

LIMPSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP MINUTES

Limpsfield Parish Council : Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (4th meeting): 20 April 7pm –9.30pm at Berry House Limpsfield

1. Attendees: Phillip Bailey (PB), John Thompson (JT), Bernard de Haldevang (BH), Martin Hogbin (MH), Geoff Dessent (GD)

Absence: Osmund Stuart Lee (OSL), Mark Wilson (MW) – OSL helpfully provided comments on the agenda just before the meeting by email.

2. Approval of Minutes of 3rd NP SG meeting

Minutes approved with no comments. JT asked for clarification about extra spend by rCOH to feed into Tandridge DC review of the Green Belt. PB explained this would be a maximum of 2 days (£1100) well within the contingency available of £4k. JT was content.

3. Neighbourhood Plan Website (quotes)

MH has already got quote of £1500 from Lingfield web contractor. All agreed this looked good and represented good value for money. However, given the amount the parish rules require a second quote. Action MB to obtain second quote. JT suggested web provider for East Shoreditch, and agreed to pass on details of this and others to MH. Decision to be made on best value for money which satisfied quality threshold.

4. Recruitment of further volunteers for Topic Working Groups

MW has already agreed to take on the mail shot to households (to invite them to recruitment meeting to topic groups) in terms of getting estimates for delivery costs, printing. GD to ask MW where things currently stand as this is becoming urgent. Target date is 30 April, with recruitment meeting planned for mid-May, suggested format as a recruitment fair with interim chairs of topic working groups (see below) seeking to recruit more people. MW also agreed to look into posters with similar objective. However, in view of limited resources and timeframes, SG members agreed mailshot priority – and poster idea might have to be deferred and used more as general publicity for the NP. It was important for the mailshot to look professional. Some draft text already available (PB revising) as was draft PN (which forms part of this). BH also suggested some artwork for the envelop- and mail shot (Limpsfield crest with grasshopper on top, which he will circulate).

SG members keen to have dedicated email and phone line for Neighbourhood plan. Action for GD to set up email (initially as a .org), and get cost estimates for a dedicated mobile. Action MH to find out how to convert both this new email address and the clerk email to a .gov.uk account as Councillors think this gives a better position of the parish council and NP work.

5. General Publicity

(a) Agreed that AECOM should be sighted on NP activities in particular with publicity. PB and GD to act as main contacts,

(b) BH revising draft text about NP for St Peters Limpsfield parish news – deadline end of April – publication end of May.

6. Stakeholder Management

Groups of stakeholders as circulated with 3rd SG minutes thought to be a good start. A few further to be added, eg Limpsfield Rotary, Limpsfield walking group, local property developers (revised at annex)

PB to draft a letter to stakeholders to engage them in the NP process. Also Topic working groups will test out their ideas with key stakeholder groups to ensure good community engagement.

Addresses of stakeholders need to be obtained. JT and GD agreed to take this on – GD to contact NP contact in TDC (who he is already in contact with). JT had access to some stakeholder addresses which he kindly agreed to share with GD.

Most efficient way of working would be for one person to coordinate stakeholder groups views – in PB's letter he will invite such volunteers – already made progress on rep for churches group. (Limpsfield vicar)

PH had identified proposed initial/interim chairs and agreed to sound these people out in his role as chair of SG and co-opt them onto SG.

JT agreed to draft an email for GD to send to unallocated volunteers (those who had not indicated topic preference to state their preference). As MW has excellent local knowledge and contacts – current proposals to be run past MW – Action GD.

7. Progress on descriptions of Parish sub-areas

Very helpful comments from Bob Harvey which all agreed. OSL had already send in comments as well. Further comments urgently wanted. MH agreed to send his thoughts in. One immediate change agreed was to remove the word “urban” from the area 3 description, although this is slightly out of line with the Tandridge district council definitions.

8. Timing on inception and Visioning meetings

Inception meeting will be held on 10 or 11 May. Action GD to find out preferences from MW, BH, OSL. Start time likely to be 5pm.

Visioning meeting likely to be 9th or 10th June. Action GD to canvass SG members for dates. Hoped some interim/initial chairs of Topic groups could also attend.

AECOM area tour to be finalized.

AOB

5th SG NP meeting to be held on 18 May 2016 at Berry House at 7pm. Agenda would be circulated beforehand and those not able to attend should send in comments.

Annex - Stakeholder Organisations and preliminary groupings (latest as at 20 April, 2016)

Sports and Leisure

Cricket club, Tennis Club, Golf Club,

Service providers

Fire service, Police NHS, schools, churches, bus operators, Southern railway, Tandridge District Council, Pubs, Restaurants, retailers, nurseries, libraries

Interest Groups

National Trust, Campaign for Rural England, Equestrian Society, WI, British Legion, rambles, Tandridge club, Fine arts society, Limpsfield walking group, Limpsfield rotary

Developers

Housing Association, Titsey Estate, estate agents, banks, farmers, highways agency (Westerham by pass), locally based property developers

Consumer Groups

Oxted and Limpsfield residents' association, citizens advice bureau

Limpsfield Parish Council : Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (5th meeting): 18 May 7pm – 10 pm at Berry House Limpsfield

1. Attendees: Phillip Bailey (PB), John Thompson (JT), Martin Hogbin (MH), Osmund Stuart Lee (OSL) Geoff Dessent (GD)

Absence: Bernard de Haldevang (BH), Mark Wilson (MW)

2. Approval of Minutes of 4th NP SG meeting

Minutes approved with no comments and added to the LPC dropbox folder

3. Reflections on NP Inception Meeting (held with RCOH)

The inception meeting was generally felt to have been very successful and given SG members a feeling of positive progress. There remains the issue of needing to align with the Tandridge District Local Plan. As this is in a state of flux, and that there is every possibility that the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan will be ready before the Tandridge Local Plan, this means the ongoing dialogue with TDC is very important. The case to build on green belt land is not clear and this is also tied up in TDC's review of the Green Belt. OSL passed on some helpful tips from the experiences of the Dormansland NP, in protecting green spaces such as the Glebe Field – that it can be useful to make reference to its wildlife and botanic features. Finally, JT noted that RCOH were very professional, and seemed well equipped for the task in hand.

4. Neighbourhood Plan Website

Good progress. MH has passed a draft contract to build the website to PB for signing off. PB agreed to go through this and sign off, subject MH checking with contractor about virus protection levels. MH felt this would not be a major concern but agreed to check this out. MH explained that the training to help SG members use the site and upload material was via a video which showed screen shots. MH also explained that it was key that SG members provided content and that all photos had to be assessed for copyright, so that we could be sure they could be used on the NP website without fear of challenge. MH agreed to check the timeline for website construction, and agreed it should be possible to get a single page up quickly including a logo/Limpsfield Village Photo and “grasshopper” image explaining that the remainder of the website was under construction. MH confirmed that he thought the ongoing costs from the contractor to maintain the website would be minimal, but he would double check. All agreed that there was a need to have a dedicated resource to keep the content up to date. This might be either GD or BH, or someone else, but this will need to be agreed at a future date as it is a key function. The original cost estimate of £1500, built in some contingency, so that actual cost was more likely to be in the region of £1,100 plus some further small amounts giving a total below £1500. The domain name of the website will be LimpsfieldNP.org.

5. Recruitment of Topic Working Group Volunteers

Progress on this has not been as positive as SG members would have liked. To date 5 or 6 general volunteers have been confirmed with their areas of topic interest now clearer. And one interim topic group chair has been confirmed. More work is needed to chase up the original list to increase the number of volunteers. GD agreed to follow up with the list and PB agreed to share the original database electronically so that this could be updated and shared at the next meeting, and put onto LPC dropbox giving access to all councillors.

The proposed mailshot proved prohibitively expensive, and following discussion the SG members present felt that the poster idea was a better means to seek further volunteers. BH would be asked to develop the content for the poster and MW handle the production. GD has sent them a note to see whether they have the time to do this, and if not the SG will need to seek agreement from LPC to outsource and pay for this work by outsourcing it..

The original idea of a recruitment fair has been dropped. JT suggested that instead we should arrange a meeting of all volunteers (to date) with SG members to get the topic groups up and running. All reflected on RCOH's advice that often such groups operated with few people, provided they had the time and commitment to make things happen.

There were concerns (not held by all) that the full SG which should include the 4 topic group chairs should have geographical balance across the Parish. This would be kept in mind in choosing topic groups chairs, but far less so as regards topic group members. PB, commenting as chair of the Steering Group, felt that achieving a good balance on the SG would help give more credibility to the NP in the referendum.

6. Publicity

Largely covered under previous items above. Key actions are to put together NP website material and get the posters seeking topic group volunteers produced and located at key points in the parish.

7. Stakeholder Management

RCOH were asked to comment on the stakeholder list. Their main comment was to ensure SG got a list of the statutory consultees. GD agreed to seek this from TDC (already actioned) . A draft letter to start stakeholder engagement was circulated by PB at the meeting, incorporating GD's comments. This was agreed and will be sent out, when the overlap between statutory stakeholders and our list is clarified. All welcomed GD's TDC engagement meetings on Neighbourhood Planning of which one had already been held and next is in July. The aim of these is to facilitate the dialogue on the NP with TDC. GD agreed to write these meetings up and circulate to SG members, and take on board any points, or concerns SG members may have going into such meetings.

8. Visioning Meeting

Due to pace of progress and availabilities of SG members, the visioning meeting will be held in early September , with an SG pre-visioning session to be set up in August to help SG members prepare.

9. Date of Next SG meeting

GD would get this in the diary with the aim of getting all SG members to attend, which may mean a different day of the week, given past attendance problems.

**Limpsfield Parish Council : Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (6th meeting):
21 June 7pm – 10.15 pm at Berry House Limpsfield**

- 1. Attendees:** Phillip Bailey (PB), Bernie de Haldevang (BH), John Thompson (JT), Martin Hogbin (MH), Osmund Stuart Lee (OSL), Mark Wilson (MW), Geoff Dessent (GD)

Absence: None

2. Approval of Minutes of 5th NP SG meeting

Minutes approved with one minor comment circulated and added to the LPC dropbox folder

3. Communications / PR

a. Neighbourhood Plan Website

Holding page established. The timeline depends on the provision of content. It was agreed using the Lingfield NP sites headings would be useful, and that content should be drawn from Bernie's article, the leaflet produced from the fate. It should also include material about what a Neighbourhood Plan can influence, the timeline, minutes and agendas of the SG meetings, progress reports about the topic groups and updates about the heritage and character study being carried out by AECOM, as well as progress by rCOH.

Action: MH and OST to develop the content as above supported by BH.

Training on how to add and manage material on the website would now be arranged.

Action MH to arrange this.

b. Dropbox use – concept / admin

MH explained the concept and noted that a number of Councillors were still having problems accessing dropbox.

Action: MH to assist all to get access to dropbox.

c. Leaflets / Posters / Social Media

PB felt that given the other pressures on Councillors', it would make sense to ask Cox and Co to help out on artwork/creative materials for leaflets/posters and

banners. It was agreed that Cox and co should be approached to do this to support MW and BH. PB felt that the contingency amount would adequately cover this.

Action PB, MW and BH to seek support from Cox and Co as required.

It was also felt that as AECOM were doing the work on stakeholder engagement that new artwork/materials produced by Cox and Co should be shown to AECOM, and that a consistent logo (the sign outside the parish church) should be used on all materials.

As regards to production of materials, MW felt he had a good provider and that we should still with them All agreed they the current provider gave excellent service and good value for money.

It was also agreed that there should be an overall plan for communications/publicity, including which vehicles are to be used and when, along with key dates for bursts of publicity.

Action PB to draw up an initial timeline for the Neighbourhood Plan, which includes the communications plan.

4. Recruitment of volunteers/remit of Topic Working Groups

a. Progress

Good progress had been made. Councillors felt that before the topic group volunteers meeting on 21 July, all volunteers should be allocated into a particular topic group PB asked GD to follow up and get new unallocated volunteers preferences. MW agreed to help with this.

Action: GD to get as many volunteers allocated to groups as possible, and then councilors would allocate the rest to topic groups before the meeting on 21 July (final check at 7th SG meeting on 20 July).

b. Outcome of Limpsfield village fate

250 NP leaflets handed out at the fate. The reminder would be distributed to key parts of the parish by MW and Bob Harvey – eg on the Chart). MW was commended on the production of the leaflet in terms of quality, value for money and speed of production.

c. Handling of Topic groups and topic group volunteer meeting on 21 July

It was agreed that as it had been difficult recruiting topic group chairs (only one to date from volunteers) that to get things going, SG Councillors would act as the initial topic chairs to then hand over to a volunteer later on, as follows:

Housing and Development - BH (supported by MW)

Building Design and Heritage - OSL (supported by PB)

Environment and Local Economy - MH

Community Assets and Infrastructure – JT

The Chairs drawn from the group of volunteers would also sit on the Steering Group to ensure good governance arrangements.

Although some good progress has been made in fleshing out the remits of the topic groups, it was agreed that the initial chairs (as listed above) should come up with 5 bullet points of the issues their topic group would address.

Action: BH, OST, MH, JT to produce bullet point objectives for their respective topic groups by 8 July so that when agreed these can be run by rCOH and GD can circulate to all those invited to the 21 July meeting.

Annex 1 to the agenda was felt to be a good starting point for the aims of the July 21st volunteers' topic group meeting. It was agreed that the precise format should be:

- (1) Overview of Neighbourhood Planning – and timeline for Limpsfield NP – PB (based on his presentation to the last annual meeting)
- (2) Initial Chair's (as stated above) to set out the precise remit of their topic group
- (3) Ideally get volunteers to split into their topic groups flesh out further what they were aiming to do, in particular thinking about the evidence they needed to pull together – and then feedback - to do this St Peters Hall rather than the library room or Glebe room would be needed

Action: PB to dust off and update his NP presentation. GD to book St Peters Church Hall.

The aim will be to keep the 21 July meeting down to 1.5 hours (5pm – 6.30pm) – and final preparations can be discussed at the next SG meeting the day before.

5. AECOM Character and Heritage Assessment Report

All have now read the draft AECOM report structure document and seen GD's comments on it.

Action: all SG members to send in their comments to GD by 30 June. GD then to seek rCOH's comments and then send all comments to AECOM.

MH and OSL were keen to have an early meeting with AECOM to discuss the draft structure. Other Councillors were happy to wait until the first main draft was produced.

Action: . **Action:** GD to seek a way of arranging this early meeting to take place (at reasonable cost) by speaking to AECOM.

6. Stakeholder management

Informal note from chair to stakeholders has been agreed.

Action: GD to work with PB's offices to finalize address list. Also GD asked to check TDC Statutory list with Woldingham Clerk and to see if there is a standard letter which should go to statutory stakeholder consultees.

7. Pre-visioning meeting

This has been set for 3 August at 5pm in Berry House. The aim of this meeting will be to build on the topic group session held on 21 July – to prepare fully for the visioning meeting to be held on 15 September 2016.

8. Date of Next SG meeting

The next (7th) NP SG meeting will take place on 20th July at 7pm Berry House, Limpsfield.

**Limpsfield Parish Council: Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (7th meeting):
20 July 7pm – 9.30 pm at Berry House Limpsfield**

1.Attendees: Phillip Bailey (PB), Bernie de Haldevang (BH), John Thompson (JT), Martin Hogbin (MH), Osmund Stuart Lee (OSL), Mark Wilson (MW), Geoff Dessent (GD)

Absence: None

2. Approval of Minutes of 5th NP SG meeting

Minutes approved and added to the LPC dropbox folder

3. Communications / PR

d. Neighbourhood Plan Website

The NP website is completed, though there is scope to add further material. Cox and Co are producing a training video and aiming to arrange a face to face session as well.

Action: MH to set up training session to be held at Berry House.

It was agreed that GD and MH would manage the website content for the most part. However, PB agreed to do a monthly update for the website after each NP SG meeting.

Action: PB to produce monthly NP update following each SG meeting for the NP website

e. Dropbox use – concept / admin

MH keen to see all relevant documents put on dropbox as a matter of course.

Action: All to engage and use dropbox for greater council efficiency.

f. Leaflets / Posters / Social Media

MW felt that it would be valuable to produce a leaflet setting out the 4 topic group objectives.

Action : MW to prepare a leaflet setting out the 4 topic group objectives for wide circulation, following the topic group meeting on 21 July .

PB circulated the proposed 4 versions of the NP logo. All liked these and it was agreed that the council would pay the £150 from NP funds to adopt and use these logos from now on.

Action: GD to ensure invoice for this is paid promptly

Following on from previous discussions, it was agreed that a communications plan was very important to ensuring the success of the NP.

Action PB to draw up an initial communications plan for the NP.

4. Recruitment of volunteers/remit of Topic Working Groups

d. Progress

Good progress had been made. There are now 16 confirmed volunteers. It will be important to spread these people evenly between the topic groups and identify volunteer topic group chairs to take over from the initial Councillor chairs, who will then join the NP SG.

e. Handling of Topic groups and topic group volunteer meeting on 21 July

Whilst there was a clear need for topic groups to collate the relevant evidence, PB felt it was important to make full use of what we already have, and that topic groups should put their requests for additional evidence to GD so that these can be properly coordinated to minimize duplication and TDC and others being bombarded with information requests.

Action: OSL, BH, MH, JT – to adhere to this approach to evidence gathering, and to instill this approach in volunteer chairs when they are recruited.

The SG Councillors have produced objectives for their respective topic groups, which have been circulated on 21 July to all the volunteers. These were discussed as follows:

Community Assets and Infrastructure

JT presented his objectives this group. PB felt that theses covered the ground well, but was slightly concerned not to over-emphasize area where LPC would have limited influence (eg NHS), and noted the omission of schools and pre-schools, which JT agreed to add. MW mentioned that information about bus timetables was weak, with no electronic displays at bus stops which might be a reasonable aspiration for the community. PB was keen that the topic group identified the key challenges and possible solutions.

Housing and Development

BH introduced his objectives for this group. There was a discussion about what a “functional village” meant. BH felt it was one where there were basic amenities available. Whilst the Limpsfield shops trade association had not met for 2 years, all

felt this was ma group which should be engaged in both this topic group and the one on environment and local economy. There was a recognition of a housing need for those “downsizing” and younger people who has grown up in the community seeking to buy their own house here. However, this was felt not to be in the arena of “affordable housing” where it was not clear there was a parish need (unless the evidence supports it).

Environment and Local Economy

MH presented his suggestions for the objectives of this group. This included sustaining and expanding the local economy including supporting the rural economy. MH made the point that all forms of development have an impact on the environment and that this should be fully taken on board (with ref to EU environmental law compliance – unlikely to change over the medium term). PB was keen that this topic group identified what was not working well, and what might be done to improve things. All were keen that the environment was described in relation not just to green belt, but areas of outstanding natural beauty and the TDC definition of areas of great landscape value.

Building Design and Heritage

The objectives of this topic group were presented by OSL. All felt that the AECOM character and heritage study would provide some good guidance for this group in terms of its focus and direction. OSL felt that it was important to catalogue the types of architecture and heritage to ensure that where something proposed/planned did not fit in, it would be easy to demonstrate this. There would be value in using the TDC definition of “buildings of character” and indeed “areas of buildings with character. PB cautioned about over-using these terms for fear of diluting their value. PB also felt that whilst the conservation areas should be flagged in this topic group, there was a strong case to develop a Conservation Plan, following adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Action : GD to circulate original topic group remits to help give further focus for the meeting on 21 July (Done)

Action OSL, MH, JT, BH to provide revised versions of their objectives to GD by noon on 21 July.

5. Stakeholder management

The Informal note from chair to stakeholders has been sent out to over 35 local Organizations. This has elicited responses from a number of these in support of the NP, and a comprehensive response from the Environment Agency setting out its wishes for the NP, for example underlining the importance of all source of water

supply, as the area is struggling to deliver the water supply needs for the community.

6. TDC Neighbourhood Planning Guidance

As requested, GD had circulated the TDC NP guidance. GD also reported that there was nothing new in it, which added significant value to the CLG guidance already circulated. All agreed of the value of the Limpsfield NP being produced before the Tandridge Local Plan, albeit with a need to ensure alignment with the Local Plan. MH commented that the timetable for the NPO was very tight and that all would need to maintain momentum.

7. Pre-visioning meeting

This has been set for 3 August at 5pm in Berry House. The aim of this meeting will be to build on the topic group session held on 21 July – to prepare fully for the visioning meeting to be held on 15 September 2016.

8. Date of Next SG meeting

The next (8th) NP SG meeting will take place on 1st August at 7pm Berry House, Limpsfield to reflect on the 21 July meeting and prepare for the pre-visioning meeting.

