THE DISTRICT COUNCIL OF TANDRIDGE

PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

Minutes and Report to Council of the meeting of the Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 10th September 2009.

PRESENT: Councillors Weightman (Chairman), Cooper (Vice-Chairman), Botten, Mrs. Connolly, Mrs. Langham, Perkins, Sydney and Walker.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors David and Turner.

100. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on the 9th June 2009 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

COUNCIL DECISION
(Subject to ratification by Council)

102. BRINGING REVISED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME INTO EFFECT (Minutes 191 (08/09) and 17)

The first Local Development Scheme (LDS), setting out which planning documents the Council intended to prepare as part of the Local Development Framework together with the timetable for doing so, had been submitted to the Secretary of State. The Scheme had been brought into effect on the 22nd April 2005.

Following the adoption of the Core Strategy in October 2008 some changes to the content and programme of the LDS had been submitted to, and agreed by, the Government Office for the South East.

RECOMMENDED – that

A. the revised Tandridge Local Development Scheme, attached at Appendix ‘A’, be agreed and come into effect on the 6th November 2009; and

B. the revised Scheme be published on the Council’s web site and made available for purchase at a price of £2.00

COMMITTEE DECISIONS
(Under powers delegated to the Committee)

103. VALIDATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Minutes 278 (07/08) and 30 (08/09))

In order to provide a quicker, more predictable and efficient planning service, the Government had introduced the standard application form 1APP. In respect of householder applications, 1APP together with the Local List adopted by the Council, had failed to deliver the quicker more predictable and efficient planning service hoped for. The Committee considered the way forward.
RESOLVED - That

A. the amended Local List of information required to validate householder applications be approved for consultation together with a revised checklist covering National and Local List requirements (as set out in Appendix ‘B’);

B. the amended Local List of information (as set out in Appendix ‘C’) required to validate householder applications be publicised for comment via the Agents Forum and in accordance with a scheme to cover statutory consultees; and

C. the results of consultation, with any amendments to the Local List of information required to validate householder applications, be reported back to a future meeting of the Committee;

104. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY – DCLG CONSULTATION ON PROPOSALS AND DRAFT REGULATIONS

The planning act 2008 provided the legislative basis for the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This would be a new charge which local planning authorities could impose on most types of development in their area. Proceeds of CIL could be spent on local and sub-regional infrastructure to support the development of the area.

The Committee considered a report which detailed implications for the Council and continued recommended responses to the Government consultation.

RESOLVED - that:

A. the responses as set out at Appendix ‘D’ be sent to the Department of Communities and Local Government;

B. the District Council does not seek or accept payments through the Surrey Planning Infrastructure Charge pending further Government advice on the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy; and

C. the Development Related Contributions Working Group consider a letter to the Chairman of Governors of all supported schools; and Senior Partners of doctors surgeries in Tandridge, copied to the Surrey County Council and Surrey PCT respectively, encouraging them to submit to the local authorities schemes that would be required to meet future demand arising from housing development.

NOTE: Councillor Botten declared a Personal Interest in this matter, the nature of the interest being that he was a Governor of Hillcroft School, Caterham. In accordance with the Members’ Local Code of Conduct, he stayed in the meeting for the duration of discussion and voting thereon.

NOTE: Councillor Mrs. Langham declared a Personal Interest in this matter, the nature of the interest being that she was a Governor of de Stafford School, Caterham. In accordance with the Members’ Local Code of Conduct, she stayed in the meeting for the duration of discussion and voting thereon.
NOTE: Councillor Sydney declared a Personal Interest in this matter, the nature of the interest being that he was a Governor of Lingfield Primary School, Lingfield. In accordance with the Members' Local Code of Conduct, he stayed in the meeting for the duration of discussion and voting thereon.

NOTE: Councillor Turner, although not a member of the Committee, declared a Personal Interest in this matter, the nature of the interest being that she was a Governor of Audley School, Caterham. In accordance with the Members' Local Code of Conduct, she stayed in the meeting for the debate.

105. CONCEPT STATEMENT FOR HARESTONE (FORMER MARIE CURIE HOSPICE) HARESTONE DRIVE, HARESTONE VALLEY ROAD, CATERHAM

This former hospice was now closed. The owner, Marie Curie Caner Care Charity was considering the future of the site. It had been considered that the interests of nearby residents; the wider community; and the owners of the site; would best be served by the production of some form of guidance to assist with the future of the site. Some local residents had used their own resources to invest in assistance from a professional planning consultant and had shared this work with the Council.

The owners of the site did not feel that they had been sufficiently engaged in the preliminary process in the concept statement. Although they had submitted significant and detailed concerns which could not be included at this time, these would be considered as part of the recommended wider formal consultation. It was possible that some points could be recommended for inclusion in the final document in some form.

The Council looked forward to negotiation during the formal consultation period with all parties. Investigations would be continued into the possibility of achieving statutory Listed Building status for ‘Harestone’.

The Committee wished to record its thanks to the local residents and to Paul Newdick, the Council’s Head of Forward Planning for their efforts in preparing the Concept Statement.

*** RESOLVED - that the Draft Concept Statement as attached at Appendix ‘E’ be published for consultation purposes.

106. STUDY BRIEF FOR CONSULTANCY WORK ON HARESTONE VALLEY AND WOLDINGHAM POLICY AREAS

As part of the Local Development Scheme work on certain Supplementary Planning Documents were a high priority. Two of the existing Policy areas listed for priority attention were Harestone Valley and Woldingham. The Committee considered the study brief which was intended to guide the work of consultants on the specified policy areas. Suggestions from Caterham Valley parish council that appraisal work be undertaken whilst tress were in leaf were noted.

RESOLVED - that the study brief at Appendix ‘F’ be approved.

107. DISCRETION IN PLANNING ENFORCEMENT (Minute 315 (08/09)

This matter had been brought before the Committee in response to a Member request under Standing order No. 17.
The Planning Committee had refused a retrospective planning application for a rebuilt barn at Perry barn Farm, West Park Road, Newchapel in April 2009. The only effective remedy was for enforcement action would have been to seek the complete removal of the building. Following investigation it was considered that complete removal of the building would be disproportionate to the harm caused. A letter was sent to all Members advising them of the position and accordingly a delegated decision was made not to take formal enforcement action.

Planning Policy guidance Note 18 (Enforcement) gave guidance on the discretionary exercise of enforcement and its effect.

RESOLVED – that the Council's interpretation of the discretionary approach be continued.

108. MONITORING OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The Committee considered its performance levels of service against previously agreed targets.

RESOLVED – that the performance information and Officer comment, attached at Appendix 'G' be noted;

Rising 8.56 p.m.
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1. **Introduction**

1.1 This Local Development Scheme sets out the proposed content of and timetable for producing the Local Development Framework (LDF) (see glossary for terms - Appendix 4).

1.2 The LDF will comprise both statutory and non-statutory Local Development Documents (LDDs).

The statutory documents will comprise:

- Core Strategy – including the vision for the District and key criteria based policies;
- District wide policy documents – for development control, affordable housing etc;
- Area Action Plans (if required) – for town centres, conservation areas or major sites;
- Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

1.3 In addition there will be non-statutory, supplementary guidance in the form of:

- Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) – for example development briefs, additional guidance on particular policies, car-parking standards etc.
- Advice notes – providing factual information to the public and applicants.

1.4 LDDs can be prepared to deal with different issues or with different geographical areas but together represent the Council’s planning policies for the District. The statutory LDDs will be Development Plan Documents (DPDs).

1.5 DPDs will be the subject of an independent examination held by a Government appointed Inspector; however this will only happen if formal objections are received during the public consultation period. Unlike Local Plan Inquiries the Inspector is able to consider the whole DPD and not just those parts the subject of objection. The Inspector’s findings will be binding.

1.6 One particular feature of the new system is the requirement to prepare a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) this is a formal policy, setting out how the planning authority will involve the community in plan making. The SCI sets out who the authority will consult and when. The LPA must comply with the SCI. The SCI must also set out the Council’s consultation policy on development control. Regulations set out the minimum standard for the SCI. The Council’s first SCI was adopted on 2 November 2006 following an independent examination. However the SCI now requires amendment in the light of new Regulations introduced in June 2008. Following new Regulations in April 2009 the SCI will no longer require an independent examination.

1.7 LDDs that are not part of the development plan (e.g. SPDs) will be the subject of public consultation but will not be the subject of an independent examination. Advice notes will not be the subject of public consultation.

2. **Local Development Scheme**

2.1 This document is the Local Development Scheme (LDS) that sets out:

- The Development Plan Documents (DPDs) that the Council intends to produce;
- A timetable for the production of documents;
- “Milestones” to be achieved as part of the process leading to adoption;
- Information on the Annual Monitoring Report;
• Which current development plans will be “saved”;
• The resources available and any constraints.

2.2 The first LDS was brought into effect in April 2005 and was subsequently revised in 2006 and 2007. The Government indicated that it did not wish local planning authorities make any further changes to their LDS after 2007 unless there were exceptional circumstances. However since the last LDS came into effect, the Council’s first DPD, its Core Strategy has been adopted and new Regulations governing the production of DPDs have been introduced. These require changes to be made to the content of the Scheme and to the timetables.

2.3 The LDS will be publicised so that the public will know what the Council is intending to do and when, and at what stage they can get involved in the process. Appendix 3 gives a diagrammatic representation of the process of producing a Development Plan Document.

2.4 Previously the LDS was required to list all the Supplementary Planning Documents that the Council intended to produce, however the Planning Act 2008 has removed this requirement. Therefore this revised LDS only shows those DPDs that are to be produced, although Appendix 5 does give, for information, a list of documents the Council will prepare or may wish to prepare at some later date.

3. Annual Monitoring Report

3.1 The LDS will be monitored on an annual basis. The progress in implementing the LDS will be set out in the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR).

3.2 The AMR will also monitor the effectiveness of saved local plan policies and the new DPD policies. This will include a trajectory forecast of future housing supply against strategic housing requirements.

3.3 Each LDD will need to be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that it is kept up to date. However, in addition to the scheduled reviews, each AMR will consider whether earlier reviews are required.

4. Timetable and Milestones

4.1 Each document listed in appendix 1 has a timetable for its preparation; these timetables include contingency periods in case there is slippage. However the Council hopes that it may be able to improve on these timetables, particularly if more staff resources become available.

4.2 PPS12 (2008 version) sets out the key milestones that must be identified in the Local Development Scheme. Progress will be monitored annually and the milestones may need to be reviewed and reported in the Annual Monitoring Report. The LDS may therefore need to be revised. The key milestones are as follows:-

- Consulting statutory bodies on the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal
- Publication of the DPD
- Submission of the DPD
- Adoption of the DPD
5. **Relationship of LDF to Existing Policies and Saved Plans**

5.1 The LDDs will provide the new planning policy framework and in due course they will replace the existing planning policy framework. For Tandridge the existing framework includes the following documents:

- Tandridge District Local Plan 2001
- Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) (various)

5.2 The Council has ‘saved’ a number of policies from the local plan that are still relevant. The first list of saved policies was applicable from 27th September 2007. However the Core Strategy has now superseded a number of other Local Plan policies. The saved local plan policies will remain in force until they are withdrawn or superseded by any subsequent DPDs.

5.3 Supplementary Planning Guidance cannot be saved, but will remain a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. There are four adopted SPG and it is not intended to replace them with SPD in the first LDF but to retain them as they are linked to Local Plan policies that are to be saved. In due course these may be replaced by Supplementary Planning Documents. The four SPG are:

- Conversion of buildings in the Green Belt – linked to saved policy RE6
- Lingfield Village Design Statement – linked to saved policy BE1
- Bletchingley Conservation Area Appraisal – linked to saved policy HE3
- Lamb’s Business Park – MDS site Brief – linked to saved policy EM3

5.4 A further SPG, “Extension of Dwellings in the Green Belt” was cancelled in December 2008 as the guidance had been rendered obsolete by the new General Permitted Development Order changes in 2008.

