Section 1 – meeting notes

MINUTES OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN ENVIRONMENT GROUP

on Thursday 25th August at 37 Detillens Lane

Present: Ann Osborn, Martin Hogbin (from the Parish Council), Marianne Bell, John Tolley, joined later by Richard Spiller

Apologies: Mark Richards (local National Trust Warden) and Jonathan Skinner (who is hopefully going to represent the farming community)

The meeting was chaired by Ann Osborn.

1. **Aims and Objects**: to discuss our vision and objectives of the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan, based on the Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan which has already been agreed with TDC. The basis of this meeting’s discussion was a paper which Ann had circulated in advance outlining her own vision of Limpsfield’s future. Topics covered were:
   - Protection of green spaces, green belt and the natural environment
   - Sustaining and expansion of the local business economy, including the agricultural economy and home businesses
   - Demographic make-up of Limpsfield now and in the future.

2. **Structure and Scope of the Group**: The group agreed that in addition to the above we should recruit representative from Limpsfield Chart, a representative of the Limpsfield Traders and a local wild-life expert.

   We considered whether our deliberations should include the urban part of Limpsfield which is effectively part of Oxted. This includes the Health Centre and Library, Council Offices and the shops at the lower end of Station Rd East. John Tolley drew a distinction between the function of these businesses and those in Limpsfield High Street, such as the Memorial Stores which is effectively the only general store in Limpsfield Village. There was a query about whether the businesses in Station Rd. East contributed towards the parish precept.

   **ACTION** Martin Hogbin was delegated to investigate this and the implications, if any.

3. **Future Development In The Parish And Change Of Use For Existing Buildings**

   3.1 **New Building**: Currently the Parish of Limpsfield is 94% green belt. It was agreed that in light of local and national needs for more housing it is unrealistic to resist all future building in the parish per se
however anxious we are to preserve its beauty and character. Therefore it is better to identify those locations where development would be largely acceptable to local residents. One such location is the former Plumbers’ Arms allotments site. The long-term reason for the removal of the allotments from this site to the new one further along the Westerham Rd. was for housing development. However, it was generally agreed that the primary local need is for affordable housing for young people, and we should resist another large five-bedroom estate. The group recognized that more development would increase pressure on local schools and medical services.

3.2 The Glebe Field: The unanimous view of the group is that we wish to protect the Glebe Field from building and retain it as a green space for the benefit of the local community.

3.3 Protection and Re-use of Rural Buildings for Rural Use:

a) Redundant farm buildings: Over time the original use for old farm buildings becomes redundant, while the buildings themselves remain structurally robust. Martin said that the Parish Council regularly discusses change of use applications for conversion to homes, or to small business premises.

b) Keeper’s Cottage on the Chart: This property was donated to the National Trust in the 1970s by local subscription to house a warden for Limpsfield Common. The Trust is now causing considerable resentment locally as it proposes to sell it off or, it was suggested, convert it to a holiday let. It was agreed that we should press to maintain the rural use and character of such buildings and retain them for people with rural jobs, i.e. not for a holiday let, or commuter who plays no part in the local community.

3.4 Purchase of Green Belt Land in Limpsfield by Croydon Council: Martin mentioned that Croydon Council has acquired a parcel of land towards the southern edge of Limpsfield parish (near Lingfield) and it is anticipated that they want to develop this to re-house their own overspill.

4. Local Business

4.1 Local Shops and Businesses: It was agreed that we need to encourage the continued commercial use of local shop premises when they become vacant, and not the adoption of planning policies that will discourage them. The meeting welcomed the setting up of a new café in the premises of the former bridal shop. Ann is talking to various local business owners, including Sue at the Bull, and was planning to talk to the manager of the Carpenter’s Arms to sound out from them the sort of help they would welcome from the Neighbourhood Plan. The meeting regretted the lack of any local shop on the Chart. With reference to the shop premises in Station Rd East it was felt that Oxted/Limpsfield already has more than enough charity shops and we should resist any more.

4.2 Businesses Run from Homes: John Tolley spoke of the variety of businesses that are being run from people’s homes, including specialized mail order firms, who in their turn make a contribution to the
viability of the Post Office. There was concern that this valuable business could be lost to Limpsfield Post Office if people are unable to park.