**Limpsfield Parish Council: Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (8th meeting):
1 August 7pm – 9.30 pm at Berry House Limpsfield**

1. Attendees: Phillip Bailey (PB), Bernie de Haldevang (BH), John Thompson (JT), Martin Hogbin (MH), Osmund Stuart Lee (OSL), Mark Wilson (MW), Geoff Dessent (GD)

Absence: None

2. Approval of Minutes of 5th NP SG meeting

Minutes approved and added to the LPC dropbox folder

3. Communications / PR

g. Neighbourhood Plan Website

Cox and Co have produced a training video and sent link to SG members.

Action: All to watch video at least twice – if any outstanding questions. These should be passed to MH to put to Cox and Co.

It was agreed that GD and MH would manage the website content for the most part. However, PB agreed to do a monthly update for the website after each NP SG meeting under a stop press banner.

Action: PB to produce monthly NP update following each SG meeting for the NP website. First entry will be for September.

h. Dropbox use – concept / admin

MH keen to see all relevant documents put on dropbox as a matter of course.

Action: All to engage and use dropbox for greater council efficiency. MH agreed to assist PB with dropbox access as he had been having problems.

i. Leaflets / Posters / Social Media

MW felt that it would be valuable to produce a leaflet setting out the 4 topic group objectives. He is progressing.

Following on from previous discussions, it was agreed that a communications plan was very important to ensuring the success of the NP.

Action PB has asked AECOM to draw up an initial communications plan for the NP (GD reminded AECOM to progress this on 2 August)

4. Reflections of Topic Group Volunteers meeting on 21 July

As Ann Osborne has agreed to chair the Environment and Local Economy topic group, this will be formally confirmed, as there were no other nominations, She will then be invited to future NP SG meetings.

Lucy Stuart-Lee will chair the Housing and Development topic group closely supported by Bernie de Haldevang..

OSL said that he felt either Angela Howells or Rob O'Donovan might wish to chair the Design and Heritage topic group.

Action: OSL to speak with Angela and Rob to identify a chair.

JT reported that he only had Rodney Coulson and David Bell were on the Community Assets and infrastructure group. And whilst both were interested to be involved, neither wished to chair due to time limitations. John Tolley joined one of the other topic groups but had indicated that he was also interested in this group. And therefore it was felt worthwhile following up to see if he wished to chair.

Action: GD to contact John Tolley (Email sent on 2 August)

An alternative chair might be William Pratt.

Action: OSL agreed to ask William if would consider chairing the Community Assets and Infrastructure group.

JT suggested that as it was proving difficult to get a volunteer chair for the community assets and infrastructure group, that this might be subsumed into the other topic groups reducing the number to 3. All felt that this was premature given the significance of the issues this group had to address and therefore PB proposed that we would retain 4 topic groups for now, and review if we really could not get a chair. All felt that volunteers had not appreciated the great importance of the community assets and infrastructure group.

JT also reported that on 21 July with AECOM and two volunteers help they had compiled an initial list of community assets. JT felt a more formal survey to do this should be undertaken. In the meantime, PB asked that this list be typed up.

Action JT to produced typed up list of community assets developed at 21 July meeting (assisted as required by GD)

PB also asked that other interim chairs do a short note of their discussions on 21 July with volunteers within their topic groups.

Action: OSL, BH, JT, MH to complete write ups before next NP SG meeting on 6 September.

Others interested in helping who had not yet come forward were the John Metcalf, Lila Turner and James Hearn

Action: GD to contact all 3 to see what involvement they would be interested in. (emails sent on 2 August)

The status of topic group document now needed some updating.

Action: GD to update topic group status document (done – see annex 1- and on dropbox)

There was a separate discussion about a recent notice erected by the farmer using the Glebe field questioning public rights of way /footpath.

Action: MW to ask Michael Bruning to look into this (as he looks after rights of way for the main LP council – seeking legal advice as necessary from Came and Co.)

5. Pre-visioning meeting

This has been set for 3 August at 7pm in Berry House. The aim of this meeting will be to build on the topic group session held on 21 July and 8th NP SG meeting to prepare fully for the visioning meeting to be held on 15 September 2016 at 1pm until 4pm.

Attendees will be:

All members of NP SG Steering Group as listed at 1 above.

Ann Osborne; Roger Oldfield; Lucy Stuart-Lee; William Pratt

There was a significant discussion about the draft list of 7 NP key issues/objectives presented at the meeting by JT. The discussion resulted in a revised key NP issues/objectives document as set out at annex 2.

6. Date of Next SG meeting

The next (9th) NP SG meeting will take place on 6th September at the slightly later time of 7.30pm at Berry House, Limpsfield to monitor progress and prepare for the visioning meeting on 15 September.

**Limpsfield Parish Council: Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (9th meeting):
6 September 7.30pm – 9.30 pm at Berry House Limpsfield**

1. Attendees: Phillip Bailey (PB), John Thompson (JT), Martin Hogbin (MH), Osmund Stuart Lee (OSL), Lucy Stuart-Lee (LSL) Geoff Dessent (GD)

Absence: Bernie de Haldevang (BdH), Mark Wilson (MW), Ann Osborn (AO)

2. Approval of Minutes of 8th NP SG meeting

Minutes approved with two minor changes (flagged) and added to the LPC dropbox folder Clerk NP (minutes).

A few general comments were made on the state of play of the Neighbourhood Plan by PB. He felt that if resources (ie numbers involved in topic groups) were less than we had hoped we may need to be less ambitious in the NP, but reminded the meeting that the NP can be reviewed and further developed every 2 -3 years.

3. Communications / PR

j. Neighbourhood Plan Website

It was agreed that GD should update the LPC website NP section from the text of the latest parish newsletter about NP to replace the current text which relates to the Tandridge Local Plan. It was also agreed that GD should put a link from the LPC website to the NP website to increase access to the new NP website.

Action GD to update LPC website as regards NP.

GD reported that the Cox and Co training video about the website was difficult to follow. Cox and Co have acknowledge this and are offering GD a session to fully understand how to manage the website.

k. Leaflets / Posters / Social Media/Comms Plan

JT raised concerns that the NP is not visible enough in the community in particular to younger people. JT also felt that the comms plan from AECOM was a little disappointing, but nonetheless it did help spark some ideas. MH felt that to engage more of the community that it might be necessary to be slightly provocative to get their interest. PB agreed to draft some text for the NP website – which could also be used on a leaflet/poster. The type of issues which might be raised include – should we have more footpaths/cycle paths ? – should there be better access to the Glebe field – what do people feel about the green belt designation ?. PB felt that as well as the major issues of housing and

development, and large possible projects (eg a new community centre) there were also lots of more minor issues which might well feature in the NP. For example, the cleaning of road signs. (In the past Surrey CC offered LPC a budget for this to take on the responsibility but this was not taken up)

Action PB to draft piece for website and leaflet/poster and circulate in particular for BdH's input for implementation by 20 September.

Everyone felt that the idea of having some post boxes for suggestions and ideas for NP something worth pursuing as it would be very visible. Such post-boxes should be brightly coloured with NP logos on it and contact details and be located at key locations within the parish and adjoining it where there was likely to be high footfall of Limpsfield parishioners which have proved harder to reach (eg Morrisons, Oxted Station).

Action: GD to look into how to make this happen within by 20 September.

4. Topic Groups progress

- **Membership** – not surprisingly the membership is dominated by older retired people who have the time to devote. And it was agreed that it was important engage younger people via other means as set out above. There were still 3 unallocated people who had volunteered.

Action: PB to chase up John Metcalf and James Hearn. GD to continue to contact Richard Walden.

- **Key issues** – all agreed that the topic groups should have met (preferably twice) before the visioning meeting and prepared a note of their ideas and findings to date by the next SG meeting to be held on 3 October the day before the visioning meeting.

Action: All Topic Group Chairs (LSL/BdH, OSL, AO, JT) progress note before 3 October.

- **Recruitment of Topic Group chairs** – this continues to be difficult as regards the Building Design and Heritage group and the Community Assets Group, which will continue for the time being to be chaired by the interim Cllr chairs (OSL and JT).

- **GD to attend NP topic group meetings** – this was agreed to be a helpful way of supporting topic groups and ensuring that the overlaps were well managed. GD agreed to take topic group meeting minutes.
- **progress**

Environment and Local Economy – meetings held and good progress as evidenced by the note circulated to this meeting showing ideas about overall vision and objectives for the topic group including ideas on progress indicators. PB very much welcomed this very positive progress. MH reported that as the Glebe field was not in the green belt, that the group would be doing work on local habit to try and get the field designated as a “local green space”. PB also advised that as it was likely that TDC would be pressing for changes to the amount of green belt, then it would be prudent for the group to consider trying to designate other green spaces as “local green spaces” to protect them.

Housing and Development – no meetings held – one planned for 15 September. GD to be invited. One of the key issues for this group will be the case to build on the old allotments (either but setting down exceptional circumstances to build in the green belt), or by declassifying from the green belt (and possibly swapping something else in). The group will need to decide whether it wishes to comment on specific sites across the parish as highlighted by TDC or whether to set out criteria for places which are suited to building and developing in the parish and those which are not.

Action: LSL/BdH to schedule first meeting of this topic group

Building Design and Heritage – no meetings but 6 people now in the topic group all gaining access to relevant dropbox folders. This groups work will be supported by the AECOM character and heritage assessment where a first draft will be available by the third week in September. However, everyone felt to help energize progress in this area the latest draft workings from AECOM should be circulated.

Action GD to ask AECOM for their latest work. (message left with Eddie Hall 7 Sept)

Community Assets and Infrastructure – topic group meeting held on 30 August. Note of that meeting has been circulated and put on dropbox. The community assets list has been enhanced and Rodney Coulson has agreed to plot all the assets on a map of the parish. Key issues which came out was a need for more allotments, the value of things which attract tourists, a dearth of overnight accommodation for tourists. Key issues on the infrastructure side were identified as parting and traffic flows/transport. MH felt there was more scope to influence off road parking (eg by type of housing parking provision to be built), than on road parking. PB asked that international financial services be added to the assets list .as well as a sustainable energy business.(These have been added on Sept 7).

5. Visioning meeting

This has been set for 4 October at 6pm (until 9pm) above Oxted Library, . The aim of this meeting will be to develop a Neighbourhood Plan vision, using the output from the 4 topic groups and the key issues identified at the pre-visioning meeting.

Attendees will be:

All members of core NP SG Steering Group plus one representative of each topic group, TDC and rCOH. This is currently:

Mark Wilson, Bernie de Haldevang, John Thompson, Philip Bailey, Osmund Stuart Lee, Geoff Dessent, Ann Osborne; Roger Oldfield; Lucy Stuart-Lee; William Pratt, Piers Mason, Brendan O'Neil plus one further person from rCOH.

Ann Osborn can't make the date but Martin Hogbin can represent her topic group.

6. Date of Next SG meeting

The next (10th) NP SG meeting will take place on 3rd October, 2016 at 7.30pm at Berry House, Limpsfield High Street

**Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (10th meeting): 3 October
7.30pm – 10.30 pm at Berry House Limpsfield**

1. Attendees: Phillip Bailey (PB), John Thompson (JT), Mark Wilson (MW), Bernie de Haldevang (BdH) Martin Hogbin (MH), Osmund Stuart Lee (OSL), Lucy Stuart-Lee (LSL) Geoff Dessent (GD), Robert O' Donovan (RoD)

Absence: ,Ann Osborn (AO)

2. Approval of Minutes of 9th NP SG meeting

Minutes approved and added to the dropbox folder Clerk NP (minutes).

3. Communications / PR

The latest article on the NP has gone out in the Limpsfield Parish Newsletter. LSL suggested we might put something similar in the Oxted Review. PB suggested that whilst exploring an article would be useful, it may also be helpful to find out how much an advert would cost in the Oxted Review to simply make people aware of the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan process.

Action : GD to contact Oxted Review

RoD suggested that we might repeat the article put in the Limpsfield Parish News in the "Chart" news to reach the residents in Limpsfield Chart.

Action: RoD to contact the "Chart" News to gauge level of interest in such an article

Action: GD to provide RoD with a copy of the NP article written for the Limpsfield Parish News

JT raised some general concerns that the SG should be doing more to engage and communicate with the residents of the parish about the NP. And asked that this was a major item at the next SG meeting. JT also questioned the value for money for the strand of AEPOM's work on stakeholder engagement where delivery to date had been disappointing.

GD reported that all the 12 (indoor) Suggestion boxes and 7 Wheelie Bin suggestion boxes were in position as planned on 3rd October. MW suggested that there should be a rota drawn up of SG members to check on all locations regularly to collect responses and replenish leaflets/pencils.

Action : GD to circulate list of locations to seek volunteers from the NP SG to take responsibility for a number of SB and WB sites. (Note circulated on 4 October)

Action: All to update dropbox with suggestions received as they come in.

This community engagement builds on the public meeting held last year, the further public meeting in July this year to start up the topic groups and the 35 stakeholder early engagement letters, which generated a number of substantive replies, eg from the environment agency, public health groups and age concern.

4. Topic Groups progress

PB welcomed the significant progress of the 4 topic groups, all of which have met at least twice.

In reviewing the background paper rCOH had produced for the forthcoming visioning meeting on 4th October, PB felt the SG should not only review the objectives, as set out from the pre-visioning session, but also some “threats” and “visions” for each topic group in turn.. The result is set out in annex 1 and was circulated at the visioning meeting

Since the last meeting AECOM have provided their latest draft of the character and heritage study which has a wealth of evidence from which to help build policies in particular in the housing and development topic group and the building design and heritage topic group.

Housing and Development

The background to the housing need for the district and the parish in particular, shows that over the period 2000 – 2015, Limpsfield parish had built around 3.8 houses per year. The TDC Local plan ranges from 2.8 houses per year to 7.7 houses per year. In the highest volume scenario, this would mean around 154 houses over the next 20 years.

MW explained that however many houses were to be built, a key factor would be to match existing housing density (as well as character) in any areas for development.

The H and D topic group felt it important to understand what shielding might be in place around new housing developments in terms of trees and hedges to limit the visual impact to the existing environment.

The H and D group identified a need for smaller houses, and not larger houses, both to meet the needs of downsizing and younger people, including some affordable housing, provided we have the evidence to support this. The household survey to be held in November should help to understand the parish’s housing needs more clearly LSL reported that there were some very good affordable housing developments in Tatsfield, which might prove to be a good model.

RoD felt that whatever housing was to be built, it was important to consider how this would be phased over time, not least to ensure that the supporting infrastructure can be considered in good time.

LSL noted that the Woldingham NP had defined an “in-fill” policy which may be something the Limpsfield NP might wish to consider following/adapting.

TDC are looking at district wide housing needs and also at developable sites. A further consultation on the latter will be launched by the end of October, which may change things from the TDC current proposal for the 5 sites in Limpsfield which the H and D group have been looking at.

Building Design and Heritage

AECOM’s report was a useful starting point for defining houses types in various areas of the parish but the BD and H group wanted to further divide these areas and are currently working on around 13 different character areas for the parish.

rCOH will also want to look at the AECOM report to assess how this will support the NP, and whether they feel there are any changes needed to it.

Action: RCOH to comment on AECOM report.

Community Assets and Infrastructure

JT explained that through Rodney Coulson’s excellent efforts, we now had a very good map of the main parish assets, which is still being added to, including those just over the parish border in which Limpsfield has a significant interest.

JT felt the group had yet to determine future asset needs, though the lack of a playground and place for mothers and children to meet had come up.

On infrastructure, key issues identified were a need to upgrade a number of footpaths, improve the cycle network, and seek ways of improving parking capacity, and managing traffic flows better.

Environment and Local Economy

This group has concerns about a gradual erosion of the green belt, and questioned whether the NP should be seeking to stop all development on the existing green belt, noting that 4 out of the 5 TDC proposed sites in Limpsfield for development were in the current green belt.

rCOH have already costed an extra study on a review of the parish’s green belt which will be considered in due course.

This group is keen to get a better understanding of the farming community, and the tension between land being seen as primarily agricultural or primarily parkland for walking on.

As regards the local economy this group noted that there may be a need to provide “key-worker” housing, to be fed into the Housing and Development group’s work.

Threats and Vision

The suggestions around threats and vision are shown for each topic group in annex 1.

5. Visioning meeting

This has been set for 4 October at 6pm (until 9pm) above Oxted Library, The aim of this meeting will be to develop a Neighbourhood Plan vision, using the output from the 4 topic groups and the key issues identified at the pre-visioning meeting.

Following some concerns raised that as the thinking about the Neighbourhood Plan is in its early stages, it would make most sense to ask Piers Mason to give an overview of the Tandridge Local Plan and take questions, but then leave the meeting to allow the steering group to develop its visioning ideas.

Attendees will be:

All members of core NP SG Steering Group plus one representative of each topic group, TDC and rCOH.

Mark Wilson, Bernie de Haldevang, Martin Hogbin, John Thompson, Philip Bailey, Osmund Stuart Lee, Geoff Dessent, Lucy Stuart-Lee; John Tolley, Laiila Turner, Piers Mason (first session only) Brendan O’Neil plus one further person from rCOH.

Ann Osborn can’t make the date but Martin Hogbin will represent her topic group.

6. Date of Next SG meeting

The next (11th) NP SG meeting will take place on 9 November, 2016 at 7.30pm at Berry House, Limpsfield High Street

ANNEX 1 – UPDATED TOPIC GROUP ISSUES, THREATS AND VISION

Housing and Development (HD)

- Housing need for the Parish – in progress – perceived need versus actual need is untested, local businesses need or not? What is the Affordable Housing need versus actual supply? Do we test the “need” assumptions using NP survey or perhaps use a third party consultant?
- Number of dwellings (Limpsfield recent history 3.8 dwelling pa, TDC Draft LP proposes 2.8 to 7.7 pa i.e. total next 20 years range 51 to 143 additional dwellings. Identified sites by TDC for about 30 (?) dwellings (old allotments and infilling).
- Phased development to spread out newbuilds
- Types - AECOM Draft H&C study identifies 5 Parish areas with the main residential “Limpsfield” area sub-divided into 4 sub-areas and the Wooded Greensand Hills area sub-divided with the High Chart “village” as a sub-area. There is a need for further differentiation of the “Limpsfield” 4-sub-areas - perhaps street by street?
- Green Space - Glebe and Brook Fields, Other?
- Parking provision - TDC new policy on newbuild parking space per bedroom assists but parking in village (residents) and in lower part of Oxted High Street (shoppers) and for Limpsfield residents using Oxted shops and rail station is a major issue
- Sites for development (in progress – TDC sites proposed in Green Belt – Hookwood removed but why?)
- New development access to Community Assets and Infrastructure - (in progress)

THREATS:

- Green Belt reclassification (three areas around Limpsfield subject to TDC “further investigation”
- Green Belt “exception” builds resulting in spread
- Trading of some Green Belt areas for protecting others – practicality?

VISION:

- Not vastly different from today
- Sympathetic and small incremental increase in dwellings

Design and Heritage (DH)

- Types of development - which suit the character and heritage of Limpsfield parish – AECOM Draft H & C study – requires local input and further sub-division of character areas
- Preserving existing heritage and character, protecting the Conservation Area and identifying districts/buildings/topography of special interest or importance – more buildings of special interest to be added
- Design Codes and guidance – what could be put in place and how would this align with the National Planning Framework – how detailed can the requirements in sub-areas for newbuilds and changes to existing be?

THREATS:

- Moorehouse development - traffic flows
- Incompatible newbuildings in sub-areas

VISION:

- Preservation of existing character
- Keep conservation area (or expand with other designations?)
- Policies to address changes to existing buildings, not just newbuilds
- Not vastly different from today - sympathetic and small incremental increase in dwellings

Community Assets and Infrastructure (CA&I)

- Community Assets/Services - see inventory (large and varied in number but village centric)
- what is needed now and in the future (in progress)
- Travel infrastructure – congestion/traffic flow on roads (traffic lights for High Street, foot and cycle path improvements)
- Parking – current and future needs and capacity (mainly Limpsfield village issue and essential to address)

THREATS:

- Traffic flow in High Street (impact of Moorehouse development?)
- Parking in Village (and lower part of Oxted High Street?)

VISION:

- Playground for children (Recreation ground part of Glebe field? – like playground on Limpsfield Chart or bigger to draw in visitors?)

Environment and Local Economy (E&LE)

- Protection of Green space – what are different definitions/types
- Green Belt – how to balance it not being part of the NP but still addressing it in the NP? Position of “no-development” versus some “exceptional” (allotments) versus protection elsewhere – is there the need for a separate Green Belt report?
- Natural Environment (not sure what this is)
- Business economy – much vibrant extensive than realised – how to involve businesses in Oxted High Street (join Limpsfield Traders Association?). Agricultural business but also market garden, equestrian, rural sports (?). How to sustain and expand – parking in village and Oxted / home businesses (in progress)
- Demographic make-up – understanding the demographic profile now and in the future and assessing what impact this may have (on the local economy, traffic flows, use of community assets, etc.)