6. **Developing and Managing the Evidence Base**

6.1 An extensive evidence base was developed to support the Core Strategy (most of which remains available on the Council’s web site¹). Some of this material will be used again, for example the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Additional evidence will be developed to support the other documents set out in this LDS. Although the previous LDS listed a range of documents that were available or were to be produced, it can prove difficult to prejudge exactly what evidence will be required and therefore this new LDS does not attempt to list such evidence. However the DPD profiles (Appendix 1) list key pieces of evidence.

6.2 There will however be certain supporting documentation for each LDD. This will include for each document:

- Statement of Conformity with the Regional Strategy
- Sustainability Appraisal incorporating a Strategic Environmental Assessment;
- Explanation of the steps undertaken to ensure that the document has been produced in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement;
- Statement explaining the relationship of the LDD to the Tandridge District Local Plan or the Core Strategy.

7. **Sustainability Appraisal**

7.1 There is a national requirement that all policies and plans are subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) to consider the impact of those policies and plans on

¹ [http://www.tandridge.gov.uk/Planning/PlanningPolicy/tomorrows_tandridge.htm](http://www.tandridge.gov.uk/Planning/PlanningPolicy/tomorrows_tandridge.htm)
social, economic and environmental objectives. In addition there is a requirement as a result of a European Directive to carry out a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of plans and programmes. Government advice indicates that the work on SEA can be embedded into the SA process.

7.2 SA/SEA is an iterative process and begins by evidence gathering, preparing a scoping report, setting objectives and indicators and then involves constantly appraising the emerging policies. The emerging policies may require adjustment to ensure that adverse impacts are reduced or mitigated.

8. Resources
8.1 The Policy section of the Planning department comprises three full time officers. However one of the three officers is not involved in the LDF.

8.2 The amount of officer time that each officer will give to the preparation of the LDF is as follows:

- Head of Planning Policy 75%
- Planning Officer 95%

8.3 In addition, for the preparation of specific LDDs the Council will call upon the expertise of appropriate members of staff. In particular the Head of Strategy and Enabling (Housing) for the Affordable Housing DPD and Development Control staff for the Development Control Policies DPD. The Council also works with other East Surrey planning authorities on a number of joint projects that support LDF production.

8.4 An allocation is made each year from the Planning Delivery Grant for work on the LDF. In the financial year 2009/2010 a sum of £100,000 has been set aside.

8.5 Any further resource requirements can be identified and resourced as necessary through the Council’s system of forward financial planning through the Medium Term Plan process.

9. Risk Assessment
9.1 In preparing the LDS, it was found that the main areas of risk relate to:

- Staffing levels. In the event that a member of staff leaves, consideration will be given to the temporary employment of contract staff.

- The capacity of the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) and other external agencies to cope with the nation-wide demand. This is outside of the Council’s control but a service level agreement with PINS should minimise the risk.

- The “soundness” of DPDs. This risk will be minimised by the experience gained from the production of a sound Core Strategy and by using the Planning Advisory Service.

- Legal challenge. This will be minimised by ensuring that DPDs are “sound” and founded on a robust evidence base and well-audited stakeholder & community engagement systems.

- Programme slippage. This will be minimised with some contingency time built into the programme.
## Appendix 1 - Local Development Document Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Statement of Community Involvement (revised)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role and Subject</td>
<td>Statement setting out how the Council will engage with the local community in the preparation of the development framework and in the determination of planning applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Coverage</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Adopted as special non-DPD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain of Conformity</td>
<td>With regulations Has regard to the Council’s consultation policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Timetable              | • Preparation April 2009 to December 2009  
• Adoption December 2009                                                                                             |
<p>| Lead officer           | Head of Planning Policy                                                                                                                                                      |
| Management arrangements| To be agreed by Planning Policy Committee                                                                                                                                      |
| Resources              | N/a                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Evidence base          | N/a                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Stakeholder and community involvement | Consultation with Parish Councils, community groups etc                                                                                                       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Residential Site Allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role and Subject</td>
<td>Will allocate any required housing sites, reserve sites. It will also consider which villages should be designated as Green Belt Settlements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Coverage</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>DPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain of Conformity</td>
<td>With Core Strategy and RSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Timetable             | Consultation on Scope of Sustainability Appraisal - March 2010
|                       | Public Participation and Preparation - May 2010 to April 2011
|                       | Publication and Pre-submission consultation - September 2011
|                       | Submission - March 2012
|                       | Examination - November 2012
|                       | Adoption - June 2013          |
| Lead officer          | Head of Planning Policy       |
| Management arrangements| Drafts to be approved by Planning Policy Committee |
| Resources             | Planning Department Staff     |
| Evidence base         | Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
<p>|                       | Specific Sustainability Appraisal work relating to the villages |
| Stakeholder and community involvement | Parish Councils, community groups, developers &amp; land owners, service providers and statutory consultees. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Gypsy and Travelling Showmen Site Allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role and subject</td>
<td>Will allocate any required sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical coverage</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>DPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain of conformity</td>
<td>With Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Timetable                                      | • Consultation on Scope of Sustainability Appraisal - March 2010  
|                                                | • Public Participation and Preparation - May 2010 to April 2011  
|                                                | • Publication and Pre-submission consultation - September 2011  
|                                                | • Submission - March 2012  
|                                                | • Examination - December 2012  
|                                                | • Adoption - June 2013 |
| Lead Officer                                   | Head of Planning Policy                       |
| Management arrangements                        | Drafts to be approved by Planning Policy Committee |
| Resources                                      | Planning Department staff/Housing Department staff |
| Evidence Base                                  | Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment  
|                                                | South East Plan (Partial Review) Distribution  
<p>|                                                | Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment |
| Stakeholder and Community Involvement          | Parish Councils, community groups and representatives of the Travelling and Showmen's communities. Surrey County Council as freeholder of an existing site. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Development Control Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role and Subject</td>
<td>Will set out generic development management/control policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Coverage</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>DPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain of Conformity</td>
<td>With Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Timetable             | • Consultation on Scope of Sustainability Appraisal - Sept 2009  
|                       | • Public Participation and Preparation - Jan 2010 to Sept 2010  
|                       | • Publication and Pre-submission consultation - November 2010  
|                       | • Submission - June 2011                             
|                       | • Examination - December 2011                        
|                       | • Adoption - June 2012                               |
| Lead officer          | Head of Planning Policy                              |
| Management arrangements | Drafts to be considered by Planning Policy Committee |
| Resources             | Planning Department staff                            |
| Evidence base         | Saved Local Plan policies                            
|                       | Monitoring of appeals decisions                      
<p>|                       | Joint East Surrey reports                            |
| Stakeholder and community involvement | Parish Councils, community groups, developers and agents |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Affordable Housing DPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role and Subject</td>
<td>To set out policy for delivering affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical coverage</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>DPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain of Conformity</td>
<td>With Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetable</td>
<td>Although the Core Strategy AH policy is a “holding policy”, given the economic situation in mid 2009 the Council has agreed to defer production of this DPD as any viability assessment, even one looking to the longer term would have little value and that it would be better to use the adopted policy and to negotiate on a site by site basis. The position will be kept under review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultation on Scope of Sustainability Appraisal - TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public Participation and Preparation - TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publication and Pre-submission consultation - TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Submission - TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Examination - TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adoption - TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Officer</td>
<td>Head of Planning Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management arrangements</td>
<td>Drafts to be approved by Planning Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Planning Department staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Enabling staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Base</td>
<td>Housing Needs Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Housing Market Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viability study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder and community involvement</td>
<td>Parish Councils, developers, agents, Registered Social Landlords, community groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Community Infrastructure Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role and Subject</td>
<td>To set out a charging regime for contributions to infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical coverage</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>DPD - It may be possible to produce this document as a Supplementary Planning Document, although any charging schedule will still need to be subject to independent examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain of Conformity</td>
<td>With Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetable</td>
<td>Although this is a high priority, no detailed timetable has been set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Officer</td>
<td>Head of Planning Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management arrangements</td>
<td>Drafts to be approved by Planning Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Planning Department staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Base</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder and community involvement</td>
<td>Parish Councils, developers, agents, community groups, service providers and utility companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td><strong>Proposals Map</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role and Subject</td>
<td>Will show policy designations and sites with specific allocations. It will also show Minerals and Waste site allocations (to be provided by the County Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Coverage</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>To be prepared as DPD but not subject to examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain of Conformity</td>
<td>With Core Strategy &amp; other DPDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetable</td>
<td>The proposals map will accompany the preparation of the site allocations DPDs, for example the housing allocations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead officer</td>
<td>Head Planning Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management arrangements</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Resources           | Planning Department staff  
|                      | Specialist map company/ICT Section GIS support staff  
|                      | Specific budgetary provision                                                                                                                     |
| Evidence base       | Existing local plan policy designations  
<p>|                      | New DPDs                                                                                                                                          |
| Stakeholder and community involvement | In conjunction with other relevant DPD consultations                                                                                          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role and Subject</td>
<td>Will consider the potential impact of LDDs on environmental, economic and social objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Coverage</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Non DPD document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain of Conformity</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetable</td>
<td>In advance of and then tracking other DPDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead officer</td>
<td>Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management arrangements</td>
<td>Technical work by officers, joint working with other Surrey Districts. Appropriate reports to be considered by Planning Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Planning Department staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint working with other Surrey Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External consultancy assistance if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific budgetary provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence base</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder and community involvement</td>
<td>Scoping Report (revised) to be subject to specific consultation SA/SEA appraisal consultations in conjunction with other LDD consultations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2 - Local Development Scheme - showing statutory documents only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Area and Brief Description</th>
<th>Chain of Conformity</th>
<th>Current Status and Priority</th>
<th>Consultation on Scope of SA (Milestone)</th>
<th>Public Participation (Reg 25) and Preparation</th>
<th>Publication of DPD and Pre-submission consultation (Reg 27)</th>
<th>Submission (Milestone)</th>
<th>Examination (Milestone)</th>
<th>Adoption (Milestone)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Community Involvement (Revised)</td>
<td>District wide</td>
<td>With regulations</td>
<td>Adopted version 2/11/06 Revision High priority</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>April 2009 to December 2009</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>December 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Allocations DPD</td>
<td>District wide</td>
<td>With Core Strategy and RSS</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>May 2010 to April 2011</td>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showmen Site Allocations DPD</td>
<td>District wide</td>
<td>With Core Strategy and RSS</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>May 2010 to April 2011</td>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Area and Brief Description</td>
<td>Chain of Conformity</td>
<td>Current Status and Priority</td>
<td>Consultation on Scope of SA (Milestone)</td>
<td>Public Participation (Reg 25) and Preparation</td>
<td>Publication of DPD and Pre-submission consultation (Reg 27)</td>
<td>Submission (Milestone)</td>
<td>Examination (Milestone)</td>
<td>Adoption (Milestone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing DPD</td>
<td>District wide</td>
<td>With Core Strategy</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Infrastructure Levy*</td>
<td>District wide</td>
<td>With Core Strategy</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals Map</td>
<td>District wide</td>
<td>With Core Strategy &amp; LDDs</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>With site allocations DPD</td>
<td>With site allocations DPD</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NB. It may be possible to produce this document as a Supplementary Planning Document, although any charging schedule will still need to be subject to independent examination. Although this is a high priority document no detailed timetable has been set.
Appendix 3 - Process of preparing a Development Plan Documents

- Local Development Scheme
- Statement of Community Involvement
- Community Engagement
- Pre-submission Public consultation
- Submission to Secretary of State
- Pre-examination meeting
- Examination in Public
- Conformity with RSS and other DPDs
- Binding Inspector's Report
- Adoption
- DPD entry into the LDF

Evidence Gathering
Including Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

Representations made on submission version DPDs
Appendix 4 - Glossary

**AMR** Annual Monitoring Report - A document to be produced each year showing progress in achieving the timetable set out in the LDS and setting out revisions to the LDS.

