximum load of passengers – both of the scheduled and on-demand type. To cover all houses in the area, the 594 and 595 would need to “wriggle” and a new occasional service for the extreme south of the parish would be needed.

9. **IMPROVING MAIN SERVICES.** Despite several attempts to improve connectivity between Oxted and Caterham, no service has been able to attract enough passengers. The question of lack of services in the evenings means that such services will not generally be viable (though the Buses for You offering remains a possibility during weeknights). It would be interesting to know how many evening events such as plays or films at the Barn Theatre, Everyman Cinema or in Redhill or Caterham would benefit from regular public transport in evening periods.

10. **CONCLUSION.** Despite increasing car congestion, it is unlikely that public transport will attract significant increased use though there will always be a demand from a minority of largely elderly or disabled people. There are a few possibilities of improving the service but not of large scale switching of people from cars.

**INDEX TO LIMPSFIELD PARISH COMMUNITY ASSETS PLAN**

A) **Elderly Housing** - warden assisted - residential - nursing.
   2) Champions Place – Kent Hatch Road Limpsfield Chart - residential.
   3) Hookwood – Hookwood Place, off Limpsfield High Street – TDC Managed – retirement/sheltered housing.

B) **Hotels & Bed & Breakfast.**
   1) B & B - 23 Granville Road.
   2) B & B - 58 Granville Road.

C) **Pubs, Restaurants, Cafes.**
   1) The Bull - Pub with Restaurant.
   2) The Carpenter’s Arms - Pub with Restaurant.
   3) The Perfect Blend - Café.
   4) The British Legion - Café/Restaurant with drinks licence.
5) Deep Blue - Fish & Chip Restaurant & Take Away.
6) Subway – Café.

D) Churches & Church Halls.
   1) St. Peter’s C of E. Tower built c1180.
   2) St. Peter’s Church Hall & Glebe Room.
   3) St. Andrews C of E plus Church Hall. Built 1895.
   4) St. Silvan. Redundant/Closed Church.
   5) Pains Hill Chapel – built 1823.

E) Retail Limpsfield High Street & Nearby.
   1) Memorial Stores & Post Office.
   2) Surrey Skin & Lazer Clinic.
   3) The Limpsfield Book Shop – Sauvarin Withers Jeweller trades on Wednesday.
   5) Limpsfield Ceramic Tiles.
   6) Serenity Beauty Salon.
   7) Fancier Dress.
   8) Joie de Ville - Boutique.
   9) The Perfect Blend – Café.

F) Retail Oxted High Street, Station Road East.
   1) Paul James - Jewellers.
   2) Paydens Ltd. - Books & Stationery.
   3) Paydens Ltd. – Dispensing Chemist.
   4) The Original Factory Shop – General Store.
   5) The Salvation Army – Charity Shop.
   6) Age UK – Charity Shop.
   7) Trimmers – Hairdresser.
   8) Hospice in the Wold – Charity Shop.
  10) Gas Station – Mens & Ladies Clothes.
  11) Thomas Hill – Hairdresser.
  12) Woodwards – Mens Clothes.
  13) St. Catherine’s Hospice – Charity Shop.
  14) La Maison Boutique – Clothes & Decorative Items.
  15) Pinnacle – Home Interiors.
  16) Belmont – Dry Cleaners.

G) Businesses Limpsfield High Street & Nearby.
   1) Solicitors – Glynis A Johnstone.
   2) Theisen Securities Ltd.
   3) Ebbutt Funeral Services.

H) Businesses Oxted High Street, Station Road East.
   1) Natwest Bank.
   2) Ashdown Travel.
J) Council Offices - Tandridge D. C.
   1) Tandridge Offices & Council Chamber.
   2) Adult Social Care.
   3) Community Partnership Team.
   4) Oxted Police Post.

K) Library.
   1) Lending Library.
   2) Citizens Advice Office.
   3) Oxted Volunteer Centre.

L) Medical Centre.

M) Dental Practices.
   1) New Lodge.
   2) Lombarden Farm.

N) Fire Station.

P) Allotments.
   1) Limpsfield off A25.
   2) Limpsfield Chart off Stoneleigh Road

Q) Community Orchard.

R) Schools.
   1) Limpsfield C.E. Infants.
   2) Limpsfield Grange - Girls with special needs.
   3) Hazelwood Prep.
   4) Panda - Nursery.
   5) St Andrews - Nursery.

S) Sporting Activities.
   1) The Limpsfield Club - Tennis, badminton, squash, table tennis, & gym.
   2) Limpsfield Chart Golf Club.
   3) Glebe Meadow & Pavilion - Unmanaged changing rooms & football pitch.
   4) Oxted & Limpsfield Cricket Club.
   5) Limpsfield Chart Cricket Club.
   6) Children’s Playground Limpsfield Chart.
   7) Limpsfield Grange School - Swimming – can be rented by groups.
   8) The British Legion – Boules.

T) Historic Assets & Attractions.
   1) Old Court Cottage - 12th Century – Oldest house in Surrey.
   2) WW2 Bomb Shelters Limpsfield Common.
   3) ‘Peter Rabbits’ - attraction for family on Limpsfield Chart.
   4) St Peter’s Church Graveyard – Historic graves.
   5) Ancient Milestone, Detillens Lane.
6) Old Horse Trough & Drinking Fountain, Detillens Lane.
8) War Memorials:
   i. St Peter’s Church – WW1 & 2, Parishioners.
   ii. St Peter’s Church - WW1 & 2, Calvary Cross.
   iii. Memorial Stores.
   iv. Limpsfield British Legion.
   v. St Andrew’s Church - WW1 & 2.
9) Village Pound.
10) Grants Farm – 16th century frame.
12) Trenchley’s Manor – 16th century, originally Trenchleys Farm.
13) Batchelor’s Farm – Wealden style.
14) Black Robin’s Farm – 16th century.
15) Moat Farm – Medieval House once moated.
17) Moorhouse Farm.
18) Detillens House – Medieval House.
19) Friars Cottage.
20) Mill House – originally had a windmill which was lost in 1925.
21) Joyce’s on the Chart & Reading Room – originally post Office & Tea Rooms with Reading
Room attached where illiterate could have their letters read for a fee.
22) Lombarden Farm – possibly the oldest house on the Chart originally built as hall house.
23) Ridlands Farm House.
24) Vicars Haw.

U) Car Parks.
   1) St Peters Hall – Limpsfield High Street.
   2) Glebe Meadow – Presently closed off with a barrier stopping public parking.
   3) Council Offices Gresham Road.

V) Major Footpaths & Ancient Roads.
   1) North Downs Way.
   2) Greensand Way.
   3) Vanguard Way.
   4) Roman Road – runs London to Lewis.

W) Businesses Limpsfield Chart & Nearby.
   1) Merlin Real Estate Ltd.
   2) Alchemy Ltd.
   3) Chartwell Barns Ltd.
   4) The Tiled Roofing Consultancy Ltd.
   5) Crossfire Productions Ltd.
   6) Xulon Panel Products Ltd.
   7) Perfect Dimension Studios Ltd.
   8) Saparua Investments Ltd.

X) Limpsfield Village Green.
INDEX OF IMPORTANT ASSETS ADJACENT TO LIMPSFIELD PARISH BOUNDARIES

A) Churches.
   1) United Reform Church plus Meeting Room.

B) Schools.
   1) Oxted Academy.

C) Rail Stations.
   1) Oxted - Direct connection to London & East Grinstead.
   2) Hurst Green - Direct connection to London & East Grinstead.
   3) Edenbridge Town – Direct connection to London & Uckfield.

D) Attractions.
   1) Titsey Place & Estate - when open it has a Café.

E) Major Footpaths.
   1) Vanguard Way.
   2) Pilgrims Way.
   3) North Downs Way.

F) Car Parks.
   1) Ellice Road.
   2) Johnsdale – permit holders 7am to 5pm Monday to Friday. Blue Badge Holders free parking.

G) Sporting Activities.
   1) Edenbridge Golf Club.
   2) Master Park – Cricket, Football, Tennis, Childrens Playground.
   3) Tandridge Golf Club.

H) Major Supermarkets.
   1) Morrisons - Oxted.
   2) Waitrose - Edenbridge.

J) Theatres & Cinemas.
   1) Barn Theatre.
   2) Everyman Cinema.
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LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
3rd COMMUNITY ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE TOPIC GROUP MEETING
29th November 2016 – 6.00pm – 7.30pm OXTED LIBRARY

Present:

Topic Group Volunteers: John Tolley (JTY)
Rodney Coulson (RC)
William Pratt (WP)
David Sutherland (DS)
David Bell (DB)
Roger Oldfield (RO)

Councillors: John Thompson (JT) – interim chair

Clerk and NP co-ordinator: Geoff Dessent (GD)

Apologies: Rev James Percival
1. Introduction

JT welcomed all to the meeting, which followed the agenda tabled on the night.

JT outlined some of his thoughts about a vision for the Neighbourhood Plan, but explained that this was to be discussed at the next Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group on 5th December, and that he would feed back the outcome of that discussion. GD outlined the progress on the wheelie bin consultation which had produced, along with the survey monkey, around 120 replies, giving a good feel of the issues, with infrastructure high on the agenda. GD also explained that currently he was leading a piece of work to engage with the 10 or so key stakeholders, which included the voluntary sector, land owners, Oxted Parish Council, local businesses as well as Tandridge District Council (TDC) and Surrey County Council. JT explained that the next stage after this was to commission a household survey which would test out some the findings and concerns, and in particular test out possible solutions.

2. Community Assets List and Map

JT thanked RC for his hard work on producing the asset list and associated map. JT felt that the work was now almost complete, and would be presented to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. Also GD was already taking forward a number of the suggestions of items to be considered to be registered as an asset of community value but he pointed out that individual houses could not be considered nor could clusters of shops or shop frontages. GD was taking this forward in discussion with the parish council and TDC.

3 Traffic Flows and Parking

RC in particular and others had considered the issues of parking and traffic flows. Traffic flows on a number of the roads between Limpsfield and Oxted were seen as problematic (eg Granville road and Bluehouse lane), and these were being considered with the current Tandridge parking review.

Action group to feed in comments to the parking review,

RC felt very strongly that by far the biggest traffic flow problem was Limpsfield high street.

Action: all to consider for the next meeting what the options there are to improve this (GD is already working with Surrey CC on 3 initiatives - first to get an unsuitable HGV warning sign to be put on the Warlingham side of the roundabout at the top of Titsey hill – second – the possibility of width restrictions for vehicles who use the high street – and finally GD has already actioned HGV Sat Nav warning flags (via the Tom Tom mapping system they use) to keep away from Limpsfield High Street completely.

On Parking, all agreed that 3 options were worthy on more detailed consideration

- A second deck for Ellice Road Car Park (being considered – whilst just outside the parish would help parking in the area)
- A second deck on the TDC car park – worthy of further exploration (perhaps funded by a
Section 106 agreement as proposed by RO, as part of any new building in Oxted).

- A proposal from WP to develop some temporary parking on the edge of the playing field near the Limpstfield tennis club and Glebe Meadow – this would be of the type where there was hard standing support in the ground whilst fully preserving the green space.

4 Bus Services

JTY presented a paper on bus services, showing that apart from peak school bus run times, it would be far better for bus operators to use small buses and perhaps operate a “wriggly” bus service which allows regular services to depart from their routes to service particular house groupings (eg to help support older people).