4.3 Parking: This is a vexed question in Limpsfield but Martin pointed out that it isn’t covered by the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. Nevertheless the Group felt that we should draw attention to the problems. The recent public meeting to launch the Neighbourhood Plan had drawn passionate complaints about difficulties of parking from parishioners, including the elderly and the frail, who wish to patronize local shops but live some distance from the High Street.

The parking space outside the Memorial Stores is frequently occupied by non-customers, sometimes for long periods. It was suggested that we might investigate the possible dedication of a few short-term parking slots immediately outside the shop specifically for customers. Ann said she would seek advice from Nick Skellett.

ACTION: Ann Osborn

A number of possible “parking spaces” exist on land owned by Maggie Wicks at the side of Kiwi Cottage. These were informally available to High Street customers in the past but are now roped off. It was suspected that Maggie may have been warned that if she permits informal use, it could become formalized over time so that she can’t legally recover it when she wants to. It was suggested that it might be possible to provide her with a licence that could be rescinded if needed. It was thought that a formal approach from the Parish Council might reassure her more than from a private individual.

ACTION: Martin Hogbin

5. Demographic Make-up of Limpsfield

Limpsfield has a fairly elderly population and the Group discussed ways of attracting younger families to the village. The chief need was the provision of more affordable homes (See 3.1). There was also some discussion about the need to provide housing for key workers such as teachers and nurses. Marianne spoke of a young teacher of her acquaintance at Oxted School who had been able to buy locally under a government key worker scheme. From the point of view of developers and builders the profit on such projects is lower than on large houses and therefore not so attractive. Ann said she would do some research into key worker housing.

ACTION: Ann Osborn

6. Protection of Green Spaces
6.1 **The Glebe Field** to the left of the stream looking from the High Street, belongs to the Diocese of Southwark; the Brook Field (sometimes referred to as the Bogs) belongs to Titsey Estate. The football pitch on the Glebe Field that was vacated when the Limpsfield Blues Football Club folded is now being managed by Limpsfield Church and is being used by various youth groups. The further end of the Glebe Field and the Bogs are grazed by Jonathan Skinner’s cattle. The village would dearly like to have the Glebe Field designated a “local green space” to protect it from threat of development. Martin said that it ticked many of the boxes in that it was well-used and highly valued by local residents, and it separated the two semi-urban communities of Limpsfield and Oxted. It is also a valuable habitat for wild-life. Kingfishers have been seen along the stream and also grey wagtails. Richard Spiller has known the Glebe Field and its flora and fauna all his life and said he would investigate further, possibly consulting Norman Robson (a botany expert at the Natural History Museum who has lived in Granville Rd. for many years). It was thought that Anne and Tony Mclaughlin probably kept a good record of the wildlife round the stream near the bridge in Bluehouse Lane where the Bloom working parties have done a lot of work. Richard will also draft general questionnaire for Glebe Field users and present it at the next meeting.

**ACTION:** Richard Spiller

6.2 **Footpaths across the Glebe Field:** Ann pointed out that it is widely assumed that a footpath runs from the church hall carpark through the football ground to the further Glebe Field. A lot of people regularly use this route and there is a very dilapidated stile but it isn’t a legal footpath, the only legal one being that from Detillens Lane (next to No. 29) across the stream and up into Granville Rd. In winter time that uphill stretch from the stream to Granville Rd is a morass of mud where it has been trampled by cows, and only accessible during the winter months wearing wellies. We agreed to try to get it repaired and fenced off from the cattle so that it can be used as an off-road route to Oxted and the Station at all times of the year.

**ACTION:** Ann Osborn

6.3 **The Panda Group (Nursery)** is in on-going negotiations to erect their own purpose-built nursery premises next to the old football pavilion as they are out-growing the room that they have hired for many years in the church hall.

6.4 **Other Potential Green Spaces:** The cricket pitch is on National Trust Land and so is already protected under commons legislation. The pond in Padbrook is also attractive and a valuable wildlife habitat, but under threat as it belongs to a London football club which would like to get planning permission. Martin agreed to look into getting the Padbrook pond designated a “local green space” as well as the Glebe Field.