**DPD** Development Plan Document - Any part of the LDF that forms part of the statutory development plan – these are: Core Strategy, area wide policies, topic policies, area action plans, proposals map, and site allocations (includes LDDs but not SCI or SPDs)

**EiP** Examination in Public - An examination chaired by an independent inspector into objections to the LDDs and into LDDs as a whole.

**GOSE** Government Office for South East- Regional government office (based in Guildford) responsible implementing national policy in the region and ensuring Local Planning Authorities policies and plans accord with national guidance.

**LDD** Local Development Document - The individual documents that set out planning policies for specific topics or for geographical areas.

**LDF** Local Development Framework - The collective name given to all those policies and documents forming the planning framework for the District.

**LDS** Local Development Scheme - A project management document setting out what the LDF will contain, a timetable for its production, proposals for monitoring and review.

**LP** Local Plan - The existing statutory plan for the area setting out policies for controlling development and proposals for particular areas/sites.

**RSS** Regional Strategy - Overarching strategy produced by Regional Planning Body, with broad land use, transport and other policies to inform LDFs, forms part of the statutory development plan – current plan called the South East Plan.

**Spatial Planning** An approach to planning that ensures the most efficient use of land by balancing competing demands. Does not consider just the physical aspects of location/land use but also economic, social and environmental matters.

**SA** Sustainability Appraisal - An appraisal of the impacts of policies and proposals on economic, social and environmental issues.

**SCI** Statement of Community Involvement - The document that sets out how the Local Planning Authority will involve and consult the public in the production of the LDF and on major development control matters.

**SEA** Strategic Environmental Assessment - An assessment of the potential impacts of policies and proposals on the environment, to include proposals for the mitigation of impacts.

**SPD** Supplementary Planning Document - A document providing an elaboration of policies, design guidance, site development guidance, parking standards etc.

**SPG** Supplementary Planning Guidance - Documents produced under the former system providing an elaboration of policies, design guidance, site development guidance.
Appendix 5 - Other Documents that the Council will be or may be preparing

(Note that this list does not form part of the Local Development Scheme and is provided for information only)

**Supplementary Planning Documents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harestone Valley</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woldingham High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Standards</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Construction (was to be Climate Neutral Development)</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbs Industrial Estate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document in support of Core Strategy policy CSP3</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Guidance</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other documents that the Council may wish to review in the future**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caterham Town Centre Brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of Buildings in the Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield Village Design Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woldingham Village Design Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambs Business Park Site Brief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix 6 - Local Development Framework Timetable**

Key:

SA - Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment
M - Milestone

See the timetable on the next page:-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Community Involvement (revised)</th>
<th>Public Participation and Preparation</th>
<th>Site Allocations</th>
<th>Public Participation and Preparation</th>
<th>Public Participation and Preparation</th>
<th>Gypsy &amp; Showmen's Site Allocations</th>
<th>Public Participation and Preparation</th>
<th>Development Control Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult on scope of SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication and Pre-submission consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Hearing meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination in Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors Report - Fact Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors Report - Final</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Requirements for Householder Applications

- Application Form, completed, signed (unless submitted electronically) and dated. A minimum of 3 copies plus the original of all documentation relating to the application should be submitted EXCEPT if the application is submitted electronically when a single copy is sufficient.
- Correct Fee
- Ownership Certificate
- Agricultural Holdings Certificate
- Site Location Plan (Scale 1:1250 or 1:2500) with the application site outlined in red and any other land owned by the applicant outlined in blue.
- Site Layout Plan/Block Plan (Scale 1:100 or 1:200)
- Existing and Proposed Elevations (Scale 1:50 or 1:100)
- Existing and proposed Floor Plans (Scale 1:50 or 1:100)
- Existing and proposed Roof Plans (Scale 1:50 or 1:100)
- Existing and Proposed site sections and finished floor and site levels (Scale 1:50 or 1:100)

Amended Local List Requirements for Householder Applications

- Flood Risk Assessment
REVISED CHECKLIST FOR HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATIONS

Householder Development Proposals requiring Planning Permission only

**DRAWINGS** – Drawings are preferred at A4 or A3, however where this is inappropriate larger drawings are acceptable.

All drawings MUST include the following information:
- The scale of the drawing (e.g. 1:100, 1:200 – must be a metric scale).
- A scale bar indicating a minimum of 0-10 metres.
- Indicate the direction of North on layout and location plans.
- Have a title to identify the development and subject of the drawing (e.g. Residential development at A Road, Oxted – Site Layout).
- Have a unique drawing number which also indicates any revisions (e.g. 1234 Revision B).
- All revisions should be described to identify any changes (e.g. Revision A – Layout changed).
- The date the drawing was drawn or any changes made.
- Annotation against the drawing to indicate all key external dimensions.

If not applying electronically, please provide if possible an electronic copy of the application on a CD ROM in pdf format. Please limit individual file sizes to less than 5Mb.

A minimum of 3 copies plus the original of all documentation relating to the application should be submitted EXCEPT if the application is submitted electronically when a single copy is sufficient.

**National Requirements** - Documents that **must** be included with your application:

- Correct Fee

- Application Form, completed, signed (unless submitted electronically) and dated

- Ownership Certificate:
  - A (included in Application Form: the applicant owns the land) **OR**
  - B (Form Part 2(1): the applicant does not own the land but has served certificate of notice on owner) **OR**
  - C (Form Part 2(2): the applicant does not own the land, is unable to issue certificate but has notified owners) **OR**
  - D (Form Part 2(2): the applicant does not own the land, is unable to issue certificate and is trying to ascertain the names and details of the owner)

- Agricultural Holdings Certificate

- Site Location Plan (Scale 1:1250 or 1:2500) with the application site outlined in red and any other land owned by the applicant outlined in blue.

- Site Layout Plan/Block Plan (Scale 1:100 or 1:200)
- Existing and Proposed Elevations (Scale 1:50 or 1:100)
- Existing and proposed Floor Plans (Scale 1:50 or 1:100)
- Existing and proposed Roof Plans (Scale 1:50 or 1:100)
- Existing and proposed site sections and finished floor and site levels (Scale 1:50 or 1:100)
- Design & Access Statement

**LOCAL REQUIREMENT**

Does your proposal require the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)? The Environment Agency has identified areas within the district that are at risk of flooding. The location of these areas is available on the Environment Agency’s web site, or from the Council. An FRA is required for every application in Flood Zones 2 or 3 (with certain limited exceptions), all new buildings, significant extensions and changes of use within the floodplain or adjacent to a Main River, and engineering operations that involve raising the level of land or significantly increasing surface water run-off to non-mains sewer systems such as watercourses and soakaways.

If yes, please provide a Flood Risk Assessment. Advice on the content of a FRA can be found in Planning Policy Statement 25.

**Other items to consider when making your application** (failure to provide this information will not make your application invalid but it is likely that the Council will not have enough information to determine your application)

- Will your proposal involve works within 5 metres of the crown spread of any tree?
  - If yes, please provide a drawing (Scale 1:200) accurately showing the position of the tree(s) in relation to the proposed works and an assessment of the implications for the work on the tree(s)
- Is your proposal for a wind turbine(s) and/or solar panel(s)?
  - If yes, please provide the manufacturer’s specification (including noise levels measured in decibels for wind turbines).
- Does the proposal involve the formation of a new vehicular access?
  - If yes, where the access is incorporated into a slope/gradient please provide a cross section (Scale 1:20) to show this
- Does the proposal involve the provision of new car parking?
  - If yes, please provide a plan (Scale 1:100 or 1:200) showing the dimensions and the position of the new access and a plan (Scale 1:100 or 1:200) showing the dimensions and the visibility splays of the new access
Does your ownership status require you to complete Ownership certificates B, C or D?
☐ If yes, please enclose a copy of the notice.

Is your proposal within a Conservation Area or an extension to/building within the garden of a Listed Building?
☐ If yes, please provide a short written statement setting out how the proposal has been designed to preserve or enhance the listed building/conservation area. As a minimum this should describe why a particular appearance and materials have been chosen.

The Council may require any of the following in order to determine your application and as such you may wish to submit such details with your application.

- Biodiversity Survey and Report
- Daylight/sunlight assessment
- Noise Impact Assessment
- Parking Provision and Access Arrangements, including disabled facilities
- Photographs/photomontages
- Plans showing key dimensions of proposal (e.g. depth and width) and distances to site boundaries and adjoining buildings and features
- Planning Statement
- Tree survey/Arboricultural implications
COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY - DCLG CONSULTATION ON PROPOSALS AND DRAFT REGULATIONS

Questionnaire

Chapter 2 - Delivering infrastructure with CIL

1: Do you agree with the proposal that the draft CIL regulations do not define infrastructure’ further? Yes

Comments: It is impossible to prejudge exactly what might constitute infrastructure within a particular area or arising to support a particular development. The definition should be kept as open as possible.

2: Is any further reporting required for CIL? No

No comments

FORMAT OF REPORTS

3: (a) Is the 1 October deadline for reporting on the previous year’s activity sufficient for local planning authorities? No

Comments: Given that a significant part of the period available for completing the report will be over the summer period, a longer period would be beneficial - it should be in line with the deadline for the Council’s Annual Monitoring Report - December each year.

The Government should specify (and provide templates for reports) to ensure consistency of approach, particularly if returns have to be made to the Government.

(b) Will this timescale enable developers and local communities to understand how CIL revenue has been applied?

Comments: Given that development and infrastructure planning/delivery takes place over a period of years rather than months there appears to be no urgency to report quickly - the main concern is that reporting is done regularly and accurately and a nine month period would allow this to happen.

GENERAL

4: Do you have any comments on any other matters raised in chapter 2 which are not covered by the questions above?

Comments: Local Authorities must be able to use the CIL to fund its administration. It is likely that dedicated staff will be required to assess the levy, collect it, spend or distribute it, serve the required notices and enforce its payment in some situations. Therefore a proportion of the levy must be able to be used to fund such staff. It is unlikely given current pressures on budgets that staff could be funded from local authority General Funds. Existing staff will not have the time and possibly skills to operate the system.

Chapter 3 - Setting the CIL Charge
CHARGING AUTHORITIES

5: Are there any circumstances where a CIL charging authority would not be able to fulfil its charging authority functions effectively? **No**

No comments

6: (a) In deciding whether to use the power at section 207 of the Act, should the Government apply different criteria? **Yes**  **No**

No comments on joint committees

(b) Which functions should a joint committee perform?

No comments

DIFFERENTIAL RATES

7: Do you agree that differential rates should be based only upon the economic viability of development? **Yes**

Comments: There is a risk that the process will become complex given to the wide variety of different type and scale of development. For example a large development may be more viable than a small development of the same type. It would be helpful if the Government could make the guidance very clear to avoid too many "special cases" being argued.

METRICS

8: Do you agree that CIL charges should be based on a metric of pounds per square metre? **Yes**

Comments: Whilst a standard metric would not provide an incentive or disincentive for residential or commercial, there is the risk that the two forms of development would have very different viability considerations within the same area. Therefore it will be essential that differential rates are considered for different forms of development.

9: Would you prefer to have a choice of charging metrics, and if so, can you suggest what and how the system could accommodate this choice without undue complexity and unfair distortions? **Yes**  **No**

No comments

10: Do you agree with the Government’s proposal to apply the charging metric to the gross internal area of development or do you think there are advantages to levying CIL on the gross external area? **Yes**

Comments: The reasons for using gross internal areas are understood, however there needs to be clear guidance on what constitutes the gross internal area, for example rooms in a house such as utility rooms or studies may not generate additional occupants and therefore will not add to the demand for infrastructure. Guidelines are required to prevent arguments over gross internal areas.

11: Do you agree that CIL should be levied on the gross development, rather than the net additional increase in development? **Yes**
Comments: It is not agreed that calculation based on gross development would discourage the development of previously developed land, all that would happen is that a standard gross calculation would place brown field and green field development on a “level playing field”.