THREATS:

- Trend away from agricultural use to “Parkland” use (but equestrian and vine groves not Parkland?)
- Green Belt reclassification
- Traffic congestion

VISION:

- A “natural” demographic of mixed ages desirable

- Accommodation for key local workers (but assumes that is none?)

Note: As there are inevitably overlapping interests between topic groups, the issues have been put under the topic group with the primary interest and task of gathering the evidence.

Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

4 October 2016

**Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (11th meeting): 9 November
7.30pm – 11 pm at Berry House Limpsfield**

- 1. Attendees:** Phillip Bailey (PB), Mark Wilson (MW) John Thompson (JT), Osmund Stuart Lee (OSL), Lucy Stuart-Lee (LSL), Ann Osborn (AO), Laila Turner (LT), Geoff Dessent (GD)
- 2. Absence:** , Martin Hogbin (MH), Robert O' Donovan (RoD), Bernard De Haldevang (BdH)

3. Approval of Minutes of 10th NP SG meeting

Minutes approved and added to the dropbox folder Clerk NP (minutes)

4. Confirmation of the Terms of Reference

PB circulated an updated version of the Terms of Reference (ToR) originally drafted in January 2016. The revised ToR clarified the procedures for agreeing expenditure by a majority of Councillors on the SG, following overall budget approval from the main Limpsfield Parish Council.

The revised wording was agreed and adopted by the NP Steering Group (SG)

Also, JT agreed to take on the role of treasurer for the NP SG.

5. Visioning meeting/report/next steps

There was a wide-ranging discussion about the visioning session and report from rCOH which also took in the main aspects of progress from the 4 topic groups.

AO felt it important to make progress on the household survey. PB explained that he felt we had a little further to go to frame the precise questions to get the best out of this, though the 93 replies to the suggestion leaflets were a very good start. And that this is something which AECOM will be asked to pull together with a view to this happening in January/February next year.

MW sad he was keen to get as much from the suggestion leaflets as possible and was happy to spend some time with the parents from Limpsfield Infants schools to generate more replies.

AO felt that in terms of visioning we should be thinking about our approach to the Green Belt and possible development, recognizing local residents' concerns. She also felt that the separation between Oxted and Limpsfield was very important. Whilst there were some who felt that there should be no development on the green belt, given the National pressure and need for housing and large amount of green

belt in Limpsfield, there would be a need to compromise and manage whatever such development might be planned.

MW felt it was important to consider carefully how much housing development was really needed and the type of housing that best responded to that need and fitted in with the local character of the parish.

AO had some concerns about the TDC proposed sites near the old allotments that there were risks of this further joining Limpsfield to Oxted, and that this would need to be taken into account when commenting on those proposals.

OSL pointed out that TDC have to seek to build the planned 9000 or so houses within the district, but it was important that we were clear what Limpsfield needed in terms of number, type and character. And that the NP would constrain things to that.

MW felt there was a clear need for affordable housing to allow local employment to flourish, but he was clear that this was “affordable” and not “social” as the need for the latter had not been demonstrated over and above current provision.

OSL had some concerns about the figures stated in rCOHs report on page 3 and PB agreed we should seek clarification on these housing numbers as what was presented was unclear.

It was noted that there is an increasing recognition by TDC that the development of adequate infrastructure is an important consideration and that there are widespread concerns.

It was agreed that it was important ahead of the commissioning of the household survey to have a clear vision statement and clear objectives across all four of the topic groups, drawing from the work to date in the topic groups, the suggestion leaflet feedback and other developments.

Acton: GD to draft something and work this up with PB to circulate to the full NP SG as soon as possible (GD sent a first draft to PB on 10 November)

6.Communications / PR

(a) Neighbourhood Plan website/Social Media/Email

There is currently no support contract in place for the NP website.. GD asked the SG approve a 1 year support contract for £500 with Cox and Co the website developers, to cover website support and the promotion of messages through use of social media. SG members felt that this was OK in principle but wanted:

- A 3 month each way cancellation clause.
- Confirmation that VAT was not payable
- included within the deal should be (monthly) np website statistics (hits etc)

Action: GD to seek a quote along the above lines, to be approved by JT on behalf of the NP SG. (Quote obtained – 10th November – and sent to JT)

There was also an outstanding action about putting some old photographs obtained by MW on the website. The action rests with MH.

It was agreed that the chairs monthly update was useful and should continue, but that perhaps a regular newsletter emailed to the ever-growing list of local contacts might be useful as well, if resources permit.

JT also felt that we should be doing more proactively on social media. This has increased with daily tweeting by GD, and can further increase with the new website/social media support contract.

(b) Leaflets Posters/Articles

Successful article has come out in Oxted local. Further articles for that magazine are being considered by MW (in consultation with BdH)

Unclear on status of proposed article for the Limpsfield Chart New (action rests with RoD)

MW also agreed to look into the costs of banners to promote the Neighbourhood Plan to residents to further help engagement. (TDC would need to give their confirmation of approval for this - details being sought about advertising approvals process by GD.)

(c) Wheelie Bin/Suggestion Box/Survey Monkey project

38 suggestion forms have been returned along with 55 replies to the parallel Survey Monkey, making a total of 93 replies, with more to come by the end of November (when the project finishes).

The paper suggestion leaflets tended to be returned by older residents, and the survey monkey used by young adults (eg parents from PANDA were keener to use Survey Monkey).

PB has analyzed all the responses to bring out the main issues, which are in descending order of frequency

- Traffic flows (eg in Limpsfield High Street/Granville Road)
- Parking
- Protection of Green Space/Green Belt from Development
- Affordable Housing and Housing for Downsizing
- Improvements to footpaths and pavements
- Better Facilities for Dog Walkers (waste bins)
- Village atmosphere/supporting local business
- Health Care provision
- Limpsfield Village Playground

- Bus Services

This list may further change as we get more replies, but given the number of responses which have come in, we have already a good indication of the things residents are most concerned about.

7.Stakeholder Management

An annex of 10 proposed key stakeholders was circulated with the agenda. This was agreed with the following changes:

- Remove Tandridge District Council and GD already has on-going dialogue with them about the Neighbourhood Plan
- Remove the Oxted and Limpsfield wives fellowship, and age Concern. Replace with Tandridge Voluntary Sector Council (who would have a good overview of these and a number of other local voluntary organizations)
- Add the National Trust
- Add Surrey County Council (Highways)

A full revised list is set out at Annex 1.

It was agreed GD would set up meetings with all ten, inviting along key people from topic groups to attend with him. It was agreed PB should be involved in the meeting with the Oxted and Limpsfield Residents Group, as this is a particularly important stakeholder as regards decisions about new development.

8.Contractors/Staff

- Rcoh – comments to be fed back on their report
- AECOM – Heritage and Character study – all felt a good piece of developing work. All to consider when this is finished it should be published ahead of the Neighbourhood Plan, to help demonstrate the evidence base being used
- AECOM – stakeholder engagement – PB explained that the next phase was to commissioning the household survey (which might be planned for January/February) and following that some public engagement meetings
- NP coordinator had put in 116 unpaid hours during September and October, due to the acceleration of work in the topic groups and the project to seek suggestions about the Neighbourhood Plan through Wheelie Bins, Suggestion Boxes and Survey Monkey.

Acton: Extra hours to be paid to be recommended by PB and agreed by the NP SG.

9.Date of Next SG meeting

The next (12th) NP SG meeting will take place on 5 December, 2016 at 7.45pm at Berry House, Limpsfield High Street

Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (12th meeting): 5 December 7.45pm – 11 pm at Berry House Limpsfield High Street

1. Attendees: Phillip Bailey (PB), Mark Wilson (MW) John Thompson (JT), Osmund Stuart Lee (OSL), Lucy Stuart-Lee (LSL), Ann Osborn (AO), Laila Turner (LT), Geoff Dessent (GD) Robert O' Donovan (RoD)

2. Absence: , Martin Hogbin (MH), , Bernard De Haldevang (BdH)

3. Approval of Minutes of 11th NP SG meeting

Minutes approved and added to the dropbox folder Clerk NP (minutes). LT wondered whether there should be direct engagement with Martin Fisher. – this will be covered as Martin is attending the January LPC meeting where Neighbourhood Plan matters will be reported and discussed.

4. Visioning meeting/report/next steps

PB circulated two documents:

- PB's vision for the parish (attached – annex 1))
- GDs suggest current vision and policy objectives (enclosed - annex 2)

PB's vision included:

- An answer to the congestion on Limpsfield high street and surrounding roads (eg one way system, Limpsfield bypass, strong HGV restrictions, other)
- New car parking capacity within and surrounding Limpsfield (on wolfs row development sites (underground), dotted around village (edge of glebe field)
- Protection of a green band space around Limpsfield
- Good quality interconnected footpaths, pavements, cycle paths and bridleways to ensure connectivity throughout the parish for residents and visitors
- Protection of views
- Support of flourishing local business
- More appropriate bus services (routes and bus sizes)

Action: All to comment on the above and in particular the alignment of the two, and to seek input from their topic groups.

Action: GD to brief rCOH and AECOM on the above and invite AECOM to a new year meeting to kick off the work on the household survey, bringing a draft outline

survey to that meeting, which has been informed by rCOH's view of the policies to be tested in the household survey.

5. Communications / PR

(a) Neighbourhood Plan Website and Social Media

- GD has been increasingly active on social media posting activity daily about the Neighbourhood Plan
- Website and support contract with Cox and Co now in place as agreed Cox and Co working up a social media plan to accompany the planned household survey, as well as slicker use of social media presence.

(b) Articles/Banners

- Article drafted by RoD (based on Oxted Local article) for the Limpsfield Chart News – we await to see whether this is taken up – if not an updated article will be produced for the Feb/March edition which will coincide with the household survey
- MW reported that large banners would cost around £40 - £50. Whilst this might be an option, others favored the smaller poster size placards as used by OLRG, in the recent Moorhouse campaign. All agreed such activity should happen to support the household survey in the new year.

(c) Wheelie Bin/Suggestion Boxes/Survey Money initial survey

All now ended with around 130 responses. The key issues emerging were:

- Traffic congestion (in particular on Limpsfield high street) and surrounding roads
- Need for more parking capacity
- Protection of village street scene
- Smaller housing (downsizing and key workers/affordable)
- Protection of green spaces (including green belt)
- Improvements to footpaths and pavements
- Concerns about health services/infrastructure in general

6. Stakeholder Holder discussions

GD reported:

- Stakeholder conversations with TDC, Environment Agency, Water companies, National Trust, Oxted Bid, Titsey estate, Surrey public health, churches, OLRG, Oxted Parish Council and the Voluntary Sector.
- 9 out of 10 proposed stakeholder conversations had taken place already with a few more planned, which seemed likely to be useful
- Common themes which emerged included that no building was not an option (endorsed by OLRG and the National Trust)

- Some building on the green belt was almost inevitable, provided this was carefully managed
- Smaller housing for downsizers and key workers should be the priority for any new build
- Stakeholder support for improving the network for footpaths and pavements, and cycle ways
- Concerns about health services, and a feeling that support for health provision in Hurst Green might be the best option
- Protecting non-green belt spaces such as the Glebe field was key
- Action on parking and traffic flows top issue for stakeholders
- All stakeholders were very pleased to be consulted and felt that the Steering group were going about the exercise of developing the NP in a very professional way

7. Topic Groups update

(a) Environment and Local Economy

- Proposals to define 4 “local green spaces” including part of the Wolfs Row/St Michael’s 5 TDC proposed development sites, as well as the Glebe/Brook field, Stanhopes green and Padbrook pond
- More work to do supporting local business

(b) Community Assets and Infrastructure

- Comprehensive map of community assets – some to be considered as assets of value
- innovative ideas on parking
- traffic flow remedy ideas
- identification of footpaths/pavement in need of enhancement but work more to do
- bus services ideas and more dialogue needed
- work still to do on community hall assets

(c) Housing and Development

- Possible development sites understood
- Issues about character and density need to be explored
- Local housing need in terms of numbers to be pinned down (downsizing/key worker affordable housing needs)

(d) Building Design and Heritage

- Aligned of 13 “character” areas defined with AECOM heritage study
- Need to overlay heritage and character needs on housing needs – density/type of building materials/style of build etc

7 .Date of Next SG meeting

The next (13th) NP SG meeting will take place in January 2017 at 7.45pm at Berry House, Limpsfield High Street (date to be agreed).

Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (13th meeting): 17 January 7.30pm – 10.40 pm at Berry House Limpsfield

1. Attendees: Phillip Bailey (PB), Mark Wilson (MW) John Thompson (JT), Osmund Stuart Lee (OSL), Geoff Dessent (GD) Robert O' Donovan (RoD) Martin Hogbin (MH), Bernard De Haldevang (BdH)

Absence: Ann Osborne (AO), Lucy Stuart-Lee (LSL)

2. Approval of Minutes of 12th NP SG meeting

Minutes approved and added to the dropbox folder Clerk NP (minutes) – done on 18 January.

3. Visioning Statement/Objectives

All agreed that latest draft circulated is adequate to help AECOM and rCOH develop the household questionnaire. However, it was agreed that the vision and policy objectives would need to be formally agreed at a future NP SG meeting, for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan document.

3A – Community Assets and Infrastructure group (added to the agenda)

There was also some feedback from the most recent Community Assets and Infrastructure topic group at which PB presented his conceptual vision for the NP.

PB recognized that there must be a wide range of options considered as regards parking and traffic flows and saw some attractions to some of CA and I groups ideas (eg traffic lights on Limpsfield High Street).

JT felt that there was a need to engage more with the Church and diocese as regards the future of St Peters Church Hall/need for a community centre. MH was keen that before substantial dialogue happened that the Glebe field be well along the road to being registered as a "Local Green Space". PB and MW felt the two could be done in parallel

Action: GD to open dialogue with diocese – following PB providing best contact

4. Communications / PR

(a) Social Media Programme – resourcing

Whilst Cox and Co have produced a helpful outline for a Social Media Plan to support the Household Survey and NP more generally, GD explained that this needed resourcing. And that there was a resource need beyond Social Media, in terms of more general publicity.

The SG discussed at length. PB was keen that there be some structure to the information disseminated about the NP with a monthly topic to be used and let out over the month around which “free-style message” by others on the SG/Topic Groups could be exchanged. However, it needed someone to gather in the information to be disseminated and keep up the media traffic. The SG came up with the following way forward:

- Ideally identify a retired PR person who could be a dedicated voluntary resource to deliver this with some oversight from the NP Coordinator with technical support from Cox and Co (plus help from others).
- Alternatively pay for a resource(s) to run the supporting household survey publicity/social media, provided this can be done at a reasonable cost.

JT has some ideas and was happy to come back to the SG, with a proposal.

Action: JT (as above)

MW and BdH agreed to do some thinking in this area about what was required in framing up a job description for this work.

Action: MW and BdH in discussion with JT and GD

(b) Articles/Banners/other

Modest size banners can be placed without planning permission. GD suggested that this would be valuable in helping to secure a high level of response to the Household Survey/general engagement with the NP.

5. Household Survey

(a) AECOM First Draft - comments

AO had already made some written comments which would be taken on board. Other comments welcomed from all SG members to the NP coordinator.

PB asked that GD seeks rCOH's input – drawing on the visioning workshop, and the initial Wheelie Bin survey for a template of policy options which we should be testing out through the household survey.

Action GD to seek input from rCOH (actioned on 18/1/17)

(b) Household Survey Logistics and Analysis

MW kindly agreed to work with GD to cost the delivery and collection of the household survey. MW to check with AECOM on whether it is a requirement to post

out a hard copy to all households or whether an electronic approach can be the first port of call with a paper version only available on request. In any event, a parallel survey monkey identical to the paper version will be developed.

Action: MW and GD

PB thought the scope of the AECOM contract included the analysis of the household survey. On checking the contract GD confirmed this is the case, provided not too much time is taken up in developing the Household Survey.

Action: GD to check with AECOM that this is covered by the contract as agreed (Action completed).

6. Topic Groups update

Environment and Local Economy

- Latest 6 “Local Green Spaces paper” – circulated for comments. There were outstanding questions on whether it was necessary to seek this status for a site currently in the green belt GD agreed to raise this in his next routine catch up with Piers Mason about the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan. Others may wish to flag potential further “Local Green Spaces “ in the wider Parish, ie outside the immediate area of the Limpsfield village where the current six are located.
- More work to do supporting local business - help with grant applications might be an area worth exploring
- next meeting 23rd February, 2017

Community Assets and Infrastructure

- Comprehensive map of community assets – some to be considered as assets of value – useful evidence for NP to draw on and refer to
- innovative ideas on parking
- traffic flow remedy ideas
- identification of footpaths/pavements in need of enhancement but more work to do (permissive footpaths upgrade to “rights of way”) MW agreed to pass on ramblers contact to JT to help follow this issue up.
- bus services ideas - direct dialogue being set up with bus operators
- one of the volunteers had agreed to help JT and GD prepare a summary recommendations paper from this group to the NP SG
- Next meeting– late Feb (22, 23 or 28th)

Housing and Development

- MW preparing a position paper with input from Woldingham, including helpful ideas on infill policy and housing density
- Noted that two further sites have now been proposed by TDC as reported by MW.
- Next meeting on 1 February

Building Design and Heritage

- The group have identified 13 areas in the parish of similar characteristics and are checking that this neatly fits within the 5 broader AECOM categories as outlined in their Heritage and character study. PB encouraged the group to keep any sub-areas within the areas designated by AECOM in their report as this is the formal evidence for the NP and is supported by professional consultants.
- Keen to draw on other NPs as regards housing density and range of characteristics
- Next mtg planned 2nd Feb

7. Date of Next SG meeting

The next (14th) NP SG meeting will take place 21st February 2017 at 7.30pm at Berry House, Limpsfield High Street..

Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (14th meeting): 15 February 7pm – 11 pm at Berry House Limpsfield

1.Attendees: Phillip Bailey (PB), Mark Wilson (MW) John Thompson (JT), Osmund Stuart Lee (OSL), Geoff Dessent (GD) Robert O' Donovan (RoD) Martin Hogbin (MH), Bernard De Haldevang (BdH), Ann Osbourne (AO)

Absence: Lucy Stuart-Lee (LSL)

The agreed sole focus for this meeting was the Household Survey. There was a lot of discussion about the getting the balance right between testing out directions of travel in the various policy areas and seeking information. GD explained that the Department of Communities and Local Government felt as we have done a first survey (albeit limited), that we should go as far as possible down the road of testing ideas and possible solutions, not least so that some could be ruled out, as well as ensuring no issues are being missed.

rCOH indicated that the household survey was out of their work scope, but offered some tips, not to over-emphasize those areas over which the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) had very limited impact. This said, it is common for NP's to set out areas that the Parish Council are aiming to act on as a list of projects. It is also worth noting that other parish's household questionnaires for their NP's do cover a wide range of topics, and certainly all the topics which residents have made comments about.

2.Content of the Household Survey

There was a good deal of discussion about the following sections of the survey:

- Cover
- Intro letter
- Maps
- Sustainable Development Section
- Housing section
- Transport Section
- Character and Heritage section (touched on)

The Environment and Local Economy sections, were not discussed, nor was the "other areas", and the return logistics section.

Action: GD to produce draft 1B taking on board the points made in discussion, and seeking a simplified overall parish map. Also to seek further inputs as follows:

- MW and PB to redraft the housing section
- JT to look at the walking and cycling sections
- AO to look further at the Economy and Local Environment section

The next SG meeting coming up very shortly on 21 Feb would aim to focus on wider NP issues and the sections not yet discussed, with the aim of getting a draft which could be circulated to all topic groups as soon as possible.

3 Logistics of running the Household Survey

GD reported that he could get the household survey hand delivered by a contractor to all households for £250 + VAT. All thought that was good value for money. However, there was some confusion about who the survey should be sent to – one per household, one for council tax payer, one for everyone on the electoral role. GD was asked to seek advice on this from AECOM and suggested he also sought advice from the Neighbourhood plan policy to check whether they had any thoughts/advice on this as well.

Action: GD to contact AECOM on the question of who should directly receive a copy of the household questionnaire (actioned on 16 Feb, with an answer from AECOM sent back the same day and circulated)

GD also had secured two comparable quotes for printing the survey (one from Tangent printers and the other from the delivery contractor. These were both around £550 + VAT for 1750 copies (which allows one per household with around 200 spare – latest number of household figure is 1541.)

GD explained that the incentives offered by Amberley in their household survey were thought to have encouraged a higher response rate from younger people, which was welcome. All agreed that incentives were a good idea.

GD also explained that Councils achieving return rates of up to 60% had done this by (a) a physical presence at set times and (b) a lot of resource intensive visiting to resident's houses at pre-arranged times for different streets.