Action; JT/JTY/GD too speak to bus operators and other relevant contacts

5. Footpaths and Pavements

All agreed that a strong network of footpaths and pavements, with access to all (including the disabled and those using pushchairs) was important. And a number of areas were flagged as being of immediate concern (eg lack of pavement at one end of Bluehouse lane, muddy parts of Glebe field footpaths, and lack of all year usage of footpaths from Rockfield road to Hazelwood School. JT felt that the group should commission the relevant parish councillor (Michael Bruning) to reflect on the group’s concerns, and prepare some recommendations on how things might be improved, picking up other areas of concern, which the ramblers might have flagged to him.

DS felt that signage to the various footpaths was something which should be improved, which others supported.

JT felt that the Neighbourhood plan should have a clear map of all the footpaths and pavements showing area where improvements were felt to be necessary, which the group supported. JT felt that there were similar concerns for cyclists but the priority for the community (from the feedback we have had from residents) was far more about footpaths and pavements.

Action GD to commission Michael Bruning on the groups behalf as above (done on 1 December)

6. A new Playground for Limpstfield Village

The wheelie bin/survey monkey responses indicated a level of support for a new playground in Limpstfield village.

Action – the group should could prepared with options for this at the next meeting.
7. A New Community Centre

There were few voices calling for this from the initial resident’s survey, and some concerns among the group that it was unclear whether the current facilities in St Peters and St Andrews were being fully utilized. A new community centre was not something the group was keen to take further.

8. Health Service Capability to meet local Needs

GD explained that whilst efforts to keep the population fitter and healthier (eg though more walking), over the next 20 years may help, the pressure would mount on the Oxted Health Centre, which was already struggling to attract GPs and particularly nurses (who found the area too expensive to live in).

GD suggested that the case for an additional health facility was probably stronger for Hurst Green than Limpsfield, given the large amount of building both present and planned in Hurst green, as compared with the far more modest TDC suggestions for Limpsfield.

All agreed that this need should be flagged in the Neighbourhood Plan, and that there may be some mileage in speaking to Oxted Parish Council to see whether they felt similarly about this issue, and what plans if any they had to address this.

The only other area which could be considered was some health provision offered in Limpsfield Chart perhaps focused on older people who found getting to Oxted Health Centre difficult. (GD has since had correspondence about grants of up to £10k for projects to support older people - the deadline for which is 13 January, but has ensured that the parish council is aware prior to its December meeting.)

9. Next Steps

JT thanked all for attending and said he would fix a date for the next meeting for the 2nd, 3rd or 4th Tuesday in January 2017, and asked members to let GD know of their availability. The venue and time of the meeting would be as for all previous meetings.
Parking

I will not repeat the issues concerning parking as this has been comprehensively covered in Rodney’s excellent note on parking with further comments from John.

Rodney also raised for discussion some solutions one of which is the playing field adjacent to the Glebe Meadows. Rodney quite rightly raises the planning issues for allowing parking on part of the field and the financial implications for both managing the parking and possibly acquiring the field for the parish.

There is nowhere else within walking distance of Limpsfield village that could adequately provide sufficient additional parking for visitors, and tourists to the village, and the Limpsfield Club. Therefore, a small section of the playing field in my view deserves serious consideration. Parking issues are only going to get worse!

My proposal is that part of the eastern end of the field be sectioned off with perhaps some hedging and that area be laid with a form of grass protection mesh as illustrated below (this would therefore be regarded as a temporary structure and hopefully not allow the field to be considered open to development).

This would alleviate some of the parking overspill on to Detillens Lane for members and visitors of the Limpsfield Club and provide for additional parking for members of St Peter’s congregation and visitors to the village. I would also suggest an access path from this section through to the Club for the members only. In return, the Limpsfield Club could manage and control the parking restrictions with some form of penalty for commuters/all day parking. Alternatively, a barrier control system could be installed and again managed by the Limpsfield Club. The club could also manage the scheduling of the fixture dates in partnership with St Peter’s with further promotion of these events to the wider community.

Traffic.

The problems of through traffic via the village high street and Detillens lane will become even more intolerable in years to come. There is a suggestion of banning HGV’s through the High Street and directing along Detillens Lane. This is likely to cause congestion at either end of Detillens, and particularly at the A25 end whilst attempting to access the A25, which will become insufferable for the residents of Detillens Lane (I being one of them).

Banning HGVs at the top of Titsey Hill travelling down to the village should certainly be given consideration.
No Thoroughfare for HGVs signs may help.

However, a long term solution would be creating a Limpsfield/Westerham bypass at a strategic point from the A25 between Limpsfield and Westerham

William Pratt
LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
COMMUNITY ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE TOPIC GROUP MEETING
20th December 2016 – 10.30am – 12n noon OXTED LIBRARY

Present:

Topic Group Volunteers: John Tolley (JTY)
Rodney Coulson (RC)

Visitor Marcus Dode (MD)

Councillors: John Thompson (JT) – interim chair

Clerk and NP co-ordinator: Geoff Dessent (GD)

Apologies: Rev James Percival (JP)
David Sutherland (DS)
David Bell (DB)
Roger Oldfield (RO)
William Pratt (WP)

1. Introduction

JT welcomed all to the meeting and thanked Marcus Dode for attending, and agreeing to offer his advice.

2. Bus Services and Traffic

JT outlined the general progress on the Neighbourhood Plan, He then asked MD to explain his role in local bus services. MD explained he had set up the East Survey Rural Partnership which is a charity which is runs across East Surrey. This has 40 minibus’s in the county 1 – 2 of which operate locally. This operates alongside the LINK services and Buses4 U.

RC explained the key traffic problems around the centre of the village and in particular in the high street which large vehicles. MD explained that the reason that the main bus operators (which he felt the group should speak to) used large double decker buses was because these were needed for the school run, and that it was uneconomic to run smaller buses off peak, ie swapping transport types twice a day (although they would clearly be more sensible).
**Action:** MD to provide GD with the key contacts for the local bus operators.

MD also clarified that double-decker buses would be classed as HGVs,

RC felt the key was to try and exclude all HGVs from Limpsfield High Street, but to ensure that two-way smaller vehicular traffic continued with adequate parking to support the business’s in the high street.

JTY outlined his ideas about an additional wriggly (small) bus service to help serve those who had limited mobility and lived off the main bus route, as such buses could deviate from their route up to a quarter of a mile as needed. MD said he saw the value in this, but explained that running a bus service with a clear and agreed schedule was easier.

MD explained that Surrey County Council like many others were cutting back on services and therefore additional local services might be needed in the future using smaller buses. He agreed to help the group work up ideas in this area.

**Action:** JTY and MD

### 3 Traffic Flows and Parking

All agreed parking was a key issue to be addressed and that the latest parking review would not solve the problems which over the years would get worse as traffic flows increase with more people, and higher levels of car ownership.

All agreed the double decking of the Ellice Road and TDC Car parks would be a sensible step, ideally if funding could be linked to developers plans for new build in Oxted.

Parking charges were thought to be one way of better managing the use of the current car parks. Also, all thought that more enforcement was important as current enforcement levels were very low. JT felt that the Neighbourhood Plan might consider outlining a scheme to fund an enforcement resource to send the right signals about parking compliance.

### 4. Footpaths and Pavements

All agreed the there was scope to improve the network of footpaths and pavements (eg on Bluehouse Lane), and provide disabled and pushchair access to those footpaths which get muddy.

JT would register this formally with NP steering group – and ask again for input from Michael Bruning as he is the lead Councillor on the PC. The group also agreed it would be useful to meet with the Ramblers.

**Action** JT to re-contact Michael Bruning.

### 5. Next Steps

JT thanked all for attending, and in particular to MD offer of help, and inputs to date.
Next meeting is at 6pm at Berry House on 10 January. Philip Bailey, the char of the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group will be attending and the aim is to ask Philip to outline his creative vision for the Neighbourhood Plan, but also to discuss where things stand on traffic and parking.
Present:

Topic Group Volunteers: John Tolley (JTY)  
Rodney Coulson (RC)  
William Pratt (WP)  
David Sutherland (DS)  
David Bell (DB)  
James Percival (JP)

Councillors:  
John Thompson (JT) – interim chair

Clerk and NP co-ordinator: Geoff Dessent (GD)

Apologies: Roger Oldfield (RO)

1. Introduction

JT welcomed everyone to the meeting, which followed the agenda previously circulated.

2. Conceptual Vision for the Neighbourhood Plan

PB outlined his conceptual vision for Limpsfield (which had been circulated to everyone, before the meeting). PB had developed this drawing on both AECOM’s work on the Character and Heritage Study, the work of the four Topic Groups and also the rCOH visioning exercise. This work was previously presented to the NP steering group on 5 December.

PB explained that this vision of the Parish, showed that it was surrounded by green borders on 3 sides and that there were numerous views, which he felt should be protected. PB also felt that the various footpaths and cycle-ways should connect up to give people access around the Parish more easily. (In some cases, this may mean it would be sensible to seek upgrading a permissive footpath to a “right of way” – a process which will be abolished by the Government in around 10 years’ time – 2026 is the latest estimated date for this.)

PB said that one of the issues rCOH has identified was whether or not the village of Limpsfield should have a centre, as they felt this was currently lacking. PB also spoke about the need for
some redevelopment of St Peters Church Hall, over the lifetime of the NP, which would need to meet future needs, and take on board the planned changes to St Peters Church and the capacity of other community facilities (eg St Andrews Church Hall).

The initial (Wheelie Bin) survey had already identified that the major issues for residents were the flow of traffic, parking and the protection of green space, with some feeling there was a need for “down-sizing houses”, “affordable housing” and “key worker housing”. The need for a good network of footpaths and pavements was also identified and there were resident comments about better cycle paths and bridleways.

PB therefore proposed a range of ideas around car parking and traffic flow, indicating some possible new car parking sites and various options for Limpsfield high street (including one way options, and a bypass for the village, noting that the latter was extremely unlikely on cost grounds).

RC felt that two-way traffic on Limpsfield High Street was important to help local Businesses thrive. He also felt that traffic lights might better control the flow, with on-street parking being on one side of the road only. All noted that parking on the High Street was dominated by local Residents (who have no off-road parking).

PB felt that the household survey should test out views about the future of St Peters Church Hall and the Glebe field, in the context of needs for a community centre, village playground and off road parking.

JT felt that the conceptual vision was too Limpsfield village centric, and more thought was needed around a vision for Limpsfield Chart, and the southerly rural parts of the Parish.

On the household survey, all agreed that it was important to gather views across all ages and test out practical options on parking and traffic flows, so the NP can make some headway on these issues in particular given the strength of feeling. And these issues and others needed to be carefully set in the context of Oxted Parish given its close proximity.

JP felt that the Church was increasingly seeking to play a wider community role and is very keen to promote a vibrant parish, which responds to all people’s needs. WP wondered whether developing a community hall/visitors centre might be a helpful option to bring more visitors to the Parish.

DS felt that it was unfortunate that parts of Limpsfield High Street did not have pavements on both sides, and felt in general the High Street could be made more pedestrian friendly, a factor which should be kept in mind when addressing the traffic flow and parking issues.

Finally, PB said that he felt that with the increase in precept and development of the NP meant the Parish Council had a significant opportunity to establish a series of projects which flowed from the NP, to actively respond to the issues residents are raising.

3. NP Household Survey - process

The process of producing the NP Household survey will be as follows:

- AECOM will produce a first draft by 13 January (which they have now done)
• The NP steering group will discuss and suggest changes to this at their next meeting on 17th January

• AECOM will then produce a second draft of the survey, taking on board all the NP steering groups comments by the end of January

• NP Topic Groups will then be given time to comment in particular on their areas of interest

• A third draft will then be prepared by AECOM, with a view to this being sent out by 1 March at the latest – this will be accompanied by a parallel survey monkey and social media campaign, along with other publicity eg banners to help ensure the highest possible level of response.