**INDEXATION**

12: Should authorities be required to index CIL charges? **Yes**

No comments

13: (a) Should indexation be based on a national index to provide simplicity, consistency and a readily understood index? **Yes**

(b) Alternatively, should charging authorities be allowed to choose different indices in different places? **No**

No comments

14: Do you agree with the Government’s proposed choice of an index of construction costs? **Yes**

No comments

15: Are you content with indexation taking place to the point of the grant of planning permission or would you prefer charges to be indexed to the point when development commences? **Yes**

Comments: This approach would give certainty to the developer for three years and avoid the local authority having to recalculate.

16: Do you think it is right to apply the index on an annual basis or do you see advantages in applying it monthly? **Yes to first question - no to second**

Comments: Should be annually for ease of operation.

17: Do you agree that charging authorities should be able to index their charges from 1 January each year (taking the November index)? **Yes**

No comments

**CHARGING SCHEDULE PROCEDURES**

18: Do you agree with the Government’s proposal to allow joint charging schedule/development plan examinations? **Yes**

No comments

19: Do regulations or guidance need to cover any additional matters relating to joint examinations? **Yes**

No comments

20: Should the CIL examiner be able to modify a draft charging schedule to increase the proposed CIL rate? **No**

No comments
GENERAL

21: Do you have comments on any other matters raised in chapter 3 which are not covered by the questions above?

Comments: the requirement (Reg. 27 (2) (a) ) to consult on the charging schedule applies to parish councils adjoining the local authority area - there is no obvious value in this - parish councils within an area are justified, but not adjoining.

Why is there a requirement (Reg. 28 (1) (c) to send a copy of the charging schedule to the bodies that were consulted? Given the commitment to e-government it should be acceptable to send an electronic copy or a link to the document on a web site and to paper copies on request.

Chapter 4 - Paying CIL

22: (a) Do you agree with the chosen definitions of building, planning permission and ‘first permits’? Yes

(b) If not, what changes would you wish to see that strike the right balance between simplicity, fairness and minimising distortions?

Comments: Not applicable

23: (a) Do you agree with our approach to when CIL is chargeable on outline and reserved planning permissions. Yes

(b) If not, what changes would you wish to see that deal fairly with these types of permissions?

Comments: Not applicable

EXEMPTIONS AND DISCOUNTS

24: (a) What are your views on the principle of providing a reduced rate of CIL for affordable housing development?

Comments: Affordable housing is normally secured with some sort of subsidy, whether that is in the land cost or grant funding. Requiring CIL on such housing, which is in itself a requirement of the planning system runs the risk of reducing the viability of such schemes and “choking off” supply.

It is accepted that this may seem unfair in that affordable housing places an additional demand on infrastructure and could risk sufficient funding being available to deliver new infrastructure. The question whether the risk to affordable homes might actually reduce the supply of the associated market housing and put further pressure on developers to develop sites below the threshold. Either no CIL or a substantial discount must be applied. Anything that reduces the affordability of such housing runs contrary to the current national emphasis on delivering affordable housing.

(b) What do you think the likely consequences of providing such a discount might be?

See comments above.

25: If the Government were to provide a reduced rate of CIL for affordable housing development, do you think that the proposed definition of affordable housing is workable in practice? No
Comments: Public funding is not always available and therefore the main criterion should be whether the affordable housing is secured by way of a planning obligation in the case of a market led scheme or public funding in the case of a housing authority or Registered Social Landlord led scheme (that is 100% of the units being affordable).

26: If the proposed definition provides a workable basis for any reduced rate of CIL for affordable housing, should CIL relief for charities building affordable housing be applied according to this definition or according to whether it fulfils the charity’s charitable purposes? Yes No

No comments

27: Should LCHO properties where receipts from staircasing are recycled for additional affordable housing, not be subject to any clawback? Yes No

(b) if LCHO properties where receipts are not recycled are subject to clawback of the CIL discount, should there be a time limit up till when staircasing to full ownership would invoke clawback? Yes No

(c) How should such a clawback operate?

No comments

28: Is 7 years an acceptable time period for clawback to operate over? Yes No

No comments

29: Is it reasonable to ask a claimant to submit an apportionment of liability in this way? Yes No

No comments

30: Do you agree that it is best not to have a special procedure for developments that have difficulty in paying the advertised rate of CIL? If not, how could it be done in a way that is fair, non-distortionary and not open to abuse?

Comment: any exceptions would be difficult to plan for and difficult to include as part of the charging schedule and will still be open to argument. There is a risk that the system could become over complicated and difficult to operate, but at the same time there is a risk that community development (not built for profit) could be lost without special procedures. On balance it is agreed that it would be better not to have special procedures.

THE LIABLE PARTY

31: Do you agree with the Government’s proposals for liable parties and assumption of liability? Yes

No comments

COLLECTING CIL

32: Are these timescales for the transfer of CIL revenue from the collecting authority to the charging authority the right ones? Yes No

No comments

PAYMENT OF CIL IN KIND
33: Do you think that the final regulations should provide for the payment of CIL in-kind? **No**

Comments: It is agreed that payment in kind could be open to challenge in terms of whether it represents the best value.

34: If you think they should, can you suggest how CIL could be paid in-kind without incurring the difficulties outlined above?

Comments: Not applicable

**PAYMENT BY INSTALMENTS**

35: (a) Should payment by instalments be provided for in the final CIL regulations in addition to the ability to pay CIL by phases of development? **Yes**

(b) How should the instalments be structured?

It is not understood how payment dates could be easily set in the Regulations. The Regulations should enable the developer to negotiate instalments with the local authority. To keep it simple 50% could be on commencement and 50% on completion. Instalments should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances.

36: Do you agree that payment on account should not be provided for in the final CIL regulations? **Yes**

No comments

**DUTY ON THE AUTHORITY TO REMOVE THE LOCAL LAND CHARGE UPON REQUEST**

37: Should the collecting authority be under a duty to remove the charge automatically on payment of the full CIL liability? **Yes**

No comments

**ENFORCEMENT OF CIL LIABILITIES**

38: Should the draft regulations be amended to require collecting authorities to have to issue a warning to liable parties (in writing and possibly by posting a warning on the site in question) before being able to impose a late payment surcharge? **Yes**

Comments: There may be situations where liable party literally forgets to make a payment, a warning letter (or site notice where the contact details of the liable party are not known) should be issued requiring payment within 28 days of the date of letter/notice.

39: Are the means of recovering CIL debts sufficient or would further methods, such as the ability to impose attachment of earnings orders, be helpful? **Yes**

No comments

40: Should the Government provide for specific enforcement measures in regulations to allow collecting authorities to penalise and deter breaches of the conditions for relief? **Yes** **No**

No comments

**COMPENSATION**
41: Is a bespoke compensation regime required for CIL where enforcement action is inappropriately taken or would the Ombudsman route suffice? **No to first question - Yes to second**

Comments: an additional layer of Regulation would further add to the complexity of the operation of CIL probably requiring legal intervention. The Ombudsman route could be simpler.

**GENERAL**

42: Do you have any comments on any other matters raised in chapter 4 which are not covered by the questions above?

Comments: The proposals to impose CIL on certain permitted development may be impractical and unworkable. Permitted Development by its very nature is not always drawn to a local planning authority’s attention, particularly where no application for a Certificate for a Lawful Proposed Use or Development is submitted. Therefore although the purposes of the CIL legislation and GPDO are different, the application of CIL to permitted development could become a difficult enforcement issue. The amount of revenue gained this way will not be significant and its collection would be disproportionate.

**Chapter 5 - Planning obligations and other powers**

43: What do you think about the Government’s proposal as set out in draft regulation 94 to scale back the use of planning obligations?

Firstly the new Regulation is difficult to understand and if adopted it should be written in a way that can be understood by the users. Provided that planning obligations are still capable of being required to mitigate the impacts of a development, then the proposals to scale them back to prevent them from being used to seek pooled contributions through any existing tariff based approach is acceptable, subject to a suitable transition period. The proposed arrangements with the transitional period are unworkable.

44: Do you think the wording of the five tests as set out in draft regulation 94 is appropriate? Is each of the five tests meaningful and workable in practice, or could any be expressed in a better way? **Yes**

Comments: It is agreed that the suggestions in the consultation that the first and last tests should be dispensed with. Enshrining the other three tests in the Regulations will make them more certain and render the other two unnecessary.

45: Do you think that a transitional period, beyond the commencement of CIL regulations in April 2010, would be required to restrict use of planning obligations to the Circular 5/05 tests. **Yes**

And if so what should it be and why is such a period required?

A two year period may be insufficient for authorities with a well developed tariff based approach. To substitute this with a new infrastructure delivery plan, to consult on and have the charging schedule adopted could well take more than two years. A five year period would be preferred - see also answer to question 49.

46: Do you agree that a scale back of planning obligations as set out in draft regulation 94 should apply universally across England and Wales regardless of whether a local authority has a CIL or not? **Yes**

Comments: Provided an adequate transitional period is permitted.
47: Should a scale back of the use of planning obligations go further and prevent the future use of planning obligations for pooled contributions and tariffs? **No**

Comments: Cash payments through planning obligations may still be required for many developments. For example CIL may be needed to fund a general increase in the provision of educational infrastructure in an area, but a specific development might put pressure on a specific school that must be remedied by an additional classroom. Cash payments will remain essential if this localised infrastructure is to be provided.

48: Do you think the Government’s proposal to provide an additional legal criterion to restrict the use of planning obligations to address planning impacts ‘solely’ caused by a CIL chargeable development is workable in practice? **No**

If not, please state why not. Can you think of an alternative which would have the same or similar effect?

Comments: It is difficult to see how this criterion if expressed in law would operate, every case is different and local authorities will need discretion about what the impacts of a development might be and what might mitigate those impacts. There may be instances where a large scheme being developed by a number of developers would require financial payments towards very local infrastructure that would not be covered by CIL. The guidance needs to be clearer on this point. It would be preferable if the concept of what might constitute impacts “solely” caused by development is covered in non-statutory guidance.

49: What transitional period, beyond the commencement of CIL regulations in April 2010, would be required to restrict use of planning obligations to mitigate impacts ‘solely’ caused by CIL chargeable developments?

Comments: The introduction of CIL will be a major undertaking and as yet untried; new skills will be required by the local authority and other participants. Its introduction could be comparable to producing a Core Strategy. There is also to prospect of many authorities all reaching examination stage at the same time resulting in the Planning Inspectorate being overwhelmed. A blanket transition period is unrealistic, there should be a phasing out of tariffs and as CIL is introduced local authorities would lose the ability to operate tariffs through Section 106 agreements, possibly with a general fall back date five years on from commencement.

50: Do you agree that a restriction of planning obligations to prevent their use for pooled contributions or tariffs should apply universally across England and Wales regardless of whether a local authority has a CIL or not? **Yes**

No comments

51: What transitional period in London do you think would be required before a scale back of the use of planning obligations which prevented the use of pooled contributions and tariffs could take effect, to ensure a smooth transition from the existing to the new planning obligations regime, taking account for the need to use planning obligations for Crossrail purposes?

No comments

52: In revising Circular 5/05 in light of the introduction of CIL what further policy or areas of clarification do you think might be required with regards to the use of planning obligations?

No comments
53: Do you think any additional further guidance (additional to a revised Circular 5/05) is required to support the use of planning obligations or CIL, and if so who would be best to provide it? Yes  No

No comments

GENERAL

54: Do you have comments on any other matters raised in chapter 5 which are not covered by the questions above?

No comments
Site of the former Marie Curie Hospice
Harestone Drive, Caterham
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 The purpose of this concept statement is to present an understanding of the site context and present options for future redevelopment of the former Marie Curie Care Home, Harestone Valley Road, Caterham. It considers potential site development options with regard to built form and density, use, scale and massing, access, open space, amenity and the sustainability of the site.

1.2 The hospice ceased operations in March 2009 and is presently unoccupied. At the time of writing, the site continued to be in the ownership of the former occupier, with no stated plans to redevelop or market the site for the purposes of reoccupation or redevelopment. However it is not unlikely that such a site will attract developer interest.