The logistics from collecting the survey still need to be agreed and appropriately resourced.

4. Date of Next SG meeting

The next (15th) NP SG meeting will take place 21st February 2017 at 7.30pm at Berry House, Limpsfield High Street..

Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (15th meeting): 21 February 7.30pm – 11 pm at Berry House Limpsfield

1. Attendees: Phillip Bailey (PB) [Chair], John Thompson (JT), Osmund Stuart Lee (OSL), Geoff Dessent (GD) Robert O' Donovan (RoD), Ann Osborn (AO), Lucy Stuart-Lee (LSL),Laila Turner (LT)

Absence: Bernard De Haldevang (BdH), Mark Wilson (MW) Martin Hogbin (MH)

2. Approval of Minutes of 13th and 14th NP SG Meetings

These were both approved without any changes. and are on dropbox.

3. Timetable for the Delivery of the Neighbourhood Plan

GD had circulated a revised timetable for delivery of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) which showed a referendum date in July 2018. There were concerns that this was too late and a keenness to bring this forward. Whilst MW had suggested aiming for May (to coincide with the local elections as Woldingham had done),members of the SG present felt that March would be better – avoiding any distraction from the Local Elections.

Action: GD to revisit timetable – and also seek views from TDC on their turnaround time, and that of the Planning inspector

A referendum in March 2018 would mean getting a draft plan to TDC by September at the very latest which meant ensuring swift progress on the Household survey and other stages of the work. It was agreed that the NP SG would meet next on 28th February to seek to finalise the remaining sections of the household survey by 1 March, to then seek topic group members' comments, and then send the survey out.

4. Communications PR

It was agreed that the rapidly developing social media activity should continue to promote the household survey via facebook and twitter and Nextdoor (going forward with the demise of streetlife) and the main PC website blog. The main website is now fully linked to the NP site, which contains regular monthly updates.

It was agreed that banners around the Parish to promote responses to the household survey would be valuable.

Action MW/BdH to look into the logistics of making this happen. The aim would be to have both a downloadable pdf of the survey and an online version for those wishing to complete the survey electronically.

5. Content of the Household Survey

Following comments, the content of the survey was discussed in detail and a number of sections were agreed subject to sight of the revised draft 1C taking in the comments from the meeting/emails. This was circulated and placed on Dropbox on 22nd February.

The remaining sections which need to be agreed are:

- Character Preservation (and Community assets)
- Transport
- Local Facilities (in part agreed)
- Green Spaces
- Local Economy
- Other Priorities

Once agreed at the next meeting on 28th February, the aim will be to seek input from all topic group members and seek to proceed with the survey.

6 Logistics of running the Household Survey

Printing and distribution has already been costed and agreed (at previous SG meetings,)

In terms of retrieving the completed surveys, it was agreed that having a physical presence at specific locations for survey's to handed in was important, and that stamp addressed envelopes was less attractive (given the expense). Some household visits to collect surveys was also felt to be useful. A parallel online survey was felt to be useful.

The analysis would be largely done by AECOM, but with a finite budget there may need to be some resourcing form the NP SG.

7. Topic Group reports

Housing and Development – LSL reported that she had now made contact with a retired planner who will be a real, asset to the group and may well be able to contribute to other topic groups.

Community Assets and Infrastructure – JT explained that the rambblers had produced an excellent paper on areas for improvements on footpaths and pavements, which was being fed into the household survey. JT also reported that contact had been made with the bus operators and a meeting will be planned. PB was keen to have a list of heritage assets alongside the list of community assets.

Action JT to take forward, with group.

Environment and Local Economy – Good progress on Local Green Spaces with 8th draft note and full pictures and diagrams now available but less progress on local economy. PB raised some concerns about whether the Pastens Road and OXT 20 sites could or should be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Heritage and Building Design – RoD explained that the group was working up policies, and had prepared input for the household survey which was mostly welcome. The group had also finalized the 13 housing character areas in the parish, which sat inside and aligned with the AECOM broader character areas.

8. Date of Next SG meeting

The next (16th) NP SG meeting will take place 28th February 2017 at 7.30pm at Berry House, Limpsfield High Street. The sole focus of this meeting will be for the NP SG to agree the Household survey in full.

Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (16th meeting): 28 February 8pm – 11.30 pm at Berry House Limpsfield

1. Attendees: Phillip Bailey (PB), Mark Wilson (MW) John Thompson (JT), Osmund Stuart Lee (OSL), Geoff Dessent (GD) Mike Kenny (MK) Martin Hogbin (MH), Ann Osborn (AO), Lucy Stuart-Lee (LSL)

Absence: Bernard De Haldevang (BdH),

The agreed sole focus for this meeting was the Household Survey

2. Changes to content of the Household Survey

The discussion led to the following changes to draft 1C of the household survey

- covering letter which needed to make reference to the work of the topic groups and also the initial “wheelie bin” survey
- new parish map provided by Rodney Coulson, which was a significant improvement on the previous parish boundary map though OSL would look to see what scope there was to further improve this

Action: OSL to determine whether a more simplify parish map can be produced, and if so to produce it as soon as possible.

- An adjustment to the question in section 2 about vision
- Significant changes to section 5 about Travel Infrastructure
- Changes to section 6 on Local facilities
- Minor change to section 7 on Local Green Spaces
- Some changes to section 8 on Local Economy
- A need to have something about the risk of urbanization
- Some changes around logistics of handling the survey – see below

Action GD to produce draft 1D of the household survey as soon as possible taking on board all the comments and suggestions made as indicated above (done within 4

hours), with a view to seeking final comments from all topic group members as soon as possible.

3 Logistics of running the Household Survey

The logistics of collecting the survey still need to be agreed and appropriately resourced. All agreed that someone being based in Oxted library at set times was useful, but needed to cater for those who are working (and consider other locations). Some door knocking may be required and banners to encourage responses.

Action: GD to seek agreement from Oxted Library/other locations

4. Date of Next SG meeting

The next (17th) NP SG meeting will be on 22nd March 2017 at 7.30pm at Berry House,

17th Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group : 22 March 7.30 pm – 11.30 pm at Berry House Limpsfield - minutes

- 1. Attendees:** Phillip Bailey (PB), John Thompson (JT), Osmund Stuart Lee (OSL), Geoff Dessent (GD) Robert O'Donovan (RoD), Martin Hogbin (MH), Lucy Stuart-Lee (LSL) Bernard De Haldevang (BdH),

Absence: Mark Wilson (MW), Ann Osborn (AO)

2.Approval of Minutes of 15th and 16th NP SG Meeting minutes

Minutes of 15th and 16th NP Steering group were approved without comment and are on dropbox.

3.Timetable for delivery of the Neighbourhood Plan

PB reminded everyone of the proposed timeline, which was aiming to complete the Neighbourhood Plan to referendum stage by March 2018. This said PB reflected that the length of time Tandridge District Council took to review the NP and also the time needed by the Planning inspector were outside the SG's control. However, it was clearly important to make as rapid progress as possible over the work over which we did have control – hence the need to get the Neighbourhood Plan Household Survey out as soon as possible.

The screening letter for the Neighbourhood Plan was agreed as drafted.

Action: GD to send the screening letter to TDC (actioned on 24 March)

4.Communications/PR

Regular daily activity has been established by GD on social media via twitter and facebook, which is being retweeted by BdH. Some of these messages also refer to Parish Council matters as well as the Neighbourhood Plan.

GD has requested quotes for banners to promote the NP household Survey – quotes awaited.

PB explained that as well as this activity there may be a need for some NP projects which if approved by the Steering group (and finance committee) for the NP coordinator to do would be classed as additional hours over and above the agreed 12 hours for the NP coordinator for 2017/18. (This is covered in more detail in the LPC minutes for March 13th 2017) PB's working assumption was that the extra NP coordinators projects hours would run at around 6 extra hours per week. This in turn will increase the overall budget for the NP to around £60k, which will require full

Council approval. There may also be NP coordinator NP delivery projects during 2018/19.

5. Household Survey – draft 1G

Numerous comments have been received and were discussed. Key changes agreed were:

- The “about you” section to be split so that only very few questions are asked at the beginning of the survey, with the rest asked at the end
- The question about vision and sustainable development to be combined with the cut down “about you” section at the beginning of the survey
- Two sections will now have ranking of importance (local facilities and law and order)
- Survey is now 24 pages long – but the printer may be able to shorten it – though as its in booklet form this would have to be reduced to 20 pages (to make any saving), which may not be possible
- Map of the Parish to be upgraded (with some extra place names) and a new map of local Green Spaces to be added **Action:** OSL
- There were a lot of tidying up and consistency checking changes

There will be a downloaded pdf version of the survey on the website and a fully interactive online version of the household survey – which will require a special NP coordinators project. It is likely that this will be done using Survey Monkey select at a cost of £26/moth for 3 months. (April/May/June)

The actions and timetable for the survey would be as follows:

Action GD to produce and circulate a revised draft taking on board the above on 23 March (done)

Action: Members of the NP SG to provide final comments on version 3 by 28th March at the very latest

Action GD to send to the printers on 29 March to get 1600 copies back by 10 April

Survey launch on 12 April at the Annual Parish meeting and to run until 30 May. Details of how people can return the surveys is included on the last page of the survey.

6. Logistics of running the Household Survey

Survey distribution has been costed at £250 + VAT. Getting a high response rate back will require some extra resource. JT reported that two of the volunteers from the Community Assets and Infrastructure Group have agreed to help. JT also wanted it recorded that members of the steering group should commit time to this very important part of achieving a successful survey..

The arrangements for the analysis of the household survey are still being finalized.

7. Protocol for sharing substantive documents

A protocol on the above was circulated (as annex 4) and comments invited. NP SG members supported this approach.

PB also invited any further comments by email but proposed that this protocol should be adopted, subject to any final comments.

.

8. Topic Groups progress reports (for rCOH)

PB handed out a template for the above. rCOH are expecting these by the end of March so that they can develop draft policies alongside the household survey and then update/adapt these when the results of the survey are available.

Action: Topic Group chairs.

9. Date of Next SG meeting

The next (18th) NP SG meeting will be on 4th April 2017 at 7.30pm at Berry House,

Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (18th meeting): 4 April 7.30 pm – 10.30 pm at Berry House Limpsfield

1.Attendees: Phillip Bailey (PB), John Thompson (JT), Osmund Stuart Lee (OSL), Geoff Dessent (GD) Martin Hogbin (MH), Lucy Stuart-Lee (LSL) Bernard De Haldevang (BdH), Ann Osborn (AO), Mark Wilson (MW),

Absence: Robert O'Donovan (RoD),

2.Approval of Minutes of 17th NP SG Meeting minutes

Minutes of 17th NP Steering group were approved without comment and are on dropbox.

3.Communications/PR

- **Websites** – main parish website (Neighbourhood plan page) being used to augment np website. it was noted that the main parish website has more functionality than the np website, but of course the latter was only in intended to be transitory, whilst the neighbourhood plan was being developed, and is fit for that purpose.
- **Social Media** – active daily presence, which is generating interest
- **Banners** – MW agreed to draft and produce some banners promoting the household survey, and consider placing these at key points eg by A25 traffic lights.
- **Protocol about sharing documents** – MH felt this has not yet been agreed and PB agreed to make amendments as suggested. BdH felt the protocol was useful.

Action: PB to circulate final version and add to dropbox

4.Annual Parish Meeting

MW agreed to put together a slide pack about the Neighbourhood Plan, including all the topic groups progress in discussion with PB, LSL, AO. RoD and John Tolley (acting for the Community Assets and Infrastructure group as JT's requested). All agreed that volunteers presenting at the APM would help demonstrate good community engagement.

5. Online Household Survey

GD report that this was in development using survey monkey select which would cost £78 (including VAT which can be reclaimed) to use this for 3 months, which is all that should be required.

9. Distribution of Paper Household Survey

GD reported that this was set up to all Limpsfield households from 12/13th April to be completed as soon as possible, allowing for the Easter break. (this will cost £250 + VAT, which the SG has approved).

10. Analysis of online and paper household Survey

PB was happy to take on the analysis of the household survey, but felt it important that AECOM provided some top level strategic interpretation of the survey results, to add insights and independence pedigree. (PB is currently negotiating with AECOM about their charges to date on stakeholder engagement work which seem excessive, and seeking to agree their precise role on analysis interpretation and workshop event management – JT fully supported this move).

11. NP Coordinator extra projects

Two projects for an initial extra 34 hour were agreed for April and May with regards to:

- Developing the online survey
- Measures to boost survey responses

Further extra NP projects for the coordinator may well be needed going forward (eg as regards supporting the development of policies).

It is expected that NP coordinator extra projects will average a further 6 hours per week over and above the 12 hours' core per week for the NP coordinator, and therefore this is the basis on which future payroll will be computed.

9. Topic Groups progress reports (for rCOH)

Drafts have been produced from each of the topic groups, but they are in different formats, and PB wishes to reflect on what further work might be needed on these before sharing them with rCOH to help them develop draft policies.

10. Date of Next SG meeting

The next (19th) NP SG meeting will be on 2nd May 2017 at 7.30pm at Berry House,

Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (19th meeting): 2 May 7.30 pm – 9.30 pm at Berry House Limpsfield

1.Attendees: Phillip Bailey (PB), John Thompson (JT), Osmund Stuart Lee (OSL), Geoff Dessent (GD) Lucy Stuart-Lee (LSL) Bernard De Haldevang (BdH), Robert O'Donovan (RoD).

Apologies: Mark Wilson (MW), Ann Osborn (AO)

Absent: Martin Hogbin (MH)

At the start of the meeting PB explained that due to the other pressures now on him, he felt unable to continue as chair of the steering group, as he felt he would not be able to give it the time required. However, he agreed to take on the analysis of the household survey and was keen to continue to be involved with the SG.

All thanked PB for his outstanding contribution.

2.Approval of Minutes of 18th NP SG Meeting minutes

Minutes of 18th NP Steering group were approved without comment and are on dropbox.

3.Communications/PR

- **Websites** – the main parish website (Neighbourhood plan page) and NP website have the AECOM heritage and character study available, and give links to the online household survey. The main parish website also listed the sessions in the library and TVSC room for residents to come and talk to a representative of the NP SG.
- **Social Media** – daily presence has been stepped up to 3 – 4 times a day on twitter and facebook, with a strong focus on the household survey
- **Banners** – MW had previously agreed to draft and produce some banners promoting the household survey, and consider placing these at key points eg by A25 traffic lights. All agreed this was very important.
- **Protocol about sharing documents** – This was agreed without any further comment and is on dropbox.

4.AECOM invoice negotiations

PB explained that he felt the £600 offered as a reduction by AECOM on their stakeholder management work was not enough, and that he would seek arbitration if necessary to resolve the situation. The main area of concern was AECOM's view that they had spent a considerable amount of time on developing the first draft of the household survey. However, members of the NP SG felt that whilst it has been a helpful starting point, it was only that and looked as though it had been taken off the shelf with a few changes only, which did not sound like much work.

PB was keen to resolve things and use what time remain on the AECOM budget on interpreting that household survey analysis. He felt if this could be done, he would recommend committing some of the as yet unused contingency monies to ensure a high-quality outcome.

5.Online Household Survey

GD reported that the online survey monkey was now up and running, with considerable help from Philip's office, with links from both websites. 29 replies have been received so far. PB reported that the analysis functionality on survey monkey was very good and had already shown up one surprise in the response so far received that "protecting car parks" was a higher priority for many than was "protecting green space".

PB concluded that the analysis of the survey monkey would be a lot less work than the analysis of the paper survey.

6.Logistics of Paper Household Survey

GD reported that the contractor had finished the delivery of the survey and claimed a high coverage but not 100%. GD had hand delivered the 20 or so gaps identified by the contractor. Disappointingly this included the whole of park mews. However Councillors and others have reported further gaps, notably on west heath wolfs row, itchingwood common, further parts of pains hill, ridlands rise, ridlands lane titsey road, stonleigh road, tally road and Limpsfield high street.

30 posters are now in place throughout the parish to help publicise the survey and to ensure anyone who has now received one asks for a copy. (The 6 sessions in the library/TVSC should also help – the first of which is on 3 May being hosted by AO. The other sessions are being hosted by GD, JT, BdH and PB, with MW acting as a reserve).

7. Analysis of online and paper household Survey

PB has indicated he will carry out the first pass analysis but is keen that AECOM provide some interpretation under their “badging” (depending on the outcome of 4 above).

8. NP Coordinator extra projects

In addition to the 34 hour already agreed for projects an extra 18 project hour was agreed for supporting the SG to develop NP policies, giving a running total of 52 hours for 2017/18 (which accounts for 6 hours a week for April and May at least).

PB recognized the value of the further project proposed on the development of a list of NP delivery projects, but preferred to hold fire on this, until the full hours need to handle the household survey were clearer – as this may run over the 52 agreed on projects so far

.

12. Topic Groups progress reports (for rCOH)

Drafts have been produced from each of the topic groups, PB felt that these should be sent to rCOH, for them to give a quick response (eg to identify any gaps etc) rather than some in-depth work. All agreed.

Action: GD to send Topic Group outputs to rCOH seeking their comments, with the above steer and any advice on a policy template.

13. Date of Next SG meeting

The next (20th) NP SG meeting is likely to be held in late May/early June, Date to be fixed

Minutes of NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 20th STEERING GROUP MTG

30th May 2017, 7.30pm at TVSC Meeting Room Oxted Library

1. Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW), Bernie De Haldevang (BdH), John Thompson (JT) Philip Bailey (PB), Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL), Ann Osborn (AO), Geoff Dessent (GD), Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK)

Apologies – Rob O'Donovan (RoD)

2. Approval of minutes of 19th NP SG meeting

These were approved without comment. MW wanted to record his thanks for PB's outstanding contribution as outgoing chairman, which was supported by all. MW as new chair was very grateful PB felt able to continue to be a member of the steering group as his insights will be invaluable. And his offer to help with the analysis of the household survey replies enormously helpful.

3. Future Composition NP Steering Group

MW introducing a paper on the above, felt, that as we moved into the next phase of the Neighbourhood Plan, it was appropriate to have more non-Councillor residents involved in the work. He pointed out that with only 4 Councillors now on the SG, there was room for up to 7 residents, which meant 3 further members, given the topic group chairs membership and the recently coopted TBK, who adds much needed planning expertise to the group.

MW felt that the appointment of two vice-chairs, would be a valuable way of spreading the workload, and this idea was supported by PB, BdH and JT. MW also felt that further expertise on social media and publicity would be valuable.

It was agreed that some possible new members would be discussed over the email and then proposed at the next Council meeting on 12 June. This may include those currently volunteering to support the work, including members of the topic groups.

4. Discussion of TDC Timeline for Completion of the Neighbourhood Plan

MW circulated the timeline which GD has discussed with TDC. He was concerned that it appeared rather long as it showed adoption of the plan in July 2019, which may well mean it would follow the adoption of the Tandridge Local Plan.

TBK reflected on the timeline, and felt that whilst it was realistic, there should be some scope to speed up some of the processes and he stressed the importance of working closely with TDC, as this would help keep things moving.

PB felt it was important to look at the TDC's version of the timeline against the rCOH plan to see whether we could reach a revised version of the timeline to share with TDC. He agreed to circulate the rCOH timeline, and previous vision documents, and ideas on objectives.

TBK felt it was important to flesh out the vision and objectives and to keep up the momentum.

As regards the need to complete a Strategic Environmental Assessment, GD confirmed that he had spoken to TDC who seem to have misinterpreted the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan view of being unlikely to designate sites within the NP. TDC are re-consulting on this – on this basis - and will update GD in due course. This means it is currently unlikely that the TDC screening opinion would require a Strategic Environmental Assessment.

PB added that if the SG wanted to do an environmental assessment of any site (eg the future of the church hall), then rCOH could do this at a cost of £2k.

5. Household Survey

Survey replies - Survey Monkey has now received 89 replies, and there have been 197 hard copy responses. All felt whilst this was encouraging that the target should be to get around 400 – 500 replies – so that there was more work to do.

AO offered to promote the survey at the forthcoming Limpsfield fete.

Banners - 4 Banners have been produced at a cost of £60 – MW is seeking to erect these shortly and was aiming to move them around for maximum impact.

Analysis Logistics – PB explained that a quick analysis could be done to identify roads where the response levels had been low. He agreed to do this with MW's help in the next few days.

Action PB and MW to identify roads with low response rates

Once these have been identified help would be needed to knock on doors to encourage more responses using the yellow reminder leaflets already produced (600 left) and the remaining copies of the survey (150 copies, following a reprint).

PB advised that if around 10 people could help data enter the hard copy forms this would allow the first level of analysis to be done very easily. The method PB has tested out is to use a second survey monkey collector.

