

Overview of Responses to LPP2 Regulation 19 Consultation

From the 27 November 2020 to 29 January 2021

The logo for Waverley Borough Council is located in the bottom right corner. It features a large blue shape that resembles a stylized 'W' or a wave. Inside this shape, the word 'Waverley' is written in a white, cursive script font. Below 'Waverley', the words 'BOROUGH COUNCIL' are written in a smaller, white, uppercase sans-serif font. A small, light blue circle is positioned above the main blue shape, partially overlapping it.

Waverley
BOROUGH COUNCIL

NOTE

This document contains a summary of representations received during the Regulation 19 consultation, which took place from the 27 November 2020 until the 29 January 2021. Representation summaries are presented in the chapter order that they appeared in the Pre-Submission Plan, and each representation summary statement is accompanied with a Council's response.

LPP2 General Issues	1
1 Calculation of Housing Targets (*Housing Strategy)	1
2 Five-Year Supply of Sites (*Housing Strategy)	1
3 Omitted Sites.....	2
4 Omitted Sites (*Outside Scope).....	2
5 Policies Succession Schedule.....	6
6 Alignment with Neighbourhood Plans	6
LPP2 Chapter 2 - General Policies.....	7
7 Environmental Implications of Development (DM1)	7
8 Energy Efficiency (DM2)	10
9 Water Supply and Wastewater Infrastructure (DM3)	10
10 Quality Places Through Design (DM4)	12
11 Safeguarding Amenity (DM5).....	14
12 Public Realm (DM6).....	15
13 Safer Places (DM7).....	16
14 Comprehensive Development (DM8)	17
15 Accessibility and Transport (DM9).....	17
16 A31 Farnham By-Pass Improvements (DM10)	18
17 Trees, Woodland, Hedgerows and Landscaping (DM11)	19
18 Planning Enforcement (DM12).....	20
LPP2 Chapter 3 - Location of Development	21
19 Settlement Boundaries	21
20 Development within Settlement Boundaries (DM13)	26
21 Extensions, Alterations, Replacement Buildings & Limited Infilling in the Green Belt (DM14).....	27
22 Development in Rural Areas (DM15).....	28
23 Dwellings for Rural Workers (DM16)	29
LPP2 Chapter 4 - Protecting Places	30
24 Haslemere Hillsides (DM17)	30
25 Farnham/Aldershot Strategic Gap (DM18)	30
26 Areas of Strategic Visual Importance	31
27 Local Green Space (DM19)	32
28 Development Affecting Listed Buildings, and/or their Settings (DM20)	32
29 Conservation Areas (DM21)	32
30 Heritage at Risk (DM22).....	33

31	Non-Designated Heritage Assets (DM23)	33
32	Historic Landscapes and Gardens (DM24)	33
33	Archaeology (DM25)	33
LPP2 Chapter 5 - Economic Prosperity.....		35
34	Employment Sites (DM26)	35
35	Development within Town Centres (DM27)	35
36	Access and Servicing (DM28)	36
37	Advertisements (DM29)	36
38	Telecommunications (DM30)	37
39	Filming (DM31)	37
40	Tourism and Recreation (DM32)	38
41	'Downs Link' Corridor (DM33).....	38
42	Access to the Countryside (DM34)	38
LPP2 Chapter 6 - Housing Policies.....		39
43	Reuse and Alterations to Large Buildings (DM35)	39
44	Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding (DM36)	39
LPP2 Chapter 7 - Housing Sites.....		41
45	Housing Sites in Haslemere.....	41
46	Housing Sites in Milford and Witley	50
48	Gypsy and Traveller Sites	54
SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.....		59
49	Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)	59
50	Sustainability Appraisal	60

LPP2 GENERAL ISSUES

1 Calculation of Housing Targets (*Housing Strategy)

- 1.1 The identified objectively assessed housing need, (or the 'OAN'), methodology and calculation of the settlement housing figures in Local Plan Part 1, is not up to date with the current NPPF Standard Method. If the new Standard Method were to be applied, this would result in a housing need uplift in Waverley. It was suggested that LPP2 should be used as a vehicle for early delivery of additional housing through additional site allocations. Furthermore, the wider policy framework does not consider impacts arising from new Brexit arrangement and the global COVID-19 pandemic.