4. Community Assets List and Map

Work on this is largely complete. The group feel this should feature in the final version of the Neighbourhood Plan. RC was thanked for his hard work on this.

5. Next Steps

Group members are invited to:

• Comment on drafts of the household survey (see section 3 above)
• Consider the case for any permissive footpaths to be put forward for “right of way” status
• Join the meetings planned with the bus operators during late January/early February

Action: Topic Group members

JTY also kindly agreed to help in summarising the final recommendations to the NP Steering Group

Action: JTY to work with GD and JT in drawing up the final recommendations of the group to the NP Steering group.

As well as the meeting proposed with the bus operators, the next main meeting of the group will be in 2nd/3rd, week in February.

Action: GD to set up two further meetings.

Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan

1. footpaths which should be upgraded (eg all weather, disabled, and/or pushchair access)

FP 78 between Detillens Lane and Granville Road – this is a well used path connecting Limpsfield village area and Oxted shopping area. It is not accessible for pushchairs due to kissing gates at
both ends, steepish slope near stream and muddy in places. The field is used for stock grazing at
times, so farmer will want gate to be stock proof.

FP 90 between Wolfs Hill (Hazelwood School) and Pollards Wood Road – this path could be
used as a shortcut avoiding roadway but it has a very steep slope that needs steps being installed.

BW 73 (near border with Titsey Parish?) - this path would normally offer an attractive route from
Limpsfield village area via Sandy Lane to Titsey House and Titsey Plantation walks. However,
just off Titsey Road the bridleway is constantly flooded, often resembling a small pond.

FP 37 Limpsfield Chart near boundary of National Trust and Titsey Foundation lands – part of
Greensand Way and takes users onto the wide permissive tracks of the High Chart. Needs a
short section to be improved for pushchair access.

FP 75 off Park Road, next to Oxted School land – there is an awkward wooden stile at field
entrance. If this could be replaced with a self closing gate, it would improve access to the field
and up to Titsey Plantation walks.

2. any permissive footpaths for which we should seek right of way status

We are very fortunate in Limpsfield to have an extensive network of public rights of way and
permissive paths. The Titsey Foundation and the National Trust own large areas, Staffhurst Wood
is either owned by The Woodland Trust or managed by Surrey Wildlife Trust. All these
organisations provide many permissive paths.

Section 31(6) of the Highway Act 1980 allows for landowners to acknowledge the existence of
those public rights of way which cross their land and to prevent new public rights of way being
created by 'presumed dedication'. A deposit/declaration made under section 31(6) (Statements of
Deposit) will not prevent rights of way that may already exist from being recorded. I believe that
all of the Titsey land where there are permissive paths is subject to such deposits.

Given Titsey’s relative benign management of its land, it is difficult to imagine a situation whereby
the public would be denied permanent access to its permissive paths network in Titsey Plantation
and the High Chart. This could change were the Titsey Estate to be sold, probably an unlikely
event in the foreseeable future.

The other three organisations mentioned above all allow extensive access to their land and so we
can be relaxed that their network of permissive paths in Limpsfield will continue. Therefore it is
not considered worthwhile to explore the possibility of applying for any of these permissive paths
to become public rights of way.

Other than the above, I cannot recall any other permissive paths in the parish.
3. any "new " footpaths" which would enhance the connectivity of the parish

For a path to become a public right of way an application has to be made to the local authority (Surrey C.C.) on the basis that historical evidence exists showing that public rights have existed in the past or members of the public attest that they have enjoyed unhindered access over the route for a continuous period of at least 20 years. Given that the Statements of Deposit referred to in 2 above cover a substantial area of Limpsfield parish, there is limited scope for such applications. Having scanned a map of the area, I have not observed any potential for new public footpaths to be created.

4. any "new Pavements" which would making walking around the parish easier (eg Bluehouse Lane)

Bluehouse
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Water
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Pains Hill

Tony Pearson
Local Footpath Secretary
The Ramblers
**PARISH ASSETS**

[] Elderly Housing

[] Allotments.


[] National Trust Ranger & Cottage on The Chart.

[] Pubs, Restaurants, Cafes.

[] Limpsfield Village Green.

[] Churches & Church Halls.

[] Businesses Limpsfield Chart & Nearby.

[] Retail Limpsfield High Street/Nearby.  

[] Major Footpaths & Ancient Roads.

[] Retail Oxted High Street, Station Road East.

[] Car Parks.

[] Businesses Limpsfield High Street & Nearby. [] Historic Assets & Attractions.

[] Businesses Oxted High Street, Station Road East.  

[] Sporting Activities.

[] Council Offices - Tandridge D. C

[] Community Orchard.

[] Library.

[] Medical Centre.

[] Fire Station.

[] Dental Practices.

**ASSETS ADJACENT TO LIMPSFIELD PARISH BOUNDARIES**

[] Churches.

[] Major Supermarkets.

[] Schools.

[] Theatres & Cinemas.

[] Rail Stations.

[] Attractions.

[] Major Footpaths.

[] Car Parks.

[] Sporting Activities.
**Wriggly Buses**

1. In recent emails I have suggested the idea of “wriggly buses”. I believe these have been used in rural areas.
2. A Wriggly bus follows a main route but can “wriggle” from the route up to, say, ½ Kilometre to pick up passengers off the route.
3. A passenger can wait for a bus at a stop on the main route, or can call a number or send a message to ask for the bus to wriggle to his house. In the second case the postcode and house name is fed into a computer program which schedules the wriggle. Programs like this are already used for parcel deliveries. The difference is that this program will need to do this in real time and on a map, which the bus driver will access before the journey commences.
4. The objective is for the journey to be completed by a specified time. However the journey time will depend on the number and location of “wriggles.” It follows that the estimated start time will depend on the basic journey length plus the wriggle time. Since the finish time is the most important it will be the start time that would need to be altered. Also the time at each stop on the main route will have an earliest and latest value depending on the number of wriggles performed before the bus arrives there.
5. Associated with the system there would need to be a means of informing people joining on the main route as to the time the bus will arrive at a main stop. This could be done by text as Southdown buses do now or by a computer.
6. Limpsfield local buses are the 594 and 595, travelling from Westerham to Oxted via Limpsfield Chart (594) or Tatsfield (595). The basic time is 21 minutes (excluding the diversion to Chalkpit Wood). It follows that if there were two wriggles of 5 minutes each, the total time would be 31 minutes. I’d doubt that the number of wriggles per service would often exceed two.
7. Because wriggly buses have to be able to traverse narrow roads, mini-buses are more suitable than standard buses.
8. Wriggly buses covering the whole of Limpsfield could be implemented by the existing 594/5 services plus an occasional “596” service to, say, Edenbridge, via Staffhurst Wood.
9. Wriggly bus services would cover two sets of customers – those needing transport at a given time at a particular stop and on demand customers travelling from their homes (currently due to be served by “Buses for You” vehicles). Since Buses for You need to be applied for at least 24 hours in advance, this would be an improvement. Such buses would enable people to visit the Health Centre without worrying about parking or to travel on long distance services by train or 410 bus to Redhill. If services could be extended into the evening there may be additional customers.
10. Wriggly buses would probably not be suitable for school transport.
1. Introduction

GD welcomed everyone to the meeting and gave GW a bit of background to the Neighbourhood Plan and the work of the topic group and its interest in Bus Services.

2 Southdown Bus Services

GW outlined all the local services Southdown provided, some on a purely commercial basis and some on a subsidised basis from Surrey CC. GW felt the level of service was good, but that the low take up of these services stemmed largely from local residents not being aware of the service.

GW explained that the reason they were using double decker buses was to accommodate the school run. And that it was not feasible to switch to smaller buses doing the middle of the day, and that the buses were largely in continuous use throughout the day.
3. Discussion

Numerous detailed points were made in discussion. The key points and actions were as follows.

- GW would consider any proposals for Wriggly bus routes

**Action:** Group to consider these and coordinate through JTY

- GW was prepared to consider working with employers to provide a park and ride facility to get employees into Oxted to ease parking in Limpsfield, provided employers could identify park and ride sites outside Oxted and Limpsfield

**Action:** Group to consider what pressure could be put on employers to consider park and ride options for their employees.

- Publicising southdowns services – GD said that the Council could help via its website and social media activity

**Action** GD – to take forward (already tweeted and posted on facebook once !)

3. Next Steps

The group were encouraged to follow up on the various actions

**Next meeting:** a date has not yet been set for this, but it is likely to follow the receipt of the analysis of the Household survey.
Neighbourhood Plan
Infrastructure Group

Community Assets

The list of Community Assets contains several categories including

a. businesses and shops,
b. housing for the elderly etc.,
c. historic buildings,
d. important social locations connected with local government and health,
e. community halls and other similar assets,
f. schools and pre-schools,
g. other locations with importance to the local community (e.g. the community orchard, allotments and Limpsfield Common).

Many of these are already protected by various means, such as listed buildings, conservation areas, the National Trust and the Titsey Foundation (a charitable trust). However, these are not infallible and the Neighbourhood Plan will need to identify further measures that can be employed for their preservation.

Infrastructure Issues

Particular problems are associated with the provision of health and education. There is no middle school in the parish and the development of St Mary’s and Downsway schools in Oxted as a junior school is likely to have issues for the education of children post infant school stage. The increase in the number of children will put pressure on buildings. Local health services are provided by the Oxted Health Centre (actually located in Limpsfield) but many believe that outer areas of the parish need improved access to these facilities. The health centre already has problems in recruiting doctors and nurses, possibly caused by lack of affordable accommodation. This will need addressing in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Other social issues include the development of social centres. Some of these are outside the parish but the preservation of community pubs in Limpsfield, Limpsfield Chart and Staffhurst Wood is particularly important and the existing Church/Community Halls in the first-named areas form a resource for continuing use by local groups. School buildings may also have a part to play. The ageing of the population will require not only provision of specialist housing units but also increase of smaller housing to accommodate down-sizing.

One of the main possibilities for development is that of tourism. Titsey Place is just outside the parish but the access is through the parish and is currently limited partly by the capacity of the access road. Some other local buildings are architecturally important. Limpsfield Common is a resource for visitors which has long been recognised (much of the money for its endowment was raised by contributions from outside the parish). Tourism will need provision for accommodation for visitors (such as Bed and Breakfast), restaurants and tea-shops.

Transport.

The majority of shops and other infrastructure are in Limpsfield or in the North-Western part of the parish which adjoins Oxted. It will be essential not to reduce customer parking for these shops and
for this development of parking in the Tandridge Council offices site and its preservation in Ellice Road is most important. Another issue of particular importance concerns the B269 road through the village and the parking in the High Street and surrounding streets. It is clear that the room for parking is limited and probably always will be. This is because of:

1. the use of streets by commuters,
2. the lack of off-street parking in old houses in the High Street
3. the need for parking in Oxted town centre both for staff and shoppers, including for the Library and the Health Centre.

Various schemes for alleviating the problem were examined by the group – in particular these related to the High Street. They included:

- a ban on all heavy vehicles (including buses) using the High Street
- a one-way or traffic light system to control the direction of traffic
- further restrictions on High Street parking (e.g. restricting parking to one side of the High Street and preventing parking by non-residents)
- additional parking space to be provided on open spaces.

Each of these options had disadvantages. Improving the signage to restrict heavy vehicles and removing the High Street from heavy vehicle satellite maps does seem to have had an effect. Restricting parking in the High Street would either deprive local residents of a parking space or have a minimal effect. Off street locations for parking will not make a significant difference, except for customers of some local shops. The group agreed the law regarding parking needed enforcement. Developments, which increase the amount of on-road parking, such as using garages to extend houses without providing off-road parking should be prevented.