Action – as many as possible SG members – and other volunteers and topic group members to attend training session on 13 June (2.30pm or 8pm) at Berry House. Once skilled each person should enter at least 20 survey forms.

6. Neighbourhood Plan Finance

Budget Update - JT will liaise with GD to provide this update in due course.

AECOM Invoice Negotiations - PB is progressing this and believes that if we can frame a much clearer analysis interpretation piece of work, then the contingency money of £2,5k as well as the existing budget of £2k should be sufficient to get AECOM to do a clearly defined piece of work giving their interpretation of the survey results (the first cut analysis would be done by the SG)

7. NP Coordinator Extra Projects

- (a) *Developing and running online survey and boosting response rates (April and May)* – GD reported that this task had taken 69 hours and was still continuing into June, - the bulk of the work was filling in the gaps of people who have not received the survey and walking the roads and knocking on doors. But it was proving effective. This figure of **69 hours** was agreed.
- (b) *Supporting SG to develop draft NP policies (18 hours)* – this was agreed in principle by the SG
- (c) *Develop project list for the NP (25 hours)* – this was agreed in principle by the SG.

Overall GD was aiming to keep the extra NP project hours to 6 per week as discussed with PB and JT, and agreed for payroll purposes. The current loading of extra NP hours would run through to the end of July. The hours required for (a), (b) and (c) may well need to be increased depending on the actual workload.,

8. Agree Dates for Future NPSG Meetings

Next meeting will be on 21 June, and the one following on 25 July – in the TVSC meeting room above Oxted Library at 7.30pm. Further dates will be agreed for the rest of the year shortly.

Minutes of NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 21st STEERING GROUP MTG

21st June 2017, 7.30pm at TVSC Meeting Room Oxted Library

1. Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW), Bernie De Haldevang (BdH), John Tolley (JTY) Philip Bailey (PB), Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL), Geoff Dessent (GD), Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK)

John Tolley kindly attended in place of John Thompson.

Apologies – Rob O'Donovan (RoD), Ann Osborn (AO)

2. Approval of minutes of 20th NP SG meeting

These were approved without comment.

3. Future Composition NP Steering Group

MW confirmed that TBK has been appointed to the Steering Group and that RoD appointed vice chair as approved by the Parish Council – at their 12 June meeting.

It was agreed that some further new members would be discussed over the email and then proposed to be appointed to the Steering Group (to be confirmed by the Parish Council) This may include those currently volunteering to support the work, including members of the topic groups.

4. Discussion of TDC Timeline for Completion of the Neighbourhood Plan

TBK reflected that whilst it should be possible to do things faster than the TDC suggested timeline, there were a number of key activities over which the SG has little control (eg TDC consultation and the planning inspectors review), therefore it was important to clarify the next steps.

Action: Taking on board the RcoH timetable and TDC views, TBK agreed to draft a timeline of activities for the next 6 months to ensure the SG maintained momentum.

It was agreed that whilst RcoH were best placed to draft the plan as they were expert in this area, it may be valuable for the SG to first draw up the headings and scope of what the NP should cover, based on the household survey replies, other evidence and SG discussions.

TBK felt it was important to flesh out the vision and objectives.

As regards the need to complete a Strategic Environmental Assessment, (SEA) GD confirmed that TDC screening opinion should be available soon (23 June or shortly thereafter). GD expected this not to require an SEA, given at this stage the SG declared its intention as not being likely to allocate sites for housing. If this changes TDC will need to review their screening opinion.

5. Household Survey

Survey replies - Survey Monkey has now received 136 replies, and there have been 262 hard copy responses. All felt that a great deal had been done and thanks due to all those who had helped in boosting responses rates, in particular Marnie and Zee who with JT and GD had walked a great number of the roads in the parish and knocked on doors. Also thanks due to MW, BdH and RoD for their efforts near the polling station and AO's efforts at the village fete.

Analysis Logistics – PB circulated a quick analysis to identify roads where the response levels had been low. This showed good coverage on all roads with 20 plus houses, but two obvious gaps were St Andrews Way and Station Road East.

Action: Marnie and GD will re-cover Limpsfield Chart (and in particular St Andrews Way), and GD and MW will target Station Road East.

PB advised that more resource was needed on paper copy data entry. (around 80- have been entered, but a further 150 plus needed to be done.).

Action – as many as possible SG members – and other volunteers and topic group members to help resource this. RoD has been supplied with 12 forms to data input – GD explained the procedure to RoD.

Prize Draw – it was agreed this would be done by a random number generator, and that all those giving a name and address would be entered. MW felt Councillors and NP SG members should be removed for the prize draw – he stressed this was a request, but all present agreed.

Action: PB to run prize draw

All agreed that some publicity shots of the winners would be good.

6. Neighbourhood Plan Finance

AECOM Invoice Negotiations - PB confirmed a £1,000 saving (£600 off invoice and a £400 credit note) and believes that if we can frame a much clearer analysis interpretation piece of work, then the contingency money of £2,500 as well as the existing budget of £2,000 should be sufficient to get AECOM to do a clearly defined piece of work giving their interpretation of the survey results (the first cut analysis

would be done by the SG), and two other pieces of work – help with a public consultation meeting, Regulation 16 procedures.

Printing Invoice - Tangent Printers had omitted to send in their invoice for the original print run of the 1800 household surveys. They had recently now done so. GD asked that this be approved before the next council meeting. To do so (under the Council's financial regulations) requires 4 Councillors need to agree this.

Action: MW has this in hand. This expenditure has been previously approved by the NP Steering Group.

7.NP Coordinator Extra Projects

- (d) *Developing and running online survey and boosting response rates (April, May and June)* – the bulk of the work was filling in the gaps of people who have not received the survey and walking the roads and knocking on doors. But it was proving effective. This previous figure of 69 hours was updated to **79 hours** and agreed.
- (e) *Supporting SG to develop draft NP policies (25 hours)* – as agreed by the SG
- (f) *Develop project list for the NP (25 hours)* – as agreed in principle by the SG.

Overall GD was aiming to keep the extra NP project hours to 6 per week as discussed with PB and JT, and agreed for payroll purposes. The current loading of extra NP hours would run through to the end of August. The hours required for (b) and (c) may need to be increased depending on the actual workload.

8. Agree Dates for Future NPSG Meetings

The next meeting will be on 25 July, in the TVSC meeting room above Oxted Library at 7.30pm. Further dates will be agreed for the rest of the year shortly.

Action MW to circulate dates (likely to be 4th Monday in the month – though the August date would be different, and was proposed as 21st August)

Minutes of NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 22nd STEERING GROUP MTG

25th July 2017, 7.30pm at TVSC Meeting Room Oxted Library

1. Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW), Bernie De Haldevang (BdH), John Thompson (JT) Philip Bailey (PB), Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL), Geoff Dessent (GD), Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK), Laila Turner (LT), Rob O'Donovan (RoD), Ann Osborn (AO)

Apologies – Marnie Janaway (MJ)

2. Welcome to new NPSG Members

3. Approval of minutes of 21st NP SG meeting

These were approved without comment.

4. Neighbourhood Timeline and Next Steps

MW asked TBK to outline the timetable he has drawn up taking into account the views of rCOH and TDC. TBK explained that he had set out what he felt was a realistic timetable, culminating in a referendum in May 2019. MW felt it was key to hold the referendum on an election day to maximize turnout, but was unsure on whether there were any restrictions on so doing.

Action: GD to check with TDC on any restrictions about holding NP referendum on an election day (TDC have since confirmed that this is fine and to be encouraged).

JT welcomed what MW felt might be called a roadmap of tasks and activities to get to the completion and adoption of the NP. However, JT felt that the timetable was optimistic and that it should be updated to reflect the actual progress in July, and the limited progress due to holidays possible in August.

GD very much welcomed the “roadmap” but felt it was crucial that each task was allocated to someone to action, otherwise progress would not be made.

Action TBK to update all documents and NP SG to consider who would do what...

LSL felt that rCOH might be asked to provide some templates to facilitate work on the various tasks, which all agreed needed to be supported by as many people as possible from the NP SG and topic groups.

MW felt that the NP SG should adopt the updated documents as the “roadmap” to completing the NP and all thanked TBK for his sterling work on this.

MW felt that early engagement with key stakeholders was important and identified some of the key land owners (Titsey Estate, National Trust, Diocese of Southwark) and the Health Centre as an obvious place to start. TBK agreed this was important.

Action: MW to seek volunteers to do this (GD noted that previously he had with PBs help spoken to 10 key stakeholders at the start of the NP process).

GD wanted to check that all NP SG members had noted (a) that the TDC Garden Village proposed sites had now reduced from 5 to 4. (the Chaldon site having been dropped).and (b)they had all seen the note GD circulated about his meeting with the new TDC infrastructure coordinator.

MW asked GD to explain the position on the need for an SEA. GD explained that whilst Historic England were pressing for an SEA even if the NP SG did not allocate sites, rCOH believed this unreasonable and GD was now pressing Historic England to reconsider. rCOH advised that environmental impact could be best dealt with via a sustainability statement which they have already budgeted to help with. If the NPSG recommends to the Parish Council that sites should be allocated in the NP, then the case for an SEA will need to be re-visited with a revised screening opinion.

If an SEA is needed, then GD explained that there was help available from Locality in the form of a further grant of £6k and some technical helps, but that it was prudent to allocate £2k beyond this to ensure all could be delivered. (This contingency has been added to the 2017/18 NP budget).

5. Household Survey

The final total of replies was 450.

Progress on Data Entry.

PB reported that 163 hard copies had now been input into the survey monkey collector, which meant there were still a shade over a hundred still to input. Some were already with NP SG members to input and a further 24 were allocated at the meeting 16 to MW, who had enlisted some help and 8 to GD.

The aim was to input all the hard paper copies to survey monkey by 19 August – the new survey monkey license renewal date. Even if this is achieved, the survey monkey license may be needed for a further month until 19 September (to ensure that all the data is properly downloaded/exported into excel – the monthly cost is £26).

Action: all to help progress hard copy data entry.

Prize Draw Logistics and timing

It was agreed that the criteria for entry into the prize draw should be name and address (not least as some people do not have an email address – and phone numbers were felt to be optional).

It was agreed this should be done at the next NP SG meeting on 21 August.

Action: PB to lead on ensuring that prize draw takes place at next NP SG meeting on 21 August.

MW was also keen that there was some publicity around this, and that the County Border News should be made aware (GD will follow this up.)

.

Analysis

PB felt that the NP SG should do a first cut analysis of the data from survey monkey – to start to draw out the headline findings and to seek advice from AECOM on their overall interpretation, given this analysis and being provided with the raw data. PB agreed to take this on. All thanked PB for his efforts and commitment on this which meant PB committing not only his time, but some of the resources of his staff. PB outlined and shared an example of what this first cut analysis looked like as regards the housing questions (see below). PB was still fleshing out what could be done within the available budget by AECOM – and this budget has been fully taken on board in the NP budgets for the current year.

LSL questioned whether AECOM were still the best people to do the overarching analysis of the household survey. PB felt that (a) they were the leading NP consultants in the Country and that (b) any other contractor would incur extra costs to get up to speed, so recommended we stick with AECOM, which all agreed.

Emerging themes/findings

PB's first cut analysis of the housing questions on 300 or so survey responses showed:

- A majority agreed with the vision statement or agreed with some caveats, but about a third did not comment (which could assert agreement or not!)
- A majority not wanting building in Limpsfield parish but a sizeable minority were in favor
- A majority were against building on the green belt, but again a sizeable minority would support it

The full details were circulated to members and NP SG. PB stressed this was simply an example of what he was planning to do on all the questions (and on all the data). So not too much should be read into this particular output, but that it did show that deeper analysis would be useful to understand who was saying what.

6. Neighbourhood Plan Finance

JT advised on the latest budget figures and projected spend as regards 2017/18. He felt that as discussed at the LPC finance committee the night before, he now had a full grip on all NP costs, noting that these would run on into 2018/19 (see below).

JT also sought views on the paper outlining likely costs in 2018/19. The estimate circulated outlined a cost of £11k, which NP SG members acknowledged.

Both PB and TBK felt that there could be some further costs and that these would be flagged as soon as possible.

7. NP Coordinator Extra Projects

- (g) *Developing and running online survey and boosting response rates (April, May and June) – the bulk of the work was filling in the gaps of people who have not received the survey and walking the roads and knocking on doors. But it was proving effective. This previous figure of 69 hours was updated to **79 hours** and agreed.*
- (h) *Supporting SG to develop draft NP policies – eg by understanding latest TDC policies (**25 hours – July August**) – as agreed by the SG*
- (i) *Develop project list for the NP (**25 hours – July – August**) – as agreed in principle by the SG.*
- (j) *Other work – September onwards – available to help do tasks outlined in the road map prepared by TBK.*

Overall GD was aiming to keep the extra NP project hours to 6 per week as discussed with PB and JT, and agreed for payroll purposes. The current loading of extra NP hours would run through to the end of August. The hours required for (b) and (c) may need to be increased (by 10 – 15 hours) depending on the actual workload.

8. Agree Dates for Future NPSG Meetings

The next meeting will be on 21 August in the TVSC meeting room above Oxted Library at 7.30pm. Further dates have now been circulated and are on the PC website (events and calendar).

Minutes of 23rd NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP Meeting

21st August 2017, 7.30pm at TVSC Meeting Room Oxted Library

1.Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW) - Chair

Philip Bailey (PB), Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL), Geoff Dessent (GD), Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK), Rob O'Donovan (RoD), Marnie Janaway (MJ)

Martin Hogbin (Parish Councillor) also attended this meeting.

Apologies – Bernie De Haldevang (BdH), John Thompson (JT), Laila Turner (LT), Ann Osborn (AO)

2.Welcome to new NPSG Members

The Chair formally welcomed Marnie Janaway to her first meeting and thanked her for all the hard work she has already put in particularly on the household survey.

3.Approval of minutes of 22nd NP SG meeting

These were approved without comment.

4.Neighbourhood Plan – Tasks Specification and Allocation

GD had circulated the latest version of the above document which had been developed using TBK's timeline document and further input from both TBK and MJ. There was a long discussion about who might be able to take on which tasks – and these were allocated for the next 6 – 8 months. One obvious concern was individuals' lack of time, and the need to draft in help from the topic groups and elsewhere, using the consultants input sparingly and where it could add the most value, given their high cost. Update document attached. It was agreed to share this document urgently with the consultants, and provide them with updates of it.

Action MW to share task specification document/timeline with the consultants.

5.Household Survey

Progress on Data Entry.

PB reported that overall there were approximately 8 of the 450 responses that still needed entry into Survey Monkey- this should be done within the next week.

Prize Draw, Criteria, Logistics and timing

It was confirmed that the criteria for entry into the prize draw should be name and address (not least as some people do not have an email address – and phone numbers were felt to be optional) It was also confirmed that Parish Councillors, and NP SG members would be excluded. PB felt that we should include all those responses which filled in at least 50% of the form, and also to include those on the borders on the Parish, and those who lived outside but worked in Limpsfield which was agreed. PB had a little bit more work to do to clean up the data and do some final checks, but was aiming to circulate a date for the prize draw shortly. This should be in late August. MW welcomed this reminding the group that the County Border News were standing ready for a photograph of the winner. MW was also keen to add some headline findings from the survey, and update. LSL suggested we might also seek more volunteers within this opportunity.

Action: PB to lead on ensuring that prize draw takes place now by the end of August. And to inform NPSG members where and when.

Analysis

PB felt that the NP SG would do a first cut analysis of the data from survey monkey to draw out the headline findings and then seek advice from AECOM on their overall interpretation. RoD asked if the timeline for this could be brought forward from December 31st for the AECOM report. PB felt end of November should be possible.

MW was keen to be as inclusive as possible for the household survey replies for the overall data analysis, (noting that TDC accepted replies on its consultations/surveys from outside the district). This was agreed.

6. Neighbourhood Plan Finance

All the budget figures will be reviewed at the next Finance Committee on 2nd October. GD reminded the group that due to the NP timeline, which all now accepted was more realistic, this meant that some expenditure in 2018/19 was likely.

7. NP Coordinator Extra Projects

NP coordinator projects noted – which included work on the task specification and allocation of tasks going forward. This now came to a total of 144 hours agreed which would take the allowed project time to the middle of September. Further tasks will largely now flow from the Task specification document.

8. Agree Dates for Future NPSG Meetings

The next meeting will be on 25th September in the TVSC meeting room above Oxted Library at 7.30pm.

Minutes of 24rd NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP Meeting

25st September 2017, 7.30pm at TVSC Meeting Room Oxted Library

1.Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW) - Chair

Philip Bailey (PB), Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL), Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK), Rob O'Donovan (RoD), Marnie Janaway (MJ), Ann Osborn (AO), John Thompson (JT), Laila Turner (LT).

Geoff Dessent (GD)- Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator

Martin Hogbin (Parish Councillor) and Phil Davies (District Councillor) also attended this meeting.

Apologies – Bernie De Haldevang (BdH),

2.Approval of minutes of 23rd NP SG meeting

These were approved without comment, and placed on the main LPC website on 26th September.

3.Neighbourhood Plan – Overview of progress

All welcomed the NP outline document fashioned by TBK and RoD, which took account of comments from consultants and drew from a number of adopted Neighbourhood Plans. AO wondered whether a summary at the start of the NP might be helpful. TBK felt this would be useful. TBK and RoD also explained that the idea of the outline NP was to now seek draft policies from topic groups – these would be finessed in the right language by rCOH (now O'Neill-Homer).

Action – Summary to be added, and topic groups to come up with draft policies.

MJ outlined the key areas of progress and the key tasks which were now pressing in order to ensure a May 2019 delivery date. MJ will continue to update this document.

4.URGENT Tasks for action

- (1) **Allocation of development sites** – initial discussion. – TBK explained that TDC had made a housing need assessment as a whole for the district but this did not make commitments by Parish. PB pointed out that the household survey gave a very good indication of what local residents wanted as regards development.

TBK explained that if sites for development (which must include not only housing but also business and community services), were allocated in the

green belt either by TDC in the Parish or the NP, then this would add pressure to the case to develop the non-green belt sites – ie the Glebe and Brook fields. Furthermore, MW added that should any of the possible parish sites identified by TDC be chosen, then there was a precedent from other areas, to hugely increase the pressure (even if done by rural exception) to build on the other 5 (green belt) sites.

TBK felt discussions with the landowners were a high priority and the key to building on the views of residents, who largely did not favour more development in the parish.

If the NP did not allocate sites and relied on the stream of general in-fill, rebuilding on brownfield sites coming forward, to meet the need, then these proposals would need to be seen and assessed in the context of the developing character and heritage policies, and needs identified for downsizing and affordable housing. MW pointed out that the former was a key need which might be met in the Parish, but that the latter need might be better met from the surrounding areas, given land prices in Limpsfield are the highest in the locality.

LT felt it was important that future housing built should reflect the needs across the demographic spectrum. PB noted that the household survey was very representative of the parishes demography, with the only area slight over represented being the over 65's – but even that not significantly so.

MW raised the issues of re-drawing the Green Belt Boundary and/or extending of the Conservation Area. TBK explained that the former could only be done with TDC directly and was not advised, and that the latter should, if desired by a NP be a spin off project culminating in a Conservation Area Statement.

GD explained that if no sites were to be allocated by the NP, then the need for a full Strategic Environmental Assessment was unlikely. He has persuaded Historic England who were pressing for one regardless that this was not realistic and TDC supported this view. TBK agreed and felt that a sustainability assessment was all that would be needed unless specific sites were to be allocated in the NP.

- (2) **Stakeholder Engagement work** – MJ stressed that this was a pressing activity. After some discussion, the list already circulated can now be updated. MW asked for GD to draft a core set of guiding questions for these discussions and asked GD to be scribe for these meetings.

Action: GD to update and circulate (actioned 26th September)

- (3) **Commissioning of AECOM on analysis of Household Survey** – PB reported that he had set out a detailed proposal to AECOM which seemed to

be largely affordable within the current budget, but he was awaiting final confirmation and timing very shortly. JT asked that he was kept in touch with any further cost needs.

- (4) **Allocation of Household Survey Text Boxes to Topic Groups** – PB was ready to send this out. MW asked that Topic Group chairs take responsibility to get Topic Group members to sign the Data Protection Act form and return the forms to GD, who will maintain a register.
- (5) **NP Outline draft** - all welcomed this (see above)
- (6) **Development of Policies (by Topic Groups)** – this would be the responsibility of the Topic Group chairs – noting that policy ideas would be finessed by our consultants.
- (7) **Collation of Evidence File** - GD has started work on this as agreed in the project plan. GD is holding this paper file which can be viewed by arrangement by any NP SG member or Councillor (office hours). MH asked whether there would be an electronic equivalent, though did not want to generate extra work. GD explained that the majority of the material was already on dropbox but that a bespoke evidence file would involve extra work.