Council Response: Calculating housing numbers is a matter for a strategic plan (i.e., LPP1), as are other issues such as Brexit and pandemic responses. The housing requirement for the towns/parishes covered by LPP2 are those from LPP1 and the housing figure, including the number of new homes that need to be allocated in these areas have been calculated using the same methodology used in LPP1. The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) requires that Local Plans should be reviewed at least very five years. LPP1 was adopted in February 2018 and is therefore, less than five years old. Any changes to housing the housing requirement for Waverley will be addressed when the Council undertakes the work to decide whether any policies in LPP1 need to be updated.

2 Five-Year Supply of Sites (*Housing Strategy)

- 2.1 Concern that housing delivery in Waverley has been significantly slower than expected since adoption of LPP1. Many developers argue that there are not enough sites to meet a five years' supply of deliverable sites as required in the NPPF.

Council Response: The Council is in the process of updating its five-year housing land supply position. This will be considered at the Examination in Public. Given the limited role of LPP2 in terms of housing allocations and the stage it has reached in the process, it is not considered appropriate to consider adding new sites at this stage. The Council will continue to monitor closely the 5-year supply position and the issue will be addressed as part of the review of LPP1. Some factual updates are required to update the housing numbers

because of new housing completions (up to 1st April 2021) in the Pre-Submission version of the document¹.

3 Omitted Sites

3.1 During the consultation, the Council received large number of representations promoting sites for housing development in Haslemere and Witley/Milford, that have been omitted from the plan.

3.2 HASLEMERE

- Land east of Haslemere Water Treatment works, Sturt Road, Haslemere
- Site A at Longdene House, Haslemere
- Scotland Park Site B, Haslemere

WITLEY/MILFORD

- Moushill Mead, Portsmouth Road, Milford
- Lower Moushill Mead; Milford
- Land at Coneycroft, Milford
- Land at Old Elstead Road, Milford
- Land to the west of West Cottage, Milford
- Land at Hurstgate, Milford
- Land West of Petworth Road, Witley

Council Response: Although the LPP2 is allocating housing sites in Haslemere and Witley/Milford, these particular sites were not chosen to be put forward as allocations in the plan as other sites were deemed to be more suitable. Several supporting documents provide the evidence to justify the site selection process in LPP2. This includes the site assessments contained in the Waverley LAA and the Sustainability Appraisal.

4 Omitted Sites (*Outside Scope)

4.1 In addition to the omitted sites promoted in Haslemere and Witley/Milford, a further 30 sites were promoted for housing through representations on the LPP2 consultation document. These 30 sites are located in areas, across Waverley,

¹ See MOD29, 31, 32, 38 and 39 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' for factual updates on housing numbers up to the 1st of April 2021.

where the LPP2 **is not** proposing to allocate housing. Sites are not being allocated in these areas due to:

- a) The relevant parish dealing with this matter through their Neighbourhood Plan, or
- b) The minimum housing allocation as set in LPP1 has being met.

4.2 Promoted sites were located in Alfold, Busbridge, Chiddingfold, Cranleigh, Dunsfold, Elstead, Ewhurst, Farnham, Frensham, Godalming (and Farncombe), and Wonersh. These sites are outlined below.

4.3 ALFOLD

- Land East of Loxwood Road, Alfold
- Land West of Loxwood Road, Alfold Crossways
- Land South of Dunsfold Road, Alfold Crossways
- Brookfield, Horsham Road, Alfold
- Land at Wildwood Livery Stables, Hook Street, Alfold
- Land at Farnhurst Farm, Alfold
- Land South of Alfold Garden Centre, off Horsham Road, Alfold Crossways
- Wildwood Golf and Country Club, Horsham Road, Alfold

Council Response: Neither the [Alfold Neighbourhood Plan](#) nor the LPP2 is proposing to allocate housing sites in the Alfold area. The minimum housing allocation for the parish, as set in LPP1, has now been met. Therefore, no further site allocations are required at this location.

4.4 BUSBRIDGE

- Land south of Wood Farm, Portsmouth Road
- Redevelopment proposal at Milford Hospital, Tuesley

Council Response: Neither the [Busbridge Neighbourhood Plan](#) (currently on hold) nor the LPP2 is proposing to allocate housing sites in Busbridge parish. LPP1 did not include a specific housing allocation for this parish and no specific site allocations are, therefore, required.

4.5 CHIDDINGFOLD

- Land to the rear of The Croft, Chiddingfold

Council Response: Following a referendum on the 8 July 2021, the [Chiddingfold Neighbourhood Plan](#) has become part of the Development Plan. It includes seven housing allocation sites. These seven sites meet the minimum

housing allocation for Chiddingfold, as set in LPP1. Therefore, no further sites are required within Chiddingfold as part of LPP2.