Non-car travelling facilities will need to be encouraged. Yet these are threatened by budget cuts. The parish council ought to encourage the use of the footpaths available. However many of these are not suitable for the disabled and need better surfaces, for example, the footpath from Detillens Lane to Granville Road. Some roads, e.g. part of Bluehouse Lane and Wolfs Row, are dangerous for pedestrians as they have no footpaths. The Neighbourhood Plan will need to propose improvements. Bicycles are supposed to travel in lanes on main roads such as the A25. These are positively dangerous as they are not maintained in a roadworthy condition and could easily cause accidents. Bridleways may be used by cyclists (though not footpaths) but their surfaces are often unsuitable and are not well maintained by Surrey County Council due to lack of funds.

Public transport in Limpsfield parish is provided mainly by two County Council funded schemes. Scheduled services provide mainly two-hourly services to the south (bus 594 via Limpsfield Chart) and north (bus 595 via Tatsfield) of the parish. “Buses for You” provides an on demand service (which has, normally, to be booked some time in advance) throughout the Tandridge District. County Council budget cuts threaten both services. The 236 service connects the east of the parish with Oxted and Edenbridge. The 410 service (a commercial service at best ½ hourly from Redhill to Hurst Green) runs through a small part of the parish. The group discussed the situation with managers from both bus companies. Advertising services could be a good way for the Parish Council to proceed and we discussed the possibility of amalgamating both services using the concept of a “wriggly bus” – one which has both a scheduled and an on demand element.

**Conclusion.**

All the above ideas will need to be tested through the Neighbourhood Plan survey.
Neighbourhood Plan
Infrastructure Group

Community Assets

The list of Community Assets contains several categories including

  h. businesses and shops,
  i. housing for the elderly etc.,
  j. historic buildings,
  k. important social locations connected with local government and health,
  l. community halls and other similar assets,
  m. schools and pre-schools,
  n. other locations with importance to the local community (e.g. the community orchard, allotments and Limpsfield Common).

Many of these are already protected by various means, such as listed buildings, conservation areas, the National Trust and the Titsey Foundation (a charitable trust). However, these are not infallible and the Neighbourhood Plan will need to identify further measures that can be employed for their preservation.

Infrastructure Issues

Particular problems are associated with the provision of health and education. There is no middle school in the parish and the development of St Mary’s and Downsway schools in Oxted as a junior school is likely to have issues for the education of children post infant school stage. The increase in the number of children will put pressure on buildings. Local health services are provided by the Oxted Health Centre (actually located in Limpsfield) but many believe that outer areas of the parish need improved access to these facilities. The health centre already has problems in recruiting doctors and nurses, possibly caused by lack of affordable accommodation. This will need addressing in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Other social issues include the development of social centres. Some of these are outside the parish but the preservation of community pubs in Limpsfield, Limpsfield Chart and Staffhurst Wood is particularly important and the existing Church/Community Halls in the first-named areas form a resource for continuing use by local groups. School buildings may also have a part to play. The ageing of the population will require not only provision of specialist housing units but also increase of smaller housing to accommodate down-sizing.

One of the main possibilities for development is that of tourism. Titsey Place is just outside the parish but the access is through the parish and is currently limited partly by the capacity of the access road. Some other local buildings are architecturally important. Limpsfield Common is a resource for visitors which has long been recognised (much of the money for its endowment was raised by contributions from outside the parish). Tourism will need provision for accommodation for visitors (such as Bed and Breakfast), restaurants and tea-shops.

Transport.

The majority of shops and other infrastructure are in Limpsfield or in the North-Western part of the parish which adjoins Oxted. It will be essential not to reduce customer parking for these shops and
for this development of parking in the Tandridge Council offices site and its preservation in Ellice Road is most important. Another issue of particular importance concerns the B269 road through the village and the parking in the High Street and surrounding streets. It is clear that the room for parking is limited and probably always will be. This is because of:

4. the use of streets by commuters,
5. the lack of off-street parking in old houses in the High Street
6. the need for parking in Oxted town centre both for staff and shoppers, including for the Library and the Health Centre.

Various schemes for alleviating the problem were examined by the group – in particular these related to the High Street. They included:

- a ban on all heavy vehicles (including buses) using the High Street
- a one-way or traffic light system to control the direction of traffic
- further restrictions on High Street parking (e.g. restricting parking to one side of the High Street and preventing parking by non-residents)
- additional parking space to be provided on open spaces.

Each of these options had disadvantages. Improving the signage to restrict heavy vehicles and removing the High Street from heavy vehicle satellite maps does seem to have had an effect. Restricting parking in the High Street would either deprive local residents of a parking space or have a minimal effect. Off street locations for parking will not make a significant difference, except for customers of some local shops. The group agreed the law regarding parking needed enforcement.

Developments, which increase the amount of on-road parking, such as using garages to extend houses without providing off-road parking should be prevented.

Non-car travelling facilities will need to be encouraged. Yet these are threatened by budget cuts. The parish council ought to encourage the use of the footpaths available. However many of these are not suitable for the disabled and need better surfaces, for example, the footpath from Detillens Lane to Granville Road. Some roads, e.g. part of Bluehouse Lane and Wolfs Row, are dangerous for pedestrians as they have no footpaths. The Neighbourhood Plan will need to propose improvements. Bicycles are supposed to travel in lanes on main roads such as the A25. These are positively dangerous as they are not maintained in a roadworthy condition and could easily cause accidents. Bridleways may be used by cyclists (though not footpaths) but their surfaces are often unsuitable and are not well maintained by Surrey County Council due to lack of funds.

Public transport in Limpsfield parish is provided mainly by two County Council funded schemes. Scheduled services provide mainly two-hourly services to the south (bus 594 via Limpsfield Chart) and north (bus 595 via Tatsfield) of the parish. “Buses for You” provides an on demand service (which has, normally, to be booked some time in advance) throughout the Tandridge District. County Council budget cuts threaten both services. The 236 service connects the east of the parish with Oxted and Edenbridge. The 410 service (a commercial service at best ½ hourly from Redhill to Hurst Green) runs through a small part of the parish. The group discussed the situation with managers from both bus companies. Advertising services could be a good way for the Parish Council to proceed and we discussed the possibility of amalgamating both services using the concept of a “wriggly bus” - one which has both a scheduled and an on demand element.

**Conclusion.**

All the above ideas will need to be tested through the Neighbourhood Plan survey.
COMMUNITY ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE NOTE – EMERGING ‘POLICES’

We have been asked to review this note received on the 15th Sept. While the note provides insufficient background information to evidence policies, it usefully outlines the scope to which policies or projects may apply. The advice set out below provides links to the approaches by other groups. There is, however, no right or wrong way of producing the background evidence to justify policies you wish to include in the plan.

We recommend the task group revisit the October 2016 Vision Note which provided insights into the direction the plan might take on this topic, outlining policies it may contain and the background work necessary to support the policies.

In terms of infrastructure, the Limpsfield NP will be implemented through a combination of the local planning authority’s consideration and determination of planning applications for development in your parish, and through the Parish Council (as ‘qualifying body’) steering public and private investment into a series of infrastructure projects/proposals contained in the plan.

Hence why the plan should distinguish between those land use planning matters that the Neighbourhood Plan will be able to address though policy, and those other matters that the Parish Council may wish to take forward as longer term projects using CIL funding or other funding or partnership mechanisms.

The NP can contain both policies and projects which reflect one or other, and I have indicated below, against each of your headings, which I believe these may be or whether the plan could cover both. I’ve also provided a few typical policies to give an indication of how your supporting evidence and recommendations may be translated into policy.
1. BROADBAND – POLICY AND PROJECT

NP Objective 6.

You indicate this could be a delivery project, but it could also be a policy (see Bledlow cum Saunderton NP Policy 13) that encourages the necessary infrastructure to be installed in new build properties. You may find it helpful to review their Task Group report which touches on many of the matters your note outlines.

Your note refers to homeworking but not business premises. It could also include the Surrey Broadband Project (Superfast Surrey). This maybe a useful starting point for your thinking on this subject.

This is a suggested wording if you intend to include Broadband as a project in the plan:

Broadband

Proposals and projects for improving access to broadband in new and existing development and which are consistent with policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council will continue to use its influence on the Surrey County Council ‘Superfast Broadband’ project to seek upgrades to broadband services in the Parish.

2. FOOTPATHS AND PAVEMENTS – POLICY AND PROJECT

NP Objective 5.

This is a topic which overlaps with the Envt. & Local Economy Group - refer Vision Note bullet 2 and 3 in the E&LE task list. Have their tasks been completed?

A footpath network was illustrated in your document ‘Limpsfield Village Vision Concept’ 5th Dec 2016 pages 3 and 5. We recommend you discuss this overlap with the E&LE Group and agree how best to take this forward.

Review the SCC Rights of Way Improvement Plan to determine where investment is being directed and where it isn’t, See objective IE5 and missing link to FP46.
3. TRANSPORT – PROJECT AND POLICY

NP Objective 4.

Since deregulation the adequacy or otherwise of bus services has become a difficult matter to address and land use plans have limited scope to address transport matters. In terms of a bus services project the Hartley Wintney Community Bus Service is often cited as best practice and appears to be financially sustainable.

Should the main transport focus of the plan be around the high street where it may have the most leverage in policy terms, then the Waddesdon NP group undertook some interesting analysis on car parking (see parking below). The Benson NP group also produced a useful short report on transport and parking matters and you may find it helpful to see how the reports’ recommendations were developed into policy in their pre-submission plan.

Typical Policy

Transport, Access & Car Parking

The Neighbourhood Plan will support proposals to:

i. promote walking, cycling and the use of public transport, including making proper provision for those with mobility impairment;

ii. promote, protect and maintain the local footpath and cycle path network, including the Vanguard Way in conjunction with Surrey County Council and Access Forum, and in doing so encourage walking and cycling for leisure especially by visitors to the area and to Titsey Place;

iii. alleviate traffic problems in the High Street with the implementation within the plan period of a local improvement scheme in partnership with Surrey CC; and

vi. develop a Parking Strategy for Limpsfield village to manage car parking spaces for businesses and visitors.

4. HEALTH SERVICES – PROJECT
NP Objective 7

Given Hurst Green is outside the NP boundary, the LNP couldn’t contain an allocation policy for a new medical centre in that location but could include a supporting policy to enable further development at the existing medical centre at Oxted. It’s not clear from your note whether you have met with the medical centre to understand their future plans, an action in the Vision Note. A policy which indicate general support for health provision would do little than that contained in either national or local plan policy – but could be symbolic – or it could be specific to the existing medical centre if they propose to expand the current services available on their site.

You have given this matter significance in terms of priority for your infrastructure spending. There are however cross boundary issues to consider with Oxted Parish.

Your background evidence could include a health capacity assessment. I have attached an example commissioned by the Binfield NP group. The report structure can be greatly simplified and some of the references to NHS commissioning services are likely to be out of date, nonetheless it offers a structure which the group could adapt very easily and quickly – and the same structure and logic could also be applied to education provision (item 7).

- Introduction
- Scope
- Constraints (ignore the train stuff).
- A combined map of proposed new housing locations and existing primary care provision (GP and Pharmacies) (combine Fig 1 and Fig 3)
- Fig 2 Assumptions on population growth vs GP requirements in your local Clinical Commissioning area
- Fig 4 Impact of development on whole time equivalent GPs
- Housing Growth
- Travel and Access (Fig 6)
- Options
- Conclusions and Recommendations.