5. Household Survey

PB explained that the headline analysis was now done and available to all those who have signed the Data Protection Act form and that the text box material was ready for the Topic Groups (see above).

MW reported that the prize draw prizes had been distributed – 1st prize – Kevin Ludbrook (Granville Road); Second prize – Sam Baird (Park Road), 3rd Prize – Donald Payne (Westerham Road), and that a photo of the winner and an associated article will appear shortly in the County Border News.

6. Neighbourhood Plan Finance

JT explained that the budget figures will be reviewed at the next Finance Committee on 2nd October and the Parish Council will take a view of the 2018/19 Precept level before the end of the year. JT flagged that the more work done by volunteers, rather than consultants and NP Co-ordinator, the lower the cost.

7. NP Coordinator Extra Projects

NP coordinator projects noted. MW/JT asked for a breakdown of the 160 hours work (September to February 2018, which is made up of the various tasks allotted to the NP Coordinator in the critical path list – provided on 26th September)

8. Other matters

JT asked whether regular catch ups has been set up with both consultants. MW reported this was in hand with monthly telephone conference call with both AECOM and O'Neill-Homer being arranged and that notes of such meetings would be shared.

Discussion about any changes to the future composition of the NPSG was deferred to a later date.

9. Date for Next NPSG Meetings

The next meeting will be on 23rd October in the TVSC meeting room above Oxted Library at 7.30pm.

Geoff Dessent – Neighbourhood Plan Coordinator

26th September 2017

Minutes of 25th NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP Meeting

23st October 2017, 7.30pm at TVSC Meeting Room Oxted Library

1.Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW) - Chair

Bernie De Haldevang (BdH), Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL), Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK), Rob O'Donovan (RoD), Marnie Janaway (MJ), Ann Osborn (AO), John Thompson (JT),

Geoff Dessent (GD)- Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator

Phil Davies (Tandridge District Councillor).

Apologies from Philip Bailey (PB) and Laila Turner (LT)

2.Approval of Minutes of 24th NP SG Meeting

JT asked about progress on setting up regular liaison meetings with consultants. The minutes were approved without further comment and placed on the main LPC website on 24th October. **Action:** GD and MW to ensure that liaison meetings with the consultants are arranged. (Done).

3.Neighbourhood Plan – Overview of progress - Tasks for action

MJ outlined the risks associated with missing deadlines, and explained that the work on stakeholder engagement and the AECOM household survey analysis has slipped a few weeks, and that should it slip further, the May 2019 referendum date would be at risk. MW felt that the development of policies could still go ahead in parallel with the stakeholder meetings, feedback from the stakeholder meetings and the business survey could be incorporated into the policy drafting process, this would help to ensure that we remained on the timetable.

GD explained that the current plan would be to produce a first draft of the NP by the end of January, to then seek comments from the consultants (Oneill-Homer – new name for rCOH) to ensure that there were no gaps and that the right language and presentation was being used, with a view to the Regulation 14 consultation going ahead in March/April

JT asked about the significant slippage to work on an agreed vision and objectives. GD said that the original plan had been to derive these top down, but drafts of these had been too vague, and that now a bottom up approach would be

used, which meant the delay in timing was not a problem. This would be drawn out of the developing plan and policies.

(8) **Allocation of Development Sites** – this is addressed under the housing group report on developing policies.

(9) **Stakeholder Engagement Work** – meeting notes with Surrey Highways, the National Trust and the Diocese of Southwark have been circulated Meetings with the Health Centre, Schools, the Environment Agency, Surrey Hills and Titsey estate still need to happen and are now urgent. Local businesses will be engaged by means of a hand delivered letter, seeking their views

Action: GD to set up meeting with the Environment Agency and Surrey Hills (and a further meeting with the National Trust)

Action MW to finalise meetings with the Health Centre and schools, though LT already meeting with Hazelwood School on 27th October. MW will also set up meeting with Titsey Estate and finalise the letter to local business with GD.

(10) **Commissioning of AECOM on Analysis of Household Survey** – MW reported that PB had been in contact with AECOM who expected to complete this work within 3 weeks (mid November).

(11) **Allocation of Household Survey Text Boxes to Topic Groups** – This has been sent out to all topic group chairs, who in turn will seek their topic groups members to sign the Data Protection form, so that the data can be released to them. GD felt it was important that topic group chairs can summarize these comments to show we have fully taken them on board. BdH warned that care needed to be taken on the weighting of such comments particularly if certain points had been made by very few people.

(12) **Collation of Evidence File.**

GD reported that this was proceeding well, and that Councillor Martin Hogbin was helping to establish an electronic version on dropbox. He was also putting the NP draft outline on dropbox, so that all could see it, and more importantly as it is populated, how this develops.

4. Development of Policies (by Topic Groups) –

(1) **Housing and development** – TBK note to the housing group had been circulated and LSL and TBK reported that:

- The case to assess a housing need in terms of numbers of houses for Limpsfield was extremely difficult and ill-advised

- All the TDC proposed development sites which are in the green belt should be ruled out, other than the “old allotments” site which merited some further discussion, in the context of the “rural exceptions” and associated risks, making a site allocation here marginal at best
- The preference by residents for any new development which might be proposed in the future was for smaller (3 bedrooms or less), and where possible more affordable housing (eg through a housing association) to meet the needs of downsizers and first-time buyers.
- A policy to shift the mix of the size of houses in the parish to less 4 plus bedroom houses was thought to be a sensible objective
- Business development goals were likely to be in line with TDC policies

(2) Heritage and Character - RoD had circulated a paper, and highlighted the key strands of the developing policies,

- to ensure that any new development was in keeping with the predominant local character using 13 areas which sub-divided the AECOM character areas
- in seeking to reinforce TDC policy and if possible further strengthen the off-road parking provision for new development
- Try to contain new building to plot sizes in keeping with their locality
- Seek to manage extensions to properties
- Protection of views
- Managing of boundaries to avoid very high fences
- Develop a base building policy

(3) Environment and Local Economy – AO circulated the latest policies and suggestions from the topic group

- On business/local economy, these were embryonic, based on what can be gleaned from the household survey, and will be further informed by the forthcoming business survey
- Local Green spaces -now 12 potential sites, but this list may be further refined (depending on advice)

Action GD to seek advice from DCLG and Oneill-Home, and whether this list was too long

(4) Community Assets and Infrastructure – JT explained, that to move things forward, he was building on all the good work produced so far by the topic group, with input from GD and Oneill-Homer. The areas of focus are broadband, footpaths and pavements, transport (car parking and bus services, traffic), health and education services (in particular adult learning)

JT also reported the helpful meeting recently with Surrey highways on helping to control HGVS.

MW thanked all for their efforts and felt good progress is being made, and was keen that near final drafts from each topic group should be available to a small group in mid-November, so that all areas could be put into a similar format and presented at the 26th NPSG meeting on 27 November, with a view to populating the NP template document. (In each case this material will be a combination of policies and delivery projects)

Action: Topic chairs to provide near finalized policies by 15 November

5. Neighbourhood Plan Finance

It was agreed that the update on finance would be made at the next NPSG meeting as expenditure was in line with the financial plan for the NP.

6. NP Coordinator Extra Projects (for information)

NP coordinator projects (@6 hours per week) noted.

7. Date for Next NPSG Meetings

The next meeting will be on 27th November in the TVA (new name for TVSC) meeting room above Oxted Library at 7.30pm.

Geoff Dessent – Neighbourhood Plan Coordinator

25th October 2017

Minutes of 26th NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP Meeting

27st November 2017, 7.30pm at TVSC Meeting Room Oxted Library

1.Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW) - Chair

Bernie De Haldevang (BdH), Philip Bailey (PB) Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL), Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK), Rob O'Donovan (RoD), Laila Turner (LT), Ann Osborn (AO), John Thompson (JT),

Geoff Dessent (GD)- Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator

Phil Davies (Tandridge District Councillor)

Martin Hogbin (Limpsfield Parish Council)

.

Apologies from Marnie Janaway (MJ)

2.Approval of Minutes of 25th NP SG Meeting

There were approved without comment.

3.Neighbourhood Plan – Overview of progress - Tasks for action

GD explained that thanks to a lot of hard work by members of the steering group, the plan remained on track for a May 2019 referendum. GD drew attention to the fact that the original intention of agreeing a vision and objectives a few months ago had changed, as it was felt a bottom up approach was more pragmatic and now that a lot more data and information was available this could more readily be taken forward (a draft has been circulated.)

3.1 Stakeholder engagement – there have been meetings with the Titsey Estate East Surrey College, Oxted Health Centre, National Trust and BT.

Whilst the letter to businesses had only produced two responses MJ and GD spoke to all the businesses in Station Road East which are in the Parish and have a produced a note of the findings. Top of the list were crime (lots of break-ins and shoplifting), car parking for staff and customers, a better street scene (more benches and green), and lastly more of a feeling of being valued by the District Council.

3,2 Analysis of Household Survey Text Box Comments - these have all now been summarised and sent to AECOM, thanks to the efforts of RoD, AO and GD.

3.3 Analysis of the Household Survey by AECOM - the AECOM work supported the analysis work done to date, AECOM being an independent consultant provides credibility to our evidence base and conclusions. There were concerns about some of the conclusions and recommendations, which may well now to put into a separate advisory note just for the NPSG's use, with the main analysis forming part of the evidence base.

AECOM also raised some points of details on the data.

Action – Comments to PB for him to collate and respond to AECOM on behalf of the NPSG.

3,4 O'Neill-Homer draft policy list/implementation project list – this was received two hours before the meeting, so had not been read by NPSG members

Action – NPSG members to send comments to MW and GD on the policies which they feel are right (and fit with their topic group work) and the same as regards the implementation projects. In both cases any gaps should be flagged. O'Neill- Homer on receiving this feedback will produce an outline NP document for early January for the NPSG to populate during January. Ideally this feedback should be as soon as possible, but in any event by the next NPSG meeting on 18 December. The O'Neill Homer document will now become the lead document for the NP, but the master document produced by MH should be retained to keep the fuller text version of the policy deliberations. MH agreed to split how document up so that each topic group could update their part and all would be in a consistent format.

3.5 Draft Vision and Objectives - updated vision and objectives were circulated (two versions of the vision statement and 1 set of 6 objectives) – developed “bottom-up” from the significant amount of evidence now gathered.

3.6 Possible Development Sites – MH agreed to develop a proposition for a development site around the Glebe Field and the Rectory involving some limited housing (2 - 3 houses). Others, felt that any such development site should be limited to a community based development. MW said that any proposal had to be evidenced based.

Action MH to produce a note on this before the next NPSG meeting

LSL felt that a development site might be put forward for the Health Centre/TDC area to rationalise this for future expanded health use and more car parking.

Action LSL and TBK. To produce a note before the next NPSG meeting

The growing consensus was not to allocate any development sites in the Green Belt (which are the only ones which developers have put forward).

10. Neighbourhood Plan Finance

JT explained that at the coming Finance Committee to be held on 4 December, that the 2018-19 budget would be set and then recommended to the Parish Council. This will include a budget for the Neighbourhood Plan to completion, and consideration of NP implementation projects, such as a proposed Conservation Area Statement (and possible plans to extend the Conservation Area).

4.NP Coordinator Extra Projects (for information)

NP coordinator projects (at 6 hours per week) noted to be reviewed in February for March 2018 onwards, as part of setting the budget for 2018/19. – and taking forward the NP to completion and a set of NP implementation projects.

5.Date for Next NPSG Meetings

The next meeting will be on 18th December in the TVA (new name for TVSC) meeting room above Oxted Library at 7.30pm.

The meeting closed at 10pm.

Geoff Dessent – Neighbourhood Plan Coordinator

28th November 2017

Minutes of 27th NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP Meeting

18st December 2017, 7.30pm at TVA Meeting Room Oxted Library

1.Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW) - Chair

Bernie De Haldevang (BdH), Marnie Janaway (MJ), Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL), Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK), Rob O'Donovan (RoD), Laila Turner (LT), Ann Osborn (AO), John Thompson (JT).

Geoff Dessent (GD) - Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator

Apologies from Cllr Philip Bailey (PB)

Cllr Martin Hogbin (Limpsfield Parish Council)

2.Approval of Minutes of 26th NP SG Meeting

Approved without comment.

3.Neighbourhood Plan – Overview of progress - Tasks for action

MJ explained that thanks to a lot of hard work by members of the steering group, the plan remained on track for a May 2019 referendum. The focus will now move in the first quarter of 2018 towards preparing a draft NP document (with O'Neill-Homer's assistance) and the Regulation 14 (Pre-submission) consultation.

3.1 Stakeholder engagement – further progress made, with meetings with Surrey Hills (AONB), National Trust, TDC, Oxted Health Centre, Limpsfield Infant's School – notes on all, recently circulated. A key discussion coming up with Historic England scheduled for 20 December to seek their views on heritage and the need for an Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

3.2 Analysis of the Household Survey by AECOM - the outstanding detailed data queries being discussed between AECOM and PB, otherwise this work is largely completed. Some of the AECOM conclusions are being added to the draft policy notes.

3,3 O'Neill-Homer draft policy list/implementation project list – a lengthy discussion about the O'Neill-Homer list of policies. NPSG members agreed that GD should further fill in the document circulated, adding the supporting policies developed so far for each topic group as annexes and aim to get this back to O'Neill-

Homer as planned on 19 December. GD agreed to circulate on 19 December and give time for comments on his draft. (This has now been done with the full agreement of the NPSG)

3.4 Allocation of sites for development - it was agreed that at this time no sites should be allocated for development.

3.5 Possible Development Sites – likely there will be policies to cover the aspirations for the Oxted Health Centre/TDC offices/Library site as a community hub, but no redevelopment site allocation. MH was keen to do further work on possible new small site developments.

Action MH to work this up with TBK

3.6 Draft Vision and Objectives – the previously circulated set of objectives look to be a good statement to date. Work on the vision statement continues to evolve.

Action TBK and BdH to further evolve the vision statement.

3.7 First Draft of Neighbourhood Plan (target date 31 January 2018) - Provided O'Neil-Homer respond as promised in early January, then this will inform the next meeting with TDC on 11 January, and allow a first draft to be developed by the end of January, with input from the NPSG at its meeting on 29th January.

3.8 – Regulation 14 Consultation - GD explained that he had studied the experience of a Regulation 14 consultation which Woldingham had carried out, which all looked sensible other than their decision to provide a full draft of the NP to all residents. MW agreed that a summary document would be better for residents, albeit with the offer to see the full draft if they wished. This could be circulated with the annual parish newsletter delivered by councillors to all Limpsfield residents in March. This would fit well with launching the Regulation 14 consultation on 12 April at the annual parish meeting.

4. Neighbourhood Plan Finance

JT will provide an update on this at the next meeting in January.

5. NP Coordinator Hours 2018/19 (for information)

18 hours per week agreed until end of March 2018. NPSG members will be updated at next meeting. (Parish Council have approved 10 hours per week. For 2018/19).

6. Date for Next NPSG Meetings

The next meeting is on 29th January, TVA meeting room, Oxted Library at 7.30pm.

Minutes of 28th NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP Meeting

29st January 2018, 7.30pm at TVA Meeting Room Oxted Library

1.Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW) - Chair

Marnie Janaway (MJ), Philip Bailey (PB) Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL), Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK), Rob O'Donovan (RoD), Laila Turner (LT), Ann Osborn (AO), Geoff Dessent (GD) - Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator

Cllr Phil Davies (PD) - (Tandridge District Council)

Cllr Martin Hogbin (MH) - (Limpsfield Parish Council)

Apologies from Cllrs Bernie De Haldevang (BdH), John Thompson (JT).

2.Approval of Minutes of 27th NP SG Meeting

Approved without comment and have been placed on the Parish Council website.

3.Neighbourhood Plan – Vision, Objectives and Policies

The meeting focused on the paper on policies circulated by TBK which had been put together from an initial O'Neill-Homer draft with inputs from all Topic Group chairs. All thanked TBK and the topic group chairs for their sterling efforts.

The minutes record the areas of concern/need for extra work, noting that much of the draft was fully supported, as well as being warmly welcomed.

a Vision and Objectives – largely agreed. The preamble “Vision” was felt useful, though the reference to social inequalities seemed by most as outside the remit. The Vision for Limpsfield felt about right. The objectives should not reflect “no housing” but “no allocated housing” and welcoming “wind-fall” developments within the other parameters of the plan. Also given the mixed views on cycling, this was felt appropriate to leave to later parts of the detailed text (with other sustainable travel items) but not specifically highlighted in the objectives.

b Housing Policies (including Spatial Plan) - unclear why TDC have changed the designation of Limpsfield chart from a green belt settlement, to being purely green belt.

Action: GD/TBK to check this point with TDC

Discussion was deferred on some aspects of housing, namely those which involved read across to TDC policies DP7 and DP8, following a declaration of pecuniary interest from one of the members of the group present.

There were differences of view as regards the future housing mix, with a number of factors needing to be further weighed up, namely residents' views, social trends, and TDC and Limpsfield future housing needs

Action: TBK to reconsider all the evidence with advice from consultants and circulate a re-draft.

All felt uncomfortable with blanket restrictions on the right to extend existing properties, though this may be considered for new build in some form depending on the outcome of the housing mix discussion and future priority of smaller houses/apartments.

All agreed that there should be no housing sites allocated in the plan, but that "wind-fall" housing should be welcomed within the parameters set out in the plan, relating to size, type, parking and character fit

.

c Heritage and Character Policies – again aspects of this discussion were deferred on those areas which related to TDC policies DP7 and DP8 (as above).

TBK felt that the drafting could be tightened up in places. All agreed that it was important to flag the idea of conducting a Conservation Area Appraisal (which would be picked up in detail in the implementation projects).

The section on Landscape Character should make explicit references to the AECOM Heritage and Character study and "Areas of Great Landscape Value" as well as "Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty".

Heritage assets were felt important PD agreed to pass on some TDC documents which related to this.

Action PD

All agreed that Annexes Q and Y, taken together with the housing densities work carried out (shown in Appendix B of the V4 draft of the NP) were a very good start in defining all the housing character areas outside the green belt, but that slightly more detail was required to describe the character of individual roads/ group of roads. All welcomed MH's draft as regards Detillens Lane.

Action: MH to work with others to produce similar documents for the other named roads/groups of roads.

d Environment Policies – concerns were raised about light pollution and a need to ensure this was taken into account not only as regards wildlife but also as regards residents.

Action: TBK to assess where this could be best worked in.

The Local Green Spaces list was reduced from 10 to 9, as from recent soundings, there was no support for the “green area at the High Street end of Detillens Lane” becoming a Local Green Space.

MW reminded the group that whilst fruitful discussions had taken place about the majority of these Local Green Spaces proposals, a formal letter had to go to all the relevant Landowners as soon as possible.

Action: AO/MW supported by GD to write to all relevant landowners enclosing the proposed Local Green Space on their Land, enclosing a background annex (since drafted by GD) about the implications of Local Green Space designation.

The connecting the parish section was felt to fit better alongside transport and other infrastructure policies as it related to broadband/phone signals.

e Community Well-Being Policies

The policy about the Oxted commercial part of Limpsfield. Including the health will be discussed with TDC as well as the Health Centre. The policy about the St Peters Hall will be discussed with the landowner and the church.

f Local Economy Policies

MW felt it was important to make reference to increasing trend to home working and the need to support SMEs which are the bedrock of a local economy in a rural area.

g Infrastructure and Community Assets Policies

MW felt it important to flag the particular concern about HGVs. One asset which was felt have been missed was the Limpsfield Chart Golf club.

MH pointed out the limitations of slow charging points for electric vehicles, which were really only suitable for at home or at work use, and so not as appropriate to the locations mentioned in the draft.

(Note: the majority of the Implementation projects will be under the infrastructure.).

4. Timing

GD handed round the latest critical path diagram produced by MJ – explaining that whilst huge progress had been made, the timing going forward was very, very tight.

5. Issues not discussed due to lack of time

- Proposed Implementation Projects

- Other parts of the draft NP text (eg background, history and evidence)
- Identification of gaps
- Regulation 14 Consultation – logistics and questionnaire – summary document
- 2018/19 Neighbourhood Plan Costs

6.Date for Next NPSG Meeting

The next meeting of the NPSG is on 19th February at the TDC Office and is a joint meeting with the full Limpsfield Parish Council.,

Minutes: Joint Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group/Parish Council Meeting

19st February 2018, 7.30pm at TDC, Station Road Eat, Limpsfield

1.Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW) - Chair

Philip Bailey (PB), Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL), Rob O'Donovan (RoD), Laila Turner (LT), Ann Osborn (AO), Martin Hogbin (MH) , Bob Harvey (RH), Michael Bruning (MB), Anthony Tuner (AT), Bernie de Haldevang (BdH), Osmund Stuart-Lee(OSL), John Thompson (JT), Geoff Dessent (GD) - Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator

Jon Dowty (JD) – Oneill-Homer

Apologies from Marnie Janaway (MJ) and Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK),

2.Purpose of the meeting

The aim of this meeting was to bring all members of the Parish Council up to speed with progress and the direction of travel of the Neighbourhood Plan. The future target dates were also outlined, culminating in the referendum on 2 May 2019, with adoption shortly after a successful referendum.

