

## **INDEX FOR STAKEHOLDER MEETING NOTES**

<b>Meeting Note</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
Overview of first round of stakeholder meetings (Dec 2016)	2
with BT	7
with Diocese of Southwark	9
with East Surrey College	11
with Environment Agency	13
with Historic England	15
with National Trust	17
with Limpsfield Infant School	19
with Oxted Health Centre	21
with Surrey CC (Heritage)	23
with Surrey CC (Highways)	25
with Surrey Hills (ANOB)	28
with Titsey Estate	30
views from businesses in station road east	32

## **Overview of First Round of Stakeholder Discussions (Dec 2016)**

(1) Oxted Parish Council – seeing clerk on 29 Nov Limpsfield coffee Shop 11am with Oxted Chair and either LPC chair/NP chair

MW and GHD met Liz Parker (LP) and Oxted Clerk. Key points covered were:

- GHD gave an overview and state of play of the Limpsfield NP to LP and Oxted Clerk
- Oxted PC very pleased to be consulted in this way
- Oxted still undecided on whether to do an NP
- Oxted PC felt Nat Trust, Oxted Bid and Limpsfield Infant school as well as Titsey estate (which we already have on our lists – MW is seeing head off Limpsfield infant School)
- Oxted PC keen to see LPC's budget breakdown the Limpsfield NP – MW agreed to provide this via GHD (actioned on 6 Dec).
- CR3 NP had a budget of around £50k, but process had been very complex with 106 site assessments done
- CR3 reported that they used AECOM and found them a little unresponsive, and needing to be chased
- CR3 NP have got a £20k Govt grant for being an early adopter of the NP process
- GHD agreed to keep Oxted PC up to speed on progress on the Limpsfield NP
- MW used the meeting to also cover other areas of mutual interest, CIL, footpaths, snow angels

(2) Environment Agency – phone conversations – no major concerns – support designation of brook field as local green space as falls within flood zone 3. Suggest we should engage with south east water and southern water. EA happy to look through draft NP. Email sent to Sutton and East Surrey (30/11/16) to ask about any difficulties about water supply – EA thought there may well be.

- (3) Oxted and Limpsfield's Residents Group – Philip attended with me for this meeting, as they are such a key stakeholder. 2pm berry house 30 Nov (martin has fed in some questions for this session)

#### Key issues discussed with Ian and Catherine from OLRG

- OLRG very unhappy with TDC analysis which has come up with a housing need of 9400 for the district and they are actively challenging it
- OLRG very unhappy that Oxted is placed above Caterham, as biggest urban centre meaning it will attract more housing – OLRG says evidence does not support this and they are challenging
- OLRG getting independent assessment of TCD sites including those in Limpsfield, which will guide their comments into the TDC sites consultation document
- OLRG suggested we ask rCOH to look at the issues they have with TDC, which Philip is taking forward
- OLRG recognise affordable housing for down-sizing and key workers is key across district
- OLRG recognise that no development is not likely to be a credible option
- OLRG keen not to cut across Limpsfield NP, and very grateful for the dialogue

- (4) OXTED BID/Limpsfield Traders – met with Sue McGowan (Oxted bid) - 5<sup>th</sup> December 10 am - Café Nero – key points:

- Oxted bid's main issue as well as supporting the Oxted shops, is to improve parking and they are currently awaiting the outcome of the current TDC parking review – they expect to hear late January – double decking ellice road and/or TDC car park are both things they support
- Oxted bid have done some work on charging for parking, but won't share this as their agreed stance is that parking should be free
- Oxted bid wondered if there was any way which local people could be prioritized to have access to local parking

- 80 paid for parking spaces currently in ellce road and Johnsdale at a cost of £500 a year
- Oxted bid keen that cycling infrastructure is improved, and very supportive up improving the network of footpaths and pavements
- Oxted have no contact with Limpsfield traders (whom I have now contacted separately – awaiting a call back)

Limpsfield High Street traders - awaiting call back from Glynis Johnstone

(5) Tandridge Voluntary Service Council – fixed with Lynn Martin manager of the TVSC (30<sup>th</sup> Nov 10am – Oxted Lib).

Key points from the vol sector were:

- Very concerned about the state of health and social care services – would support a case for a health service facility in HG, and agreed case for this stronger than for Limpsfield village
- Agree walking should be promoted and welcome anything done to promote this including better footpaths
- Agree that the downsizes and key workers should be provided with affordable housing – wondered whether the latter group would be easier to cater for in HG, as Limpsfield prices may not go down low enough – unless part buy/housing assocs are used.
- Believe LPC should work with Oxted PC when developing its NP, as some of the solutions may lie in the Oxted Parish area
- TVSC had concerns about infrastructure lag
- TVSC were very pleased to be consulted

(6) Titsey Estate/Titsey Parish Meeting (key local land owner) – met with Guy and John Innes. Issues were:

- Keen to protect green spaces
- Keen to protect the character of Limpsfield village
- Believe some building must happen, but be carefully managed in the community or their will be pressure for uncontrolled large amounts of development

- Clearly want to develop old allotments site
- No strong views on types of housing built on their land (old allotments site) and felt that if all 5 sites in the wolfs row/St Michael's school area were developed some green spaces would be need within it Were less against some large houses being built than our survey replies
- Biggest concerns were about parking to ensure the business in Limpsfield high street thrive
- Pleased to be consulted – likely to want a separate meeting with Councillors about other issues outside the Neighbourhood Plan

(7) St Peters Parish Church (representing the churches) -seeking session with Tony S-H from St Peters and Wendy Harvey from St Andrews (5 December 2.30pm) Key issues from St Andrews:

- St Andrews recognised the need for affordable housing, suggestion that flats (via a coverision of a larger of property of bespoke new blocks) might be the answer for lower paid ley workers
- Some concerns about health services
- Worries about the aging population
- Concerns that we do not exclude the housing needs of refugees which Croydon may wish to pass on to us
- Felt that St Andrews and St Peters church hall are under-used
- Felt that the Chart community is very separate from Limpsfield village
- Feel there is scope to make the bus service more relevant to the needs of the community
- Supports the improvement of local footpaths and pavements
- Concerns about speeding traffic on Kent hatch road

(8) Surrey Public Health - left 2 voice mails with Rachel Gill – public health consultant. Spoken to her colleagues and passed on some evidence requests in particular about walking.

