

**Report on the Regulation 14 Consultation ended 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2018**

**On**

**The Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan**

**Prepared for Limpsfield Parish Council and the  
Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group by**

**Cllr. R Philip Bailey B.Sc., MBA, MCSI**

**12 August 2018**

## CONTENTS

|     |  |    |
|-----|--|----|
| 1.  | Background .....   | 3  |
| 2.  | Responses to Regulation 14 Questionnaire .....   | 3  |
| 3.  | Closed Question Responses – “Agree”, “Disagree”, “No strong view” and Number of Comments ..... | 5  |
| 4.  | Open Question 1 Vision & Objectives (No LNP policy) .....                                      | 6  |
| 5.  | Open Question 2 Spatial Strategy (LNP 1 policy) .....  | 7  |
| 6.  | Open Question 3 Housing Development within the Built-up Area (LNP 2 policy) .....              | 8  |
| 7.  | Open Question 4 Housing Type and Mix (LNP 3 policy).....                                       | 9  |
| 8.  | Open Question 5 Managing Design in the Built-up Area (LNP 4 policy) .....                      | 10 |
| 9.  | Open Question 6 Limpsfield Village Conservation Area (LNP 5 policy) .....                      | 11 |
| 10. | Open Question 7 Landscape Character (LNP 6 policy) .....                                       | 12 |
| 11. | Open Question 8 Local Heritage Assets (LNP 7 policy).....                                      | 13 |
| 12. | Open Question 9 Local Green Spaces (LNP 8 policy) .....  | 14 |
| 13. | Open Question 10 Promoting Biodiversity (LNP 9 policy) .....                                   | 15 |
| 14. | Open Question 11 Employment & Business across the Parish (LNP 10 policy).....                  | 16 |
| 15. | Open Question 12 Rural Economy (LNP 11 policy).....  | 17 |
| 16. | Open Question 13 Community Services in Oxted Town Centre (LNP 12 policy) .....                 | 18 |
| 17. | Open Question 14 Community Services in Limpsfield Village (LNP 13 policy) .....                | 19 |
| 18. | Open Question 15 Sustainable Transport, Access & Car Parking (LNP 14 policy) .....             | 20 |
| 19. | Open Question 16 Connecting the Parish (LNP 15 policy) .....                                   | 21 |

### **APPENDIX A - Regulation 14 Leaflet and Questionnaire**

### **APPENDIX B – Open Question Responses Sub-headings used for Summary Headings**

## 1. Background

The Limpsfield Parish Council published a Neighbourhood Plan pre-submission plan (the “Reg 14 PS Plan”) for public consultation on 8<sup>th</sup> June 2018 under the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 Act and in accordance with EU Directive 2001/42. Consultation under Regulation 14 of the Act commenced on 8<sup>th</sup> June 2018 and lasted for 6 weeks until 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2018 (the “Reg. 14 Consultation”).

The consultation was made by distribution of a leaflet summarising the Reg 14 PS Plan accompanied with a questionnaire form (the “Reg. 14 Questionnaire”). The leaflet summary provided a website reference for reviewing the full Reg 14 PS Plan and well as details as to where hard copies of the Reg 14 PS Plan could be reviewed at the local Library. A copy of the leaflet summary and the Reg. 14 Questionnaire is shown in Appendix A.

The leaflets and Reg. 14 Questionnaires were delivered in hard copy to every household in Limpsfield (in excess of 1859 households) by volunteers. The Reg. 14 Questionnaire could be completed in hard copy and returned to the Parish Council at certain collection sites (Limpsfield Village Store, Limpsfield Village St. Peters Hall, Limpsfield Chart St Andrews Church and Oxted Library). In addition, the Reg. 14 Questionnaire could be completed on-line using a Survey Monkey form.

## 2. Responses to Regulation 14 Questionnaire

154 questionnaires were returned. 53 were completed on-line and 101 were completed in hard copy. Out of these, one was a reply from Kent County Council (“KCC”) as a reply to a specific consultation invitation. It has been removed from the residents’ survey and the general comments given by KCC included under the Regulation 14 Stakeholder Consultation analysis. Accordingly, there were 153 completed questionnaires.

143 (93%) of respondents provided post code identification. Of these 140 stated they were residents although only 135 post codes matched Limpsfield post code addresses, the rest being nearby Limpsfield. All 140 have been included in the analysis. Of the remaining 3 respondents, 2 post-codes matched post codes nearby to Limpsfield and the third was SES Water replying as owner of the Pastens Reservoir which is in Limpsfield. All 3 have been included in the analysis. Of the 10 respondents where no post code was given, 4 stated they were residents and 6 stated they were not. The replies from these 6 were reviewed and their comments were in line with many other from Limpsfield and were not spurious. Accordingly, to ensure all possible legitimate consultees were included, all 10 respondents were included in the analysis. Accordingly, all of the questionnaires returned by the 153 respondents have been included in the analysis.

The Reg. 14 Questionnaire listed 16 questions covering Vision and Objectives and 15 policy areas (LNP1 to LNP15) and required for each a simple indication as to whether the respondent “Agreed”, “Disagreed” or had “No strong view”. These are referred to as “closed questions”. In addition, for each question respondents were invited to complete a “comments” box. A final question 17 invited “Any other comments”. These are referred to as “open questions”.

The analysis of the answers to the closed questions and a summary of the number of comments received to the open questions is shown in Section 4.

The comments provided to the open questions were analysed as follows:

- The Question 17 “Any other comments” were matched where possible to the 15 specific policy related questions (2 to 16) and re-allocated accordingly. Comments relating to question 1 (the statement “Vision & Objectives”) or very general responses or non-matched responses were allocated to “Vision & Objectives”.
- The specific comments and the allocated “Any other comments” under each of the 16 questions were then grouped under “Sub-headings”. The open comments were very varied and so there were a large number of Sub-headings for some of the questions. The Sub-headings are set out in Appendix B.
- The Sub-headings for each question were then gathered into a maximum of 10 “Summary Headings” and, where necessary, under a general “Other” heading. This was to make the analysis manageable, readable and understandable. Those gathered under “Other” were typically single comments that had only general relevance.

For each of the questions 1 to 16 the closed question responses are again summarised and the Summary Headings are listed in Sections 4 to 19 below.

In each of these Sections 4 to 19 the author has added a comment about the relevance to the Neighbourhood Plan of the Reg 14 Questionnaire comments received as listed under the Summary Headings. Where changes may be needed to the PS Plan these are shown underlined and in italics. These suggested changes are the personal view of the author and it is for the Steering Group to agree any changes to the PS Plan for approval by the Parish Council.