1.3 The site is located within a predominantly low density residential area, which is described in more detail in the next section of this statement.

1.4 Any development of the site would need to ensure compliance with the relevant statutory and non-statutory provisions in force at the time of development. This statement has been prepared according to the provisions in force at the time of writing.
2.0 Context

2.1 The existing urban framework, grain and appearance, density, scale and landscape of an area reflects its history, function and connections with adjoining areas. Local building form and detail contribute to the distinct quality of a place. The context appraisal within this section of the statement presents the physical context of the site and surrounding area, which will inform the design options. Consideration of design and layout must be informed by the wider context, having regard not just to any immediate neighbouring buildings but the townscape and landscape of the wider locality.

Design policy and guidance

2.2 Statutory policies for planning and design are set at national, regional and local level by the Government, the South East England Partnership Board, and Tandridge District Council. They are described in more detail in appendix 3 of this statement.

2.3 Planning and design policy places importance on the retention of local character and distinctiveness. National and local policies suggest density aims for residential uses to achieve sustainable development, including the need to protect such local character.

2.4 The site is within the area known as Harestone Valley, which is a north-south valley defined by two parallel ridges to the east and west. Caterham town centre and railway station is to the north-west of the site, within a 700m level walk of the site entrance. The site has an area of approximately 1.12ha, which includes the entrance leg and Harestone Drive. The net developable area is approximately 0.75ha.

2.5 The sole access to the road network is a narrow access road off Harestone Valley Road. Residents of Harestone Valley Road note that this road is exceptionally busy during periods of the day with school and commuter traffic. The access road, named Harestone Drive, is single-lane in places, leads to existing housing (which is not the subject of this statement) and curves to avoid mature trees, with limited visibility in places.

2.6 The site is roughly rectangular in shape. It originally covered about twice its current area, with much of the original site subdivided for new housing, a process that continued into the 1990s. Much of this development shares the site access road. This and other surrounding development has 'land-locked' the site. (Refer to appendix 2 for a description of the site’s historical development).
Existing area layout, with on-site parking areas identified
Landscape setting

2.7 The site has a significant slope, rising to the east from the site entrance. Some developed parts of the land have been levelled to form terraces, meaning that there are steep embankments elsewhere on the site.

2.8 There are two main ‘levelled’ parts of the site. One of these areas forms the ornamental gardens to the main building, and the other contains office and nursing accommodation.

2.9 The ornamental gardens together with the tree areas both inside and on the perimeter of the site contribute greatly to the character of the area and the living environment of people not only using the site, but residents bordering the site and beyond. Views into the site are greatly enhanced by its sloping nature and by the valley itself. The present sylvan but open aspect has a wide influence on the context and character for both sides of the Harestone Valley.

2.10 The main structure on the site is a two and a half-storey building (with additional basement). Known as Harestone at the time of its construction in 1879, it is an imposing red brick and tile structure with significant levels of ornamentation. It appears to be in a good condition internally and externally; however there have been alterations connected with its occupying uses over time. Internally, original coving and panelling remains from the building’s original use (particularly on the ground floor), as does the imposing central staircase.

2.11 Other buildings on the site, which are located on the higher levelled area, comprise temporary and permanent single-storey office accommodation, and two-storey nursing and office accommodation, which was constructed after the main building. The building’s stables have been separated from this site and are in separate occupation as residential dwellings.

2.12 All trees on the site are protected by a ‘blanket’ Tree Protection Order (TPO). Significant and mature specimens are located around the site, particularly towards the southern and western boundaries, where there is significant coverage surrounding the ornamental garden and site entrance.

Right: The contours of the site indicate that the site and its surroundings have a significant upward slope from west (left) to east (right)
Surrounding development

2.13 The immediately surrounding area, roughly defined as the area east of Harestone Valley Road, is predominantly two-storey detached houses built in the first half of the 20th century. Predominant building materials are dark or rendered brickwork and tiled roofs. Some newer infill development has been constructed within the area. In recent years, development has been subject to the BES Harestone Valley Policy within the Tandridge District Local Plan. This is now a “saved” policy, which previously set a density maximum of 38 habitable rooms per hectare (hr/ha) for new development. However this density guideline has for some time and on several sites been exceeded; where it has been demonstrated that the landscape dominated character of the area has still been protected. As a result the density constraints are now being applied flexibly.

2.14 Buildings are set out to form parallel lines with their streets, and have fairly large gardens. More informal patterns can be found in newer developments of detached houses, including the cluster of homes to the immediate north of the site.

2.15 The area to the west of Harestone Valley Road has a different built character, with the original large houses in expansive grounds redeveloped for flats. In some cases the original buildings have been retained; in others new development ranging from the 1960s to the present day has replicated the former buildings’ footprints and scale, as flatted developments within large grounds. As a result, the density is generally higher in this area. The area is also subject to steeper contours, with established vegetation meaning that the area has a terraced, sylvan nature which provides views into Harestone Valley.
Key views

2.16 There are a number of key views both into and out of the site:

- Views from the site to the ridge to the west. The existing pattern of development has preserved the ridgeline;
- Views towards the site from the ridges to the east and west; and
- A view into the site from the main entrance on Harestone Valley Road, within which the front elevation of the main building is partly visible.

2.17 Additionally there are glimpsed views of the site between existing buildings, particularly from Loxford Way, and from the rear windows and gardens of surrounding homes.
Contribution to local character

2.18 As stated previously, the site is one of the few remaining within the area that retains not only its original building, but also the surrounding grounds. While this was the predominant pattern of development within the early urban history of Harestone Valley, it now stands as a link to the history of the area. More importantly, the building (in its siting, scale and appearance) and the space surrounding it contributes significantly to the character of the immediate neighbourhood.

2.19 The openness of the site itself presents an arcadian character that serves as a link between the semi-rural nature of the site as it was in history (and indeed retains a feeling of today) and the suburban development that has subsequently enveloped the original grounds. The retention of tree belts and the openness of the site presents significant benefits to the surrounding area.
3.0 Land use options

3.1 The Development Plan for the area includes, amongst other documents, the adopted Core Strategy and certain “saved” policies from the Tandridge District Local Plan 2001. The first parts of this policy background to consider are Policy CSP13 of the Core Strategy and saved Policy HE2 of the former Local Plan.

Retention of community facility

3.2 A sequential approach would be necessary involving consideration of the existing building and site for its existing use under CSP13 followed by its suitability for a community use. If neither of these are viable or practicable prospects, then other community uses of the site for the site should be considered followed by the use of the site for Extra Care Housing under CSP8. None of these uses or residential development are mutually exclusive and could be combined within the site particularly with the retention of the existing building and ornamental gardens. Because of its local association the building is one of character within the terms of saved Local Plan policy HE2 and a scheme not including its retention would need to be justified. The requirements under these Policies would all need to be evaluated prior to any residential proposals. Whilst this Concept Statement offers a preferred option with a residential use, the use of the building and grounds for these other uses would be equally acceptable.

Residential Development

3.3 In the event that there is no requirement for community facilities, no requirement for the existing building to be retained and no possibility of Extra Care Housing being provided on this site, then the last option in the sequential approach would appear to be residential development. There are a number of saved Local Plan and adopted Core Strategy policies that would impact on residential redevelopment proposals, not least of which would be Local Plan Policies BE1 and BE5 and Core Strategy policies CSP18 and CSP19. Although notwithstanding the existing scale and size of the existing building, Policy BE5 would direct the new form of residential development towards two storey dwellings rather than a single large building block. However such an approach may be justified in view of the existing structure and may be a more appropriate solution for the site. Although the open space formed by this site is ancillary to the main building, the demolition of the building would not be a signal for the extensive and indiscriminate covering of the whole site with residential development. The gardens and other open land associated with this site forms such an important and integral part of the character of the area that a significant degree of openness should be retained. This should include some form of focal open space that would benefit residents of both existing and proposed dwellings. Any prospective developer would need to have regard to Core Strategy policies CSP4 regarding provision of affordable housing (either on site or as a commuted sum for development elsewhere); and CSP7 relating to housing balance including considerations of the size and type of dwellings.
The need to retain open space, including the widest possible retention of the ornamental gardens, to ensure the conservation of groups of trees and individual specimens; to have regard to the levels of the site and to achieve more than the minimum privacy distances stated in saved Policy BE1 will result in a density for residential redevelopment that should relate satisfactorily to the site and its surroundings. These general principles apply to any form of new development on the site.
4.0 Design options

4.1 In accordance with PPS1, development on the site should make the best use of land. However, this must be undertaken in accordance with other important provisions, such as the need to ensure good design, which incorporates protecting the character of the area and amenities of existing residents.

4.2 Initial consultation with the local community suggests that the most valued aspect of the area around the site is the existing urban character – that of low-medium density residential development, among a verdant setting comprising an abundance of mature trees and an open landscape. ‘By Design’ and other design guidance suggests that the retention of character and amenity are factors that contribute to successful place-making in development. Good design will provide for the best use of the site, while ensuring that the character of the site and surrounding area is preserved and enhanced.

4.3 In considering future development options for the site, there are variables that will affect the predicted form of development:

- While the existing main building on the site has historic value and is a “Building of Character”, it has no formal protection;

- The original house was built at a time when similar large houses were built within this area of Caterham. Some of these still exist, having been developed for other uses or converted into flats. Often the curtilage has been developed, sometimes affecting the setting of the original building;

- Both the main building and its open, surrounding grounds contribute significantly to local character, with the views within the site towards the building underlining its imposing stature;

- The importance of the present character and contribution of this site to the quality of living for existing residents, and of maintaining the existing views into and across the site; and

- Other factors, such as the value of the current layout to biodiversity and impact on noise generation, must be considered.

4.4 The retention of the current building, within its present open setting, is therefore strongly supported. Development of the site should consider the reuse of the building for residential or other uses (as explored below), with the retention of the other site features that significantly contribute to the building’s setting, such as the ornamental gardens surrounding the building.

4.5 It is noted that retention of the building is the preferred option in terms of statutory Core Strategy and sustainability requirements, which encourage the reuse of existing buildings rather than redevelopment.
Use

4.6 There are several constraints that prevent intensive use of the site. These include the following:

- Site access: The site has a one-lane, narrow access that winds to avoid mature protected trees. A transport assessment will need to accompany any proposals for intensification or changes of use, to ensure that access and egress into the site will be safe for vehicles and pedestrians. Residents also note that Harestone Valley Road becomes extremely busy at times and the assessment should consider the capacity of Harestone Valley Road and the impact of any development on it and on its junction with Station Avenue.

- Proximity of surrounding residential development: Development should not contain uses that would be likely to cause undue detrimental factors to residential amenity, or neighbours’ enjoyment of their properties, through noise, increases in traffic levels, blockage of sunlight, daylight or outlook, or other disruption.

- Retention of the existing building: As stated earlier, the retention of the existing building is strongly supported. Proposed development should be able to reuse the building and ensure that its setting is retained. Other areas of the site, such as the office and nursing accommodation, may be suitable for redevelopment.

- Design and Access Statement: Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a design and access statement. Other necessary assessments would relate to tree condition; landform, including sections through the site; an ecological assessment including surveys for protected species and any assessments of the viability of community uses and retention of the main building.

4.7 A design exercise has been undertaken as part of this statement, to examine whether the conversion of the former hospice building is viable for residential use. The findings of this exercise can be viewed at Appendix 1.
Access

4.8 The narrow access to the site winds through protected trees and as such is single-lane and shared by pedestrians in places. Proposals for development will need to show that traffic or pedestrian safety will not be compromised, or significantly impact on the houses on either side of the entrance, especially in regards to noise and pollution.

4.9 Proposals for alternative access into the site including any possible widening of the access road will need to demonstrate that there is no detriment to highway safety or character and amenity of the area, including significant impacts on the houses on either side of the entrance.