(9) National Trust – in contact with Robin Satow – land manager for Nat Trust in our area – Rachel Fletcher is contact from 14 December

Telecon with Nat Trust planners:

- Believe that TDC 9400 housing number is too high – should be challenged – Brighton resisted gov pressure for housing successfully
- In favor of promoting walking, but keen that any footpath upgrades do not hinder the local habitat
- Believe that affordable housing for key workers and downsizers can be very tightly specified (eg bookham np for downsizers)
- Local needs housing assessment could be a two-edged sword – what if it exceeds TDC suggestions
- Keen to protect green space – agree with local green space proposals
- Agree that green belt can be released for housing if local need warrants it
- Keen to stay involved in developing NP – very pleased to have been consulted

(10) Surrey County Council – highways – awaiting an email back.

## LIMPSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

**Clerk to Parish Council:**  
Geoff Dessent

**Tel No:**  
01883 722400  
**e-mail:**  
clerk@limpsfield.org  
[www.limpsfield.org](http://www.limpsfield.org)

**Address:**  
8 Hurst Green Close  
Oxted  
Surrey  
RH8 9AN

### **LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – Discussion between British Telecom and Limpsfield Parish Council NP Steering group representatives**

#### **Present:**

**BT Group**

Stacey King (SK)

**NP Volunteer**

Marnie Janaway (MJ)

**Clerk and NP co-ordinator:**

Geoff Dessent (GD)

**Date of Meeting:**

15<sup>th</sup> November 2017 (4pm – 5.30pm)

#### **1. Introduction**

MJ thanked SK for the opportunity to discuss the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and Broadband issues. GD outlined the progress made on the NP, and in particular highlighted the household survey delivered to all residents, currently being analysed, which has thrown up concerns about Broadband Speeds throughout the Parish.

#### **2 Issues raised and BT Views**

SK outlined the approach BT took to an area, first explaining that it was a relatively simple task to determine broadband speeds in any locality (via a website <https://www.btwholesale.com/includes/adsl/adsl.htm> ") by referencing addresses, postcodes or even better phone numbers. GD explained that data on this linked to concerns made about broadband had been captured in the household survey, but that of course Data Protection controls, would mean this source may well not be available. This said, there was a degree of local knowledge as to where the local dips in broadband speeds were located, and all addresses in the Parish were listed in the electoral role. (A quick overview would be easy enough to do.)

SK explained that:

- BT are part of the Superfast Surrey broadband project

- There are 2 technologies used Fibre to the premises (FTTP) with fibre cables from the exchange to each property. Increasingly more FTTP is being used and based, costs would be determined after a survey. An average ball park could be in the region of £1000 per property, however it could be more or less dependent on a number of factors or
- Fibre to the Cabinet (FTTC) where there is fibre from the exchange to the cabinet and then the existing copper cables to each property can be an option, but the speeds would be lower and drop off the further away a property is from the Box.
- The Parish Council can play a coordinating role by bringing together all those interested in increasing their broadband speed, but cannot put in any funding, which must all come from private sources (i.e. end users)
- A useful approach can be to undertake pilots from much smaller areas (eg a particular road), and then promoting this to the wider Parish – this bite size approach was often favoured by Parish Councils.
- BT would be happy to take on such small pilot projects, but in each case, would quote a cost for the provision to all users proposed and this cost would have to be found – if potential end users dropped out, then the cost to those continuing to seek faster broadband would increase,

GD noted that the financial risks would need to be carefully managed, as whilst the Parish Council would not be funding any such project, it would have some responsibility for putting the deal together acting as the single contact and contracting point for the community.

GD also noted that even with the bite-size approach suggested a significant project team would be needed to make any such project happen. And further roll out would involve more people resource.

### 3. Next Steps

GD thanked SK and explained that the NP Steering Group would be talking to other potential Broadband providers, advising the Group of the options to consider a faster Broadband project in the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan. If the NP Steering Group and the Parish Council felt there was a delivery project to do on Broadband a provider would be selected and work put in hand. The timing of this is unclear as whilst the NP is unlikely to be adopted until May 2019, clearly any such project could be done prior to then, using the NP as a vehicle to set out progress at that time and next steps.

The immediate next step would be to assess the size of the problem, by means of the website SK mentioned (see above) and local information available complaint with the Data Protection Act 1998.



## LIMPSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

**Clerk to Parish Council:**  
Geoff Dessent

**Tel No:**  
01883 722400  
**e-mail:**  
clerk@limpsfield.org  
[www.limpsfield.org](http://www.limpsfield.org)

**Address:**  
8 Hurst Green Close  
Oxted  
Surrey  
RH8 9AN

### **LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (NP)– Discussion between Diocese of Southwark and Limpsfield Parish Council NP Steering group representatives**

#### Present:

**Diocese of Southwark**

Fiona Hallard (FH)  
Debbie Highwood (DH)

**Councillors:**

Mark Wilson (MW)

**NP Volunteer**

Ann Osborn (AO)

**Clerk and NP co-ordinator:**

Geoff Dessent (GD)

#### 1.Introduction

MW thanked FH for the meeting and set out the background to the development of the Neighbourhood Plan, explaining that 2 surveys had been done of residents – a first one to try and uncover the big issues and a more detailed household survey delivered to all Limpsfield residents. MW provided FH with a copy of the household survey for reference and explained that the completed survey responses were currently being analysed, and that the 450 responses was a good representation of resident's views.