3. Closed Question Responses – “Agree”, “Disagree”, “No strong view” and Number of Comments

| No. | Question                                    | Policy | Number of Respondents (max 153) |          |                |                   | Percent of those that replied to question |          |                | Specific, General Comments Allocated and Consolidated Comments Used |                            |                         |                               |                                    |
|-----|---|--------|---------------------------------|----------|----------------|-------------------|---|----------|----------------|---|----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
|     |   |        | Agree                           | Disagree | No strong view | Total Respondents | Agree                                     | Disagree | No strong view | Question Specific Comments used                                     | General Comments Allocated | Total Comments Provided | Comments used in Sub-headings | No. of Respondents Giving Comments |
| 1   | Vision & Objectives                         | N/A    | 138                             | 6        | 9              | 153               | 90%                                       | 4%       | 6%             | 32  | 31                         | 63                      | 50                            | 45                                 |
| 2   | Spatial Strategy                            | LNP1   | 127                             | 10       | 16             | 153               | 83%                                       | 7%       | 10%            | 29  | 0                          | 29                      | 22                            | 21                                 |
| 3   | Housing within the Built up Area            | LNP2   | 115                             | 19       | 19             | 153               | 75%                                       | 12%      | 12%            | 40  | 9                          | 49                      | 47                            | 39                                 |
| 4   | Housing Type and Mix                        | LNP3   | 124                             | 17       | 12             | 153               | 81%                                       | 11%      | 8%             | 43  | 8                          | 51                      | 42                            | 41                                 |
| 5   | Managing Design in the Built-up Area        | LNP4   | 136                             | 4        | 13             | 153               | 89%                                       | 3%       | 8%             | 28  | 2                          | 30                      | 23                            | 22                                 |
| 6   | Limpsfield Village Conservation Area        | LNP5   | 139                             | 5        | 9              | 153               | 91%                                       | 3%       | 6%             | 21  | 0                          | 21                      | 22                            | 20                                 |
| 7   | Landscape Character                         | LNP6   | 138                             | 6        | 9              | 153               | 90%                                       | 4%       | 6%             | 12  | 1                          | 13                      | 13                            | 13                                 |
| 8   | Local Heritage Assets                       | LNP7   | 144                             | 1        | 8              | 153               | 94%                                       | 1%       | 5%             | 12  | 1                          | 13                      | 12                            | 12                                 |
| 9   | Local Green Spaces                          | LNP8   | 129                             | 10       | 14             | 153               | 84%                                       | 7%       | 9%             | 31  | 2                          | 33                      | 24                            | 22                                 |
| 10  | Promoting Biodiversity                      | LNP9   | 127                             | 3        | 22             | 152               | 84%                                       | 2%       | 14%            | 10  | 1                          | 11                      | 10                            | 8                                  |
| 11  | Employment & Business across the Parish     | LNP10  | 133                             | 3        | 17             | 153               | 87%                                       | 2%       | 11%            | 20  | 0                          | 20                      | 19                            | 19                                 |
| 12  | Rural Economy                               | LNP11  | 128                             | 5        | 19             | 152               | 84%                                       | 3%       | 13%            | 13  | 1                          | 14                      | 11                            | 10                                 |
| 13  | Community Services in Oxted Town Centre     | LNP12  | 136                             | 6        | 10             | 152               | 89%                                       | 4%       | 7%             | 23  | 3                          | 26                      | 21                            | 20                                 |
| 14  | Community Service Limpsfield Village        | LNP13  | 134                             | 3        | 16             | 153               | 88%                                       | 2%       | 10%            | 13  | 7                          | 20                      | 16                            | 15                                 |
| 15  | Sustainable Transport, Access & Car Parking | LNP14  | 133                             | 7        | 12             | 152               | 88%                                       | 5%       | 8%             | 36  | 13                         | 49                      | 49                            | 38                                 |
| 16  | Connecting the Parish                       | LNP15  | 134                             | 2        | 17             | 153               | 88%                                       | 1%       | 11%            | 14  | 0                          | 14                      | 16                            | 14                                 |
|     |   |        | 132                             | 7        | 14             | 153               | 87%                                       | 4%       | 9%             | 377   | 79                         | 456                     | 397                           | 22                                 |
|     |   |        | <b>Averages</b>                 |          |                |                   |   |          | <b>Totals</b>  |   |                            |                         |                               | <b>Average</b>                     |

The 153 respondents to the Reg 14 Questionnaire may be compared to the 425 respondents to the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan Household Survey carried out in 2017. The number of households in Limpsfield was 1,430 at the 2011 Census and so the Reg 14 Questionnaire respondents represent 11% of households whereas the Household Survey respondents represented 30%. To the closed “Agree” / “Disagree” question, on average 87% agreed, with a range from 75% (LNP2 Housing within the Built-up Area) to 94% (LNP7 Local Heritage Assets). A total of 456 comments were provided by the 153 respondents. When duplicated and non-relevant comments were removed, the remaining 397 comments were allocated to sub-headings under each question. The three policy areas with the lowest “Agree” and highest “Disagree” responses are shown below together with the result for the Vision & Objectives statement.

| Policy area                                     | Agree | Disagree | No strong view | Total Comments Provided | Comments used in Sub-headings | No of Respondents giving Comments |
|---|-------|----------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| LNP2 Housing in the Built-up Area               | 75%   | 12%      | 12%            | 49                      | 47                            | 39                                |
| LNP3 Housing type and mix                       | 81%   | 11%      | 8%             | 51                      | 42                            | 41                                |
| LNP1 Spatial Strategy                           | 83%   | 7%       | 10%            | 29                      | 22                            | 21                                |
| LNP14 Sustainable Transport, Access and Parking | 88%   | 5%       | 8%             | 49                      | 49                            | 38                                |
| Statement: Vision & Objectives                  | 90%   | 4%       | 6%             | 63                      | 50                            | 45                                |