7. **ACTIONS**
MARTIN to investigate green spaces

RICHARD to produce a wild-life survey and draft a questionnaire for Glebe Field users which he will present at the next meeting.

JOHN to talk to PO users

ANN will amend her document on the basis of this evening’s discussions and circulate it. She felt, and we agreed, that it is better for us to produce our own document than have someone else’s ideas suggested to us.

8. **Further Meetings**

   6th September – Steering Group

   4th October – Visioning Group

   14th October at 10.30 am, 37 Detillens Lane?? - Next meeting of the Environment Group.

There being no other business the meeting ended at 7 pm with thanks to Ann Osborn for hosting it.
LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN ENVIRONMENT GROUP

25th November 2016 at 37 Detillens Lane
by courtesy of Ann Osborn

Present: Ann Osborn, Martin Hogbin, Geoff Dessent, John Tolley, Ian Simm, Marianne Bell

1. Apologies: Mark Richards, Richard Spiller

2. Minutes of Meeting of 14th October:

Item 2 re item 3.3 of 25th August:

“These limit occupation to rural workers”: John said that this should add “and people actively involved in the keeper’s work.” The Keeper’s Cottage on the Chart was originally provided by local subscription in the 1970s to house the Chart Warden and is effectively in lieu of salary. It is unlikely that anyone on a National Trust salary could afford to pay comparable rent and there is great unhappiness between the Trust and the local committee over this issue. It was pointed out that most of the people “actively involved in the keeper’s work” are volunteers involved in the Task Force, most of whom are retired people already living in the area. Does this criteria include them?

Item 6.2

It should be feasible to construct a cow-proof path between the bridge stream and Granville Rd.

3. Update on the Meeting of the Steering Group of 9th November (Geoff Dessent)

Geoff reported that there had been over 100 replies to the survey, comprising both online and paper returns from the various collecting boxes around the village. They came from a pretty representative cross-section of the demographic of Limpsfield. Younger people had mainly replied via the survey monkey, older people on paper. When Geoff had gone to the Panda Group to canvass parents’ views he found that generally they had previously been unaware of the NP, but were very anxious to give their views, particularly when they realised they could do it online.

Analysis of replies to date showed that major concerns were traffic, parking, lack of affordable housing, dogbins, footpaths, protection of the Glebe Field and the ambience of the village. Younger families would like a children’s playground in the centre of the Village in addition to one at Limpsfield Chart.

Geoff was asked to draft a vision statement based on these replies.


Ann presented for discussion an initial draft of our application for certain valued green places to be protected and formally declared Local Green Spaces, based on a successful application from North Dorset. These include the Glebe Field and the Brook Field, the village green at Stanhopes and the pond at Padbrook, all within Limpsfield village, but outside the Green Belt. All fall within the criteria for Local Green Spaces. We understand that any application to develop the Brook Field would probably be blocked by the Environment Agency as it is located
on the flood plain. The footpath through the Glebe Field is actually part of the link path between the North Downs Way and the Greensand Way. This continues up through Padbrook so that alone doesn’t necessarily preclude future development. Might the Glebe Field be a suitable site for a playground?

Geoff suggested adding to our list a further site on the south side of the A25 which belongs to St. Michael’s and was once part of the school playing fields. This actually falls within the Green Belt but is one that is being considered as a potential development site. Its adoption as a Local Green Space would help retain the existing distinctive green cordon between Limpsfield and Oxted parishes and prevent the two from merging imperceptibly into one continuous urban sprawl. There was some discussion about whether it could be a possible location for a playground but some doubt was expressed as to whether it would be used much if families had to cross the busy A25. John Tolley wondered if there might be any possibility of creating another footpath across the St. Michael’s land, effectively linking the end of Detillens Lane with Wolf’s Row. The National Trust sees the provision of more footpaths as a way of getting people out of their cars.

5. **Housing and Development on Green Belt Land**

Tandridge District, along with the rest of the country, is under pressure from central government to build a lot more houses, especially affordable housing for purchase and rent. A ball park figure suggested for the whole District is 9,500 between 2012 and 2022, which would house an estimated 30,000 extra people across the whole District. Doubts were voiced about whether the Tandridge area is likely to generate this level of population increase naturally over that time period. There is no enthusiasm to welcome a lot of urban overspill, especially when our infrastructure is already inadequate to serve the existing population. Martin queried whether the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan should put an outright ban on all housing development in the parish, as Woldingham have done. In spite of this their NP has been accepted. We will need really strong arguments to resist large-scale development and the starting position has to be a very clear understanding of local needs and wishes.