MW also explained that the current timeline was to seek a referendum, to adopt the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan in May 2019.

MW said that residents have expressed a lot of views and in particular had shown a great deal of support for protecting various green spaces in the Parish, in particular the Glebe field which the Diocese owned. (This can be done by designating such areas as "Local Green Spaces" in a Neighbourhood Plan)

MW explained that there would be a formal consultation process in due course but that currently stakeholder's views were being sought informally to help guide the process of developing the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan.

#### 2 Diocese of Southwark Position

FH explained that the Diocese approach to managing their assets, many of which were land, was to retain it, and seek to generate revenue from it. As to the particular case in Limpsfield, FH explained that there were two issues:

- (1) The site of Dorothy's Cottage – FH explained that the Diocese only have limited funds and repair and replacement of Vicarages for Mission and Ministry was the priority. To invest a lot of capital to rebuild houses for only a small rental was not the best use of Diocesan funds, when only a modest rental would then be achieved. The Diocese and Parish are considering alternative other uses including possibly just additional Parish parking facilities (landscaped). A feasibility study was in hand and for discussion with The Parish. The Diocese/Parish will talk to TDC about their ideas in due course.
  
- (2) The Glebe Field - in line with the overall policy on assets, the Diocese are retaining the field, but was keen to work with those in the local community to establish a sustainable and regular funding stream from the asset.

FH agreed that feasibly the existing Church Hall (or a future redeveloped Church Hall) could potentially provide additional community functions, but explained that being a Parish property, it is theirs to control and funding would need to be down to the local Community. This might include a nursery facility, sports facilities and perhaps even new health facilities for the community. It may even support a further meeting place/coffee shop.

MW explained that any development of the Church Hall would have to be in the medium term, but that this might be a helpful background idea to give context to the current planning application from the Nursery for a temporary building on the Glebe Field, to accommodate the nurseries growth plans.

### 3. Next Steps

MW explained that the formal Neighbourhood Plan consultations would involve the Diocese and were likely to contain detailed plans for the Glebe Field, on which the Diocese views would be formally sought, FH explained that in this process, her senior management team, would need to agree a final position.

## LIMPSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

**Clerk to Parish Council:**  
Geoff Dessent

**Tel No:**  
01883 722400  
**e-mail:**  
clerk@limpsfield.org  
[www.limpsfield.org](http://www.limpsfield.org)

**Address:**  
8 Hurst Green Close  
Oxted  
Surrey  
RH8 9AN

### **LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – Discussion between East Surrey College and Limpsfield Parish Council NP Steering group representatives**

#### Present:

#### **East Surrey College**

Philip Wilson (PW) - course coordinator  
Jyoti Baker (JB) – finance director

#### **NP Volunteer**

Marnie Janaway (MJ)

#### **Clerk and NP co-ordinator:**

Geoff Dessent (GD)

#### **Date of Meeting:**

21<sup>th</sup> November 2017 (9am – 10am)

#### 1. Introduction

GD thanked PW for the opportunity to discuss the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and Adult learning. GD outlined the progress made on the NP, and in particular highlighted the household survey delivered to all residents, currently being analysed, which has thrown up concerns about the “Adult learning offer” for the Parish.

#### 2 Issues raised by East Surrey college

PW and JB explained that:

- Range of topics on which adult learning can be provided is very wide, from learning a language to creative machine embroidery
- Type of learning approaches is very varied and flexible including; distance learning, webinars, courses at East Surrey College and outreach courses, based at locations within Limpsfield Parish
- Courses could be short (eg a day), or a weekend, or occur over several weeks and taster session are also on offer
- Where bespoke courses are being offered within the Parish, it was key to have the equipment and facilities, but even more important to cover the financial risks. Such courses become unviable with less than about 10 people

- East Surrey College provided the courses at their venue in Redhill, including distance learning, but the Workers' Education Association provided locally based course

### 3. Next Steps

GD thanked PW and JB and felt that the next actions were about the NP Steering Group finding out what people in the Parish are looking for both in subject area and type of learning, and present this back to East Surrey College to advise on what might be possible.

**Action:** GD and MJ to seek more information from residents on what they are looking for as regards Adult learning, and provide some immediate information about what's on offer.

# LIMPSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

**Clerk to Parish Council:**  
Geoff Dessent

**Tel No:**  
01883 722400  
**e-mail:**  
clerk@limpsfield.org  
[www.limpsfield.org](http://www.limpsfield.org)

**Address:**  
8 Hurst Green Close  
Oxted  
Surrey  
RH8 9AN

## **LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (NP)– Discussion between Environment Agency and Limpsfield Parish Council NP Steering group reps – 27<sup>th</sup> October 2017**

Present:

<b>Environment Agency</b>	Samantha Watts
<b>Councillors:</b>	None
<b>NP Volunteers</b>	None
<b>Clerk and NP co-ordinator:</b>	Geoff Dessent (GD)

### 1.Introduction

GD thanked SW for the discussion and set out the background to the development of the Neighbourhood Plan, explaining the current state of progress and the target adoption date of May 2019. GD also explained that it was unlikely that any new development sites for housing would be allocated, and that any new proposals for building would be directed towards smaller housing, following the responses from the household survey.

GD explained that the Limpsfield NP was likely to designate a number of Local Green Spaces and seek the protection of views.

GD was keen to ensure alignment as far as possible with environment agency policies to minimise comments at the formal consultation stage, recognising that things do change over time, so new issues may come up from either side.