4. Open Question 1 Vision & Objectives (No LNP policy)

| 1 Vision & Objectives   |  |  |   |   |                                   |                          |  |                      |   |       |
|---|--|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|----------------------|---|-------|
|   |  | Agree  | Disagree  | No strong view                                      | Totals                            |                          |  |                      |   |       |
| No. respondents   |  | 138  | 6   | 9   | 153                               |                          |  |                      |   |       |
| Percent of total respondents  |  | 90%  | 4%  | 6%  | 100%                              |                          |  |                      |   |       |
| No. that strongly agree / disagree  |  | 14   | 0   | N/A   | 14                                |                          |  |                      |   |       |
| No. of comments (incl. strongly agree / disagree)                               |  | 40   | 6   | 4   | 50                                |                          |  |                      |   |       |
| Percent of total comments   |  | 80%  | 12%   | 8%  | 100%                              |                          |  |                      |   |       |
| No. of respondents commented  |  | 36   | 5   | 4   | 45                                |                          |  |                      |   |       |
| Percent of total respondents  |  | 24%  | 3%  | 3%  | 29%                               |                          |  |                      |   |       |
| Summary Headings & Number of Comments   |  |  |   |   |                                   |                          |  |                      |   |       |
| No trust in TDC / SCC / Government to support NP & concern about new Local Plan | Not enough vision for the next 15-20 years | Concern about schools, Health Centre and no local shops on Chart | Not enough <40 yr. olds in survey / concern about provisos & lack of detail / all residents should be treated alike | More off road cycle ways / safer roads for cyclists | Concern about traffic and parking | Concern about Green Belt | Use Green Belt for development rather than over-develop urban area | No house development | NP too complicated, no money to implement, just preserves and not enhances what we have | Other |
| 8   | 4  | 6  | 5   | 2   | 2                                 | 2                        | 2  | 2                    | 3   | 0     |

153 respondents replied (max 153) with 138 (90%) agreeing with the Vision & Objectives with 14 respondents commented that they agreed “strongly”. 6 (4%) respondents disagreed and 9 (6%) had no strong view.

45 respondents (29% of 153) made 50 different comments of which 14 were to express strong support. Of the 36 remainder, the highest number (8) expressed concern about that local, regional or national government would override the final NP. Others (4) expressed a “lack of vision” in the PS Plan and others (5 + 3) criticised it for too many provisos, lack of detail or conversely that it too complicated. One respondent thought the PS Plan preserves rather than enhances Limpsfield. Most other comments (16) reiterated concerns raised in the Household Survey about infrastructure, the Green Belt, traffic congestion and parking but did not specifically criticise the PS Plan. An interesting point raised by 2 respondents was to use the Green Belt for development rather than over-develop the urban area.

Nothing exceptional or new about the PS Plan can be said to have come to light from these comments, except for the scepticism expressed by 18% of the 45 respondents about non-support from local/regional/national government. In the final plan preparation, the few comments given about “too many provisos”, “lack of detail” or being “too complicated” should be born in mind.

5. Open Question 2 Spatial Strategy (LNP 1 policy)

| 2 Spatial Strategy                                |  |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |                                      |       |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|-------|
|   |  | Agree   | Disagree  | No strong view                            | Totals                                       |  |  |  |                                      |       |
| No. respondents                                   |  | 127   | 10  | 16  | 153  |  |  |  |                                      |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |  | 83%   | 7%  | 10%                                       | 100%   |  |  |  |                                      |       |
| No. that strongly agree / disagree                |  | 0   | 0   | N/A                                       | -  |  |  |  |                                      |       |
| No. of comments (incl. strongly agree / disagree) |  | 10  | 6   | 6   | 22   |  |  |  |                                      |       |
| Percent of total comments                         |  | 45%   | 27%   | 27%                                       | 100%   |  |  |  |                                      |       |
| No. of respondents commented                      |  | 10  | 6   | 5   | 21   |  |  |  |                                      |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |  | 7%  | 4%  | 3%  | 14%  |  |  |  |                                      |       |
| Summary Headings & Number of Comments             |  |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |                                      |       |
| Restrict/Protect or no building in the Green Belt | There is a need to build on the Green belt | Policies should include TDC core strategy now removed from local plan | Restrict development generally and on Oxted services site | The Spatial Strategy LNP1 is not a policy | Plan does not address change in demographics | One housing site should be identified (Old Allotments) | Prevent sprawl by having small pocket developments | For Glebe field involve Diocese of Southwark who could have building plans | Small infills rather than extensions | Other |
| 5   | 3  | 3   | 3   | 1   | 1  | 1  | 1  | 3  | 1                                    | 0     |

153 respondents replied (max 153) with 127 (83%) agreeing with the Spatial Strategy policy. 10 (7%) respondents disagreed and 16 (10%) had no strong view.

21 respondents (14% of 153) made 22 different comments of which 10 were to express strong support. Of the 12 remainder, the highest number (5) were against any development in the Green Belt although 3 respondents thought the opposite. Restricting development, re-instating TDC core strategies removed in the new Local Plan and consulting with the Diocese of Southwark about the Glebe Field as a Green Space all featured equally with 3 comments each. The only direct criticisms of the PS Plan were 1 comment that LNP1 Spatial Strategy was “not a policy”, 1 comment that a housing development site should have been identified (the Old Allotments) and 1 comment that the PS Plan did not take account of the change in demographics over the plan period.

Although the Spatial Strategy policy is rather general, it does layout the approach to approving developments. Allocating development sites was carefully considered in relation to the needs identified in the Household Survey but no major developments were required. However, the Old Allotment site was carefully considered because of its closeness to the Village and general suitability, but was not allocated since it is the Green Belt and such “exceptional circumstances” developments are delegated to TDC as the local authority responsible. The 1 comment about the change in demographics is reflected in the LNP2/3 policies for meeting housing the need for downsizing, apartments and sheltered accommodation for the aging population but the impact of demographic changes on Spatial Strategy should be considered and amendments made. The 3 comments about re-instating TDC core strategies now removed is addressed under LNP2.

6. Open Question 3 Housing Development within the Built-up Area (LNP 2 policy)

| 3 Housing within built-up area                    |  |   |  |   |  |   |  |  |                         |       |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------|
|   |  | Agree   | Disagree   | No strong view                                | Totals   |   |  |  |                         |       |
| No. respondents                                   |  | 115   | 19   | 19  | 153  |   |  |  |                         |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |  | 75%   | 12%  | 12%   | 100%   |   |  |  |                         |       |
| No. that strongly agree / disagree                |  | 0   | 0  | N/A   | -  |   |  |  |                         |       |
| No. of comments (incl. strongly agree / disagree) |  | 25  | 17   | 5   | 47   |   |  |  |                         |       |
| Percent of total comments                         |  | 53%   | 36%  | 11%   | 100%   |   |  |  |                         |       |
| No. of respondents commented                      |  | 19  | 15   | 5   | 39   |   |  |  |                         |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |  | 12%   | 10%  | 3%  | 25%  |   |  |  |                         |       |
| Summary Headings & Number of Comments             |  |   |  |   |  |   |  |  |                         |       |
| No development and too much infill                | New housing must be in character and include density and not overdevelopment | Smaller houses must not be high density, be of adequate size and not impact value of area | Support for young people and downsizers / 2/3 bed properties | Need affordable homes for essential personnel | Must be off-road parking for new house, apartments and sheltered accommodation | Plan does not address change in demographic | Developments should maintain gap between other settlements / no back garden infill | Want low rise developments and no flats / convert larger houses into flats | Need for infrastructure | Other |
| 8   | 10   | 5   | 5  | 2   | 2  | 1   | 3  | 2  | 3                       | 6     |

153 respondents replied (max 153) with 115 (75%) agreeing with the Housing within the Built-up Area policy. 19 (12%) respondents disagreed and 19 (12%) had no strong view. Reflecting that this was the lowest number of “Agreed” (and highest number of “Disagree”) respondents compared to all other questions and policies, it was also the second highest number of comments (47) made by 39 respondents (25% of 153) on this policy. There were no strong comments in support.