4.10 Proposals for development will need to demonstrate adequate parking provision, which does not dominate the appearance or character of the development, and meets sustainability and density requirements. Any scheme should comply with current standards.

Siting

4.11 The least sensitive part of the site - when factors such as protected tree locations, the ornamental gardens, the setting of the main building, and the amenity of existing residents is considered - is the raised land to the east of the main building and its immediately surrounding grounds.

4.12 Should the former hospice building not be retained, its location would be suitable for a similarly striking building. This location would not require the removal of trees, although care should be taken to ensure that the surrounding areas, including the ornamental gardens, are protected and continue to contribute to character. Additionally, the location of ancillary uses - such as parking - should be carefully considered with a preference to these ancillary uses being located in similar positions to those currently existing on the site.

Scale, massing and appearance

4.13 New buildings should minimise impact on adjoining and nearby residents, and preserve the character, including landscape and views, of the site and area.

4.14 The single and partial two-storey existing buildings on the upper part of the site are of a low-rise nature. Should new buildings be constructed here, they should be positioned to minimise the impact on existing residents’ outlook and privacy. Due to the slope of the land, there is likely to be scope for two-storey buildings in this location. As indicated in paragraph 3.4 above, it is expected that the minimum privacy/amenity distances quoted in Local Plan policy BE1 will be exceeded, especially in terms of the new development in relation to existing surrounding dwellings.

4.15 Should the former hospice building be replaced, a new building should have consideration to the scale and mass of the existing building, with regard to its impact on adjoining properties and effect on local character. It is considered that a sympathetically designed building of similar height and scale, restricted to the existing footprint, could be appropriate. Car parking and other ancillary matters such as refuse and recycling will need to be provided in a way which reduces their impact.

4.16 Selection of materials and styles should use local architectural cues where possible. Materials and ornamentation should be used to reduce the impact of massing where appropriate. The existing building comprises a palette of materials appropriate to the area.
Residential density

4.17 Should residential development be the preferred use, the proposal will need to ensure that it is at a density that does not detrimentally affect the character of the site or surrounding area. Given the low density nature of the immediate surroundings, density would need to be driven by scheme design, which would be sympathetic to the surrounding character (and the amenities of existing residents), and take account of good design principles and statutory obligations (such as the requirement to make the best use of the land).

4.18 As noted above the density requirements in Local Plan policy BE5 have been exceeded on occasions and as a result the Council is applying the policy flexibly. Core Strategy policy CSP19 Density indicates that within the built up areas development should be within the range 30 - 55 dwellings per hectare, unless the design solution for such a density would conflict with the local character and distinctiveness of an area where a lower density is more appropriate. It is therefore imperative that development retains the local character, and that the proposed density demonstrates a positive contribution to character and environment. Notwithstanding the flexibility with which the Harestone Valley policy has been applied, this is one of the few major sites to come forward for redevelopment in Harestone Valley. The objectives of the policy must therefore be paramount. Taking into account all the constraints on the site a lower density may be required here. This in turn, may be another factor affecting the viability of retaining the existing building.

4.19 For the purposes of this concept statement and in accordance with policy guidance, the site area used for density calculations includes only the developable area - that is, it excludes the areas with protected tree groups and access area.

Landscape and sustainability

4.20 Development should be located away from existing tree groups and high quality individual trees to allow sufficient clearance for crown and root systems. New planting should be considered, particularly along those boundaries where currently there is little planting or to reinforce gaps in existing planting. The existing brick boundary walls are an attractive feature of the site and should be retained.

4.21 Any new development should incorporate, where possible, locally sourced materials and materials which take advantage of solar gain while minimising heat loss. Sustainable drainage should be incorporated, and parking areas should use permeable surfaces to minimise runoff. The Council will require a saving in CO2 emissions and some of the saving must be achieved through the inclusion of renewable energy (see policy CSP14 of the Core Strategy).
Options for development

4.22 Using the preceding information, it is evident that the site can be developed in a number of ways. These are identified below:

a) Retaining the existing building, with the existing or similar use, and developing homes on the upper/eastern part of the site. This option would offer a mixed use but would be dependent on the viability of buildings and the suitability of access into the site, among other factors. Only limited additional development could be accommodated because of the need to retain an appropriate setting for the existing large scale building;

b) Redeveloping by conversion the building for residential use, with homes on the upper/eastern part of the site, and retaining the ornamental gardens. This will require care in terms of parking provision and detailed arrangements for refuse, recycling etc;

c) Developing flats on the footprint of the existing building, and houses on the upper part of the site, using similar scale and massing, with regard to local amenity and character;

d) Redeveloping the entire site to provide housing. Higher density housing is the least preferred option as this would not retain the local character. Single housing, while potentially having a lower amenity impact may not fall within the range of 30 - 55 dpha; however a lower density may be justified if a design solution within the range would result in conflict with local character and distinctiveness.

4.23 While these options could be combined, it is noted that the most appropriate option in terms of protecting local character is option b, or option c if retention of the building is not viable.

Preferred Option: Option b)

4.24 This preferred option assumes there is no alternative community use and the retention of the existing building with conversion into residential units, (a model scheme is shown at appendix 1), and development of housing on the upper level of the site. The preferred option opposite shows the development of up to seven predominately detached houses, similar to the more recent surrounding development, on the upper level of the site. A slightly alternative version of this proposal, indicating building envelopes on the upper level of the site, is shown in the diagram below.

Alternative option: Building envelopes

4.25 Using the area for density calculation as described previously (calculated as a net developable area of approximately 0.75ha), the residential density for this proposal is 30.5 dwellings per hectare (d/ha). This assumes that there would be a yield of at least 23 new dwellings - in this example, 16 dwellings within the former hospice building, and 4-7 new dwellings elsewhere on the site. This is within the range referred to in policy CSP19. Alternative forms of new residential development with the retained main house may be possible but a higher density would only be acceptable if the policy objectives are still met.

4.26 This option indicates that redevelopment of the site using the existing building could be within the density range for the area with minimal detrimental impact on local character. The retention of this character is assisted to a large degree by the retention of the historic building and its ornamental grounds. It is considered that
a more intensive development would be highly unlikely to preserve the local character and that detached housing could only retain the character and privacy if built to a density below the range for the area.

4.27 It should be stressed that this is only an indicative diagrammatic scheme which shows no detail. It does not represent the only option for the future and should not dictate either a rigid scheme for the site; and neither should it be regarded as a maximum for the site.

Preferred option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum retention of protected trees</th>
<th>Views retained to and from building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrow entrance retained for tree protection, character and local amenity</td>
<td>Density calculations incorporate only the developable area of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum two storey height of new build, to preserve views across site</td>
<td>Existing building retained, or new building created with a similar footprint and scale/mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back gardens to allow for retention of trees on boundary and enable 22+m separation to existing homes</td>
<td>Large areas of open space around new development, in style of existing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking areas do not overwhelm development and are visible from dwellings</td>
<td>Open space retained as community resource and for contribution to local character</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5.0 Summary

### Site context

**Access and setting**
- Limited, narrow access
- Sloping site with levelled areas
- 1.12ha gross site area, net developable area 0.75ha approximately
- Pockets of mature trees protected by TPO
- No detriment to residents on either side of any existing or new access
- No detriment to houses on either side of Harestone Drive through increased noise, traffic congestion and pollution

**Site buildings**
- Historic building in relatively good condition, recently vacated, 2.5 storeys
- One of the few remaining large houses with grounds, once common in the area
- Open, ornamental grounds to rear
- Newer buildings to east of main building
- Most recent use as a nursing home

**Surrounding development**
- Low-density housing building in past 100 years
- Large gardens and generally sylvan character
- Key views to and from site towards surrounding ridges, and surrounding homes

**Character**
- Building and grounds provide a link to the historic pattern of development of the area
- Retention of grounds gives the area an open character
- Retention of trees and shrubs maintains privacy and biodiversity
- Open views into the site form both sides of the valley, and down the valley from Loxford Road and above

### Design options

**Use**
- Access constraints prevent intensive development
- Nearby residents’ amenity must be maintained
- Community, care-based or residential uses are appropriate
- Potential for conversion of existing building to flats
- Removal of existing building requires viability study

**Access**
- No detriment to adjacent residents and trees at access
- Adequate parking to be provided, not overpowering character of development

**Siting**
- Least sensitive part of the site is the ‘upper’ half
- Care should be taken to retain open character, especially of ‘lower’ half around existing building

**Scale, massing and appearance**
- New buildings must minimise impact on adjoining residents
- Character (including landscape and views) must not be compromised
- Should hospice building be replaced, a building of similar scale and massing may be appropriate
- Local architectural styles to be drawn on where possible

**Density**
- In accordance with national and local policies, it would be possible for the site to be developed at or below the lower end of the range set out in Core Strategy policy CSP19. Densities at the higher end of the range would be unlikely to meet the policy objectives and therefore would not be supported. The density of any proposal would need to demonstrate a positive influence to the character of the area and continue to maintain the present open and sylvan nature of the site.

**Landscape and sustainability**
- Development to be away from protected trees
- Sustainable construction methods and materials to be used
Proposals

- Residential use assumed
- Retention of existing building is preferred, with potential for reuse for community purposes or conversion to residential
- Ornamental garden to be retained for contribution to character
- New housing on eastern portion of land
- Upper level density as presented in CSP19 is unlikely to be supported (for reasons of character).
Appendix 1: Model scheme

A1.1 A model scheme showing a hypothetical conversion of the former hospice building into residential flats has been produced. The exercise demonstrates the potential for conversion of the existing building.

A1.2 The model has been drawn for the purposes of obtaining a density figure for the site and showing that the footprint of the existing building is sustainable. It does not take into account the existing state of the building, nor the Council’s requirement for dwellings or preference for dwelling size or tenure. Further information on such matters should be discussed with Council officers.

Ground floor layout (not to scale on page)
Appendix 2: Site history

A2.1 The current building was designed by Sir John Sulman (1849-1934) in the early part of his career. He subsequently moved to Australia, where he made a significant contribution to the development of the Australian ‘style’ of architecture and town planning, being instrumental in the growth of Sydney around the beginning of the 20th century. A suburb of Canberra is named after him¹.

A2.2 The photographs and their descriptions on this page are from ‘Bygone Caterham’ (Tooke, 1988, plates 23-25)². Used with permission.

1875 historic map. The original Harestone House is shown on this map, and is one of the few houses in the area, although there are more closer to the town centre to the north (which had been growing since the opening of the railway some 19 years earlier). The large grounds of the house are apparent.

1896 historic map. The current building has been constructed slightly to the north of the previous Harestone House, which has been demolished. The current stables and layout of the grounds are recognisable, with a new sweeping drive from Harestone Valley Road, and grand houses appearing opposite the site.

1935 historic map. The house and site has taken the configuration that it mostly retains today, although the main site entrance is from Colbourn Avenue to the north. Development of homes around the site, including on Harestone Valley Road, is beginning to occur.

1967 historic map. The site entrance is now on Harestone Valley Road and housing development on Loxford Way. Later development within the site itself has not yet occurred, although the stables have been subdivided for residential use.
Appendix 3: Policy

A3.1 The following paragraphs summarise the background design policies that have informed and influenced the proposals.

National Policy

Planning Policy Statement 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development

A3.2 PPS 1 recognises that high quality and inclusive design is a key element in achieving sustainable development (paragraphs 33, 34). It also states that "Planning Authorities should have regard to good practice set out in ‘By Design’.

Planning Policy Statement 3 – Housing

A3.3 Should the site be utilised for residential development, PPS3 will apply. This sets out the framework for the delivery of the Government’s housing objectives. It also encourages the creation of sustainable residential environments, highlighting the role of public transport provision, and making the best use of land to deliver:

- Housing developments in suitable locations that offer a good range of community facilities with access to jobs, key services and infrastructure;
- Efficient and effective use of land, including reuse of previously developed land, where appropriate;
- A density of development not dictated by existing development but by an imaginative design and layout, with more efficient use of land without compromising the quality of the local environment (the guidance sets a suggested minimum level of 30 dwellings per hectare);
- A choice of housing, both market and affordable, to support a variety of households in all areas, and to address community requirements; and
- To create sustainable, inclusive, mixed communities in all areas.