Typical Policy

Medical Services

The Neighbourhood Plan will support proposals for new development or a change of use of a building within the built-up area boundary to deliver a D1 medical services facility, provided the proposals can demonstrate the site is suited to this purpose in terms of access, car parking and design and will not lead to a loss of amenity for local residents.
5. SENSE OF COMMUNITY/ISOLATION RISKS – PROJECT

NP Objective 7

In terms of signposting, this is clearly a project which could be taken forward by the Parish Council now. CIL funding is intended for capital rather than revenue expenditure.

Is there scope at the St Peter’s Church Hall for such a project to evolve, if for example there are specific requirements or physical adaptations which could be funded by CIL?

Or would a community bus service benefit those who may be physically isolated in the Parish with no access to a car?

6. PARKING – POLICY AND PROJECT

NP Objective 4 & 5

Your note extends beyond the matter of parking into sustainable travel but it’s understood how emotive parking issues can be.

See also item 3 above. On Parking first, the vision note suggested an assessment of traffic and parking in Limpsfield village. I’ve attached an example of how this was presented visually by the group at Waddesdon (See example of Parking Constraints & Opportunities map on their exhibition boards).
7. EDUCATION - PROJECT

See item 4.

8. TRAFFIC SPEEDS AND HGVS – PROJECT AND POLICY

See item 3 (Benson). I agree that discussions with key stakeholders is essential to determine solutions.

9. COMMUNITY ASSETS - POLICY

NP Objective 7

I agree that ‘listing and logging’ is the way to approach this by identifying all buildings and associated land of community benefit (not open spaces), describe their value, take a photo and show on a plan.

Assess options to extend any community asset, or if necessary to maintain viability at some point in the future plan period, and what it might incorporate in terms of uses and need for additional space/car parking etc.

The Herefordshire NP Community Facilities guidance note may help to define the task and assets you may wish to list. Note however, that we no longer include a policy for ‘Assets of Community value’ in neighbourhood plans as this can be undertaken independently of the plan by the parish council.

Typical Policy

Community Facilities

Proposals to improve the viability of an established community use of the following buildings and facilities by way of the extension or partial redevelopment of existing buildings will be supported, provided the design of the scheme and the resulting increase in use are appropriate in design terms and will not harm the amenities of adjoining residential properties.

- Name facilities here
Jon Dowty
oneillhomer

29th September 2017
APPENDIX

POSITION STATEMENT RECEIVED 15 SEPT 2017 (BE EMAIL)

Jon

John Thomson - the chair of the community assets and Infrastructure topic group for the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan and I are finding it difficult to formulate policies/projects in this area (despite a lot of views and evidence) - I would be grateful for any thoughts you have on our musings to date (see below) - is this the sort of thing you can work from or do you need more precision and context/evidence.

Regards

Geoff Dessent

Broadband - need to bring the poorest served areas as regards broadband and mobile signal up to the level of the best in the Parish. As home working becomes more common in the future, this will gain in importance as a Neighbourhood Plan Delivery Project

Footpaths and Pavements - important to maintain and strengthen the network of footpaths including, better accessibility, and making better links throughout the Parish - eg between Limpsfield village and Limpsfield Chart,

Transport - bus services need to better meet local needs, offer value for money and be well publicised.

Health Services - the Health services in Limpsfield cannot be seen in isolation from the needs of Oxted and Hurst Green, especially if the latter is to grow in population, through more house building. The expected future demand for health services needs to be met by an increase in capacity in the local area, which may include, for example, a hub being developed in Hurst Green. This should be the leading priority for new infrastructure expenditure

Sense of Community/Isolation risks - all local services and opportunities should be better signposted and made fully accessible to all in the community.
Parking - this issue concerns the wider community of Oxted and Hurst Green as well as Limpsfield. And needs to be tackled on several fronts - namely the promotion of more sustainable travel, the provision of adequate parking facilities for employees (including park and ride) by their employers, taking pressure off on street parking and car parks, as well adequate provision of off road parking for all new housing development, to minimise future congestion and parking problems.

Education - Adult learning is the most obvious gap in the current provision, and should be prioritised in future.

Traffic Speed and HGVs- wide concerns about high traffic speeds need to be addressed in discussion with Surrey Highways and Surrey Police, along with better control of HGV traffic.

Community Assets - The significant number of community assets in the Parish need to be protected and preserved, through a number of "listing/logging" measures.
COMMUNITY ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE NOTE – EMERGING ‘POLICIES’

We have been asked to review this note received on the 15th Sept. While the note provides insufficient background information to evidence policies, it usefully outlines the scope to which policies or projects may apply. The advice set out below provides links to the approaches by other groups. There is, however, no right or wrong way of producing the background evidence to justify policies you wish to include in the plan.

We recommend the task group revisit the October 2016 Vision Note which provided insights into the direction the plan might take on this topic, outlining policies it may contain and the background work necessary to support the policies.

In terms of infrastructure, the Limpsfield NP will be implemented through a combination of the local planning authority’s consideration and determination of planning applications for development in your parish, and through the Parish Council (as ‘qualifying body’) steering public and private investment into a series of infrastructure projects/proposals contained in the plan.

Hence why the plan should distinguish between those land use planning matters that the Neighbourhood Plan will be able to address though policy, and those other matters that the Parish Council may wish to take forward as longer term projects using CIL funding or other funding or partnership mechanisms.

The NP can contain both policies and projects which reflect one or other, and I have indicated below, against each of your headings, which I believe these may be or whether the plan could cover both. I’ve also provided a few typical policies to give an indication of how your supporting evidence and recommendations may be translated into policy.
1. BROADBAND – POLICY AND PROJECT

NP Objective 6.

You indicate this could be a delivery project, but it could also be a policy (see Bledlow cum Saunderton NP Policy 13) that encourages the necessary infrastructure to be installed in new build properties. You may find it helpful to review their Task Group report which touches on many of the matters your note outlines.

Your note refers to homeworking but not business premises. It could also include the Surrey Broadband Project (Superfast Surrey). This maybe a useful starting point for your thinking on this subject.

This is a suggested wording if you intend to include Broadband as a project in the plan:

**Broadband**

*Proposals and projects for improving access to broadband in new and existing development and which are consistent with policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council will continue to use its influence on the Surrey County Council ‘Superfast Broadband’ project to seek upgrades to broadband services in the Parish.*

2. FOOTPATHS AND PAVEMENTS – POLICY AND PROJECT

NP Objective 5.

This is a topic which overlaps with the Envt. & Local Economy Group - refer Vision Note bullet 2 and 3 in the E&LE task list. Have their tasks been completed?

A footpath network was illustrated in your document ‘Limpsfield Village Vision Concept’ 5th Dec 2016 pages 3 and 5. We recommend you discuss this overlap with the E&LE Group and agree how best to take this forward.

Review the SCC Rights of Way Improvement Plan to determine where investment is being directed and where it isn’t, See objective IE5 and missing link to FP46.
3. TRANSPORT – PROJECT AND POLICY

NP Objective 4.

Since deregulation the adequacy or otherwise of bus services has become a difficult matter to address and land use plans have limited scope to address transport matters. In terms of a bus services project the Hartley Wintney Community Bus Service is often cited as best practice and appears to be financially sustainable.

Should the main transport focus of the plan be around the high street where it may have the most leverage in policy terms, then the Waddesdon NP group undertook some interesting analysis on car parking (see parking below). The Benson NP group also produced a useful short report on transport and parking matters and you may find it helpful to see how the reports’ recommendations were developed into policy in their pre-submission plan.

Typical Policy

Transport, Access & Car Parking

The Neighbourhood Plan will support proposals to:

i. promote walking, cycling and the use of public transport, including making proper provision for those with mobility impairment;

ii. promote, protect and maintain the local footpath and cycle path network, including the Vanguard Way in conjunction with Surrey County Council and Access Forum, and in doing so encourage walking and cycling for leisure especially by visitors to the area and to Titsey Place;

iii. alleviate traffic problems in the High Street with the implementation within the plan period of a local improvement scheme in partnership with Surrey CC; and

vi. develop a Parking Strategy for Limpsfield village to manage car parking spaces for businesses and visitors.

4. HEALTH SERVICES – PROJECT
NP Objective 7

Given Hurst Green is outside the NP boundary, the LNP couldn’t contain an allocation policy for a new medical centre in that location but could include a supporting policy to enable further development at the existing medical centre at Oxted. It’s not clear from your note whether you have met with the medical centre to understand their future plans, an action in the Vision Note. A policy which indicate general support for health provision would do little than that contained in either national or local plan policy – but could be symbolic – or it could be specific to the existing medical centre if they propose to expand the current services available on their site.

You have given this matter significance in terms of priority for your infrastructure spending. There are however cross boundary issues to consider with Oxted Parish.

Your background evidence could include a health capacity assessment. I have attached an example commissioned by the Binfield NP group. The report structure can be greatly simplified and some of the references to NHS commissioning services are likely to be out of date, nonetheless it offers a structure which the group could adapt very easily and quickly – and the same structure and logic could also be applied to education provision (item 7).

- Introduction
- Scope
- Constraints (ignore the train stuff)
- A combined map of proposed new housing locations and existing primary care provision (GP and Pharmacies) (combine Fig 1 and Fig 3)
- Fig 2 Assumptions on population growth vs GP requirements in your local Clinical Commissioning area
- Fig 4 Impact of development on whole time equivalent GPs
- Housing Growth
- Travel and Access (Fig 6)
- Options
- Conclusions and Recommendations.

**Typical Policy**

**Medical Services**

*The Neighbourhood Plan will support proposals for new development or a change of use of a building within the built-up area boundary to deliver a D1 medical services facility, provided the proposals can demonstrate the site is suited to this purpose in terms of access, car parking and design and will not lead to a loss of amenity for local residents.*
5. SENSE OF COMMUNITY/ISOLATION RISKS – PROJECT

NP Objective 7

In terms of signposting, this is clearly a project which could be taken forward by the Parish Council now. CIL funding is intended for capital rather than revenue expenditure.

Is there scope at the St Peter’s Church Hall for such a project to evolve, if for example there are specific requirements or physical adaptations which could be funded by CIL?

Or would a community bus service benefit those who may be physically isolated in the Parish with no access to a car?

6. PARKING – POLICY AND PROJECT

NP Objective 4 & 5

Your note extends beyond the matter of parking into sustainable travel but it’s understood how emotive parking issues can be.

See also item 3 above. On Parking first, the vision note suggested an assessment of traffic and parking in Limpsfield village. I’ve attached an example of how this was presented visually by the group at Waddesdon (See example of Parking Constraints & Opportunities map on their exhibition boards).
7. EDUCATION - PROJECT

See item 4.

8. TRAFFIC SPEEDS AND HGVS – PROJECT AND POLICY

See item 3 (Benson). I agree that discussions with key stakeholders is essential to determine solutions.

9. COMMUNITY ASSETS - POLICY

NP Objective 7

I agree that ‘listing and logging’ is the way to approach this by identifying all buildings and associated land of community benefit (not open spaces), describe their value, take a photo and show on a plan.

Assess options to extend any community asset, or if necessary to maintain viability at some point in the future plan period, and what it might incorporate in terms of uses and need for additional space/car parking etc.

The Herefordshire NP Community Facilities guidance note may help to define the task and assets you may wish to list. Note however, that we no longer include a policy for ‘Assets of Community value’ in neighbourhood plans as this can be undertaken independently of the plan by the parish council.

Typical Policy

Community Facilities

Proposals to improve the viability of an established community use of the following buildings and facilities by way of the extension or partial redevelopment of existing buildings will be supported, provided the design of the scheme and the resulting increase in use are appropriate in design terms and will not harm the amenities of adjoining residential properties.