Predictable comments reiterated the importance of developments being “in character” (10), not wanting development at all (8) and the need for infrastructure (3). 5 comments emphasised that small houses must not be high density and should be of adequate size and another 5 comments reiterated the need for houses for young people and for downsizers with 2 mentioning the need for affordable housing for “essential personnel”. Design aspects were also commented upon, of interest being the call for “low rise but no flats” (1 of 2) offset by one wanting larger houses converted into flats (1 of 2) and the need for adequate off-road parking provision.

*The lowest level of Agreement for LNP2 compared to all other policies could be attributed to the briefness of the leaflet summary that itself reflects the briefness and blandness of the PS Plan LNP2. One reason is that detailed design policies, especially for the separate “character areas” in the Built-up Area are addressed elsewhere in much detail and so the policy LNP2 appears weak in this regard. Although character is adequately covered elsewhere, the issues raised in the comments about density, gaps between houses, infill and flats (needed according to the Household Survey but it seems resisted by potential neighbours) should be addressed in LNP2 and currently they are not.*



7. Open Question 4 Housing Type and Mix (LNP 3 policy)

| 4 Housing Type and Mix                                   |   |   |  |                                 |  |   |   |                                     |       |
|--|---|---|--|---------------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|-------|
|  |   | Agree   | Disagree   | No strong view                  | Totals   |   |   |                                     |       |
| <b>No. respondents</b>                                   |   | 124   | 17   | 12                              | 153  |   |   |                                     |       |
| <b>Percent of total respondents</b>                      |   | 81%   | 11%  | 8%                              | 100%   |   |   |                                     |       |
| <b>No. that strongly agree / disagree</b>                |   | 0   | 0  | N/A                             | -  |   |   |                                     |       |
| <b>No. of comments (incl. strongly agree / disagree)</b> |   | 23  | 12   | 7                               | 42   |   |   |                                     |       |
| <b>Percent of total comments</b>                         |   | 55%   | 29%  | 17%                             | 100%   |   |   |                                     |       |
| <b>No. of respondents commented</b>                      |   | 22  | 12   | 7                               | 41   |   |   |                                     |       |
| <b>Percent of total respondents</b>                      |   | 14%   | 8%   | 5%                              | 27%  |   |   |                                     |       |
| Summary Headings & Number of Comments                    |   |   |  |                                 |  |   |   |                                     |       |
| Require 3 or fewer bed properties                        | Policy is appropriate mix of houses to meet all needs | Support smaller houses & smaller houses to meet local need only | Need for low cost housing and affordable housing | Developments to be in character | Against smaller houses/flats / do not over build | Market demand will determine house type and mix | Character, density, infill, infrastructure issues important | Tighter controls and clearer policy | Other |
| 5  | 4   | 7   | 4  | 2                               | 7  | 2   | 7   | 4                                   | 0     |

153 respondents replied (max 153) with 124 (81%) agreeing with the Housing Type and Mix policy. 17 (11%) respondents disagreed and 12 (8%) had no strong view. Reflecting that this was the second-lowest number of “Agreed” and second-highest number of “Disagree” respondents compared to all other questions and policies, there were also the third highest number of comments (42) made by 41 respondents (27% of 153) on this policy. As with LNP2, there were no strong comments in support.

Comments were well balanced as regards the need for smaller houses. 7 comments supported the building of smaller houses (most only to meet local need) with 7 comments against smaller houses and flats. 5 comments required 3 or fewer bedroom properties and 4 comments thought the policy mix proposed met all needs. There were 4 comments reiterating the need for low cost and affordable housing partly offset by 2 comments that market demand will determine house type. Specifically addressing the PS Plan, 4 comments asked for tighter controls and clearer policy.

*Unlike LNP2, LNP3 was very detailed and perhaps too complicated but the comments response to the policy was balanced as might be hoped for since one cannot meet every resident’s individual need. The resistance to PS Plan LNP3 from TDC that it does not provide the “flexibility” they desire in the new Local Plan will necessitate a further review of this policy but the balanced comments received from residents implies the current policy is on the right track. The need for low cost and affordable housing is adequately noted in the policy as delegated to TDC. The criticism that tighter controls and a clear policy is required (4 comments) should be born in mind in the re-drafting of LNP3.*

8. Open Question 5 Managing Design in the Built-up Area (LNP 4 policy)

| 5 Managing Design in built-up area                |                          |  |  |  |                                     |  |  |       |       |
|---|--------------------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|-------|-------|
|   |                          | Agree  | Disagree   | No strong view                               | Totals                              |  |  |       |       |
| No. respondents                                   |                          | 136  | 4  | 13   | 153                                 |  |  |       |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |                          | 89%  | 3%   | 8%   | 100%                                |  |  |       |       |
| No. that strongly agree / disagree                |                          | 2  | 0  | N/A  | 2                                   |  |  |       |       |
| No. of comments (incl. strongly agree / disagree) |                          | 18   | 2  | 3  | 23                                  |  |  |       |       |
| Percent of total comments                         |                          | 78%  | 9%   | 13%  | 100%                                |  |  |       |       |
| No. of respondents commented                      |                          | 17   | 2  | 3  | 22                                  |  |  |       |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |                          | 11%  | 1%   | 2%   | 14%                                 |  |  |       |       |
| Summary Headings & Number of Comments             |                          |  |  |  |                                     |  |  |       |       |
| Protect character / leafy street scenes           | Smaller houses preferred | Restrict over large extensions and building in front gardens | Innovative bold design required so dwellings spacious & environmentally friendly | No new builds or flats on single house sites | New developments to be in character | Tighter controls needed / proposals too subjective | New development to be in keeping with existing design and size | Other | Other |
| 2   | 2                        | 2  | 6  | 2  | 3                                   | 2  | 1  | 0     | 0     |

153 respondents replied (max 153) with 136 (89%) agreeing with the Housing Design in the Built-up Area policy. 4 (3%) respondents disagreed and 13 (8%) had no strong view.