### 2 Environment Agency Position

SW set out the key issues for the Environment Agency, which should be flagged in the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan.

**Groundwater protection** – there are two water source protection zones in the parish which should be logged and protected – these are shown on the enclosed map – one just to the north of the M25 and the other in pains hill (The other source protection zones shown on the map are outside the parish).

**Land Fill site** – there is a land fill site near Brill’s farm, Grants lane – and development in this area should be referred to the environment agency to ensure the proper risk assessments are carried out if any development is to go ahead.

**Green Infrastructure** – Green infrastructure is a term which describes a network of interconnected green and blue spaces – the environment agency promotes this for the benefit of the community and a reference can be made in the Neighbourhood Plan alongside the proposed Local Green Space designations and protection of footpaths.

**Flood Zones** – the environment agency has provided a map of flood risks in the parish, drawing particular attention to flood risks levels 2 and 3 – which affect the Glebe and Brook field (map attached) – the environment agency would expect to see detailed risks assessment for any development proposal in flood zone 3#2 and would oppose any development in flood risk 3.

**Protection of Views** – SW explained that this issue was one to discuss with Natural England.

**Good Practice Neighbourhood Plans** – SW commended the Neighbourhood Plan for Wye (near Ashford) as a NP which they felt represented a good practice example from the Environment Agency’s point of view.

### 3. Next Steps

GD explained that the formal Neighbourhood Plan consultations would involve the Environment Agency and that he was keen that if there were any new developments that a further telecon could be arranged.

Text reflecting the above discussions would be proposed in the draft Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan.

## LIMPSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

**Clerk to Parish Council:**  
Geoff Dessent

**Tel No:**  
01883 722400  
**e-mail:**  
clerk@limpsfield.org  
[www.limpsfield.org](http://www.limpsfield.org)

**Address:**  
8 Hurst Green Close  
Oxted  
Surrey  
RH8 9AN

### **LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (NP)– Discussion between Historic England and Limpsfield Parish NP Steering group reps – 20 December 2017**

Present:

**Historic England**

Alan Byrne (AB)

**Councillors:**

Mark Wilson (MW)

**NP Volunteers**

Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK)

**Clerk and NP co-ordinator:**

Geoff Dessent (GD)

#### 1. Introduction

MW thanked AB for the opportunity to have a discussion about the developing Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan.

MW outlined the current progress on the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan, explaining that having done a comprehensive residents survey, that a series of key stakeholder discussion were now taking place. And as one of these stakeholders, it was clearly important to have the Historic England view.

MW also mentioned that current thinking in the Limpsfield NP steering group was that one of the outcomes of the Neighbourhood Plan would be to draft a Conservation Assessment statement with a possibility of seeing whether it was possible to expand the Conservation area.

MW explained that the current thinking was not to allocate any sites for development and influence the character of any “windfall” development through a Character assessment approach.

#### 2 Historic England views and comments

AB made the following points

- welcomed such early engagement and keen to help and advise to iron out any issues well in advance of formal consultation.
- welcomed the Character Assessment approach and noted that policies were being developed to maintain the character of the 7 AECOM character areas, then subdivided into 13 smaller areas, to respond to any develop proposals which came forward
- felt that given the approach being taken to protecting the Character and Heritage of the Parish and the current intention not to allocate any sites suggested that a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) would not be required from a Historic England point of view
- happy to assist with the drafting of heritage polices where this could be helpful, though ownership of the policies rests with Limpsfield Parish Council
- noted that Surrey Highways were open to collaborative work and joint funding and commended this approach, which has included some decluttering of signage across the County and sympathetic ground landscaping (eg on Kerbstones)
- understood that the Dorothy's cottage site was part of the grade 2 listing of the old rectory site, and would discuss with colleagues as to whether the Dorothy's cottage element (now that it has burnt down with nothing left) might be delisted – and welcomed a conversation with the landowner (Diocese of Southwark) on future plans including any on landscaped car parking to remove the eye-sore of the current hoarding and help address local needs for car parking.
- welcomed the prospect of a Conservation area assessment and felt this would be a very helpful tool going forward.
- stated that Tandridge District Council (TDC) are legally obliged to regularly review and keep up to date their conservation area designations, and suggested that should the Parish Council be undertaking a Conservation Area Assessment (as envisaged) that TDC might consider contributing resources/funding to make this happen as one way of demonstrating compliance with their duty in this area,

### 3. Next Steps

MW thanked AB for this very helpful session and agreed to keep in touch, and to share the output of the planned discussed with Surrey CC – Heritage – (Martin Higgins), planned for early January 2018.



## LIMPSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

**Clerk to Parish Council:**

Geoff Dessent

**Tel No:**

01883 722400

**e-mail:**

clerk@limpsfield.org

[www.limpsfield.org](http://www.limpsfield.org)

**Address:**

8 Hurst Green Close

Oxted

Surrey

RH8 9AN

### **LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (NP)– Discussion between the National Trust and Limpsfield Parish Council NP Steering group reps – 23 November 2017**

Present:

**National Trust**

Andy Green

Mark Richards (MR)

**Councillors:**

Mark Wilson (MW)

**NP Volunteers**

None

**Clerk and NP co-ordinator:**

Geoff Dessent (GD)

1.Introduction

MW thanked MR and AG for the opportunity to have a discussion about the developing Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan.

MW outlined the current progress on the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan, explaining that having done a comprehensive residents survey, that a series of key stakeholder discussion were now taking place. And as the major land-owner in the Parish, it was clearly important to have the National Trusts view.