Survey responses received so far have shown local opinion to be in favour of affordable housing, both for rental and purchase, for key workers such as teachers and health workers, and ideally would like their children to be able to afford to live and bring up their families here. It was queried whether it was possible to prioritise affordable houses for younger families over older people down-sizing such, have acquired a lot of the more modest-sized housing pool in Limpsfield over recent years. We don’t need more large 5-bedroomed houses which tend to be developers’ preferences. We don’t want to sacrifice the Green Belt to large housing estates for urban overspill. And our infrastructure including school places, shortage of doctors, parking facilities etc. is already under great strain without a huge population increase. In theory new infrastructure should follow housing development but there is a time lag, and there is already a shortfall in many areas. Geoff proposed that we carry out a thorough survey to define local housing needs to understand what the parish’s true requirements are. This needs to be very simple and focussed.
The meeting studied a map of the Oxted/Limpsfield section of Tandridge showing a number of sites within the parish of Limpsfield with potential for housing development. These sites are under consultation but not a foregone conclusion. One of the sites under consultation is the site along the A25 considered by the meeting as a possible Local Green Space (see Item 3).

(The meeting agreed that we will have) When the plan is discussed with TDC it is possible that we will need to accept some development to meet local needs including affordable housing, but we must set firm criteria so that it causes the least damage to the local environment and the Green Belt. The way we word this in the NP has to be very clear and unambiguous. Our starting point should be that the Green Belt is sacrosanct, but if we are required to surrender some for house-building it should be the least damaging, eg. the former allotment site opposite Wolf’s Row. Martin said that most of the planning applications that come before the Parish Council are for infill and this will continue. Planning permissions for infill tend to stipulate that the buildings have to be in keeping with the rest of the street.

6. **Further Actions:**

To complete the Local Green Space paper – Ann will add the additional sites south of the A25 and send out for comments, and also ask Richard for more information on the Glebe Field.

We need to think more about the needs of local businesses and how we may assist them.

The Neighbourhood steering group is considering conducting a survey of local need to establish the views of residents, and also arranging meetings with local stakeholders.

7. **Next Meeting**

Wednesday, 11th January 2017, 10.30 am at 37 Detillens Lane.
MINUTES OF THE LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
ENVIRONMENT GROUP
11th January 2017 at 37 Detillens Lane
by courtesy of Ann Osborn


1. Apologies: None

2. Minutes of 25th November 2016 and Matters Arising

a) Rural Housing: (See Item 2 re item 3.3 of 25.8) Mark Richards now pays a reduced rent for Keeper’s Cottage. This arrangement will continue so long as he stays in his present role, but if he were to move on the National Trust will want planning rules altered to allow them to treat it as any commercial property. At the time of building planning rules were stretched to allow it to be built on common land specifically to house the common warden. It was financed by local subscription. Mark’s job definition is now defined as “Ranger” not “keeper” as he ranges across a number of NT properties. Should we apply for a name change to “Ranger’s Cottage”? Whatever happens after Mark’s time, we very much wish to retain it for rural workers. John queried whether the definition “rural worker” could apply to a person who commuter to London for his/her day job but also did voluntary work on the Common.

House prices and rents in this area are way beyond what most rural workers can afford and we don’t want to lose the dwindling stock of farm cottages to the commercial market. There may be other similar properties in the parish, such as former farm cottages in Water Lane which belong to the Titsey Estate. Martin said he would consult rCOH and ask them to investigate possible tightening of the planning rules to the maximum to protect them from just becoming more commuters’ homes or weekend cottages in the fullness of time. The wording of the final version of the Plan must be drafted very carefully to avoid loopholes which could be exploited.