22 respondents (14% of 153) made 23 different comments of which 2 were to express strong support. Of the 21 remainder, the highest number (6) was to encourage innovative design so buildings were spacious and environmentally friendly. Offsetting this was that designs should be in character (2+3+1= 6 comments). The other comments are not relevant design comments, except the objection to flats.

Policy LNP4 seems well supported but the 6 comments about the need for “innovative design” could conflict with the emphasis in the current PS Plan on retaining the existing character in the specific areas. Some acknowledgement to innovative design should be incorporated in this policy to ensure that Limpsfield does not stand-still architecturally. The 2 comments about “tighter controls” and it being “too subjective” are repeated comments from 2 of the 4 respondents making the same comment about LNP3 but they are not warranted here.

9. Open Question 6 Limpsfield Village Conservation Area (LNP 5 policy)

| 6 Limpsfield Village Conservation                 |  |                      |   |                                      |                  |                   |       |       |       |
|---|--|----------------------|---|--------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|
|   |  | Agree                | Disagree  | No strong view                       | Totals           |                   |       |       |       |
| No. respondents                                   |  | 139                  | 5   | 9                                    | 153              |                   |       |       |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |  | 91%                  | 3%  | 6%                                   | 100%             |                   |       |       |       |
| No. that strongly agree / disagree                |  | 3                    | 0   | N/A                                  | 3                |                   |       |       |       |
| No. of comments (incl. strongly agree / disagree) |  | 17                   | 5   | -                                    | 22               |                   |       |       |       |
| Percent of total comments                         |  | 77%                  | 23%   | 0%                                   | 100%             |                   |       |       |       |
| No. of respondents commented                      |  | 15                   | 5   | -                                    | 20               |                   |       |       |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |  | 10%                  | 3%  | 0%                                   | 13%              |                   |       |       |       |
| Summary Headings & Number of Comments             |  |                      |   |                                      |                  |                   |       |       |       |
| Discourage / more control on any development      | Provide more parking reduce congestion | Restrict HGs / Buses | Promote local business / minimise change of use | No special treatment for the Village | Retain character | Too many provisos | Other | Other | Other |
| 4   | 3                                      | 4                    | 2   | 2                                    | 3                | 1                 | 0     | 0     | 0     |

153 respondents replied (max 153) with 139 (91%) agreeing with the Limpsfield Village Conservation policy. 5 (3%) respondents disagreed and 9 (6%) had no strong view.

20 respondents (13% of 153) made 20 different comments of which 3 were to express strong support. Of the 17 remainder, the two highest number (4 each) was to restrict development and restrict HGVs from the Village. Parking and congestion follow this with 3 comments each. These issues, and the others mentioned, are all addressed in LNP 5.

There was a very high agreement to this policy with no comments that were particularly new or revealing. When reviewing this policy the single comment that “there are too many provisos” should be checked.

10. Open Question 7 Landscape Character (LNP 6 policy)

| 7 Landscape Character   |                                       |  |                     |        |       |       |       |       |       |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|   | Agree                                 | Disagree   | No strong view      | Totals |       |       |       |       |       |
| No. respondents   | 138                                   | 6  | 9                   | 153    |       |       |       |       |       |
| Percent of total respondents  | 90%                                   | 4%   | 6%                  | 100%   |       |       |       |       |       |
| No. that strongly agree / disagree  | 4                                     | 0  | N/A                 | 4      |       |       |       |       |       |
| No. of comments (incl. strongly   | 8                                     | 4  | 1                   | 13     |       |       |       |       |       |
| Percent of total comments   | 62%                                   | 31%  | 8%                  | 100%   |       |       |       |       |       |
| No. of respondents commented  | 8                                     | 4  | 1                   | 13     |       |       |       |       |       |
| Percent of total respondents  | 5%                                    | 3%   | 1%                  | 8%     |       |       |       |       |       |
| Summary Headings & Number of Comments   |                                       |  |                     |        |       |       |       |       |       |
| AONB should be extended to cover High Chart, to Kent border & areas LC04 and LC05 | Conserve Glebe Field & No development | Some development could occur e.g. as affordable "cottages" | Not fully addressed | Other  | Other | Other | Other | Other | Other |
| 2   | 3                                     | 3  | 1                   | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     |

153 respondents replied (max 153) with 138 (90%) agreeing with the Landscape Character policy. 6 (4%) respondents disagreed and 9 (6%) had no strong view.

Only 13 respondents (8% of 153) made 13 different comments of which 4 were to express strong support. Of the 9 remainder, the two highest number (3 each) called for the Glebe Field to be protected from development and that “affordable cottages”, one assumes regardless of the landscape. The 2 comments calling for the AONB to be extended is understandable but not a realistic policy to pursue in the NP.

*There was a very high agreement to this policy with no comments that were particularly new or revealing.*

11. Open Question 8 Local Heritage Assets (LNP 7 policy)

| 8 Local Heritage Assets               |                                   |                     |                              |                                |        |       |       |       |       |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|                                       |                                   | Agree               | Disagree                     | No strong view                 | Totals |       |       |       |       |
| No. respondents                       |                                   | 144                 | 1                            | 8                              | 153    |       |       |       |       |
| Percent of total respondents          |                                   | 94%                 | 1%                           | 5%                             | 100%   |       |       |       |       |
| No. that strongly agree / disagree    |                                   | 4                   | 0                            | N/A                            | 4      |       |       |       |       |
| No. of comments (incl. strongly       |                                   | 12                  | -                            | -                              | 12     |       |       |       |       |
| Percent of total comments             |                                   | 100%                | 0%                           | 0%                             | 100%   |       |       |       |       |
| No. of respondents commented          |                                   | 11                  | -                            | -                              | 11     |       |       |       |       |
| Percent of total respondents          |                                   | 7%                  | 0%                           | 0%                             | 7%     |       |       |       |       |
| Summary Headings & Number of Comments |                                   |                     |                              |                                |        |       |       |       |       |
| Drinking fountain should be added     | Archaeology sites should be added | Not a complete list | Where is funding for review? | Only designate if very special | Other  | Other | Other | Other | Other |
| 2                                     | 2                                 | 1                   | 1                            | 1                              | 1      | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     |

153 respondents replied (max 153) with 144 (94%) agreeing with the Local Heritage Assets policy, the highest level of agreement of all policies. 1 (1%) respondent disagreed and 8 (5%) had no strong view.