## 2 National Trust views and comments

A? and MR made the following points

- Very grateful to have been brought into the conversation at this relatively early stage of the development of the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan, as with other NPs they have often not seen them until they were virtually complete
- The NT continue to look at ways to generate revenue, to offset the cost of maintaining their land, and in particular natural habitats for wildlife. eg introducing car parking charges, and noted that the “Friends of Limpsfield Common” had not been pushed and promoted as well as it might be – and both were sources of revenue., Likewise boosting NT membership to allow car parks to remain at least free to members.
- Had mixed views about public electric vehicle charging points, feeling the jury was still out a bit on whether this was the way forward, rather than replacement battery packs pre-charged or indeed, greatly expanded car hire, with vastly reduced car ownership.
- Felt that there would be scope to have outdoor trails for children, as an adjunct to playgrounds (like the one the Parish Council have in Limpsfield Chart), provided the funding can be found.
- Felt that the Surrey Wildlife Trust should be consulted on the Limpsfield NP, which MW agreed was a very helpful suggestion
- Keen to get a better working relationship with the Titsey Estate, for a more coordinated approach to land management in the Parish
- MR confirmed that the new lease for the Limpsfield Chart Playground was being prepared and agreed to draw up a list of repairs/improvements to the playground which was still in remarkably good condition after 10 years, but was now beginning to show its age.

### **Action MR**

### 3. Next Steps

MW thanked A? and MR for this very helpful session, and would follow up on the possibility of the Parish Council hosting a meeting between the Titsey Estate and the National Trust to help foster a closer relationship.

### **Action: MW**

**Action:** GD to set up a stakeholder meeting with the Surrey Wildlife Trust

## LIMPSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

**Clerk to Parish Council:**  
Geoff Dessent

**Tel No:**  
01883 722400  
**e-mail:**  
clerk@limpsfield.org  
[www.limpsfield.org](http://www.limpsfield.org)

**Address:**  
8 Hurst Green Close  
Oxted  
Surrey  
RH8 9AN

### **LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (NP)– Discussion between Limpsfield Infant School and Limpsfield NP Steering group reps – 28 November 2017**

#### Present:

**Limpsfield Infant School** Jenny Baird (JB) – Head teacher  
Jennie Richards (JR) – School Governor (vice-  
chair)  
Sue Vodicka (SV) – School Governor (chair)

**Councillors:** Mark Wilson (MW)

**NP Volunteers** None

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

#### 1.Introduction

MW thanked JB for the opportunity to have a discussion about the developing Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan.

MW outlined the current progress on the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan, explaining that having done a comprehensive residents survey, that a series of key stakeholder discussion were now taking place. And as a key School in the Parish, it was important to ensure we understood Limpsfield Infant's school's thoughts and concerns.

GD outlined the timetable through to the proposed referendum in May 2019.

#### 2 Limpsfield Infant School views and comments

JB, JR and SV were:

- Grateful to have been brought into the conversation at this relatively early stage of the development of the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan
- Have significant concerns about traffic speeds on the A25 opposite the School, in particular now that they no longer had a lollypop person to aid crossing - explaining

that a number of measures had been put in place but that it remained a concern. They were keen more is done – eg painting the road red to slow traffic -though they recognised that a pelican crossing (at a cost of £100k) may be a prohibitive cost. MW explained that a Speedwatch scheme may be the answer and that GD had been in touch with Surrey Police to understand the process. JB explained had Ann Osborn on the School's behalf had also investigated this option, and this would be a welcome further measure.

- Had concerns about crime – thefts from the school continued to occur, with a very low Police presence in the area meant deterrent levels for crime were equally low
- Maintaining the free Car Parking locally which the National Trust provide was important for parents to drop-off and pick up from the school – and the current arrangements worked well.
- Maintaining school numbers was also a concern, a common issue for all infant schools due to the latest demographic patterns - and key to the school's efforts on this were strong links with the PANDA nursery – also local school bus services were important to allow a parent to rely on that for an older sibling whilst focusing on taking the younger one themselves to Limpsfield school.

### 3. Next Steps

MW thanked JB for the session, and promised to keep the school in touch as things develop.

**LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**  
**Discussion between Dr D. Hill, Oxted Health Centre, and Limpsfield**  
**Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Representatives**  
**14<sup>th</sup> November 2017**

Present:

**Oxted Health Centre  
Councillors:**

Dr D. Hill  
Mark Wilson  
John Thompson

**NP Volunteers:**

Ted Beresford-Knox  
Laila Turner

1. Introduction

Mark Wilson introduced the work of the Parish Council in preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and indicated that this was one of a number of meetings with stakeholders to help understand their views as part of the preparation of the Plan's 'evidence base'.

2 Oxted Health Centre

Dr Hill outlined the way in which the health service was developing with an expectation that there would, in the future, be closer working between the health service, social care and organisations involved in mental health care. In this respect, Oxted Health Centre was working with other practices and other agencies across the East Surrey area, including Tandridge District Council. There was an increasing focus on the prevention of illnesses and on 'well-being' services.

Dr Hill noted that there had been no great increase in the number of patients over the years, but that there were increasing pressures without extra resources. Mark Wilson asked whether this was related to a growth in the elderly population. Dr Hill agreed that this was part of the issue, particularly related to care homes which require significant commitment from the health service.

Dr Hill explained the current thinking with regard to the Health Centre. The Health Centre is privately owned and leased to the health services. The lease has a further 14 years to run until 2031 with a break clause in 10 years' time in 2027. Current plans include increased public access to the two floors of the Centre and use of underutilised space in Tandridge District Council offices. Further linkage with Caterham Deane Hospital to provide out-of-hours services was being worked on. The structure of the Health Centre meant that extra space through the addition of an extra floor was not possible. For the longer term, the Health Centre wanted to remain located within the Town Centre, possibly as part of a comprehensive development. There were no proposals for additional facilities at Hurst Green, nor was it felt there was a need for facilities in Limpsfield Village. Provision of smaller health facilities involves duplication of administration costs and would not be in line with the wider approach towards the centralisation of services. There could, however, be a need for additional facilities in locations where significant growth would take place, for example if there were a new village.