4.6 CRANLEIGH

- Land off Guildford Road, Cranleigh
- Longfield site in Cranleigh
- Land adjoining Vachery Lane, Cranleigh

Council Response: The housing allocations required in Cranleigh to meet the LPP1 requirement for the Parish will be determined by the [Cranleigh Neighbourhood Plan](#) (currently being prepared). Therefore, housing allocations in Cranleigh will not be made within LPP2.

4.7 DUNSFOLD

- Land to the south of Shoppe Hill and west of Dunsfold Common Road, Dunsfold

Council Response: The housing allocations required in Dunsfold to meet the LPP1 requirement for the Parish will be determined by the [Dunsfold Neighbourhood Plan](#) (currently being prepared). Therefore, housing allocations in Dunsfold will not be made within LPP2.

4.8 ELSTEAD

- Sunray Farm, Elstead
- Land off West Hill and Hill Crest, Elstead

Council Response: Housing site allocations are proposed in the [draft Elstead and Weyburn Neighbourhood Plan](#) (currently being prepared), therefore further sites are not required as part of LPP2. A Regulation 14 Focused Consultation on Housing Policies was undertaken in May 2021.

4.9 EWHURST

- Treetops, Mapledrakes Road, Ewhurst
- Land at Windacres Farm, Church Street, Rudgwick

Council Response: Neither the [Ewhurst and Ellen's Green Neighbourhood Plan](#) (Regulation 14 Pre-Submission consultation undertaken) nor LPP2 is proposing to allocate housing sites in Ewhurst. The minimum housing allocation for the parish, as set in LPP1, has now been met. Therefore, no further sites are required within Ewhurst as part of LPP2.

4.10 FARNHAM

- Land at Waverley Lane, Farnham
- Hawthorns, Hale Road, Farnham
- Land in Badshot Lea, Farnham
- Site at Land West of Badshot Lea
- Proposal at Waverley Abbey Estate for residential monastic community

Council Response: The [Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2032](#) was 'made' (adopted) on 3 April 2020 and includes housing allocation sites. These sites meet the minimum housing allocation for Farnham, as set in LPP1. Therefore, no further sites are required within Farnham as part of LPP2.

4.11 FRENESHAM

- Dial House and land, Frensham

Council Response: The minimum housing allocation for the parish, as set in LPP1, has been met. Therefore, no sites are required within Frensham as part of LPP2.

4.12 GODALMING AND FARNCOMBE

- Thames Water Depot at Borough Road, Godalming
- Little Primrose, Milford
- Westbrook Mills car park

Council Response: The 'made' [Godalming and Farncombe Neighbourhood](#) does not allocate housing sites in Godalming. Plan, neither does LPP2 propose to allocate housing sites in the Godalming area. The minimum housing allocation for the town, as set in LPP1, has now been met. Therefore, no further sites are required within Godalming as part of LPP2.

4.13 WONERSH

- Site at Tangley Close, Little Tangley, Wonersh
- Land at Barnett Lane, Wonersh

Council Response: LPP2 is not proposing to allocate housing sites in the Wonersh area. The minimum housing allocation for the parish, as set in LPP1, has now been met. Therefore, no further sites are required within Wonersh as part of LPP2.

5 Policies Succession Schedule

- 5.1 The plan does not detail which policies will supersede the policies in Local Plan 2002, this has raised concern that Regulation 8(5) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 has not been met.

Council Response: Para 1.1 of Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) states that together with LPP1, LPP2 replaces the current Local Plan. Whilst a schedule of superseded policies may be helpful, there is no obligation to explicitly set out for each policy in LPP2 that it intends to supersede another policy and to state that fact/and identify the policy, in order to meet regulation 8(5) of the Local Planning Regulations 2021.

6 Alignment with Neighbourhood Plans

- 6.1 There should be greater consistency and alignment between LPP2 and Neighbourhood Plans (NPs). With NPs now getting adopted², the planning policy landscape is becoming more varied across the Borough, adding more complexity to matters that were previously well understood.

Council Response: Para 18 of the NPPF states that non-strategic matters can be covered by Local Plans and/or individual NPs. Their preparation considers other plans to ensure that there is a level of consistency between plans. This is to provide a clear framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made, under NPPF Para 16d. Para 28 states that the NPs should not undermine strategic policies in the Local Plan. Where NPs have been prepared at different times, Para 30 of the NPPF sets out which policies take precedence.