MW had circulated and made paper copies available at the meeting of :

- Agenda
- Presentation progress report
- Latest draft of the Neighbourhood Plan
- Q and A about Strategic Environment Assessments

MW also felt it was important that the guiding principles of all policies and implementation projects should be:

- Evidence based (resident or business survey and stakeholder meetings)
- Deliverable (in the Plan period)
- Affordable

3. Neighbourhood Plan – Vision, Objectives and Policies

MW presented the full text of the current NP draft in his presentation, drawing attention to the key points which merited in depth discussion.

a Vision and Objectives

JD said that the number of objectives were pitched about right, not too many and well-focused. Councillors were invited to submit any detailed comments.

b Housing Policies (including Spatial Plan)

No concerns raised on the proposal not to allocate any sites for housing development. New “windfall” developments would be supported, provided they met other criteria in the NP.

A policy aimed at ensuring that at least some smaller houses are built in any new “windfall” developments was supported – the precise detail to be worked up. JD felt that the residents survey plus the high proportion of larger houses in the Parish (as compared to the District, County and National level) all supported this. Also, AT pointed out that many of the planning applications received are to enlarge existing properties, thereby reducing the proportion of smaller houses available.

c Heritage and Character Policies

All agreed that protecting the character and heritage of the parish was important JD felt that the AECOM study helpfully provided the evidence for this. (and further work was being done to add detail to the character of particular roads by the NPSG).

MW explained that one of the likely implementation projects would be to conduct a Conservation Areas Appraisal to help reinforce the above policy within the Conservation area itself, and that Historic England felt TDC should contribute to this work – a point which TDC accepted.

JD advised that policies around replacement buildings and extensions in the green belt was broadly fine. but that the detail of the proposals would be best put into supporting text rather than specific policies, given the strong National policy aim to protect the green belt.

JD also explained that flagging up the areas covered by the AONB (areas of outstanding Natural beauty) and AGLV (areas of Great Landscape Value) was also important.

JD also explained that whilst local heritage assets might be referenced for protection, there was no need to reference listed buildings and ancient woodland which was already well protected.

d Environment Policies

It was noted that the Biodiversity policy was aligned with Natural England's objectives.

On the proposed list of local Green Spaces, JD advised that the Glebe field may be seen as an extensive tract of land and therefore may not find favor with an examiner. He agreed to provide the environment topic group with more information on the further development of the justification for the current list of proposed spaces for "Local Green Space" designation.

A rural diversification policy set out the need to preserve the countryside but to support to re-use of existing/redundant buildings, including for local small businesses.

e Community Well-Being Policies

Two policies were supported which (a) protected the health centre and any local expansion, resisting its relocation and also protecting the immediate surrounding area against unwelcome development and (b). recognized the need to redevelop the St Peter's Hall and surrounding area, working with the Land owner (Diocese of Southwark) and the local Church.

JD advised that the reference to protecting community assets would be better dealt with in the implementation projects section, and could in any event be done outside an NP – but could helpfully be flagged in the list of implementation projects.

f Local Economy Policies

A policy to resist the loss of businesses in Limpsfield high street and lower end of station road east (in Limpsfield parish) was supported. As referenced above the support of home working and the use of redundant agricultural business premises for local small business should also be supported.

g Infrastructure and Community Assets Policies

A policy to promote the wider provision of superfast broad was seen as a positive way of promoting better connectivity and home working right across the Parish.

A policy to respond to the concerns from residents about the traffic congestion and HGV use of Limpsfield high street was seen as important. In addition, this policy included the aim of improving local bus services and seeking to improve the network

of local footpaths, pavements and cycle ways, and other forms of sustainable travel (eg electric vehicle)

Improved parking in Limpsfield village should be promoted and all welcomed proposals in this regard.

JD explained that there was a limited amount which could be done on crime prevention, but that reference to this need, in both policy sections and implementation projects was sensible given the concerns raised.

4.Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA)

Originally Tandridge District Council (TDC) had felt an SEA was unnecessary. However, in the light of the two policies which firstly sort to protect the Oxted Health Centre/Library/TDC building area and secondly the policy to promote the redevelopment of the St Peter's Hall and surrounding area site, then TDC now felt an SEA was triggered. This would be needed to cover the full plan. And this would need to be ready in draft form for consultation, at the same time as the Regulation 14 consultation of the draft NP.

There were 3 options

- Ask O'neill-Homer to undertake this (and a quote had already been submitted) to conduct and SEA within the required timescale.
- Seek a quote from another organization (as yet unknown)
- Explore the option of a grant from Locality which in effect meant the SEA could be carried out for free. (probably by AECOM via Locality)

Action: GD to explore the Locality route, but that if this was not possible, either due to eligibility grounds and/or in view of the tight timescale, MW would seek agreement from Councillors to approve the expenditure necessary for O'Neill-homer to undertake the work.

(Note JD was not present for this item)

5.Traffic alleviation on Limpsfield High Street

There were some concerns that whilst all agreed that the alleviation of traffic congestion on Limpsfield High Street was a priority, as highlighted by residents, that it was important to ensure this did not lead to shifting the problem to other local roads.

11.Future meetings

GD explained that the next full Council meeting was on 12 March, and the March NP meeting was on 26th March.

Action: MW to suggest how NP sign off from Parish Council was best handled bearing in mind the above dates, the Easter holiday period and the need for the Regulation 14 (Pre-submission) consultation to launch on 12 April

6. Issues yet to be discussed

- Proposed Implementation Projects
- Other parts of the draft NP text (eg background, history and evidence)
- Identification of gaps
- Regulation 14 Consultation – logistics and questionnaire

Minutes of 30th NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP Meeting

26st March 2018, 7.30pm at TVA Meeting Room Oxted Library

1. Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW) - Chair

John Thompson (JT), Bernie de Haldevang (BdH), Philip Bailey (PB), Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL), Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK), Rob O'Donovan (RoD), Ann Osborn (AO), Geoff Dessent (GD) - Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator

Cllr Martin Hogbin (MH) - (Limpsfield Parish Council)

Apologies from Marnie Janaway (MJ) and Laila Turner (LT)

2. Approval of Minutes of 28th NP SG Meeting and Joint Parish Council and NPSG (29th meeting)

Approved without comment and both have been placed on the Parish Council website.

3. List of Proposed Implementation Projects

These were discussed and amended as shown in Annex A. This update will be incorporated in version 9 of the draft NP for further comments. (PB will examine the supporting survey evidence, which relate to the Implementation Projects)

4. Work needed to complete the first full draft of the NP document (note circulated to show this)

Appendix B - Character Areas needed further work. RoD agreed to lead on this and explained that the sub-areas (of the AECOM character areas) defined by the Heritage and Character topic group would be reduced to focus on the non-green belt area, with the green belt being treated separately. RoD also felt that the character descriptions should be a little shorter than those already produced from Detillens Lane and Park Road. MH offered to help with Appendix B. OSL had been asked to help with maps, and GD with revising the housing density figures as needed.

TBK explained oneill homer felt the overall NP draft document was too long and should be more like 50 pages rather than 75 pages. Some of the detail was needed in appendices, but other more detailed material could be presented in separate documents and in the evidence file being developed on the NP website. TBK was worried that a lot of the preamble and background sections were too long.

Policies about the green belt, back garden development, “sheltered housing” and how best to meet the future need for more smaller homes needs further work.

It was also agreed that all the main iterations of the NP document should be placed on Dropbox. GD explained that a number of versions up to Version 6 were already on Dropbox, and that he would add versions 7 and 8 – and any other previous versions missing and circulate version 8. (This was actioned on 27 March).

5. Regulation 14 (Pre-submission) Consultation

The consultation would now be launched towards the end of May. A 4-page summary of the NP along with a short questionnaire would be sent to all households and businesses. Volunteers would be sought to distribute this. MW pointed out that the revised timing allowed more time to produce a higher quality document. PB felt that the questionnaire should be as simple as possible and flagged that this meant the analysis of it would need to be done in around 5 weeks. It was agreed a Survey Monkey should also be produced. (GD has drafted this mirroring the paper copy set out in Appendix C of version 8 of the draft NP. MW explained that the full draft NP document would need to be sent to the list of 80 or so Statutory Consultees (the list provided by TDC) and be put on the website for residents and others to access.

6. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

MW reported the Parish Council has agreed oneill homer should undertake the SEA work, now required by TDC. This was expected to be completed in the next few weeks in good time for the launch of the pre-submission (Reg 14) consultation.

7. Neighbourhood Coordinators Hours for 2018/19

MW reported that the Parish Council had agreed a budget for 10 hours per week for the NP coordinator throughout 2018/19. JT flagged there may need to be some time for implementation projects going forward. NPSG members were asked to note this.

8. Household Survey Analysis by AECOM

PB expected this to be completed by early April, and in order to progress things without paying AECOM any more, he was assisting them as much as possible.

9. Date for Next NPSG Meeting

The next meeting of the NPSG is 30th April at the TVA room above Oxted Library.

Minutes of 31st NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP Meeting

30th April 2018, 7.30pm at TVA Meeting Room Oxted Library

1. Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW) - Chair

John Thompson (JT), Philip Bailey (PB), Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL), Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK), Rob O'Donovan (RoD), Ann Osborn (AO), Marnie Janaway (MJ), Laila Turner (LT) and Geoff Dessent (GD) - Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator

Apologies from Bernie de Haldevang (BdH).

2. Approval of Minutes of 30th NP SG Meeting

Approved without comment and have been placed on the Parish Council website.

3. Comments on Version 9 Policies, Objectives and Vision Document

These were discussed and suggestions made as shown in Annex A.

4. Feedback from O'Neill-Homer

This has not yet been received.

Action GD to chase., with option of a phone call between MW and O'Neill-Homer if needed.

5. Work needed to complete the first full draft of the NP document (note circulated to show this)

MW noted that a lot of the non-policy sections (history and background, foreword, glossary, and appendices which included objectives performance indicators and a summary of the consultation work and evidence base documents) had been developed by GD, and therefore it was a matter of fine tuning this material, rather than starting from scratch and agreed to work with GD to take this on, along with AO. Part of this work will need to determine how much of the material should go in annexes to keep the main document length to around 50 pages (excluding annexes).

Appendix B - Character Areas RoD had made significant further progress on this and with the help on maps (from Cllr Stuart-Lee) and housing densities from GD, felt this both linked better to the AECOM heritage and character studies (as suggested by O'Neill-Homer) and captured the work of the heritage and character topic group.

6. Regulation 14 (Pre-submission) Consultation

See section on timing..

7. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

The Scoping report of the SEA has been sent to TDC, and the necessary statutory consultees (Environment Agency, Historic England, Nature England) to respond by early to Mid-May to allow the full SEA to be ready by the end of May. GD explained this is largely a technical document and that the group should be strongly guided by O'Neill-Homer, who were producing this.

8. Household Survey Analysis by AECOM

All felt this should be published as soon as possible on the NP website, with some hard copies available in Oxted Library. However, PB was keen to first add a couple of table about the views expressed by residents about if development were to happen, where this might occur, and where residents felt strongly that development should not happen. PB, having added these factual tables, which had just got lost in the drafting process, would seek AECOM's final sign off and then publication would proceed.

MW noted that residents' may also request a hard copy at either of the two summer fairs where the NP would be promoted and agreed to work with the clerk to ensure printed copies would be produced within the publicity budget allocated.

9. Timetable

MJ pointed out that meeting the timetable for the launch of the pre-submission (reg 14) consultation was very tight, and that, whilst it might just be possible to allow a further two weeks to get the document ready (along with the SEA, survey, parallel survey monkey and 4-page summary), but that slippage past mid-June for the launch of the pre-submission consultation would put serious doubts over the planned May 2019 referendum date. This hinges on TDC getting a post reg 14 revised document by 1 September to allow their regulation 16 consultation to proceed in a timely manner. .

10.Date for Next NPSG Meeting

The next meeting of the NPSG (to be held jointly with the Parish Council to sign off the pre-submission draft of the NP document) is 21st May at the TDC Building (Lyndsey Room) and MW decided to cancel the planned NPSG meeting on 28 May as a result.

Minutes: Joint Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group/Parish Council Meeting

21st May 2018, 7.30pm at TDC, Station Road East, Limpsfield

1.Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW) - Chair

Philip Bailey (PB), Rob O'Donovan (RoD), Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK), Laila Turner (LT), Ann Osborn (AO), Martin Hogbin (MH), Bob Harvey (RH), Anthony Turner (AT), Osmund Stuart-Lee(OSL), John Thompson (JT), Geoff Dessent (GD) -
Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator

2. Apologies from Marnie Janaway (MJ), Michael Bruning (MB), Bernie de Haldevang (BdH) and Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL).

3. The Future Timeline

MW reviewed the timeline to achieve adoption of the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan (NP) by the summer of 2019, noting that this gave TDC and the examiner both three months to do their respective pieces of work.

4. Neighbourhood Plan V11 – Vision, Objectives and Policies

No comments were made at the meeting on the vision and objectives, though the former might be made more concise.

On Policies, there was a lengthy discussion about housing policies (including extensions) in considering PB's well-evidenced paper on the subject. As a result, significant changes will be made to LNP 2 and LNP 3, both of which may change further following the reg 14 consultation.

Councillors agreed that the definition of smaller houses was 4 bedrooms or less on a majority vote. PB considered smaller houses should include 4 bedrooms being more spacious and AT considered 3 Bedrooms to be more appropriate.

Councillors also agreed that specific reference to apartments should be made to show that these were not excluded as regards future development, and that any such developments which were classified as "sheltered" should still adhere to the existing TDC off road parking standards, with no reliance on "tandem parking".

Councillors agreed that the Green Belt Policies section (LNP6) should be dropped as proposed by TDC, because there was no case to include any policies on the green belt which went beyond NPPF and District Council policies.

Written detailed comments received from MB, and RH and offered from PB will be incorporated into the draft document..

Agreed Changes to the draft NP (V11)

V12 will be prepared to reflect all the changes discussed and made in writing including future comments on implementation projects (see below).

Maps including how to best set out the "policies map(s) would also be taken forward with particular reference to Oneill-Homer.

Action : GD

5. Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA)

Comments from Historic England and Natural England have been fed back to Oneill-Homer on the SEA scoping report to help them finalise the SEA draft report to add to the pack of documents for the pre-submission (reg 14 consultation) to launch on 29 May.

6. Future meetings

Given the progress made at this meeting, the NPSG on 28th May will be cancelled, and energies channeled into meeting the 29th May reg 14 launch date deadline. Subsequent NPSG meetings in the events dairy will go ahead, noting TBK's point that even following the launch of the reg 14 consultation, there is a great deal of work still to do in refining the document to be suitable for the TDC reg 16 consultation and the examiner.

7. Issues yet to be fully discussed/next steps

- Proposed Implementation Projects
- Other parts of the draft NP text (eg background, history and evidence)
- Regulation 14 Consultation – logistics, NP summary and questionnaire

Action: MW to circulate the list of implementation projects included in Version 11, and a revised version based on MW and AO's reflections for Councillors to vote on. MW also to circulate a 4-page summary of the NP.

Action Councillors and all NPSG members: comments welcome on other parts of the draft NP (version 11) not discussed, including the questionnaire. MW also felt there would be value in seeking professional support to improve the look of the final document. MH agreed with this but also felt it was important that this process of improving the look of the final document happened at the end of the process to minimise costs.

Minutes of 33rd NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP Meeting

25th June 2018, 7.30pm at TVA Meeting Room Oxted Library

1. Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW) - Chair

Philip Bailey (PB), Martin Hogbin (MH), Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL), Ann Osborn (AO), Laila Turner (LT) and Geoff Dessent (GD) - Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator

3. Apologies from Bernie de Haldevang (BdH). John Thompson (JT) Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK), Rob O'Donovan (RoD) Marnie Janaway (MJ)

4. Approval of Minutes of 32nd NP SG Meeting (Joint with Parish Council)

Approved with comment added by Anthony Turner. (Subsequent comments from Philip Bailey awaited for inclusion for final version to be put on website).

5. Regulation 14 Re-Submission consultation

MW reported that:

- Consultation was running from 11 June until 23 July to fulfill the statutory 6-week requirement

- Summary and comments form delivered to 100% of addresses in the Parish
- Survey Monkey up and running mirroring summary and comments form
- Social Media activity now in full flow to encourage replies in particular on Survey Monkey
- Statutory consultation with 80 stakeholders (which includes the SEA) also underway from 11 June. No replies to date
- Response rate 18 replies on survey monkey and 20 replies on hard copies, and survey monkey replies circulated to NPSG members (and now on dropbox) – hard copy responses will be coded by MW
- MW was keen to boost the survey responses as much as possible and to that end he was placing an article in the county border news and pushing forward to produce some banners/boards to promote the consultation
- MH was concerned that the Local Green Spaces letters should also be sent out by post – preferably by the clerk but agreed that the Chair could do this with retrospective agreement from the Council from their July meeting.
- MW explained that he had had a negative response back from the landowner of the Boulthurst way field and only a holding reply from the National Trust

6.Feedback from meeting with TDC on 19th June

- Extensive comments from TDC, on which Oneill-Hmer had now also commented– circulated to all
- TDC have agreed to start the process of appointing an examiner, on which NPSG will seek ONEILL-HOMERS views
- TDC had concerns about policy LNP3 and all agreed that this would need further discussion but PB felt it was important to resolve the way forward on all the other policies, and debate LNP3 (Housing mix) last as this was one of the more complex areas
- Whilst TDC have asked for a revised draft of the NP back (initially by mid-July, and then latterly by early July), it was agreed that TDC would get a revised version back on September 1st as the reg 16 draft, ideally improved in terms of look and presentation

- TDC are continuing to press for a viability assessment for policy LNP3 but were unable to make the case for this fully and were seeking further advice.

7.Next Steps and Timeline

- The aim will be to bring back a revised draft of the NP document taking on board the various comments from stakeholders and residents by the next NPSG meeting on 23rd July, and thence to the Parish Council on August 13th (This will also take on board the changes to the Tandridge Local Plan.)
- It was agreed that the reg 16 document to be delivered to TDC by 1 September should be improved as regard look and feel. A draft specification for this work should be put out to tender. (The draft specification was produced by the clerk on 26th June and circulated)

8.Date for Next NPSG Meeting

The next meeting of the NPSG will be on 23rd July.

Minutes of 34th NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP Meeting

23th July 2018, 7.30pm at TVA Meeting Room Oxted Library

1.Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW) - Chair

Philip Bailey (PB), Martin Hogbin (MH), Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL), Laila Turner (LT)), Bernie de Haldevang (BdH). John Thompson (JT) Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK), Rob O'Donovan (RoD and Geoff Dessent (GD) - Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator

2. Apologies from Ann Osborn (AO) Marnie Janaway (MJ),

Councillor Stuart-Lee (OSL) attended for a short time.

3. Approval of Minutes of 33rd NP SG Meeting (Joint with Parish Council)

Approved without comment. Now on the LPC website.

4. Regulation 14 Re-Submission consultation Status Report

There have been 50 replies on survey monkey and a further 70 or so on paper copies. This is a lower level response than for the household survey, but nevertheless captures any concerns. The vast majority of responses were in support of the proposed policies. The consultation did not include the proposed implementation projects.

5.Bids for “Improving the Look and Feel of the NP Document”

Whilst 4 organisations were invited to bid, only two put in formal bids. Both submitted an example of how they could improve the NP document. The majority view was in favor of Bid C.

The bidding process was done without revealing the names of the companies bidding for total transparency as one of the bidders was known to a number of Councillors. The successful bid was from Sophie Martin at a fixed price of £700.

MW felt that providing the final document to the successful bidder for 14 August as required (and agreed) may be problematic, and therefore a potential delay has been flagged to the successful bidder.

Action: GD to inform bidders of the outcome of competition (done).

6.Changes to Tandridge Local Plan/Revised Policies

TDC are proposing to withdraw a number of their detailed development policies from the Local plan, which gives rise to some gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan. A summary of the discussion is as follows:

- LNP2 (Housing development in the built up area) – this has been redrafted to include the core of TDC’s DP8 policy given it is likely this will disappear from the Local Plan
- LNP3 (Housing Mix) – different versions circulated to be agreed by email – the TDC assertion for the need for a viability assessment or this policy is being challenged, with evidence
- LNP7 (Local Heritage assets) – the list is being reviewed to ensure it is fully up to date and includes all relevant heritage assets

- LNP13 (Community Services in Limpsfield Village – TBK keen to put a ring round this to protect it and questioned whether this should include the new temporary nursery building on the glebe meadow and cricket pavilion.