Recruitment issues were discussed and it was noted that there were currently two vacancies for full time doctors. Dr Hill felt that housing costs generally were a factor but also the fact that at present the Health Centre was not a training practice.

The issue of parking at the Health Centre, for both staff and patients, was discussed. Dr Hill felt that 'park and ride' for staff could be helpful as could arrangements which enabled people using the Health Centre to get free parking.

In terms of other areas where the health services might be helped by the Parish Council's work, Dr Hill noted the importance of communicating to people the availability of different medical services in the area and the role of the 111 service.

### 3. Conclusion of the Meeting

Mark Wilson thanked Dr Hill for his time in discussing the Health Centre and indicated that notes of the meeting would be sent to the practice manager, Ronnie Godfrey for agreement.

## LIMPSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

**Clerk to Parish Council:**  
Geoff Dessent

**Tel No:**  
01883 722400  
**e-mail:**  
clerk@limpsfield.org  
[www.limpsfield.org](http://www.limpsfield.org)

**Address:**  
8 Hurst Green Close  
Oxted  
Surrey  
RH8 9AN

### **LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (NP)– Discussion between Surrey CC (Heritage) and Limpsfield Parish NP Steering group reps – 11 January 2018**

#### Present:

**Surrey CC (Heritage)**

Martin Higgins (MH)

**Councillors:**

Mark Wilson (MW)

**NP Volunteers**

Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK)

**Clerk and NP co-ordinator:**

Geoff Dessent (GD)

#### 1.Introduction

MW thanked MH for the opportunity to have a discussion about the developing Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan.

MW outlined the current progress on the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan, explaining that having done a comprehensive residents survey, that a series of key stakeholder discussions were now taking place. And as one of these stakeholders, it was clearly important to have the Surrey CC (Heritage) view.

MW also mentioned that current thinking in the Limpsfield NP steering group was that one of the outcomes of the Neighbourhood Plan would be to draft a Conservation Area Appraisal with a possibility of seeing whether there was a case to expand the Conservation area.

MW explained that the current thinking was not to allocate any sites for development and influence the character of any “windfall” development through a Character assessment approach.

#### 2 Surrey CC (Heritage) views and comments

MH made the following points

- welcomed such engagement and keen to help and advise

- welcomed the Character Assessment approach and noted that policies were being developed to maintain the character of the 7 AECOM character areas, then sub-divided into 13 smaller areas, to respond to any development proposals which came forward – and had a number of detailed comments on the AECOM character and heritage report including the fact that Limpsfield High Street was a planned medieval village which he felt should be recorded

**Action:** MH to provide comments to GD to pass onto to AECOM to update their final report.

- There were some useful books which may provide more history of the building development of the Parish namely those by Peter Gray and Kay Percy (currently held be Linfield Library) as well as “Surrey Design”
- Felt it was of value to list the “non-listed” historical assets in the Parish – including such things as finger posts as well as buildings, and this this list should be drawn up using some clear criteria and linked to the Historic Environment Register – which Planning officers would be aware of. (TDC and other Districts such as Waverly had lists of such criteria)
- Welcomed the prospect of a Conservation area assessment and felt this would be a very helpful tool going forward.
- Felt that any contractor chosen to do the Conservation Area Appraisals (CAA) should be a specialist in that area, and that he could pass on some suggestions (i.e. examples of good CAAs)
- Explained that whilst it would be appropriate to assess within the Conservation Area Appraisal whether there was a case to change the boundary (eg to expand it), he was clear that a Conservation Area designation could not be used solely to help protect land from development.

### 3. Next Steps

MW thanked MH for this very helpful session and would seek to keep him in the loop as the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan develops.



## LIMPSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

**Clerk to Parish Council:**  
Geoff Dessent

**Tel No:**  
01883 722400  
**e-mail:**  
clerk@limpsfield.org  
[www.limpsfield.org](http://www.limpsfield.org)

**Address:**  
8 Hurst Green Close  
Oxted  
Surrey  
RH8 9AN

### **LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – Discussion between Surrey Highways and Limpsfield Parish Council NP Steering group representatives**

#### Present:

<b>Surrey Highways</b>	Philippa Gates (PG)
<b>Councillors:</b>	John Thompson (JT), Cameron McIntosh (CM)
<b>NP Volunteer</b>	Ann Osborn (AO)
<b>Clerk and NP co-ordinator:</b>	Geoff Dessent (GD)

#### 1.Introduction

GD thanked PG for the opportunity to discuss the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and Highways issues. GD outlined the progress made on the NP, and in particular highlighted the household survey delivered to all residents, currently being analysed, which has thrown up a number of issues about parking, traffic and other highways issues. GD explained that at this stage the NP Steering group were keen to consult all major stakeholders to get their views alongside those of local residents. The aim was to go to a referendum in May 2019, with adoption of the NP shortly after.

#### 2 Issues raised and Surrey Highways Views

*HGVs use of Limpsfield High Street* – continuing concerns about this despite the action to alert the HGV Sat Nav system to avoid this. PG agreed to check on progress in moving the HGV warning sign to the far side of the Titsey hill roundabout, which was an action Surrey CC have in hand. JT raised a concern about the signage at the Limpsfield Traffic lights, being too late to inform HGV drivers – PG felt a new more visible sign may help this, and agreed to look into costings for this.

#### Action PG

*Buses use of Limpsfield High Street* – GD asked whether large buses could be persuaded to avoid the high street. PG explained this should be taken up with the Surrey passenger transport team, and explained that there was a balance to be struck between congestion and ease of access for elderly bus passengers.

Action – GD to contact Surrey CC passenger transport team.