- Name facilities here
Jon Dowty
oneillhomer

29th September 2017
APPENDIX

POSITION STATEMENT RECEIVED 15 SEPT 2017 (BE EMAIL)

Jon

John Thomson - the chair of the community assets and infrastructure topic group for the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan and I are finding it difficult to formulate policies/projects in this area (despite a lot of views and evidence) - I would be grateful for any thoughts you have on our musings to date (see below) - is this the sort of thing you can work from or do you need more precision and context/evidence.

Regards

Geoff Dessent

Broadband - need to bring the poorest served areas as regards broadband and mobile signal up to the level of the best in the Parish. As home working becomes more common in the future, this will gain in importance as a Neighbourhood Plan Delivery Project

Footpaths and Pavements - important to maintain and strengthen the network of footpaths including, better accessibility, and making better links throughout the Parish - eg between Limpsfield village and Limpsfield Chart,

Transport - bus services need to better meet local needs, offer value for money and be well publicised.

Health Services - the Health services in Limpsfield cannot be seen in isolation from the needs of Oxted and Hurst Green, especially if the latter is to grow in population, through more house building. The expected future demand for health services needs to be met by an increase in capacity in the local area, which may include, for example, a hub being developed in Hurst Green. This should be the leading priority for new infrastructure expenditure

Sense of Community/Isolation risks - all local services and opportunities should be better signposted and made fully accessible to all in the community.
Parking - this issue concerns the wider community of Oxted and Hurst Green as well as Limpsfield. And needs to be tackled on several fronts - namely the promotion of more sustainable travel, the provision of adequate parking facilities for employees (including park and ride) by their employers, taking pressure off on street parking and car parks, as well adequate provision of off road parking for all new housing development, to minimise future congestion and parking problems.

Education - Adult learning is the most obvious gap in the current provision, and should be prioritised in future.

Traffic Speed and HGVs- wide concerns about high traffic speeds need to be addressed in discussion with Surrey Highways and Surrey Police, along with better control of HGV traffic.

Community Assets - The significant number of community assets in the Parish need to be protected and preserved, through a number of "listing/"logging" measures.
COMMUNITY ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE TEXT BOX COMMENTS

This sets out the out the most frequently mentioned issues, with examples of location where these have been frequently mentioned. Topics or issues raised by 3 or less responses have not been included. This analysis is more qualitative than quantitative but is a fair representation of the main views being expressed, listed in residents’ comments priority order in each section.

1. Comments on Community Assets

Shops: - general concern to protect shops in Limpsfield high street and the lower end of Oxted Station Road East (also in the Parish). Strong support for local retail, and keenness to stop change of use from retail to housing.

History and Character – important to preserve the character and heritage of the Parish, with particular references to Limpsfield village - concerns about traffic volume and large (HGV) vehicles which risk damaging the local character.

Parking – concerns about parking and the need for more off street provision to preserve the look of the parish, again focus is on Limpsfield village and surrounding area

Tourism – some support to encourage tourism in the area, making the most of the historic buildings and protecting green spaces.

[Summary based on 74 text box comments – topic listed in order of frequency of comments]

2. Traffic Volume reduction measures

HGV’s – significant concern about there being too many HGVs on narrow roads. Limpsfield High Street mentioned frequently.

Limpsfield High Street – concerns about congestion – but very mixed views on the solution to this (traffic lights and one-way systems have a large pro- and anti -lobby)
**Walking and Cycling** – support for more walking and cycling and less car use particularly for short journeys – eg “walk to school” (walking buses mentioned)

**Travel to work** – support for more use of public transport, walking, cycling and car sharing.

**By-Pass (for Limpsfield High Street)** – some support for this, but no acknowledgement about prohibitive cost

[Summary based on 226 text box comments – topic listed in order of frequency of comments]

**3. Transport Issues**

**Speeding** – a lot of concerns about speeding throughout the Parish – roads in Limpsfield village and Limpsfield Chart mentioned. Reference to the virtues of speed signs and “Speedwatch” schemes.

**Parking** - a lot of concern 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.

**Footpaths and Pavements** – support to keep the network of footpaths in good order, clear of overhanging shrubbery and with all-weather access to all potential users of them – references are made to the footpaths and pavements mentioned in the Household Survey. A lot of references to the missing pavement section in Bluehouse lane in particular.

**Cycle Routes** – support to improve the network of cycle routes provided there is evidence these would be used and can be safe.

**Bus Services** = these are seen are not meeting local needs well, with empty buses in evidence and a general lack of information about the services being offered.

**Large Vehicles** – concerns about large buses and HGV’s blocking narrow roads.
4. Facilities which are thought to be important for the Future

**Health Facilities** – a lot of concern about the lack of current health services capacity, and references to the need for more health services, including other locations within the tier 1 settlement of Limpsfield, Oxted and Hurst Green, with the latter being mentioned most often.

**Children’s Playground** – support for a children’s playground in Limpsfield village, with the Glebe filed be mentioned as the most sensible location for this.

**Broadband** – need for faster Broadband across the whole Parish.

**Benches** – a lot of support for, more benches throughout the Parish, with Limpsfield Chart and Limpsfield village being mentioned.

**Day Care** – more provision for older people of day care facilities.

**Public Toilets** – provision of clean public toilets – locations mentioned include Limpsfield Chart and Limpsfield village.

**Shops** - more shops with a wider variety. Positive support for shops selling local produce, and shops in Limpsfield Chart. Negative comments about too many Charity shops.

**Upgrade St Peters Church Hall** – some support for this, with the offer of a wider range of facilities.
(1) Transport and Parking Policy

The Neighbourhood Plan will support proposals to:

i. promote walking, cycling and the use of public transport, including making proper provision for those with mobility impairment which will improve sustainability in the area.

ii. promote, protect and maintain the local footpath and cycle path network, including the Vanguard Way, Greensand Way in conjunction with Surrey County Council and Access Forum, and in doing so encourage walking and cycling for leisure especially by visitors to the area and to Titsey Place;

iii. alleviate traffic problems in particular in Limpsfield High Street with the implementation within the plan period of a local improvement scheme in partnership with Surrey CC;

vi. develop a Parking Strategy for Limpsfield village to better manage car parking spaces for businesses and visitors.

vii consider evidence where existing permissive footpaths might be upgraded to “rights of way” on the definitive official map, as this option will be unavailable from 2026.

viii seek to establish 3 electric vehicle charging points, in the 3 main hubs in the Parish, namely Limpsfield Chart, Limpsfield village and the lower end of Oxted Station Road East (Limpsfield Parish’s main commercial and facilities centre)

Footpaths and Pavements - aim to improve the network of footpaths and pavements in the parish with access to all potential users for transport and leisure purposes enhancing the sustainability of the area. We believe it is important to maintain and strengthen the network of footpaths including, better accessibility, and making better links throughout the Parish - eg between Limpsfield village and Limpsfield Chart.

Footpaths and Pavements Delivery Project

It will be important to work alongside the Rights of way improvement plan for Surrey, which aims to enhance and promote the rights of way network to make it more useful and attractive for everyone. The County Council will promote the rights of ways network and encourage more walking, riding and cycling to support the local economy and a sustainable and healthy society Explore Surrey – available as an e-newsletter. Five main objectives have been identified:
• to improve accessibility to services, facilities and the wider countryside along rights of way

• to improve connectivity of rights of way and to reduce severance

• to improve the quality of the rights of way network

• to increase recreational enjoyment

• to secure coordinated implementation of the Rights of Way Improvement Plan within resources available.

It will also be important to work with the Tandridge District Council infrastructure lead to help on key priorities including:

• New pavement provision in Bluehouse Lane; Short Lane; Wolf’s Hill; Water Lane; Brick Kiln Lane; Pains Hill (highlighted by East Surrey ramblers)

• All-weather, disabled and pushchair access to the footpath from Detillens Land to Granville road – and the same between wolfs Row and Rockfield road.

• Ideas for better linking between Limpsfield chart and Limpsfield Village

• Continue the valuable dialogue with the Surrey Ramblers on a rolling programme of improvements

The evidence from the household survey shows that, residents seeking improvements in footpaths included:

• 47% as regards Detillens lane to Granville road

• 32% between Wolfs Row and Rockfield Road

And 41% of residents felt a new footpath from Limpsfield Village to Titsey place via Sandy lane would be valuable.

[Place Holder – map of current footpaths, bridleways and pavements in 2017 including their status – and the network envisaged by 2022, with particular reference to FP78, FP90, BW 73, FP 37, FP75]

Cycling – to provide safe cycling routes, where we have the evidence these will be regularly used.

[Place holder – map of current cycling routes and potential for new routes, where we have the evidence that these will be used]

Bus Services - bus services need to better meet local needs, offer value for money and be well publicised.
We will work with the bus services providers to consider what changes can be made to main services, feeder services and delivered services. We will in particular look at whether there is a need for “wriggly” buses in the Parish to better meet the needs of those living away from recognised bus routes.

[Place Holder – map of current Bus Service provision]

**Bus Services Delivery Project**

Residents have raised concerns about the bus services not meeting local needs, and adding to unwanted HGV traffic. This project will seek to work with local bus services providers to:

- Actively promote the bus services which are available
- Explore the need and scope for wriggly buses (which can off route to pick people up)
- Look at the scope to use smaller vehicles, or ensure that any large vehicles used, avoid key pinch points such as Limpsfield High Street
- Ensure that the Limpsfield Chart and the more rural parts of the parish are better served.
- Explore pre-payment options to Bus Services, rather than “pay as you go” as a means of increasing Bus Service take-up

**Parking** – the aim is to reduce the need for parking, and at the same time provide the capacity which is needed, coupled with adequate (illegal) parking enforcement

[Place Holder – photos showing illegal parking and congestion problems – also see Annex about Surrey CC parking review and its implications for the Parish]

Any parking strategy for Limpsfield Parish must be done is consort with the tier one community including Oxted and Hurst Green, taking account of changes already in train and its deficiencies.

**Parking Delivery Project**

- Assess the future levels of parking need, coupled with actions being taken to reduce car use (more walking, cycling and more use of public transport)
- Identify any sites for more parking provision and the logistics to make this happen including the possibility of using the end of the playing fields/tennis club grounds for additional off-road parking.
- Assess the need and funding availability for more parking enforcement
(2) Health, Well-Being and Community Services - the Health services in Limpsfield cannot be seen in isolation from the needs of Oxted and Hurst Green, especially if the latter is to grow in population, through more house building. The expected future demand for health services needs to be met by an increase in capacity in the local area. This should be the leading priority for new infrastructure expenditure.

Sense of Community/Isolation risks - all local services and opportunities should be better signposted and made fully accessible to all in the community.

Health Service Delivery Project

Health services need to also be seen in the context of wider community services which can promote health and well-being as broadly as possible and give support to social care services.

Government policy is to centralise health services into a small number of larger (known as D1) health hubs to reduce the administrative overheads. Thought needs to be given as how to ensure the health services facility remains within the current locality, by utilising space in the adjoining TDC office facility (which is something which is already starting to happen). Supporting community health and social care services may be augmented in other sites in the community, but it is paramount that the core primary care facility remains largely where it is, and that areas of new development in the District grow their own Health hubs and facilities.

Community/Isolation Risks Development Project

The existing St Peters Church Hall will no longer be fit for purpose in the timeframe of the Neighbourhood Plan. And this coupled with the Diocese of Southwark’s aspiration to create a revenue stream from their land on which this is located, suggests a need to redevelop the site.

The redevelopment of St Peters Church Hall into something which better meets the needs of the community is a project which needs taking forward. The first step will be to get a clear understanding of what the future community wants. And then to assess how this might be delivered for the sake of the Community and the Diocese of Southwark (as Landowner).