b) Footpaths: (Item 4, para 2) Re John’s proposal to create a new footpath across St. Michael’s land in the event of Local Green Space status being granted, Ian told the meeting that no new rights of way are to be created, but we could ask the owner to create a permissive path. We also discussed the footpaths in the Glebe Field. A right of way from Granville Rd crosses the Titsey Brook and the Glebe Field to Detillens Lane. An informal path links this with a gap in the hedge separating the grazing land from the football pitch. There has been a dilapidated stile here in the past and it has been used for decades by local residents as a route through to the church hall car park and the High Street. This is generally but erroneously assumed to be a right of way.
3. **Local Green Spaces**

Ann presented a third draft of her paper on proposed Local Green Spaces. The meeting recommended 2/3 further locations to be added to the list:

a) the area of National Trust land at the junction of the High Street and the A25 uphill to Pebble Hill Cottages and

b) Tidy’s Green at the junction of Detillens Lane and the A25 in front of the Rat Catchers, along with the small grass area on the opposite corner which contains the old watering trough. Geoff thought that TDC would be happy to approve all the recommended Green Spaces so long as we don’t put forward too many (one parish had asked for 273). Ann will redraft her paper to be sent to the Steering Committee meeting next week. This paper will include evidence from Richard Spiller from his wildlife survey; he will mark in mature trees. Geoff will accompany it with a suitable map. In turn this will be forwarded to rCOH to redraft using the correct legal terminology.

The stretch of St Michael’s land that we’ve identified on the south side of the A25 doesn’t fully conform to the criteria for Local Green Space designation as the public have never had access to it. On the other hand it can be described as “demonstrably special” since we wish to retain a green break between Oxted and Limpsfield. Strictly speaking this falls within the Green Belt. Because there is no public access it is probably quite rich in wild-life. Applications for those green spaces that lie in residential areas like Stanhopes and Padbrook have to be approved by the residents. Stanhopes has already been approved enthusiastically.

Younger parents would like to see a children’s playground on the Glebe Field. The Limpsfield Chart playground is very popular, and young children are said not to like Master Park. (The Chart playground is also more sheltered and less cold than Master Park).

4. **Local Businesses**

a) **The High Street**: The new café is thriving. In particular young mums have welcomed it as a meeting place since they find parking in Oxted so difficult. The Old Bakery is still standing empty, and Serenity (opposite the Memorial Stores) has closed. Commercial centres have increasingly to focus on the kinds of goods and services that can’t be obtained online. There isn’t a huge footfall in Limpsfield High Street, so any businesses we can attract have to be destination businesses in their own right. When the house-to-house survey goes out there should be questions about the type of business residents would welcome in the village, and what they think would work well – or not. Grants are available to help new rural businesses set up, but most people aren’t aware of them. If they were better publicized the Parish Council would help with the applications.

b) **Parking**: A 20 minute limit outside the Memorial Stores is being proposed to discourage long-term parking and free up parking the space for customers.

c) **Panda Group**: One thriving local business is the Panda Group, which wishes to build its own purpose-built premises next to the football pavilion. Opinions about this vary with some people seeing it as a thriving business and local facility to be encouraged, while others are in principle against the whole idea of another building on the Glebe Field.
d) If the Glebe Field achieves Local Green Space status the Church and village shouldn’t feel the need to guard the approaches – church hall, car park etc – so jealously from potential development threats, and more creative use could be found for this space. There was some speculation about future re-development of the church hall, possibly more as a community hall. Would a private business be interested in rebuilding it if it could be two storeys with offices on the upper level? Ian drew a parallel with the proposed redevelopment of the cricket pavilion on Master Park on the same footprint.

5. **Feedback From The Steering Group**

The household survey has been drafted by AECOM and the first draft is due out next week. This will be circulated to topic groups for them to suggest questions. It is very important to make sure that the questions asked are the right ones. Housing is one of the most burning issues and it is very important to get people’s true opinions. Realistically it isn’t possible to divorce Limpsfield’s housing needs and infrastructure from those of Oxted and Hurst Green. This Group attaches high priority to provision of more affordable housing for key workers in the area; would residents agree? And would they be prepared to release any Green Belt land for essential development, given that 95% of Limpsfield parish is Green Belt, and pressure is coming from central government to release some of it to alleviate the housing shortage? Tandridge have agreed a quota of 9,500 new houses but it is unlikely that they can fulfil this without encroaching on the Green Belt. All the “yellow-flagged” sites in Limpsfield parish on the TDC map of potential development sites lie within the Green Belt. We know that local people are very anxious to protect the Green Belt, but the meeting felt that if we appeared reasonable and agreed to sacrifice one site of our choosing we might be in a stronger position to protect the rest. In this event that site should be the Plumbers Arms site on the junction of the A25 and Wolf’s Row, which nobody uses since the allotment holders left and is becoming very overgrown.