*Street Lighting* – CM explained that the current policy was to switch off street light between midnight and 5am. PG felt the case for retaining lights switched on in Bluehouse Lane to accommodate last trains was a strong one. CM happy to sign a letter from the Parish Council seeking this.

Action GD to work with CM to pursue this.

*Footpaths* – AO asked about the possibility of making the footpath from Detillens Land to Granville road – “all-weather” . PG suggested that contact should be made with the Country Side team at Surrey CC.

Action - GD to contact Surrey Countryside team.

JT asked about the problem of the lack of pavement in Bluehouse land. PG explained that they had looked into this previously and that the width of the road meant that householders would have to surrender about a metre of their Garden to also for a full pavement to be put in. Residents had refused.

Action: Limpsfield NP SG to consider whether further discussion with Bluehouse Lane residents might be fruitful.

*Cycle ways* – AO asked what scope there may be to improve cycle ways. PG said that funding cuts would prevent significant action on this. CM felt that one area where there may be scope was to provide cycle parking at each end of Oxted high street.

Action CM to consider this further.

*Planning Applications seeking new access to A-Roads* – PG explained that Surrey highways are consulted on these and would consider the safety implications in any case, and if they had safety concerns would raise an objection.

*Surrey Highways Vision* – JT whether surrey highways had a vision statement. PG explained that whilst they did not have a vision statement, Surrey CC did have 3 strategic objectives which could be found on their website, which might prove useful context for the NP.

*Surrey County Councillors Budget Allowance* – CM explained that these had been significantly reduced but that he had drawn on this funding to get local Street signage cleaned recently. AO and JT thanked CM for this action, which had been very well received by residents.

*Tandridge District Council Highways Funding* - PG explained this had been cut from £180k last year to £36k this year and welcomed any partnership and joint funding arrangements which might be possible with the Parish Council and/or others.

*Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan content* – GD asked PG whether they were anything things she would wish to see in the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan, and equally anything she would not wish to see. PG said she would respond in due course.

Action PG to give comments on the above to GD ideally by the end of October.

*Speed Limits* – PG explained these were set under the Surrey Police guidelines.

*Parking Enforcement* – CM was keen to see more enforcement, but reflected that TDC budgets were limited, and that they current used Banstead and Reigate to deliver their activity in this area.

### 3. Next Steps

GD thanked PG and CM for their time, and summarised the various actions listed above.

## LIMPSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

**Clerk to Parish Council:**  
Geoff Dessent

**Tel No:**  
01883 722400  
**e-mail:**  
clerk@limpsfield.org  
[www.limpsfield.org](http://www.limpsfield.org)

**Address:**  
8 Hurst Green Close  
Oxted  
Surrey  
RH8 9AN

### **LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (NP)– Discussion between Surrey Hills (AONB) and Limpsfield Parish NP Steering group reps – 30 November 2017**

#### Present:

**Surrey Hills (AONB)**

Rob Fairbanks (RF)  
Clive Smith (CS)

**Councillors:**

Mark Wilson (MW)

**NP Volunteers**

None

**Clerk and NP co-ordinator:**

Geoff Dessent (GD)

#### 1.Introduction

MW thanked RF and CS for the opportunity to have a discussion about the developing Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan.

MW outlined the current progress on the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan, explaining that having done a comprehensive residents survey, that a series of key stakeholder discussion were now taking place. And as one of these stakeholders, it was clearly important to have the Surrey Hills (AONB) views.

MW was keen to understand more about the designations of AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) and AGLV (Area of Great Landscape Value), of which Limpsfield Parish has both.

MW also mentioned that current thinking in the Limpsfield NP steering group was that one of the outcomes of the Neighbourhood Plan would be to draft a Conservation Assessment statement with a possibility of seeing whether it was possible to expand the Conservation area.

## 2 AONB views and comments

RF and CS made the following points

- AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) is a National Designation, which carries weight with Local Authorities, the NPPF and Central Government as regards any new development.
- AGLV (Area of Great Landscape Value) is also of interest to Surrey Hills, but it not a national designation, but does carry some weight but not as much as AONB locally.
- Natural England are aiming to do a review of the ANOB boundaries and Surrey Hills is likely to be one of the first areas to be considered – as yet no firm timeline is known – However, – Natural England have confirmed that the review will progress after the Suffolk Coast and Heaths which should be completed in 2018. Surrey Hills (AONB) are seeking to have its ANOB boundaries which covers 5 Districts expanded,
- Keen to promote” rustic” village signage, with Surrey Highway’s blessing to help add to the AONB appearance
- It was important that Parish Council's did bid for their District Council’s CIL money, which they have a right to do, to enhance the local area (for example for improved appropriate signage)
- Views were important to protect and Surrey Hills had done some work on “inspiring views” – views can be listed in an NP as things to protect

## 3. Next Steps

MW thanked RF and CS for this very helpful session and agreed to keep in touch, not least to hear how the planned Natural England review of the AONB is progressing.

## LIMPSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

**Clerk to Parish Council:**  
Geoff Dessent

**Tel No:**  
01883 722400  
**e-mail:**  
clerk@limpsfield.org  
[www.limpsfield.org](http://www.limpsfield.org)

**Address:**  
8 Hurst Green Close  
Oxted  
Surrey  
RH8 9AN

### **LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (NP) – Discussion between Titsey Estate and Limpsfield NP Steering group reps – 24th November 2017**

#### Present:

#### **Titsey Estate**

Guy Innes (GI)  
John Innes (JI)

#### **Councillors:**

Mark Wilson (MW)  
Anthony Turner (AT)

#### **NP Volunteers**

None

#### **Clerk and NP co-ordinator:**

Geoff Dessent (GD)

#### 1.Introduction

MW thanked GI and JI for the opportunity to have a discussion about the developing Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan.