Only 11 respondents (7% of 153) made 12 different comments of which 4 were to express strong support. Of the 8 remainder, the highest (2) called for archaeology sites to be protected.

*There was a very high agreement to this policy which already includes an undertaking to review archaeology sites and no further changes are deemed necessary.*

12. Open Question 9 Local Green Spaces (LNP 8 policy)

| 9 Local Green Spaces                              |  |                                   |   |  |                             |                                 |  |  |       |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|-------|
|   |  | Agree                             | Disagree  | No strong view                                     | Totals                      |                                 |  |  |       |
| No. respondents                                   |  | 129                               | 10  | 14   | 153                         |                                 |  |  |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |  | 84%                               | 7%  | 9%   | 100%                        |                                 |  |  |       |
| No. that strongly agree / disagree                |  | 5                                 | 0   | N/A  | 5                           |                                 |  |  |       |
| No. of comments (incl. strongly agree / disagree) |  | 14                                | 6   | 4  | 24                          |                                 |  |  |       |
| Percent of total comments                         |  | 58%                               | 25%   | 17%  | 100%                        |                                 |  |  |       |
| No. of respondents commented                      |  | 12                                | 6   | 4  | 22                          |                                 |  |  |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |  | 8%                                | 4%  | 3%   | 14%                         |                                 |  |  |       |
| Summary Headings & Number of Comments             |  |                                   |   |  |                             |                                 |  |  |       |
| No development even in exceptional circumstances  | Too many Green Spaces (Boulthurst Way & Pastens Reservoir) | Some Green Spaces seem very small | More use of Glebe Field & Meadow/ Helps urban area "breath" | Should be more Green Spaces in any new development | Support Carpenter Arms area | Could be part of social housing | The Diocese can't support Glebe Meadow/Field as a LGS. | Some areas should be return to natural grassland | Other |
| 4   | 5  | 1                                 | 2   | 1  | 1                           | 1                               | 1  | 1  | 2     |

153 respondents replied (max 153) with 129 (84%) agreeing with the Local Green Spaces policy. 10 (7%) respondents disagreed and 14 (9%) had no strong view.

22 respondents (14% of 153) made 24 different comments of which 5 were to express strong support. Of the 19 remainder, the highest (5) considered that there were too many Green Spaces nominated in the PS Plan, in particular that the Boulthurst Way and Pastens Reservoir spaces should be removed. No development of the proposed spaces was supported by 4 comments, but this is part of the designation. An interesting and useful comment made by one respondent was that there should be Green Spaces designated in any new development. The full comment is worth repeating here: "But feel there should be more (green spaces). If we continue to extend out from existing developments you will need to find more of these. Those developments on the fringe, like Bay Trees and the Hollies, do not have a green space, nor have they needed one due to their proximity with fields. Start extending beyond these and suddenly it is just one massive sprawl of houses with the closest open space being Hurst Green - too far to let your kids safely go and play on their own"

*The existing list of Green Spaces is due to be reviewed but also the valuable comment quoted above suggests a need to include a reference in LNP8 to Green Spaces to be incorporated in any sizable new developments (in the built-up area to be incorporated in LNP2 and/or LNP4), including in respect of any TDC development in the Green Belt).*

13. Open Question 10 Promoting Biodiversity (LNP 9 policy)

| 10 Promoting Biodiversity                         |  |   |                                 |                |        |   |       |       |       |
|---|--|---|---------------------------------|----------------|--------|---|-------|-------|-------|
|   |  | Agree   | Disagree                        | No strong view | Totals | Note: Total responses add 1 for those that did not answer question but made comment |       |       |       |
| No. respondents                                   |  | 127   | 3                               | 22             | 152    |   |       |       |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |  | 84%   | 2%                              | 14%            | 100%   |   |       |       |       |
| No. that strongly agree / disagree                |  | 4   | 1                               | N/A            | 5      |   |       |       |       |
| No. of comments (incl. strongly agree / disagree) |  | 5   | 4                               | -              | 10     |   |       |       |       |
| Percent of total comments                         |  | 50%   | 40%                             | 0%             | 100%   |   |       |       |       |
| No. of respondents commented                      |  | 4   | 3                               | -              | 7      |   |       |       |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |  | 3%  | 2%                              | 0%             | 5%     |   |       |       |       |
| Summary Headings & Number of Comments             |  |   |                                 |                |        |   |       |       |       |
| Assessment before development                     | An assessment should be made of protected species, ancient woodland, archaeology, etc. as part of LNP4 (Design)/LNP5 (Conservation Area) | Protect wildlife and expand view of diversity | Houses more important than bats | Other          | Other  | Other   | Other | Other | Other |
| 1   | 1  | 2   | 1                               | 0              | 0      | 0   | 0     | 0     | 0     |

152 respondents replied (max 153 – 1 skipped but made a comment) with 127 (84%) agreeing with the Promoting Biodiversity policy. 3 (2%) respondents disagreed and 22 (14%) had no strong view.

7 respondents (5% of 152) made 10 different comments of which 4 were to express strong support and 1 strongly disagreed. Of the 5 remainder, the highest (2) wanted to protect wildlife and expand the view of diversity. Of the other comments, 1 +1 = 2 suggested that prior assessment be made before any development.

*There was a high-level agreement to this policy with only a few comments. Although planning requirements already require a biodiversity statement, based on the comments here a more proactive approach could be taken by the Parish Council to wildlife/biodiversity assessment as part of an NP policy and this could be incorporated into the plan.*

14. Open Question 11 Employment & Business across the Parish (LNP 10 policy)

| 11 Employment & Business                          |                              |  |   |   |                                  |       |       |       |       |
|---|------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|   |                              | Agree  | Disagree  | No strong view                                      | Totals                           |       |       |       |       |
| No. respondents                                   |                              | 133  | 3   | 17  | 153                              |       |       |       |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |                              | 87%  | 2%  | 11%   | 100%                             |       |       |       |       |
| No. that strongly agree / disagree                |                              | 4  | 0   | N/A   | 4                                |       |       |       |       |
| No. of comments (incl. strongly agree / disagree) |                              | 14   | 3   | 2   | 19                               |       |       |       |       |
| Percent of total comments                         |                              | 74%  | 16%   | 11%   | 100%                             |       |       |       |       |
| No. of respondents commented                      |                              | 14   | 3   | 2   | 19                               |       |       |       |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |                              | 9%   | 2%  | 1%  | 12%                              |       |       |       |       |
| Summary Headings & Number of Comments             |                              |  |   |   |                                  |       |       |       |       |
| Parking/congestion needs to be addressed          | Business rates are a problem | Support required for shops - regeneration, funding | Not enough facilities / no change of use in High Street | Should not impact adjoining residents / environment | Would like to work in Limpsfield | Other | Other | Other | Other |
| 4   | 2                            | 3  | 2   | 3   | 1                                | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     |

153 respondents replied (max 153) with 133 (87%) agreeing with the Employment & Business policy. 3 (2%) respondents disagreed and 17 (11%) had no strong view.