A3.4 Relevant additional national urban design guidance is provided by the following documents:

- By Design;
- By Design, Better Places to Live;
- The Urban Design Compendium;
- Safer Places; The Planning System and Crime Prevention;
- Better Neighbourhoods, Making Higher Densities Work; and
- CABE / English Heritage guidance on Tall Buildings.

By Design, Urban Design in the Planning System: Towards Better Practice

A3.5 This promotes the need for good urban design and seeks to raise the standards of urban design. ‘By Design’ promotes an approach, which emphasises the creation of design objectives and principles. The factors established in creating successful urban design include:

- Character: a place with its own identity;
- Continuity and enclosure: a place where public and private areas are clearly distinguished;
- Ease of movement: a place that is easy to get to and move through;
- Legibility: A place that has a clear image and is easy to understand; and
- Diversity: A place with variety and choice.

Regional Policy

A3.6 The South East Plan, published in May 2009, sets the strategic direction of development within the region around London, reflecting the aims of national policies.

A3.7 The Surrey Design Guide sets out the general urban design principles that new development should seek to achieve, with an emphasis on good design quality and the protection of local character.
Local Policy

A3.8 The Tandridge Core Strategy, adopted on 15 October 2008, forms part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) and updates the previous adopted Local Plan. The following policies are relevant to the site.

- CSP 1 Location of Development: Development to occur in existing built-up areas.
- CSP 2 Housing Provision: A net increase of at least 2,500 dwellings is expected within the period 2006 to 2026.
- CSP 4 Affordable Housing.
- CSP 7 Housing Balance: In developments of 5 or more dwellings, the Council requires an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes in accordance with current identified needs.
- CSP 8 Extra Care Housing: The Council expects to provide for the development of at least 162 units of Extra Care Housing in the period up to 2016, with further units thereafter.
- CSP 11 Infrastructure and Services: Planning permission will only be granted where sufficient infrastructure exists or can be provided.
- CSP 12 Managing Travel Demand: New development should have regard to adopted highway design and parking standards.
- CSP 13 Community, Sport & Recreation and Services: Appropriate open space to be provided.
- CSP 14 Sustainable Construction: Development should seek to achieve CO2 emission reductions, incorporate renewable energy and be a minimum of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3.
- CSP 15 Environmental Quality: Measures are set out to minimise the impact on natural resources, including Secured by Design, Lifetime Homes, and for existing buildings to be reused.
- CSP 17 Biodiversity: Development proposals should protect biodiversity, and aim to restore or create suitable habitats to sustain wildlife.
- CSP 18 Character and Design: New development must reflect and respect the character, setting and local context of areas, including residential amenity, open spaces and biodiversity.
- CSP 19 Density: New development should have a density of between 30 and 55 dwellings per hectare, unless it conflicts with the local character and distinctiveness of an area. Such character and distinctiveness may also be identified in Village Design Statements, Conservation Area Appraisals or Supplementary Planning Documents.

A3.9 Paragraph 15.5 of the Core Strategy is particularly relevant to this proposal, stating that while the Council will seek to make the best use of urban land by requiring densities that provide more dwellings, there will be locations where the character of the surrounding area is such that it will be necessary to limit densities to avoid a development that is out of character with its surroundings. Developers should seek to exhibit design flair and consider the impacts on the amenities of surrounding properties, the topography of the site and existing trees and planting. The Council recognises that whilst residential gardens are defined as brown field land, this does not necessarily mean that they are suitable for development. Other paragraphs within this section, specifically 15.2, 15.8 and 15.9, are relevant.

A3.10 Certain policies of the Local Plan were saved when the Core Strategy was adopted. These remain in force at the time of writing. Among these are BE1 General Policy for New Development and BE5 Harestone Valley Policy, although the densities are now being applied flexibly. Planning Officers are also able to offer guidance on the provision of refuse and recycling facilities. There is also saved policy HE2 which requires the application of criteria to identify buildings of character.
1. **Introduction**

“Planning policies and decisions should be based on...information on the environmental characteristics of the area.” (PPS1 para. 19)

“Good design is fundamental to using land efficiently. LPAs should facilitate good design by identifying the features that define the character of a particular area.” (PPS3 para. 48)

1.1 Tandridge District Council seeks expressions of interest from suitably qualified and experienced organisations to undertake a character appraisal of two residential areas of the District; to prepare suitable design guidance for those areas; and to advise on the preparation of townscape/design policies covering those areas.

1.2 The Harestone Valley area of Caterham is residential area characterised by a high quality environment that is derived from its topography and tree covered slopes. The area originally developed in Victorian times with the arrival of the railway in Caterham. At that time the area was characterised by large villas. Since that time development has continued and although the area is extensively developed, much is at a low density and trees are still the dominant feature in the landscape. It has an area of approximately 96 hectares.

1.3 The District Council and the Caterham Valley Parish Council are keen to provide a robust new policy for the area that will replace the existing saved local plan policy. The new policy will guide development and be a sound basis for Development Management decisions over the next ten years and possibly beyond.

1.4 Woldingham is a residential area entirely surrounded by the Green Belt. It was a small hamlet until the coming of the railway in 1884. After that date land was purchased in large plots of at least half an acre, (many were larger) with a stipulation the buildings were to be of high quality and only to be used as a dwelling. Development has occurred over the years but the village retains its high quality environment characterised by low density development. It has an area of approximately 89 hectares. More information on the development of the area can be found in Chapter 2 of the Woldingham Village Design Statement.

1.5 The District Council and the Woldingham Parish Council are keen to provide a robust new policy to replace the existing saved local plan policy. The new policy will guide development and be a sound basis for Development Management decisions over the next ten years and possibly beyond.

2. **Policy Background - The Harestone Policy area**

2.1 The Harestone Valley Policy was first introduced in 1965 by Surrey County Council in consultation with the former Caterham and Warlingham UDC. It was introduced to protect the particular character of the area from inappropriate development following a period of high development activity in the early to mid 1960s. The policy was reviewed in 1982 and reaffirmed by the District Council.
2.2 In 1982 when the policy was reviewed a report to the District Council set out the original reasons why the Policy was introduced. These were stated as:

"Harestone Valley is an area with distinctive qualities of landscape and amenity, much of which derives from the topography and well treed slopes. It is essentially a residential area of low density development of which the buildings in the main do not detract from the fine landscape. Owing to the age of many of the properties a substantial amount of redevelopment is envisaged in the future, and it is important that this should be done in such a way as to retain the existing characteristics……….

2.3 In re-affirming the policy in 1982 the District Council report noted that the density requirements of the Policy had been breached on a number of occasions. It was also noted that these developments had not resulted overall in a significant diminution of the landscape character of the area because of the particular value placed on tree retention in the schemes. The report noted that a flexible approach to development was possible; the recommendation of the report was as follows:

"The Harestone Valley Policy adopted in 1965 be re-affirmed but the Council note the previous flexible approach by which, on certain sites, it is possible to exceed the Policy density figure without detriment to the character and local environment."

2.4 The policy was incorporated into the North of the Downs Local Plan, amended to be on the basis of habitable rooms per unit area rather than persons per unit area.

2.5 The policy was carried forward into the Tandridge District Local Plan. Although it was the subject of objection the Inspector who considered the draft plan in 1999 did not support the objections and the policy was therefore part of the adopted local plan in 2001 (BE5).

2.6 Policy BE5 reaffirmed the policy approach for the area once again. It largely repeated Policy 9 of the North of the Downs Local Plan, though it included amended figures concerning the definition of a habitable room. It also included within the policy the definition of a habitable room. This had previously been in the supporting text.

2.7 The Local Plan policy and it supporting text, which has been “saved” is as follows:-

**Harestone Valley Policy Area**

3.34 During the time of generally high development activity during the early and mid 1960’s, the County Council and the former Caterham & Warlingham Urban District Council became concerned about the effects of redevelopment on the Harestone Valley area with its distinctive qualities of steep valley sides, heavy with tree cover, which during earlier years had been characterised by large dwellings in spacious grounds.

3.35 Accordingly, a Policy was prepared by the County Planning Officer in consultation with the former Urban District Council and was approved in April 1965. Generally, the Policy sought to allow higher densities nearer to the town centre and Caterham Valley and lower densities up the valley sides.

3.36 The main objectives of the Policy are to maintain the predominance of tree cover over buildings; to prevent premature development which would prejudice the best form of comprehensive development; to secure privacy for the residents of new and existing developments; and to ensure that the amount of development
which takes place accords with the development plan for the areas upon which service provision has been based.

3.37 The Policy, therefore, has been designed to preserve the existing amenities and special characteristics of the area, and density policies for the various parts of the area were put forward to achieve the objectives. In 1982, the Policy was reviewed and reaffirmed but the Council noted the previous flexible approach by which, on certain sites, it has been possible to exceed the Policy density figure without detriment to the character and local environment. The Policy is therefore retained in this Local Plan, together with some of its original background text.

3.38 The area covered by the Policy lies to the South of Caterham Valley Town Centre, and is bounded on the east by Godstone Road and Tupwood Lane and to the west by Church Hill and Stanstead Road; to the south the boundary is that of the residential area where it joins the Green Belt. Harestone Valley is an area with distinctive qualities of landscape and amenity, much of which derives from the topography and tree-lined slopes. It is essentially a residential area of low density development in which buildings in the main do not detract from the fine landscape.

3.39 The general principles which it is intended to apply are as follows:

(i) the importance of maintaining to the utmost the existing predominance of trees over buildings. This could be achieved partly by making Tree Preservation Orders where appropriate, and also by ensuring that new forms of development leave as many trees as possible unaffected;

(ii) in order to safeguard the natural physical features of the area and to secure the best form of development, schemes will be regarded as premature unless the areas of redevelopment are of sufficient size and suitable shape to enable comprehensive schemes to be prepared;

(iii) there is a substantial amount of existing residential property in the area which will remain. Any new development must secure not only reasonable privacy for the new residents, but also must not impinge unreasonably on the privacy and environment now enjoyed by existing residents.

**POLICY BE5- Harestone Valley Area**

Having regard to the differing nature of the existing development and to the physical characteristics, the Harestone Valley Policy, together with the provisions of Policy BE1 will be applied according to the areas shown on the proposals map as follows:-

(i) the area where higher densities would be considered. The area is bounded by the public car park, the supermarket and St. John’s Church to the North, Godstone Road to the East, Harestone Hill to the west, and the north side of Grange Road to the south. Similar conditions apply to Church Hill. Within these areas an average net density of 93 habitable rooms per hectare (38 habitable rooms per acre) will be regarded as acceptable. It is anticipated that the development will be in the form of flats. Suitable schemes for houses could also be considered, but in such cases the residential density would need to be at a lower figure.
(ii) the remainder of the area excluding the western slopes above Harestone Valley Road and Underwood Road. The future development of this area should be in the form of private houses at an average net density of 38 habitable rooms per hectare (15 habitable rooms per acre).

(iii) the western slopes above Harestone Valley Road and Underwood Road. In this area, a suitable form of residential development whether in houses or flats would be acceptable, provided that the scheme is in harmony with the very special characteristics of the landscape. This could be achieved only by a relatively low density comparable with (ii) above (i.e. 38 habitable rooms per hectare) but schemes for suitably designed flats at slightly higher densities will be considered on their merits. It will be particularly necessary to preserve the existing cover of trees, and in general, the height of flats should not exceed three storeys in order that the development should not be intrusive in the landscape. Neither flats or houses should extend up the steep valley slopes. The nature of this area is such from the point of view of tree cover and topography that satisfactory redevelopment can be achieved only by comprehensive schemes. For this reason development will be refused unless the site is of sufficient size and suitable shape to achieve this.