MW outlined the current progress on the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan, explaining that having done a comprehensive residents survey, that a series of key stakeholder discussion were now taking place. And as a key landowner in the Parish, it was important to consult with the Titsey Estate.

MW also outlined the timetable through to the proposed referendum in May 2019.

#### 2 Titsey Estate views and comments

GI and JI said:

- Welcomed the discussion and being involved in the development of the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan
- Keen to, preserve the Heritage and Character of the area and avoid unwelcome development

- Feel development on the Brooke field which the Titsey estate own would be inappropriate, but open to discuss any ideas to generate revenue form the land, without impacting negatively on the locality
- Keen to explore ways of generating revenue from the “old allotments “green belt site opposite Wolfs row but no firm plans as to what this might look like.

MW explained the implications of the Parish Council allocating a site in the green belt for development, and would keep in touch on what the PC decides to do within the developing Neighbourhood Plan.

- Keen to work more closely with the National Trust to better coordinate land management and access for the public in the area
- JI and GI also indicated their support for an initiative to mark the centenary of the end of World War 1

### 3. Next Steps

MW thanked JI and GI for the session, and agreed to identify opportunities to bring the National Trust and the Titsey estate together for a discussion to help better coordinate land management in the area.

## **VIEW FROM THE STATION ROAD EAST SHOPS AND BUSINESSES IN LIMPSFIELD PARISH**

Below are the questions asked of the approximately 20 businesses located in Station Road East – Limpsfield Parish on 23 November 2017.

There are some key points and potential actions, namely:

**Parking** – can we support and help (for staff and shoppers)?

**Safety & Crime**– this came through and was an unpleasant surprise. This seems an everyday occurrence. The Factory Shop is losing £000's each week.

**Environment** – improve the feel and look of Station Road East; benches etc

**Communication** – all felt under-valued and ignored by TDC

### **Suggested actions**

- Look into some form of community support person, or persons
- Look into Crime & Safety, CCTV was asked for; also reinstating SHOPWATCH
- Look into mix of shops & general feel of area – can we assist on mix of shops; benches, trees and greenery. Litter etc.
- Look into more regular support & communication with these businesses
- Parking – can we look at parking bays, good use of existing space

**Q: Business environment: Given your location – Do you feel that you have a viable business base? e.g. Flow of shoppers, clients, customers.**

All felt that there was a good future in Oxted; liked the village/ small town feel. Only one was reviewing its base after 2 years of trading. They have other business bases where rent, rates are 50% less and the support from the council is better.

### **Major concerns on**

Parking – all had asked for 2 hours; but feeling was that TDC has ignored this request.

Short stay spaces were asked for; but very few if any provided – e.g. 20 min max stay for drop off.

Crime – shop lifting seems rife; Police although based across the road in TDC offices do not come for 20+ mins; or say they can't leave the station unattended?

There were also concerns about shoppers having their bank pin numbers copied when paying for items or using cashpoints leading to consumer/bank financial losses.



There was a SHOPWATCH scheme; but this has stopped? Unsure but we understood this was something TDC shut down.

Support from Council – all felt they were not listened too; went to meetings; if they asked for support or difficult questions; always deferred to next year or the “never, never file”

**Q: Would anything aid? Or are you happy with all?  
Business rates? Parking? Staff – can you keep, recruit staff required?**

### **Major concerns on**

Parking for staff and shoppers

Many felt that the one- hour free (Ellice Road) parking limited the “shop and browse” feel of a small town.

Shoppers were under time constraints if they did not wish to pay.

Volunteer staff – when not paid could not be expected to pay for parking.

Shop staff are not highly paid. Shops are suggesting staff come in late and park on the local roads.

Ellice Road Parking – free 1 hour too little. There are good reasons to suggest 2 hours; e.g. if visiting a restaurant, you cannot guarantee to be out in an hour. This adds stress to both the client and the staff to serve quickly.

If you have children, or are elderly getting ready and out of the car can take 10 / 15 mins.

Morrisons have dropped parking to 2 hours; one business owner though in their contract they agreed 3 hours?

Safety at night – CCTV, street lighting; one shop in our area is open until 11pm. The Assistant Manager is a very petite female; she has concerns with the increase in crime and safety.

Parking for staff – the Council has issued permits; but seems to have oversold? So even when paying £600 a year they cannot park.

Some businesses pay for these permits; others have to sub out of their personal bonus.

Noting some of the parking in the free zone of Station Road East; “I personally felt that the parking skills and use of spaces was not great. – Could we have parking bays for a good- sized car marked out”.

**Q: Mix of facilities in your area? Do you feel that more needs to be done to assist? Seating? Litter bins?**

**Better range of shops, facilities? How would you encourage?**

**Enforcement officers or information, community help visible? For elderly shoppers, visitors etc.**

### **Major concerns regarding**

With crime being an escalating issue, many valued the idea of some form of Community Officer to aid parking, information and general anti-crime support, Litter etc.

Felt that the parking wardens were more of a joke; and at times causing more issues by parking illegally whilst giving tickets.

Police and lack of support

TDC – did not get a glowing rating; hence if we carry through and listen, chat with them regularly – this would be valued.

Environment – liked the idea of more greenery, benches et for shoppers and areas where as staff they can enjoy the Town on lunch breaks etc.

Charity shops and mix of shops. A “Vape Shop” is going into the Bishops site. A lot of concern on the variety of shops and can we assist.

All of the above – improved safety, parking vital

A Roundabout outside the Bank might improve safety and reduce traffic speeds.

**Q: Anything else**

### **Major concerns on**

New development; 70 luxury flats – pressure again on parking. Space and general feel of the town centre.

All want to be listened too; but feel going to meetings is a waste of time.

Felt LOVE OXTED was positive