There were concerns at the Diocese of Southwark's objection to the proposed designation of the Glebe Field and Glebe Meadow as Local Green Spaces. MW felt the case for the meadow was stronger but was keen following advice from O'Neill-Homer to keep both in as proposed Local Green Spaces, beefing up the case for each as much as possible. GD is arranging a meeting with the Diocese to discuss their views (date now arranged for 7 August).

OSL made some comments about the need to ensure that any sheltered housing was not constrained on parking. MW agreed to provide local evidence for this as regards the Hookwood bungalows, which would be added as information supporting the parking policy.

7.Next Steps and Timeline

The timeline was submitted by MJ, which was very much welcomed by MW, as he felt this useful update kept everyone on their toes. and it was clear that timings are now very, very tight indeed. MW felt the planned timetable was still deliverable.

8.Date for Next NPSG Meeting

The next meeting of the NPSG will be on 20th August.

Minutes of 35th NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP Meeting

20th August 2018, 7.30pm at TVA Meeting Room Oxted Library

1.Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW) - Chair

Philip Bailey (PB), Martin Hogbin (MH), Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL), Laila Turner (LT), Bernie de Haldevang (BdH), John Thompson (JT), Ann Osborn (AO), Marnie Janaway (MJ), and Geoff Dessent (GD) - Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator

2. Apologies from Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK), Rob O'Donovan (RoD)

3. Approval of Minutes of 34th NP SG Meeting (Joint with Parish Council)

Approved without comment. Now on the Parish Council website.

4.Regulation 14 Re-Submission consultation conclusions

PB summarised his analysis of the Regulation 14 Consultation and was also keen that his commentary and suggestions on the written comments should be taken into account. He explained that the comment about there should be green space in any planned new development was a particularly helpful thought which should be into consideration.

MW will seek to reflect PB's comments in the next version of the NP.

MW outlined where the main changes had been made to policies. The main outstanding points were on the detail of policy LNP3 and MW and PB will discuss further with input from O'Neill-Homer to refine this fully. The wording on sheltered accommodation and parking provision needed to be improved, MW taking advice from Jon Dowty.

.

5.Regulation 16 (submission version) Documents

JT welcomed the Consultation Statement, and there were no comments on it by the group, other than to note this was a useful document. GD pointed out it was a requirement for the submission stage, along with the basic conditions statement and Strategic Environmental Assessment (the latter two being produced by O'Neill-Homer – see section 8)

PB agreed to make some comments on the LNP3 Viability Assessment, which the group agreed should also be submitted with the submission papers.

As regards the main NP document, it was agreed that the proposed Local Green Spaces at Pasterns Road/Pains Hill and the land next the playing field in Boulthurst way should be removed as in both cases these were in the green belt and the land-owners had objected.

It was also agreed that despite the objection from the Diocese and an expected objection for the Church, the Glebe Field and Glebe Meadow would be kept in as Local Green Spaces. It was also agreed that MW would respond as agreed to the Diocese's letter of objection.

GD felt that the case for the Glebe Field was weaker than for the Glebe Meadow. MH agreed to seek further evidence (eg of community use of the Glebe Field) to further strengthen the case for this.

MW said on implementation projects that he felt whilst there was an interest in improved adult learning which had come through in the Household Survey, this could be better addressed by the Parish Council, rather than being listed in the Neighbourhood Plan, where it was difficult to align this project with a plan policy.

JT was concerned that promoting cycling routes seemed to have been lost. MW agreed that should be put back in and was a little unclear how this had disappeared.

PB was keen that the implementation work on Connecting the Parish was widened beyond broadband to pick more general connectivity between Oxted, Limpsfield village and Limpsfield chart. This has been previously discussed and outlined in earlier papers (e.g. transport links, footpaths and cycle-ways.)

6. “Improving the Look and Feel of the NP Document - status

Work now in hand. MW said he should get early sight of this on 21st August to get a feel for what the new document will look like and would share something as soon as possible with the group.

7.Examiner

GD explained that it was for TDC to arrange for an examiner and to that end they are seeking to identify an examiner in time for December, and will ask the Parish Council’s views on 3 possible names. GD felt that the Parish Council/NPSG should seek advice from O’Neill-Homer, given their extensive experience of working on over 100 Neighbourhood Plans.

8.NP Budget 2018/19

JT said the figures stood for themselves, but did point out that there would be expenditure next year (2019/20) on the Neighbourhood Plan, and that this would be considered by the Parish Council Finance committee and then the full Council over the coming months.

9.Next Steps and Timeline

The aim remained to get the full set of documents to TDC by 3rd September. O’Neill-Homer’s current estimate was to deliver the policy map by 24th August and the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Basic Conditions Statement by 7th September. GD has already asked that O’Neill-Homer try to meet the original deadline of 3rd September.

Meeting with TDC on 13 September, MW, GD would be attending and JT and MH were also keen to attend. One of the issues for discussion will be about the progress on appointing the examiner.

10.Date for Next NPSG Meeting

The next meeting of the NPSG will be on 30th August and will include members of the full Parish Council, who are able to attend. This will be held in the TDC building, Lyndsey room.

ANNEX A - COMMENTS ON THE NP OBJECTIVES, VISION AND POLICIES

Vision

Largely unchanged, but perhaps a little too lengthy, albeit that the preamble is a valuable was of demonstrating an intent to be taking a broad view

Objectives

GD noted the numbers had disappeared and pointed out these would need to be put back, as TDC had requested this as it then linked the objectives to the performance indicators.

JT had sent in some suggestions about rewording the objectives around community and infrastructure to broaden them to better reflect the topic group work.

Policies

LNP1 - JT felt that this policy should feature in the objectives in some way given its overarching nature.

LNP2 – TBK clear that no sites for development would be put forward, and flagged the risks associated with any proposal to seek a rural exception to build on the green belt as this would immediately raise questions about building on non-green belt land, which residents were very keen to protect (eg Glebe Field, Brook Field and Glebe Meadow)

LNP3 – concerns about the housing mix drafting (3rd paragraph) which had been provided by Oneill-Homer of being over prescriptive. ONeill-Homer had advised on this because they expected the vast majority of any new developments in the Parish to be between 1 and 3 houses.

Action: PB to offer some alternative drafting, which aimed to ensure that desire for more of a focus for smaller housing did not conflict with broader objectives on preserving the character of the parish. And that any such policy made sense should there be any bigger developments.

There were also concerns that the reference to housing made clear that this included apartments as well as houses.

LNP 4 – this is supported by the developing Appendix B (see item 5 above)

LNP 5 - this policy was fairly straightforward dealing with the conservation area

LNP 6 - TDC objected to this policy as they felt National Green Belt policy sufficed – the future of this policy will need to be carefully agreed with TDC. (Also, PB was concerned that recommending only a 20% expansion of property – as drafted currently - in the green belt was too restrictive)

LNP 7 - an explanation of the likely disappearance of the Area of Great Landscape value (AGLV) has been added with a link to the AECOM character study, to ensure any AGLV which does not become included within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) has some form of future protection.

LNP 8 - MW questioned the accuracy of the list of Local Heritage Assets, which would be checked. PB and JT were concerned it did not capture the full range of important heritage assets (which were not formally listed). PB agreed to circulate some further material on this which had been produced by Surrey CC. TBK would explore what flexibility there was to have a place marker for some added material at the reg 14 consultation stage which would then be completed at the reg 16 consultation stage.

LNP 9 - it was agreed that either all those proposed Local Green Spaces designations originally in the green belt would be included, and therefore the space outside the Carpenters Arms should be added back in (or all 3 removed). On balance for the moment all 3 would be included. AO agreed to put back in the material for the space outside the Carpenters Arms. (The logic is to put some added protection in place for such areas which could be valuable, should the green belt boundaries be moved in the future)

MW agreed to get the letters to landowners of the proposed Local Green Spaces sent out using the drafts prepared by GD.

LNP 10 – TBK explained he had made some minor changes to this section which had originally been produced by Oneill-Homer, so was keen to ensure they were happy with it.

LNP 11 – TBK explained no major content changes to this policy from earlier drafts

LNP 12 - TBK had combined two previous policies here to help make the document more readable and concise. PB flagged it would be useful to refer to equestrian activity as this featured in the Parish.

LNP 13 – TDC felt that this policy and LNP 14 could be combined. However, the logic of keeping them separate was that LNP 13 was about protecting Community Services (near to Oxted town centre), and LNP 14 was about developing a stronger (Limpsfield village) community hub for the future

LNP 14 – the development of the St Peters Hall and surrounding area should be discussed with St Peters Church and the Diocese of Southwark before the regulation 14 consultation starts.

LNP 15 – JT had circulated the output from the Community Assets and Infrastructure group as he felt this policy did not capture the breadth of their views and proposals in particular as regards green networks, pedestrian safety and public transport (TBK was taking these ideas on board), though felt that some of this might be better covered within the implementation projects sections

LNP 16 – seemed to capture things fairly well as regards the concerns about broadband speeds in some areas of the Parish but might also be broadened to reflect better the Community Assets and Infrastructure topic groups views.

ANNEX A - PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION PROJECTS

Assets of Community Value

- I. The Bull Inn, Limpsfield High Street (already listed as an asset of community value)*
- II. Limpsfield Village Stores*
- III. Carpenters Arms, Limpsfield Chart*
- IV. Limpsfield Tennis Club*
- V. Oxted Library*
- VI. St Andrew's Church hall, Limpsfield Chart*
- VII. Core shops in Limpsfield High Street*
- VIII. British Legion (Club), Limpsfield*
- IX. Limpsfield Golf Club*

The Parish Council will seek to have all the above assets registered as Assets of Community Value. (The costs of this work are limited to the cost of Land Registry Plans which is very small, around £10 per application).

Conservation Area Appraisal

Limpsfield Parish Council will, with the support of Tandridge District Council undertake a Conservation Area Appraisal/Assessment and associated Management Action Plan for the Conservation Area and consider within this, whether there is a case to enlarge the Conservation Area.

Traffic Speed, Pedestrian Safety, Congestion and Parking

The Parish Council will develop a series of actions:

- Examine the options for more off-street parking in Limpsfield High Street
- Set up Community Speedwatch (Limpsfield High Street and A25 near Limpsfield School, Ridlands Lane and other areas where volunteers are available.)
- Work with Surrey Highways to look at options for improving pedestrian safety in Bluehouse Lane. and re-position existing "Unsuitable for HGV" signs located at the top of Titsey Hill and at the A25 / Limpsfield High Street junction and introduce the new pictogram warning sign, and Synchronise the HGV satellite navigation markers with the physical signs.
- Seek the re painting of existing yellow/double yellow lines in the parish, particularly Limpsfield High Street.
- Seek better enforcement of parking restrictions throughout the parish
- Examine the options working with employers to run park and ride schemes for their staff to ease congestion and parking pressures in Limpsfield Parish.

Broadband Delivery Project

The Parish Council will continue to use its influence on the Surrey County Council 'Superfast Broadband' project to seek upgrades to broadband services in the Parish. It will also work with Broadband providers directly noting that some rural parts of the parish have poor broadband download speeds. Other emerging technologies will also be examined if they appear to offer a better solution.

Shop Watch Scheme/Shoppers Rewards Scheme

Working with Tandridge District Council (TDC), Regen Oxted and the Police the Parish Council will reintroduce "shopwatch" – or another appropriate scheme designed to combat shoplifting and damage to shops. The focus of this work will initially be on Station Road East, where this seems to be a particular current problem.

Work with TDC Oxted Regen and the Parish Shops in Station Road East on a rewards scheme, which entitles those shopping in the shops to get parking vouchers for the Ellice road Car park, enabling them to park for free for periods of over an hour.

Existing Public Footpath Improvements

Working with partners to maintain and enhance foot and cycle networks to improve sustainable travel and recreation including Vanguard Way, Greensand Way and North Down's Way and enhancing links between Limpsfield village. Limpsfield Chart and Titsey Place. Better promotion of footpaths and walks in Limpsfield, Including the development of on- line walking guides, in conjunction with the National Trust and Titsey estate, for visitors and residents to enjoy the Limpsfield area. And make existing public footpaths easier to use, with new stiles or kissing gates on partnership with the Ramblers.

Work with Landowners and Surrey CC to upgrade permissive paths to 'Rights of Way' prior to 2026. This will safeguard their status should future land-owners not wish to allow permissive footpath status. (Whilst the risks may be low with current land-owners, this option will no longer be possible after 2026).

Work with SCC and the landowners to arrange and help fund an upgrade to muddy sections of public footpath 78, close to the bridge over the River Eden leading to Granville road, laying an improved surface of local natural materials which will resist the mud, but not change the rural nature of the path. (Ann O's suggestion).

Redevelopment of the St Peters Hall and Surrounding area

Working with the Land Owner (Diocese of Southwark) and St Peters Church look at a feasibility study which helps better serve the local community and aims to generate income for the Church and Landowner.

Electric Vehicle Charging Points

Work with SCC (the Highways Authority) to improve sustainable car journey's by examining the case for locating 3 "rapid" electric vehicle charging points in the Parish for example which might be on Limpsfield High Street, Limpsfield Chart and Oxted Station Road East (Health Centre or Library).

Bus Services

Work with Bus Service providers to better assess bus service needs in the community and seek to enhance existing services including consideration of the value of introducing new 'wiggly' bus service(s). This is in the context of a significant shrinking of bus services nationally – 134 million miles of bus routes across the UK have been lost over the past four years - which impacts most on those on lower incomes.

Adult Learning

Limpsfield Parish Council will work with East Surrey College (the key provider for this area, and other providers as appropriate) to help publicise local adult learning opportunities and help facilities access to this where possible.

Proposed Local Green Spaces

The Parish Council is seeking to designate a number of local Green Spaces, which if approved will grant these areas of land "green belt" status.

- **Glebe Field and Glebe Meadow - (Owned by Diocese of Southwark)**
- Brook Field - (Owned by Titsey Estate)
- The Padbrook pond and public areas on the estate – (Current owner unknown)
- Stanhopes village green - (Owned by Limpsfield Parish Council)
- Tidy's Green – (Owned by Tandridge District Council)
- Land to the north of the A25 between the traffic lights and Limpsfield infant school (Owned by Surrey CC)
- Field between Pastens Road and Pains Hill (Owned by Sutton & East Surrey or Southern Water)
- **Land adjacent to Boulhurst Way playing Field (Owned by private individual)**
- **Land in front of Hookwood bungalows - – (Owned by Tandridge District Council)**

(Bold type denotes possible refusal by landowner)

Minutes: 3rd Joint Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group/Parish Council Meeting

30 August 2018, 7.30pm at TDC, Station Road East, Limpsfield

1.Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW) - Chair

Philip Bailey (PB), Marnie Janaway (MJ), Laila Turner (LT), Ann Osborn (AO), Martin Hogbin (MH), Anthony Turner (AT), Osmund Stuart-Lee (OSL), John Thompson (JT), Geoff Dessent (GD) - Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator

2.Apologies from Michael Bruning (MB), Bernie de Haldevang (BdH), Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL). Rob O'Donovan (RoD Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK), and Bob Harvey (RH),

3.Regulation 16 (submission) package for agreement

MW explained the main changes made to the NP document and indicated that the outstanding points made by PB reflecting residents' comments on new innovative design, Green open spaces in new developments, the impact of demographic changes on spatial policy and a children's' playground in Limpsfield village would all be taken on board.

A discussion on sheltered housing resulted in a revision to state that the policy should now read:

All sheltered accommodation (which was considered to be residential) should have a minimum parking standard of one parking place per self-contained unit.

MH felt that this was fine for 1 and 2 bedroomed dwellings but questioned about parking provision for 3 and 4 bedroomed sheltered dwellings. AT felt there was no evidence that sheltered accommodation was built with more than 2 bedrooms, and invited MH to put forward some evidence for future consideration.

MJ felt that the NP should be more innovative and welcomed the additions suggested (above). The project proposed on adult learning was felt best dealt with outside the Neighbourhood Plan and would be referred to the Parish Council for action.

The regulation 16 draft was agreed by a majority of Councillors subject to a number of inclusions above with 4 Councillors in favor (AT, MW, JT,PB) and two stating an abstention (MH and OSL) (Note only six Councillors present to vote.)

OSL asked to see how his particular comments had been taken into account in regard of the reg 14 survey. PB agreed to provide evidence on this (since done)

A minor typo was pointed out on the consultation statement which has now been corrected. There were no comments on the LNP3 Viability assessment.

It was noted that the NP main document, consultation statement and LNP3 policy viability assessment would be submitted to TDC on 3rd September, with the basic conditions statement and the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) statement to follow very shortly. (technical documents being produced by O'Neill-Homer fully in line with the other policy documents agreed)

4.Local Green Spaces proposed designations update

It was agreed to drop:

- The land in Bouthurst way next to the playground
- The land below Pastens road, adjoining Pains Hill

And it was agreed to retain the Glebe Meadow and Glebe field despite the objections put in by the land owner (Diocese of Southwark)

5.Next steps

As stated above, the main NP document and the consultation statement and LNP3 Viability assessment will be submitted on September 3rd to TDC, with the Basic Conditions Statement and SEA to follow shortly after, with a view to TDC conducting a regulation 16 consultation starting on 17 September, concluding on 29 October, with the Government Examiner starting his work in December,

6.Future meetings

The next NPSG will be held on 22nd October 2018 in the TVA meeting room above Oxted Library.

Minutes of 36th NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP Meeting **22nd October 2018, 7.30pm at TVA Meeting Room Oxted Library**

1.Attendees and Apologies for Absence

Mark Wilson (MW) - Chair

Ted Beresford-Knox (TBK), Rob O'Donovan (RoD), Laila Turner (LT), John Thompson (JT), and Geoff Dessent (GD) - Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator

2.Apologies from Philip Bailey (PB), Martin Hogbin (MH), Lucy Stuart Lee (LSL) Bernie de Haldevang (BdH), Ann Osborn (AO), Marnie Janaway (MJ),

3.Noting of Minutes of Parish Council meeting held on 13th August

These minutes recorded the Parish Councils agreement to the regulation 16 submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan, which was then passed to TDC.

4.Regulation 16 Consultation

The regulation 16 consultation will close on 29 October. To date TDC have indicated that there have been around 20 replies.

GD explained that TDC would summarise the comments and that these would be submitted along with the Plan and other supporting documents to the examiner.

TBK explained that in some cases a District Council might suggest modifications to the Plan as a result of the comments and advise that it could be beneficial to submit such ideas to the examiner to make their task easier.

MW explained that he, GD and TBK would be meeting with TDC on 30th October.

5.Examiner

Members of the Limsfield Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) present felt either examiner would carry out a very a professional job in examining the Plan, as both clearly have a lot of experience. However, their preference was for Mr Slater.

Parish Councillors not at the meeting have also been canvassed and again a majority (indeed all 7 who have replied out of 9) were in favour of Mr Slater. This decision will be formally ratified (for the record) by the Parish Council when it next meets on 12 November.

GD will convey this decision to TDC so that the examination can begin in early December.

MW also explained that he had been sent an example of how an examiner works on a Neighbourhood Plan, which set out the various stages. He briefly described this and asked that this was circulated to all Parish Councillors and NSPG members.

Action: GD to circulate as above (Action completed on 23 October)

6. NP Budget to completion

GD explained that to date, the Parish Council had spent £63,800 and that the total cost to completion of the Plan was likely to be around £73,600. Taking account of the remaining monies in the NP budget and the Locality Grant of £9,000, this meant it was likely that the PC would need to add a further £1,500 or so next year (2019/20). This would ensure continued support from the NP Coordinator and cover any communication/publicity costs in the run up to the Annual Parish Meeting (early to mid-April) and Referendum (2nd May)

JT also explained that the Parish Council finance committee would be meeting on 24 October and be discussing an outline Parish Council budget for 2019/20. MW agreed that it was important that this discussion and future discussions at the NPSG

(and Parish Council) started to map out the priorities and costs of the various implementation projects outlined in the Plan. MW noted that work on Speedwatch Schemes (eg on Limpsfield High Street and Bluehouse Lane) were already progressing.

JT reminded colleagues that the list of NP implementation projects included a Conservation Area Assessment, upgrading of footpaths, cycle ways, faster broadband, electric car charging points, Community Speedwatch, parking enforcement, and work on other community projects relating to Limpsfield village.

7.Date for Next NPSG Meeting

As the feedback from the Regulation 16 consultation should be available in early November, it was agreed that rather than waiting until the next scheduled NPSG meeting on 26 November, there would be a special update item on the next Parish Council meeting to be held on 12 November and the November NPSG would then be cancelled.