6. **Date Of Next Meeting**

Thursday 23rd February at 2 pm at 37 Detillens Lane.
Monday, 17th October 2017 at 37 Detillens Lane
by courtesy of Ann Osborn

Present: Ann Osborn, Geoff Dessent, Ian Simm, Mark Richards, Martin Hogbin, Marianne Bell
Apologies: John Tolley, Richard Spiller

1. **The Minutes of the Meeting** of 13th March 2017 were taken as read. There were no matters arising.

2. **Results of the Household Survey:** 450 replies had been received which represents one third of the parish. A good cross-section of the roads were represented, and a good demographical cross-section. As anticipated, younger respondents tended to reply online, while older people opted for the paper format.

3. **Housing:** Respondents were heavily against any more building in the parish, and certainly not in the Green Belt. Any further developments should be small ones and where building does occur most want to see the focus on affordability.

4. **Environment**. Apart from protection of green spaces (see item 5) other issues that concerned respondents included burglary, fly-tipping and noise.

5. **Local Green Spaces:** Respondents showed a great eagerness to protect local green spaces; for example, 90% were enthusiastic about registering the Glebe Field. We have to notify all the land owners before submitting our formal applications, and they may well object. That doesn’t prevent us from going ahead. In some cases we may need professional advice. We need to prioritise those that are not in the Green Belt, and be wary about trying to register too many. We should express very clearly what we want; our consultants will produce the appropriate form of words. Formal applications need to be accompanied by maps. Martin will talk to Osmund Stewart Lee about preparing them.

5.1 Of the established list the meeting agreed that the Glebe Field and Meadow should be registered as one unit; the Brook Field is under separate ownership. Ann has spoken with representatives of the Diocese of Southwark who own the Glebe Field/Meadow who said that they have currently no plans to develop the land, although they would like to obtain some income from it. The Panda Group plan to erect a temporary building on the Glebe Meadow just past the football pavilion if and when they can get planning permission. There was some discussion about whether the Diocese might agree to grant permissive path status to the footpath.
between the Glebe Field and Glebe Meadow; it already is one in all but name and has been used as such for many years.

5.2 The meeting then considered additional suggestions for Local Green Space registration from respondents.

- **The “paddock” to the back of Stanhopes.** Marianne queried whether this referred to the whole of the Hookwood Field, or to the sub-section between the right of way and Stanhopes’ back gardens. This was formerly one field but was divided some years ago by a tenant to separate his stock from someone else’s to whom he had sublet a part. It hasn’t been grazed in recent years, but the footpath is currently the subject of a planning application to move it closer to Stanhopes, prior to the introduction of sheep on the Hookwood side. The meeting agreed that the field or part of it might possibly qualify. The first step is to consult the owner.

- **Hookwood Park:** meadowland around Hookwood Park and the green in front of the Hookwood old people’s bungalows. The wooded area between Hookwood Park and the British Legion. The meeting agreed that Hookwood Park is a very pretty country lane and might well qualify. The wooded area up to the British Legion belongs to the National Trust.

- **Padbrook:** open space locally known as the “square”. The meeting wasn’t 100% sure what this meant but thought it was probably the shrubbery in front of the houses towards the top just before Priest’s Hill. The meeting thought it would qualify.

- **Pains Hill woodland.**

- **Bluebell Woods** between the Wolf’s Hill rest home and St. Michael’s.

- **The new allotment site on the A25.** The meeting agreed to include this in order to be on the safe side. It lies well outside the residential part of Limpsfield and any development would certainly push the built perimeter of Limpsfield and Oxted way beyond present boundaries. This land belongs to the Titsey Estate and should be included in conversations about the Brook Field.