For the avoidance of doubt, habitable rooms include all the rooms in the dwelling except halls, landings, circulation spaces, bathrooms, shower rooms, WC’s (including en-suite facilities) cloak rooms and utility rooms. Hall and other circulation spaces larger than 10 square metres and where the layout permits them to be used as a habitable room will be included. Kitchens which are larger than 10 square metres will be counted as a habitable room, and where there is a utility room, a kitchen less than 10 square metres will also be counted as a habitable room. Habitable rooms exceeding 20 square metres will be counted as two or more habitable rooms. Proposals should include within the site areas usable land, and steeply sloping or otherwise unusable areas will be excluded from density area calculations.

2.8 Although Policy BE5 has been “saved” the Council has acknowledged that it needs reviewing. The Council is required to report policies that may not be entirely in accord with national guidance in the Annual Monitoring Report. The following is taken from the Annual Monitoring Report for 2007-2008:

BE5 – Harestone Valley Area
Although it is accepted that density limits are inappropriate, in practice recently permitted schemes in the area have had higher densities. PPS3 indicates areas with lower than the national minimum density of 30 dpha are permissible, where justified. The policy has also been supported on appeal in some instances recently. The policy has served the area well and will continue to be applied flexibly and its retention is justified until a Supplementary Planning Document has been adopted for the area. Its retention is justified to prevent there being a policy vacuum until a replacement strategy is in place, particularly as the area is under pressure for development.

2.9 The Harestone area falls within the built up area and Core Strategy Policy CSP19 Density indicates that densities will be within the range 30 - 55 dwellings per hectare, unless the design solution for such a density would conflict with the local character and distinctiveness of an area where lower density is more appropriate; such character and distinctiveness may also be identified in Village Design Statements, Conservation area Appraisals or Supplementary Planning Documents. The purpose of this brief is to instruct an appraisal in this regard.

3. Policy Background - The Woldingham Policy area
3.1 Woldingham is an area that lies partly within the Green Belt with a developed area that is excluded from the Green Belt, this study only applies to the area excluded from the Green Belt. Over the years infilling has taken place, but generally its character has been retained. The North of the Downs Local Plan 1992 sought to protect the character by restricting curtilages to not less than 0.2ha (0.5 acre) and in the area opposite The Crescent densities were not to exceed 38 habitable rooms per hectare (15 habitable rooms per acre) and were restricted to 2 storey retirement/sheltered housing.

3.2 However because of concerns about the continuing pressure for development in the late 1990s, that if unchecked would result in a gradual erosion of the special character, the District Council worked with the local community to prepare a criteria based policy within the District wide local plan. The following policy was included within the adopted Tandridge District Local Plan 2001.

**POLICY BE7 - Woldingham**

Within Woldingham, as shown on the Proposals Map, residential development or redevelopment proposals including extensions to existing property will be permitted where such proposals:

(a) do not detract from the character of the area, or the adjoining Green Belt and meet the requirements of Policy BE1 ‘General Policy for New Development’; Policy BE9 ‘Wooded Hillsides’, and Policy BE12 concerning extensions;

(b) do not require the inappropriate or progressive subdivision of curtilages (subdivision will be inappropriate where it results in curtilages of less than 0.2 ha or where it involves the further subdivision of part of an already subdivided curtilage);

(c) do not result in a frontage width below those prevailing in the area;

(d) do not result in developments which appear cramped in relation to their plot boundaries and out of scale with neighbouring properties (including being too large or too small);

(e) reflect the variety of dwelling types in Woldingham and do not include homogenous designs;

(f) do not include tandem development or development in depth involving the formation of cul-de-sacs;

(g) do not require the unacceptable lopping, topping or felling of trees, removal of shrub areas and boundary hedges which contribute to the character and amenity of the area; and where necessary provide additional tree cover to lessen the impact of any development and contribute to the retention of the wooded character of the area; and

(h) do not propose the use of materials which would be out of keeping with the area including the introduction of boundary/frontage walls, fences and gates, Policy BE14 will be applied to proposals for the erection of new walls, fences and gates.
3.3 In September 2005 the Council adopted the Woldingham Village Design Statement as a Supplementary Planning Document. The Village Design Statement was compiled on behalf of Woldingham residents by the Village Design Statement Committee. The Statement describes the village and qualities most valued by local people and provides guidelines for preserving/promoting the built and natural heritage of the area, general guidelines, guidelines for new build, extensions, replacement dwellings, alterations and boundary treatments. (A copy of the Village Design Statement will be available from the District Council or is available at http://www.tandridge.gov.uk/documents/document_display.htm?pk_document=448)

3.4 Policy BE7 was “saved” by the Council in 2007 and has not been superseded by the adoption of the Core Strategy. Core Strategy Policy CSP1 Location of Development now defines Woldingham as a Category 2 Settlement where development appropriate to the needs of rural communities will be permitted through infilling and on sites allocated for affordable housing. The policy also states that there will be no expansion of Woldingham and that “saved” policy BE7 will continue to apply to development within the settlement boundary until this is replaced by a policy in a Development Control DPD.

3.5 Policy CSP19 Density of the Core Strategy states that within rural areas, including Woldingham densities will be within the range 30 - 40 dwellings per hectare, unless the design solution for such a density would conflict with the local character and distinctiveness of an area where a lower density is more appropriate; such character and distinctiveness may also be identified in Village Design Statements, Conservation Area Appraisals or Supplementary Planning Documents. Saved Policy BE7 “Woldingham” of the Local Plan will also continue to apply until it is replaced by a policy in a Development Control DPD.

4. Next Steps

4.1 The Tandridge District Core Strategy was adopted in October 2008 and the next parts of the Local Development Framework to be prepared are a Development Management Development Plan Document and any required Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs). The Council is currently revising the Local Development Scheme and although it is no longer necessary to include SPDs in the scheme, the Council has listed a SPD for the Harestone Area and an SPD for the Woldingham Area.

4.2 The Council considers that as these two areas have benefitted from having special character area policies for a number of years that it is important not to leave a “policy vacuum” and that replacement policies must be introduced. It is therefore proposed that the new Development Management DPD would contain a policy or policies for the two areas, which would be underpinned by more detailed guidance in two SPDs. However for this approach to be judged to be “sound” it will be necessary to have a robust and justified evidence base in the form of a character appraisal of both areas.

5. Project Requirements and Outputs

5.1 Stage 1

To undertake a character appraisal of the Harestone policy area and a separate character appraisal of the Woldingham policy area, including consideration of any possible changes to the boundary of the Harestone area. (The Woldingham policy area is coincident with the settlement boundary and therefore no changes to the boundary are expected).

5.2 Stage 2

To recommend to the Council the most appropriate way of expressing guidance for future development within those areas. It is expected that such guidance will be set out in two
separate Supplementary Planning Documents. To attend an evening meeting of the Caterham Valley Parish Council and an evening meeting of the Woldingham Parish Council/Woldingham Association to explain the findings of the character appraisals and to explain the approaches being recommended to the District Council.

5.3 Stage 3

To write two consultation draft Supplementary Planning Documents based on the evidence gathered through the character appraisals undertaken at Stage 1 and the advice given at Stage 2, to provide detailed guidance for the future development of the areas. Such guidance will be suitable for use in the Development Management process.

To recommend a draft townscape/design policy or policies for both areas to be included in the forthcoming Development Management Policy Development Plan Document that will provide an overarching statutory policy that will link with the two Supplementary Planning Documents.

5.4 Stage 4

To consider any responses from public consultation exercises and to amend the guidance and draft DPD policy/policies in conjunction with the District Council.

5.5 Stage 5

To prepare a methodology based on the work done at stages 1 to 3 that can used by the Council to appraise other areas and prepare future guidance.

5.6 Parallel Stage

Although there is no longer a requirement to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal nor Strategic Environmental Assessment of SPDs, there is still a need to screen the two draft SPDs to ensure that the legal requirements for SA have been met where there are impacts that have not been covered in the appraisal of the parent DPD or where an assessment is required by the SEA Directive.

5.7 Outputs

i) Draft character appraisals of the two areas, supported by maps, diagrams and photographs as appropriate, ten hard copies of the Harestone appraisal and fifteen hard copies of the Woldingham appraisal should be supplied for discussion at Stage 2. The documents should also be supplied electronically (in Word format or other alternative format to be agreed).

ii) Final versions of the character appraisals. Ten hard copies of the Harestone draft document and fifteen hard copies of the Woldingham document should be supplied; the documents should also be supplied electronically including in PDF format.

iii) Two separate draft Supplementary Planning Documents for the two areas, supported by maps, diagrams and photographs as appropriate. Ten hard copies of the Harestone draft document and fifteen hard copies of the Woldingham draft document should be supplied; the documents should also be supplied electronically, (in Word format or other alternative format to be agreed - including for use in the Council’s Limehouse Consultation Portal if required).

iv) Final versions of the two Supplementary Planning Documents following public consultation and consideration by the Council. Ten hard copies of the Harestone draft document and fifteen hard copies of the Woldingham document should be supplied; the documents should also be supplied electronically including in PDF format.
v) A report setting out a recommended draft Development Management Policy or Policies for the areas and the reasons for the policy or policies, such policies being linked to the two Supplementary Planning Documents - also to be supplied electronically (in Word format or other alternative format to be agreed).

vi) A screening report setting out whether it is necessary to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment of the two Supplementary Planning Documents - also to be supplied electronically, (in Word format or other alternative format to be agreed)

vii) A document setting out the methodology used at Stages 1 - 3 that can be used by the Council to appraise other areas - also to be supplied electronically (in Word format or other alternative format to be agreed).

6. Liaison Arrangements

6.1 The Council’s Director of Planning, Bob Evans will be the project client on behalf of the Council (01883 732850)  Bevans@tandridge.gov.uk

6.2 The Council’s Head of Planning Policy Paul Newdick will be the project liaison officer (01883 732860) PNewdick@tandridge.gov.uk

7. Projected Timing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of the selected Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First meeting with Council to agree methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal work in the two areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of draft appraisals to the Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with Council and Parish Councils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of final appraisals to the Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of SA/SEA screening report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of two draft SPD to the Council and draft report setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out recommended DM DPD policy or policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of consultation draft SPDs and final report on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommended DPD policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of consultation draft SPDs by Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation on SPDs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalising SPDs after public consultation and consideration by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of appraisal methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: The above project timetable to filled in by the Council on appointment of consultant

8. Quotation Proposals

8.1 Consultants should provide a description of the proposed approach and methodology, their experience of similar project work, the number of people to be employed, their qualifications,
and the amount of time that each would be expected to contribute to the project in days; the hourly rates to be charged, and the fixed total cost of the project, in the required format (all days rates and costs to be quoted must be inclusive of travel/subsistence and any disbursements);

8.2 Consultants should make provision for meetings with the Council to discuss the methodology and progress.

8.3 A project plan shall be provided.

8.4 The selection of the consultant will be on the basis of cost, qualifications, experience of similar work, the quality of the technical proposals.

8.5 The consultant is invited to provide examples of similar project work they have been involved in over the past 2-3 years with names, references and contact details.

9. Appendices

Maps of the two study areas – Not shown here
### Planning Related National Indicators 2009/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>NI 155</td>
<td>Number of affordable homes delivered (gross)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>NI 157a</td>
<td>Processing of planning applications as measured against targets for ‘major’ application types</td>
<td>On target</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>76.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>NI 157b</td>
<td>Processing of planning applications as measured against targets for ‘minor’ application types</td>
<td>On target</td>
<td>81.70%</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>74.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>NI 157c</td>
<td>Processing of planning applications as measured against targets for ‘other’ application types</td>
<td>On target</td>
<td>93.20%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>88.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>NI 159</td>
<td>Supply of ready to develop housing sites</td>
<td>To be calculated on an annual basis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135%</td>
<td>109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>NI 170</td>
<td>Previously developed land that has been vacant or derelict for more than 5 years</td>
<td>To be calculated on an annual basis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>NI 197</td>
<td>Improved local biodiversity – active management of local sites (local max possible score 1.60)</td>
<td>No longer reported at District level</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>