The associated calls for a playground in Limpsfield, may well suggest than the new facility for the PANDA (on the Glebe meadow) Nursery is moved into a new community hub, with a playground on the Glebe field (which many residents supported) , when the temporary building for the Nursery is removed.

(3) Broadband - need to bring the poorest served areas as regards broadband and mobile signal up to the level of the best in the Parish. As home working becomes more common in the future, this will gain in importance as a

Neighbourhood Plan Delivery Project It will also be of benefit of small local businesses in the Parish.

The household survey showed that faster Broadband was the second most important facility development to the community infrastructure.

**Broadband Policy**

Connecting the Parish Development proposals to provide access to a super-fast broadband network to the villages of the parish, and outlying properties in the countryside, and to improve the speed of existing services, will be supported, provided the location and design of any above-ground network installations reflect the character of the local area. Proposals for housing and employment schemes must provide appropriate ducting suited to fibre communications technologies that is either connected to the public highway; through satellite broadband; a community led local access network; or to another location that can be justified. Proposals should demonstrate how any development will contribute to and be compatible with local fibre or internet connectivity. This should be through a ‘Connectivity Statement’ provided with relevant planning applications. Such statements should include details of:

- The intended land use and the anticipated connectivity requirements of the development.
- Known nearby data networks and their anticipated speed (fixed copper, 3G, 4G, fibre, satellite, microwave, etc.).
- Realistic viability and delivery assessments of connection potential or contribution to any such networks.
- Measures taken by the applicants to work with Telecom providers to ensure that Superfast Broadband is available at the point of occupation.

A significant number of respondents cited poor broadband speeds as being an issue, with poor mobile phone reception also being mentioned.

Availability of high speed broadband is a critical factor in securing the sustainability of the parish and unlocking untapped economic potential. National Planning Policy supports the need for high quality communications infrastructure, acknowledging its role in supporting economic activity and enhancing the provision of local facilities and services, particularly in rural areas. The Rural Productivity Plan (DEFRA; 2015) places fast and reliable broadband services at the top of a ten-point plan to boost rural productivity.

There has been a market failure to provide good connectivity in rural areas resulting in a number of government backed initiatives to remedy this situation. This failure extends to the parish. The ability of these initiatives to deliver good connectivity to all existing and new developments is, as yet, unknown.
Broadband Delivery Project

Proposals and projects for improving access to broadband in new and existing development and which are consistent with policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council will continue to use its influence on the Surrey County Council ‘Superfast Broadband’ project to seek upgrades to broadband services in the Parish. It will also work with Broadband providers directly. The Parish Council has had discussions with 3 potential providers and has a good understand of the options available.

This delivery project will also look at mobile phone signal strengths, which is poor in some parts of the Parish on some networks.

(4) Education - Adult learning is the most obvious gap in the current provision, and should be prioritised in future.

Whilst only 50 people completing the household survey made comments about adult learning, of this almost half of them were dissatisfied with the “adult learning offer”

Education Delivery project

Limpsfield Parish Council will work with East Surrey College (the key provider for this area and other providers as appropriate) to assess local adult learning needs and determine what might be done to address the concerns raised by residents in the household survey. Once the local needs have been assessed, a blend of options are available, including:

- Bespoke course at East Surrey College in Redhill
- Outreach learning course (provided these are economically viable in terms of numbers attending) at locations in the Parish – the Church halls in Limpsfield Village, Limpsfield Chart and the TVA Facility in the commercial hub of the Parish in Gresham road.
- Distance learning solutions which could go hand in glove with proposed improvements to broadband speeds

(5) Traffic Speed and HGVs- wide concerns about high traffic speeds need to be addressed in discussion with Surrey Highways and Surrey Police, along with better control of HGV traffic.

Control of HGVs

Work is already in hand with Surrey Highways to improve the signage to seek to persuade HGV drivers to avoid Limpsfield High Street. This builds further on collaborative work already undertaken to flag Limpsfield High Street as unsuitable for HGVs on the HGV satellite navigation system.
Traffic Speeds Delivery Project

A Community Speed watch scheme could be taken forward by the Parish Council to help combat high speeds. This would work as follows:

Initially a team of 6 local people would be formed.

Once this team has been identified Surrey Police would set up training for these volunteers.

The team should also identify the roads we would like to conduct a Speed Watch and where they would propose to stand to do this.

Surrey Police will arrange for the Road/s to be Risk assessed. If the road is accepted as suitable for Community Speed Watch, a speed watch programme could then go ahead.

The criteria for suitable roads for a speed watch programme are:

- Can they be seen.
- Is there a suitable place to put the signs out? (No good if the road has high hedgerows of similar where the signs cannot be placed and seen by approaching drivers)
- Is there a footway that CSW can walk along to be able to place these signs out (if not then I will not allow the site as it would be dangerous for them to walk in the road)?
- Must not be within 200m of a change of speed limit.
- Must not obstruct a footway.
- They are away from a bend.

Surrey Police also require 1 person to be the Co-Ordinator, so that they only have one point of contact with one member of the team.

It will then be the responsibility for the co-ordinator to pass any information onto the rest of the team.

(6) Community Assets/Facilities - The significant number of community assets and facilities in the Parish need to be protected and preserved, and in some cases improved through a number of "listing/logging" measures.

Community Asset/Facilities Policy

Proposals to improve the viability of an established community use of the following buildings and facilities by way of the extension or partial redevelopment of existing buildings will be supported, provided the design of the scheme and the resulting increase in use are appropriate in design terms and will not harm the amenities of adjoining residential properties.

Drawing from the evidence of the household survey, the area we shall focus on going forward will be to consider Assets which are felt to be of community value and
seek to protect these in the first instance by formally registering them as “Assets of Community Value” and by considering other forms of additional protection. These include both “Heritage Assets” and “Facilities Assets”.

The initial list identified by residents and the topic group are:

- the Bull Inn (being consider by TDC currently)
- the Brook Field, (which is also being considered for Local Green Space Designation)
- Limpsfield Village Stores
- Padboork Green
- Carpenters Arms – Limpsfield Chart
- Limpsfield Tennis Club
- Oxted Library (which is in Limpsfield Parish)
- St Peters Church Hall, Limpsfield
- St Andrews Church Hall, Limpsfield Chart
- Core Shops in Limpsfield High Street
- British Legion, Limpsfield
- Limpsfield Chart Allotments

(7) Tourism

The Household Survey showed mixed views on the value of promoting tourism to the area. Whilst there is much heritage with old buildings, a graveyard with famous people and outstanding views and footpaths, there were concerns about an influx of visitors which may bring unwelcome traffic and extra parking pressure, despite the potential benefits to the local economy.

[Placeholder – we await the AECOM analysis of the household survey – to help pin this down]
COMMUNITY ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE TOPIC GROUP COMMENTS

O’Neill-Homer Policy List

**LNP 20 – Connecting Parish** – should be listed under infrastructure and use the policy drafted in the attached “draft policies document”, which covers both Broadband speeds and Mobile phone signal strength.

**LNP 21 – should read Limpsfield Health Centre rather than Oxted Medical Centre** – map of the facility and adjoining area to be included – not least as the Health Centre Admin functions are being moved into the TDC building nearby.

**LNP 22** – Our aim here will be to have an outline policy and to include within any redevelopment plan, accommodation for the Nursery. We are not intending to allocate this site for redevelopment, not least as the Land-owner is in the driver seat so the policy needs to be speculative in nature and set out working with the Land-owner and Local Community.

**LNP 23** – the list of 12 facilities may change and therefore we should keep the number fluid and also be clear that there are several forms of protection; namely “asset of community value”; “Local Green Space Designation”; Conservation Area Protection (through a proposed Conservation Area Assessment statement)

**LNP 24** - Unclear what is meant by “access” – also a reference to policy on Bus Services is needed (see enclosed policy note)

**LNP 25** – Rename to “Sustainable Travel throughout the Parish” – there should be a link to LNP 17 – but this should remain here

**LNP 26** - this should relate to several new parking areas – and include a map of where these are – and make due references to the recent Surrey/Tandridge review of Parking.

**Missing Policies**

**Law and Order** – Work with Local Business and the Police to combat shoplifting and shop raids in particular on the south end of Station Road East, for example, by reintroducing Shopwatch. Work collaboratively with Landowners and the Police to combat fly tipping. Work with the Police to reduce burglaries in the Parish.

**Tourism** – Work with the Local Land Owners and Surrey Hill’s AONB to support the better use and management of the Parish’s land assets, without putting adverse pressure on Parking. A focus is likely to be in Limpsfield Chart and the Titsey Estate and a reinvigoration of the Friends of Limpsfield Common [Add maps]
HGVs and traffic Speed – Work with Surrey Highways and Surrey Police to actively reduce traffic speeds (eg through Speedwatch schemes where feasible) and HGV traffic on unsuitable roads in the Parish (Eg add warnings to HGV Tom-Tom Sat Nav System, as already done on Limpsfield High Street).
O’Neill-Homer Implementation Projects

Additional Implementation projects:

- Faster Broadband and better Phone signal coverage
- Speedwatch – to reduce traffic speeds
- Control of HGV traffic
- Law and Order – in line with relevant policy
- Tourism – in line with relevant policy
- Feasibility study to redevelop the St Peters Church Hall Site
- Programme of Protection of Community assets (eg by registering as an asset of community value, designating as a Local Green space, use of a conservation area assessment statement)
- Provision of Parking Enforcement resource
COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE – Policies & Implementation Projects

(1) Transport and Parking Policy

The Neighbourhood Plan will support proposals:

To take an integrated approach to creative traffic management & modal shift through public realm, environmental & safety improvements in the form of wider & additional pavements, 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 the walking-cycling neighbourhood'

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-remodelling and best-practice in regard to cycle lane provision and the pros and cons of a one-way system)

To 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.

i. promote walking, cycling and the use of public transport, including making proper provision for those with mobility impairment which will improve sustainability in the area.

ii. promote, protect and maintain the local footpath and cycle path network, including the Vanguard Way, Greensand Way in conjunction with Surrey County Council and Access Forum, and in doing so encourage walking and cycling for leisure especially by visitors to the area and to Titsey Place;

iii. alleviate traffic problems in particular in Limpsfield High Street with the implementation within the plan period of a local improvement scheme in partnership with Surrey CC;
vi. develop a Parking Strategy for Limpsfield village which mitigates pressures and encourages sustainable travel and better manages car parking spaces for businesses and visitors.

vii consider evidence where existing permissive footpaths might be upgraded to “rights of way” on the definitive official map, as this option will be unavailable from 2026.

viii seek to establish 3 electric vehicle charging points, in the 3 main Hubs in the Parish, namely Limpsfield Chart, Limpsfield village and the lower end of Oxted Station Road East (Limpsfield Parish’s main commercial and facilities centre)

**Footpaths and Pavements - aim to improve the network of footpaths and pavements in the parish with access to all potential users for transport and leisure purposes enhancing the sustainability of the area.** We believe it is important to maintain and strengthen the network of footpaths including, better accessibility, and making better links throughout the Parish - eg between Limpsfield village and Limpsfield Chart.

**Footpaths and Pavements Delivery Project**

It will be important to work alongside the Rights of way improvement plan for Surrey, which aims to enhance and promote the rights of way network to make it more useful and attractive for everyone. The County Council will promote the rights of ways network and encourage more walking, riding and cycling to support the local economy and a sustainable and healthy society Explore Surrey – available as an e-newsletter. Five main objectives have been identified:

- to improve accessibility to services, facilities and the wider countryside along rights of way
- to improve connectivity of rights of way and to reduce severance
- to improve the quality of the rights of way network
- to increase recreational enjoyment
- to secure coordinated implementation of the Rights of Way Improvement
- Plan within resources available.