- **The north end of Ridlands Rise and Ridlands Grove:** these belong to the National Trust and so are already protected.

- **The corner of the Tennis Club between Detillens Lane and the High Street** is worth inclusion. While belonging to the Tennis club it has been maintained for some years by the Limpsfield in Bloom working parties, who have planted many spring bulbs etc. It is valued by local residents as contributing to the rural character of the village.

- **Itchingwood Common and Staffhurst Wood** are already protected.

- **The Tennis Club** itself would not qualify as it constitutes a brown-field site.

- **Oxted School playing fields and Master Park** are out of our area.
6. **Employment and Business Policies**: Although Limpsfield has a large number of businesses of various kinds, answers to the survey from the business community were fairly sluggish so it and it remains unclear how the Parish might help them. Ann commented that she has never persuaded the Limpsfield Traders (who represent businesses in the High Street) to send a delegate to the Bloom meetings. Geoff Dessent and Mark Wilson will go round and deliver more questionnaires to try to elicit more information.

- It was agreed that local businesses should be registered as assets of local value, and especially the Bull, which is currently on the market. Our food and retail outlets should be protected, subject to available parking, and not be permitted change from retail to housing.
- Local farmers should be supported and helped to sell produce locally where possible; this might become easier after Brexit.
- It is hoped that more off-street parking may become available on the Trevor Lawrence/Dorothy’s Cottage site. The meeting briefly discussed the possible provision of roadside parking meters for non-residents, also possibly paying for more roadside parking enforcement. The Parish Council will be asked to look into this.
- Support will be given to the provision of faster broadband speeds which are somewhat variable. It was suggested that this might be due to peculiar local atmospherics.
- Further activities, like Limpsfield in Bloom, to improve and maintain the look of Limpsfield village.
- Martin asked what our attitude was to phone masts; we haven’t really discussed it.

The meeting agreed that the Neighbourhood Plan could be used as a convenient framework for future policies, but the Parish Council should beware of committing to things they can’t do.

7. **AOB**: What happens next? Feedback on our Local Green Spaces applications and analysis of the local surveys by ACOM. Business responses.

8. **Date of next meeting** (if necessary): Tuesday 5th December 2 pm at 37 Detillens Lane. To be confirmed.
Section 2 – Potential Local Green Spaces

Local Green Spaces - Area 1A – The Glebe Field

Glebe Field looking east

Landowner

THE SOUTH LONDON CHURCH FUND AND SOUTHWARK DIOCESAN BOARD OF
FINANCE (Co. Regn. No. 236594) of Trinity House 4 Chapel Court, Borough High Street,
London SE1 1HW.

Location and map

This area is in the centre of the northern part of the parish and is contiguous with the
Glebe Meadow and the Brook Field. It is bounded to the south by the Glebe Field
and Meadow and to the north by the gardens of Granville Road. It is not in the
Green belt.
Local Green Spaces - Area - 1B Glebe Meadow

*Glebe Meadow looking towards sports pavilion*

**Landowner**

THE SOUTH LONDON CHURCH FUND AND SOUTHWARK DIOCESAN BOARD OF FINANCE (Co. Regn. No. 236594) of Trinity House 4 Chapel Court, Borough High Street, London SE1 1HW.
Location and map

This area is bounded to the west by the Glebe field and to the south by the Limpsfield Club. To the east the area is bounded by church land and a small car park and sports pavilion. The area is not in the Green Belt.
Local Green Spaces - Area 1C - Brook field

Brook Field looking west

Landowner

DAVID ARCHIBALD INNES and PHILIPPA INNES of Hensill House, Hawkhurst, Kent.
Location and map

This area is in the centre of the northern part of the parish and is contiguous with the Glebe Field and the Glebe Meadow. It is bounded to the south by the Glebe field and to the north by the gardens of Granville Road. It is not in the Green belt.
Local Green Spaces - Area 2 - The Padbrook pond and adjacent public areas

The pond area

Other grassed areas
Location and map

The land consists of the public green space adjacent to the pond and the other public green space nearby.
NPPF Criteria

1 Planning permission

There is no current planning permission on this area.

2 Community proximity

The areas are surrounded by the Padbrook development and is easily accessible on foot from the village.