19 respondents (12% of 153) made 19 different comments of which 4 were to express strong support. Of the 15 remainder, the highest number (4) wanted to parking and congestion to be addressed. This was followed by 3 comments supporting existing shops with 3 comments about there should be no adverse impact on adjoining residents or environment.

*There was a high-level agreement to this policy and the comments made are already well reflected in the draft policy.*



15. Open Question 12 Rural Economy (LNP 11 policy)

| 12 Rural Economy   |  |                 |                    |                                |        |       |       |       |       |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|  |  | Agree           | Disagree           | No strong view                 | Totals |       |       |       |       |
| <b>No. respondents</b>                                   |  | 128             | 5                  | 19                             | 152    |       |       |       |       |
| <b>Percent of total respondents</b>                      |  | 84%             | 3%                 | 13%                            | 100%   |       |       |       |       |
| <b>No. that strongly agree / disagree</b>                |  | 1               | 0                  | N/A                            | 1      |       |       |       |       |
| <b>No. of comments (incl. strongly agree / disagree)</b> |  | 7               | 4                  | -                              | 11     |       |       |       |       |
| <b>Percent of total comments</b>                         |  | 64%             | 36%                | 0%                             | 100%   |       |       |       |       |
| <b>No. of respondents commented</b>                      |  | 7               | 3                  | -                              | 10     |       |       |       |       |
| <b>Percent of total respondents</b>                      |  | 5%              | 2%                 | 0%                             | 7%     |       |       |       |       |
| Summary Headings & Number of Comments                    |  |                 |                    |                                |        |       |       |       |       |
| Support farms / Green Belt                               | Limited change or diversification for farm buildings | No new building | Allow new building | No mention of Limpsfield Chart | Other  | Other | Other | Other | Other |
| 5  | 2  | 1               | 1                  | 1                              | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     |

152 respondents replied (max 153 – 1 skipped) with 128 (84%) agreeing with the Rural Economy policy. 5 (3%) respondents disagreed and 19 (13%) had no strong view.

10 respondents (7% of 152) made 11 different comments of which 1 was to express strong support. Of the 10 remainder, the highest number (5) wanted to support farms and the Green Belt.

*There was a high-level agreement to this policy and the comments made are already well reflected in the draft policy.*

16. Open Question 13 Community Services in Oxted Town Centre (LNP 12 policy)

| 13 Community Service Oxted                        |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |   |       |       |       |
|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|-------|-------|-------|
|   |                                  | Agree                                 | Disagree   | No strong view                         | Totals                                     | Note: Total responses add 1 for those that did not answer question but made comment |       |       |       |
| No. respondents                                   |                                  | 136                                   | 6  | 10                                     | 152  |   |       |       |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |                                  | 89%                                   | 4%   | 7%                                     | 100%                                       |   |       |       |       |
| No. that strongly agree / disagree                |                                  | 2                                     | 0  | N/A                                    | 2  |   |       |       |       |
| No. of comments (incl. strongly agree / disagree) |                                  | 13                                    | 5  | 2                                      | 21   |   |       |       |       |
| Percent of total comments                         |                                  | 62%                                   | 24%  | 10%                                    | 100%                                       |   |       |       |       |
| No. of respondents commented                      |                                  | 12                                    | 5  | 2                                      | 19   |   |       |       |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |                                  | 8%                                    | 3%   | 1%                                     | 13%  |   |       |       |       |
| Summary Headings & Number of Comments             |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |   |       |       |       |
| Keep Health Centre / Library here                 | Reduce pressure on Health Centre | No development of Oxted services site | Okay to develop Oxted services site mix for used / affordable housing if services improved | Need services for changing demographic | Need for infrastructure before development | Other   | Other | Other | Other |
| 7   | 5                                | 2                                     | 3  | 1                                      | 1  | 0   | 0     | 0     | 0     |

152 respondents replied (max 153 – 1 skipped but made a comment) with 136 (89%) agreeing with the Community Services in Oxted Town Centre policy. 6 (4%) respondents disagreed and 10 (7%) had no strong view.

19 respondents (13% of 152) made 21 different comments of which 2 expressed strong support. Of the 19 remainder, the highest number (7) wanted to keep the Health Centre and Library where they were. Reducing pressure on the Health Centre by having satellite surgeries is always favoured but is not within the remit of the NP, even if clinically acceptable. The 2 “no” comments to development of the services were off-set by the 3 comments supporting mixed type development.

*There was a high-level agreement to this policy and the comments made are already well reflected in the draft policy.*

17. Open Question 14 Community Services in Limpsfield Village (LNP 13 policy)

| 14 Community Service Limpsfield                   |                           |                                  |                   |                            |  |   |                                   |                      |       |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------|
|   |                           | Agree                            | Disagree          | No strong view             | Totals                                 |   |                                   |                      |       |
| No. respondents                                   |                           | 134                              | 3                 | 16                         | 153                                    |   |                                   |                      |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |                           | 88%                              | 2%                | 10%                        | 100%                                   |   |                                   |                      |       |
| No. that strongly agree / disagree                |                           | 2                                | 0                 | N/A                        | 2                                      |   |                                   |                      |       |
| No. of comments (incl. strongly agree / disagree) |                           | 14                               | 2                 | -                          | 16                                     |   |                                   |                      |       |
| Percent of total comments                         |                           | 88%                              | 13%               | 0%                         | 100%                                   |   |                                   |                      |       |
| No. of respondents commented                      |                           | 14                               | 1                 | -                          | 15                                     |   |                                   |                      |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |                           | 9%                               | 1%                | 0%                         | 10%                                    |   |                                   |                      |       |
| Summary Headings & Number of Comments             |                           |                                  |                   |                            |  |   |                                   |                      |       |
| Make alternative hub to Oxted                     | Reduce traffic congestion | Improve church hall / facilities | Need new cemetery | Need playground in Village | Support local shops, protect character | Have a "visiting GP" surgery in Village | Community services in other parts | Maintain Glebe Field | Other |
| 1   | 1                         | 2                                | 1                 | 3                          | 2                                      | 1                                       | 1                                 | 1                    | 1     |

153 respondents replied (max 153) with 134 (88%) agreeing with the Community Services in Limpsfield Village and other Parts of the Parish policy. 3 (2%) respondents disagreed and 16 (10%) had no strong view.