It will also be important to work with the Tandridge District Council infrastructure lead to help on key priorities including:

- New pavement provision in Bluehouse Lane; Short Lane; Wolf’s Hill; Water Lane; Brick Kiln Lane; Pains Hill (highlighted by East Surrey ramblers)
• All-weather, disabled and pushchair access to the footpath from Detillens Land to Granville road – and the same between wolfs Row and Rockfield road.
• Ideas for better linking between Limpsfield chart and Limpsfield Village
• Continue the valuable dialogue with the Surrey Ramblers on a rolling programme of improvements

The evidence from the household survey shows that, residents seeking improvements in footpaths included:

• 47% as regards Detillens lane to Granville road
• 32% between Wolfs Row and Rockfield Road

And 41% of residents felt a new footpath from Limpsfield Village to Titsey place via Sandy lane would be valuable.

[Place Holder — map of current footpaths, bridleways and pavements in 2017 including their status – and the network envisaged by 2022, with particular reference to FP78, FP90, BW 73, FP 37, FP75]

Cycling – to provide safe cycling routes, where we have the evidence that these will be regularly used.

[Place holder – map of current cycling routes and potential for new routes, where we have the evidence that these will be used]

**Bus Services** - bus services need to better meet local needs, offer value for money and be well publicised.

• We will work with the bus services providers to consider what changes can be made to main services, feeder services and delivered services – see summary of routes and provision
• We will in particular look at whether there is a need for “wriggly” buses in the Parish to better meet the needs of those living away from recognised bus routes (see separate paper and reasoning by J Tolley)

[Place Holder – map of current Bus Service provision]

**Bus Services Delivery Project**

Residents have raised concerns about the bus services not meeting local needs, and adding to unwanted HGV traffic.

This project will seek to work with local bus services providers to

• Actively promote the bus services which are available
• Explore the need and scope for wriggly buses (which can off route to pick people up)
• Look at the scope to use smaller vehicles, or ensure that any large vehicles used, avoid key pinch points such as Limpsfield High Street
• Ensure that the Limpsfield Chart and the more rural parts of the parish are better served.
• Explore pre-payment (e.g. fixed annual payment / contribution from users rather than current variable income usage) options to Bus Services, rather than “pay as you go” as a means of increasing Bus Service take-up

Parking – the aim is to reduce the need for parking, and at the same time provide the capacity which is needed, coupled with adequate (illegal) parking enforcement

[Place Holder – photos showing illegal parking and congestion problems – also see Annex about Surrey CC parking review and its implications for the Parish] [R Coulson comments]

Any parking strategy for Limpsfield Parish must be done in consort with the tier one community including Oxted and Hurst Green, taking account of changes already in train and its deficiencies.

Parking Delivery Project

• Assess the future levels of parking need, coupled with actions being taken to reduce car use (more walking, cycling and more use of public transport)
• Identify any sites for more parking provision and the logistics to make this happen including the possibility of using the eastern end of the playing fields/tennis club grounds adjacent to the Glebe meadow for additional off-road parking.
• Assess the need and funding availability for more parking enforcement

(2) Health, Well-Being and Community Services - the Health services in Limpsfield cannot be seen in isolation from the needs of Oxted and Hurst Green, especially if the latter is to grow in population, through more house building. The expected future demand for health services needs to be met by an increase in capacity in the local area. This should be the leading priority for new infrastructure expenditure

Sense of Community/Isolation risks - all local services and opportunities should be better signposted and made fully accessible to all in the community.

Health Service Delivery Project
Health services need to also be seen in the context of wider community services which can promote health and well-being as broadly as possible and give support to social care and organisations involved in mental health care.

Government policy is to centralise health services into a small number of larger (known as D1) health hubs to reduce the administrative overheads. Thought needs to be given as how to ensure the health services facility remains within the current locality, by utilising space in the adjoining TDC office facility (which is something which is already starting to happen) Supporting community health and social care services may be augmented in other sites in the community, but it is paramount that the core primary care facility remains largely where it is, and that areas of new development in the District grow their own Health hubs and facilities.

**Community/Isolation Risks Development Project**

The existing St Peters Church Hall will no longer be fit for purpose in the timeframe of the Neighbourhood Plan. And this coupled with the Diocese of Southwark’s aspiration to create a revenue stream from their land on which this is located, suggests a need to redevelop the site.

The redevelopment of St Peters Church Hall into something which better meets the needs of the community is a project which needs taking forward. The first step will be to get a clear understanding of what the future community wants. And then to assess how this might be delivered for the sake of the Community and the Diocese of Southwark (as Landowner)

The associated calls for a playground in Limpsfield, may well suggest than the new facility for the PANDA (on the Glebe meadow) Nursery is moved into a new community hub, with a playground on the Glebe field (which many residents supported), when the temporary building for the Nursery is removed.

**3) Broadband**

To continue to push for faster broadband, although there is no specific spatial implication here

There is a need to bring the poorest served areas as regards broadband and mobile signal up to the level of the best in the Parish. As home working becomes more common in the future, this will gain in importance as a Neighbourhood Plan Delivery Project It will also be of benefit of small local businesses in the Parish.

The household survey showed that faster Broadband was the second most important facility development to the community infrastructure.

**Broadband Policy**
Connecting the Parish Development proposals to provide access to a super-fast broadband network to the villages of the parish, and outlying properties in the countryside, and to improve the speed of existing services, will be supported, provided the location and design of any above-ground network installations reflect the character of the local area. Proposals for housing and employment schemes must provide appropriate ducting suited to fibre communications technologies that is either connected to the public highway; through satellite broadband; a community led local access network; or to another location that can be justified. Proposals should demonstrate how any development will contribute to and be compatible with local fibre or internet connectivity. This should be through a ‘Connectivity Statement’ provided with relevant planning applications. Such statements should include details of:

- The intended land use and the anticipated connectivity requirements of the development.
- Known nearby data networks and their anticipated speed (fixed copper, 3G, 4G, fibre, satellite, microwave, etc.).
- Realistic viability and delivery assessments of connection potential or contribution to any such networks.
- Measures taken by the applicants to work with Telecom providers to ensure that Superfast Broadband is available at the point of occupation.

A significant number of respondents cited poor broadband speeds as being an issue, with poor mobile phone reception also being mentioned.

Availability of high speed broadband is a critical factor in securing the sustainability of the parish and unlocking untapped economic potential. National Planning Policy supports the need for high quality communications infrastructure, acknowledging its role in supporting economic activity and enhancing the provision of local facilities and services, particularly in rural areas. The Rural Productivity Plan (DEFRA; 2015) places fast and reliable broadband services at the top of a ten-point plan to boost rural productivity.

There has been a market failure to provide good connectivity in rural areas resulting in a number of government backed initiatives to remedy this situation. This failure extends to the parish. The ability of these initiatives to deliver good connectivity to all existing and new developments is, as yet, unknown.

**Broadband Delivery Project**

Proposals and projects for improving access to broadband in new and existing development and which are consistent with policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council will continue to use its influence on the Surrey County Council ‘Superfast Broadband’ project to seek upgrades to broadband services in the Parish. It will also work with Broadband providers directly. The Parish Council has had
discussions with 3 potential providers and has a good understand of the options available.

This delivery project will also look at mobile phone signal strengths, which is poor in some parts of the Parish on some networks.

(4) **Education** - Adult learning is the most obvious gap in the current provision, and should be prioritised in future.

Whilst only 50 people completing the household survey made comments about adult learning, of this almost half of them were dissatisfied with the “adult learning offer”

**Education Delivery project**

Limpsfield Parish Council will work with East Surrey College (the key provider for this area and other providers as appropriate) to assess local adult learning needs and determine what might be done to address the concerns raised by residents in the household survey. Once the local needs have been assessed, a blend of options are available, including:

- Bespoke course at East Surrey College in Redhill
- Outreach learning course (provided these are economically viable in terms of numbers attending) at locations in the Parish – the Church halls in Limpsfield Village, Limpsfield Chart and the TVA Facility in the commercial hub of the Parish in Gresham road.
- Distance learning solutions which could go hand in glove with proposed improvements to broadband speeds

(5) **Traffic Speed and HGVs**- wide concerns about high traffic speeds need to be addressed in discussion with Surrey Highways and Surrey Police, along with better control of HGV traffic.

**Control of HGVs**

Work is already in hand with Surrey Highways to improve the signage to seek to persuade HGV drivers to avoid Limpsfield High Street. This builds further on collaborative work already undertaken to flag Limpsfield High Street as unsuitable for HGVs on the HGV satellite navigation system.

**Traffic Speeds Delivery Project**

A Community Speed watch scheme could be taken forward by the Parish Council to help combat high speeds. This would work as follows:

Initially a team of 6 local people would be formed.
Once this team has been identified Surrey Police would set up training for these volunteers.

The team should also identify the roads we would like to conduct a Speed Watch and where they would propose to stand to do this.

Surrey Police will arrange for the Road/s to be Risk assessed. If the road is accepted as suitable for Community Speed Watch, a speed watch programme could then go ahead.

The criteria for suitable roads for a speed watch programme are:

- Can they be seen.
- Is there a suitable place to put the signs out? (No good if the road has high hedgerows of similar where the signs cannot be placed and seen by approaching drivers)
- Is there a footway that CSW can walk along to be able to place these signs out (if not then I will not allow the site as it would be dangerous for them to walk in the road)?
- Must not be within 200m of a change of speed limit.
- Must not obstruct a footway.
- They are away from a bend.

Surrey Police also require 1 person to be the Co-Ordinator, so that they only have one point of contact with one member of the team.

It will then be the responsibility for the co-ordinator to pass any information onto the rest of the team.

(6) Community Assets/Facilities - The significant number of community assets and facilities in the Parish need to be protected and preserved, and in some cases improved through a number of "listing/logging" measures.

Community Asset/Facilities Policy

Proposals to improve the viability of an established community use of the following buildings and facilities by way of the extension or partial redevelopment of existing buildings will be supported, provided the design of the scheme and the resulting increase in use are appropriate in design terms and will not harm the amenities of adjoining residential properties.

Drawing from the evidence of the household survey, the area we shall focus on going forward will be to consider Assets which are felt to be of community value and any assets which are felt to be generally valuable. Assets of Community value can be dealt with outside the Neighbourhood Plan, through the Parish Council. We will seek to protect these in the first instance by formally registering them as “Assets of Community Value” and by considering other forms of additional protection. These include both “Heritage Assets” and “Facilities Assets”. Also, the designation of “local Green Space” and protections afforded by the Conservation area will be relevant.
here. {A conservation area assessment statement, and a review of the Conservation Boundary would seem to have merit.}.

The initial list identified by residents and the topic group are:

- the Bull Inn (being consider by TDC currently)
- the Brook Field, (which is also being considered for Local Green Space Designation)
- Limpsfield Village Stores
- 20 Station Road East Shops (in Limpsfield Parish)
- Carpenters Arms – Limpsfield Chart
- Limpsfield Tennis Club
- Oxted Library (which is in Limpsfield Parish)
- St Peters Church Hall, Limpsfield
- St Andrews Church Hall, Limpsfield Chart
- Core Shops in Limpsfield High Street
- British Legion, Limpsfield
- Limpsfield Chart Allotments

[Placeholder – maps and value descriptions – RC]

(7) Tourism

The Household Survey showed mixed views on the value of promoting tourism to the area. Whilst there is much heritage with old buildings, a graveyard with famous people and outstanding views and footpaths, there were concerns about an influx of visitors which may bring unwelcome traffic and extra parking pressure, despite the potential benefits to the local economy.

[Placeholder – we await the AECOM analysis of the household survey – to help pin this down]