3 Special nature

Padbrook housing estate was built in the 1980s on a local field which had a natural pond. The pond area has been maintained and enhances the estate, providing valued open space in the middle of the housing. There are ducks and a duck house and local residents and their children enjoy watching the ducks and ducklings. Moorhens and other waterfowl also enjoy the pond. There are frogs spawning there.

4 Extent

The total area is less than 1 hectare
Local Green Spaces - Area 3 - Stanhopes village green

Stanhopes village green

Landowner

Limpsfield Parish Council
Location and map

The area is surrounded by the Stanhopes development.

It is not in the Green belt.
Local Green Spaces - Area 4A - Tidys Green West

The main area in front of the Rat Catcher's Cottage

Landowner

Tandridge District Council
Location and map

The area is bounded to the south south by the A25, and is in front of the Rat Catcher's Cottage. It is not part of the Green Belt.
Local Green Spaces - Area 4B - Tidys Green East

The area is next to the drinking fountain, signpost, and water trough
Location and map

The two area is bounded to the south south by the A25, and on the other side of the junction of the A25 with Detillens Lane. It is not part of the Green Belt.
Local Green Spaces - Area 5 - Land to the south of the A25 (OXT 24 and 55 on Tandridge Local plan)

South of the A25

View from A25
Location and map
NPPF Criteria

1 Planning permission

There is no planning permission on this site.

2 Community proximity

The land is bordered by the local communities of Brassey Road and Brassey Hill, St Michaels and Wolf's Row.

3 Special nature

This piece of greenbelt land is a critical dividing space between Limpsfield village and the houses along the A25 spreading from Oxted town to East Hill and the start of Westerham Road. Residents are very keen to maintain the special character of Limpsfield village and feel that there is a fundamental need to protect the green open spaces around the village. Thus this area has a particular local significance. It is tranquil and quiet and as it is not accessible to the public it is likely to have a richness of wildlife, unique to the greensand area, so it has an important ecological significance. Foxgloves, scabious, cow parsley, bluebells and ferns are some of the natural plants of the greensand.

This land was part of the playing field for St Michael’s school and many older people remember taking part in sports there themselves or watching their children, so this has historic value for them.

4 Extent
Local Green Spaces - Area 6 - Land to the north of the A25 between the traffic lights and Limpsfield Infant School

Picture description
Location and map
Local Green Spaces - Area 7 - Pastens reservoir and field between Pastens Road and Pains Hill

Picture description
Location and map
Local Green Spaces - Area 8 - Land to the south of the parish adjacent to Boulthurst Way playing field

Picture description
Location and map

(OXT 20 on TDC local plan)
NPPF Criteria

1 Planning permission

There is no planning permission on this site.

2 Community proximity

The area is adjacent to the community of Hurst Green in the parish of Oxted South that it serves.

3 Special nature

This is an area of Hurst Green that provides a vital open space between Limpsfield and Oxted and is next to OXT 52 (in South Oxted parish) which extends this open area and is of such significance to local people that they have a facebook page and over 300 members of a ‘Save Boulthurst Park’ group. It gives them a much used and greatly valued recreational space. Children, dog walkers and others take advantage of the freedom to walk and play and breathe cleaner air. Oxt 20 is an ecological and biodiverse area which is a haven for a variety of species and provides an open backdrop to the Boulthurst Way playing field. Flowers include aconites, winter anemones and bluebells and many different birds have been spotted, including woodpeckers and owls.

There is a potential risk of flooding if the area is built upon as the stream that runs to the west has dramatically increased its flow in heavy rain and flooded gardens in Boulthurst way and Hazelwood road. Additional building would exacerbate this risk.

4 Extent
Local Green Spaces - Area - 9 Limpsfield Chart village in front of the Carpenter’s Arms pub

Picture description
Location and map
NPPF Criteria

1 Planning permission

There is no planning permission on this area

2 Community proximity

This land is close to the Carpenter's Arms pub and to the Limpsfield Chart Settlement

3 Special nature

This is a piece of natural common land with trees, grass and flora and fauna, providing a rural open space, and protecting the village from the busy road. It is important to local residents as it provides a green space in front of the pub, the church and the surrounding houses and is a critical part of the village feel of the Chart.

4 Extent