15 respondents (10% of 153) made 16 different comments of which 2 expressed strong support. Of the 14 remainder, the highest number (3) wanted to have a playground in the environs of the Village. Other comments were wide-ranging although improving the church hall facility (2 comments) and the need for an expanded or additional cemetery (1 comment) are most relevant as well as the 1 comment saying “.... community services should be fostered elsewhere in the Parish, not just in the Conservation Area”.

*There was a high-level agreement to this policy and generally the comments are already well reflected in the PS Plan. However, the specific services mentioned in the comments for a playground in the Village (that found good support in the Household Survey – see Section 8.2) and the need for an expanded cemetery (St. Peter’s grave yard having limited new capacity) should be reviewed for inclusion, particularly since these facilities are often provided by the local Parish Council. (e.g. as in Oxted).*

18. Open Question 15 Sustainable Transport, Access & Car Parking (LNP 14 policy)

| 15 Sustainable Transport, Access & Parking        |              |              |                         |  |                 |                 |   |   |       |
|---|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|---|---|-------|
|   |              | Agree        | Disagree                | No strong view                                 | Totals          |                 |   |   |       |
| No. respondents                                   |              | 133          | 7                       | 12   | 152             |                 |   |   |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |              | 88%          | 5%                      | 8%   | 100%            |                 |   |   |       |
| No. that strongly agree / disagree                |              | 1            | 0                       | N/A  | 1               |                 |   |   |       |
| No. of comments (incl. strongly agree / disagree) |              | 34           | 8                       | 7  | 49              |                 |   |   |       |
| Percent of total comments                         |              | 69%          | 16%                     | 14%  | 100%            |                 |   |   |       |
| No. of respondents commented                      |              | 28           | 6                       | 4  | 38              |                 |   |   |       |
| Percent of total respondents                      |              | 18%          | 4%                      | 3%   | 25%             |                 |   |   |       |
| Summary Headings & Number of Comments             |              |              |                         |  |                 |                 |   |   |       |
| Restrict HGVs                                     | More parking | Less parking | Better public transport | Solutions for traffic congestion / High Street | More cycle ways | Less cycle ways | Electric charge points for cars /cycles | Specific road safety requests (Bluehouse Lane, Snatts Hill) | Other |
| 3   | 9            | 4            | 5                       | 6  | 3               | 2               | 4                                       | 4   | 8     |

152 respondents replied (max 153 – 1 skipped) with 133 (88%) agreeing with the Sustainable Transport, Access & Car Parking policy. 7 (5%) respondents disagreed and 12 (8%) had no strong view.

38 respondents (25% of 152) made 49 different comments of which 1 expressed strong support. This was the highest number of comments made on any policy related question. Of the 48 remainder, the highest number (9) wanted more parking being partly off-set by 4 comments wanting less. “Solutions” for congestion and restrictions on HGVs drew 6+3=9 comments, around half referring to problems in Limpsfield High Street. Better public transport attracted 5 comments and, as in the household Survey, the support for more cycle ways (3) was offset by those against (2). Electric charging point for cars and cycles and as specific road safety requests drew 4 comments each. There were 8 single comments gathered under “Other” comments, none adding particularly to the policy as drafted except the single but pertinent criticism the “nothing specific proposed”.

*Despite the large number and diverse comments, at 88% agreement (5% disagreement) there was a high level of support for this policy. An area commented upon and not specifically addressed in the PS Plan was the need for electric charging points for cycles. The criticism about “solutions” for traffic and the single “nothing specific proposed” comment fail to see that in Section 6 of the PS Plan various steps are set out to address traffic congestion and parking. When making the reference to Section 6 in the policy text adding a summary of these steps should assure the reader that plan projects would address these issues.*

19. Open Question 16 Connecting the Parish (LNP 15 policy)

| 16 Connecting the Parish  |                                       |  |                                    |                                   |        |       |       |       |       |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|   |                                       | Agree  | Disagree                           | No strong view                    | Totals |       |       |       |       |
| No. respondents   |                                       | 134  | 2                                  | 17                                | 153    |       |       |       |       |
| Percent of total respondents  |                                       | 88%  | 1%                                 | 11%                               | 100%   |       |       |       |       |
| No. that strongly agree / disagree  |                                       | 3  | 0                                  | N/A                               | 3      |       |       |       |       |
| No. of comments (incl. strongly agree / disagree)   |                                       | 12   | 1                                  | 3                                 | 16     |       |       |       |       |
| Percent of total comments   |                                       | 75%  | 6%                                 | 19%                               | 100%   |       |       |       |       |
| No. of respondents commented  |                                       | 10   | 1                                  | 3                                 | 14     |       |       |       |       |
| Percent of total respondents  |                                       | 7%   | 1%                                 | 2%                                | 9%     |       |       |       |       |
| Summary Headings & Number of Comments   |                                       |  |                                    |                                   |        |       |       |       |       |
| Broadband to keep up with technology, not good coverage, what is cost, will suppliers improve | Broadband adverse impact on character | Broadband makes area more attractive / able to work from home / it is urgent | Need for footpaths to connect area | Broadband good but not imperative | Other  | Other | Other | Other | Other |
| 5   | 2                                     | 3  | 2                                  | 1                                 | 0      | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     |

153 respondents replied (max 153) with 134 (88%) agreeing with the Connecting the Parish policy. Only 2 (1%) respondents disagreed and 17 (11%) had no strong view.

14 respondents (9% of 153) made 16 different comments of which 3 expressed strong support. Of the 13 remainder, the highest number (5) expressed concern about the technology and coverage of Broadband. 3 comments supported Broadband but this was partly off-set by 2+1=3 comments concerned on character or it not being imperative. 2 comments raised the issue of the need for footpaths to better connect the area.

*The Broadband issues raised are well addressed in the PS Plan policy but to the extent that no other “connectivity” policy is included. 2 comments pointed to the need for footpaths to connect the area and in the Household Survey there was good support for upgrading connecting footpaths (Section 7.10 & Figure 17), for cycle ways (Figure 18) albeit with reservations and many open question comments supporting walking, cycling and buses for local journeys (Sections 7.19 to 7.23). Policy LNP 15 is currently deficient in not addressing the broader “connectivity” issues in the Parish.*

## APPENDIX A

To follow

## APPENDIX B

To follow