² See MOD1, 2, 28 and 30 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' for factual updates relating to progress of Neighbourhood Plans

LPP2 CHAPTER 2 - GENERAL POLICIES

7 Environmental Implications of Development (DM1)

- 7.1 Policy DM1 sets out the criteria for assessing the environmental implications of development. This includes managing different types of pollution and contamination, minimising the emission of greenhouses gasses and maximising opportunities to deliver biodiversity net gain. Whilst there was a level of support for Policy DM1, many respondents suggested that it should be strengthened and more positively worded. Comments also advocated setting out stronger biodiversity requirements and sought more recognition of the role the wider environment plays in mitigating and adapting to climate change.

GENERAL POLICY INTENT

- 7.2 Policy DM1 is inconsistent with other environmental strategic policies set out in the Climate Change and Flood Risk Management chapter of LPP1.

Council Response: LPP1 sets out the strategic approach to:

- a) Mitigating and adapting to the impacts of climate change through Policy CC1 Climate Change, and
- b) Promoting sustainable patterns of development and reducing greenhouse gas emissions through Policy CC2 Sustainable Design and Construction.

LPP2 sets out new development management policies, including DM1, that are intended to support these strategic policies and the Council's 2019 Climate Change Declaration.

BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN REQUIREMENTS

- 7.3 Multiple consultees suggested a higher minimum requirement for biodiversity net gain, up to 20%, would be desirable as part of DM1. Policy should identify how biodiversity net gain/and mitigation will apply to every single development, and the policy should consider the impacts on all biodiversity, not just selected protected species.

Council Response: Policy DM1 requires sites to maximise opportunities to provide biodiversity net gain. This requirement will be assessed through the planning application assessment process. The approach in DM1 follows Para 175 a) of the NPPF, which states that environmental impacts should be avoided, but where they cannot, they should be appropriately mitigated and/or compensated for. A national requirement for 10% biodiversity net gain is

currently being considered by the government. At this time, the Council has no evidence to suggest that a higher local rate is required.

BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN METHODOLOGY

- 7.4** Whilst many were supportive of the inclusion of biodiversity net gain requirements, others suggested that biodiversity policy provisions could go a lot further by adopting the use of the government's (Defra) Biodiversity Metric v2.0, for measuring and recording net gains. Furthermore, the LPP2 should seek opportunities for wider environmental net gain and opportunities in Natural Capital.

Council Response: Should LPP2 be adopted, the Council will consider the best approach for implementing the biodiversity net gain aspect of Policy DM1 and will consider the use of Defra's Metric v2.0 or an updated version. The Council considers that Natural Capital is covered by LPP1 Policies NE1: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation and NE2: Green and Blue Infrastructure.

IMPACT ON SPECIAL PROTECTION AREAS (SPAS)

- 7.5** The Plan fails to identify a policy to secure appropriate mitigation for housing development in the wider SPA zone of influence. The Council's approach to increases in residential dwellings within the wider zones of influence of Wealden Heaths Phase I and II SPAs is set out in Policy NE1: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation of LPP1 and a HRA has been undertaken specifically for LPP2. As it stands, there is no adopted avoidance strategy for the Wealden Heaths SPA, so sites do have to be considered on a case-by-case basis and this is set out in LPP1 (Paragraph 16.28).

Council Response: Some form of mitigation may be required for sites (size dependant) around Haslemere in view of the proximity to the Wealden Heaths SPA. The Council consider that the current LPP2 allocation criterion that requires development to demonstrate that it is not likely to have a significant effect on the Wealden Heaths SPA is consistent with the LPP1 strategy and there is no need to modify LPP2 except to make it clear that any avoidance and mitigation measures proposed will be in consultation and with agreement from Natural England. Nevertheless, in order to provide greater certainty that the allocated sites can be delivered, the Council is looking at what mitigation measures can be implemented which includes the feasibility of local open space being used for recreational purposes as an alternative to visiting the SPA. This work is ongoing.

EMPHASIS AND CLARITY ON AIR POLLUTION

- 7.6** Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) have been identified due to excessive emissions of Nitrogen Dioxide but not particulate matter. Concern increased transport and resultant air (and noise) pollution are major issues as the local roads are not adequate to cope with the current volumes of vehicular traffic.

Council Response: Any applications for development in such locations must be accompanied by an air quality assessment. In line with Para 181 of the NPPF, new development in AQMAs will only be permitted where it is consistent with the local air quality action plan. Mitigation will be agreed through a planning application or required as a condition attached to a planning consent. The Council agree that the reference to particulate matter, as presented in the draft LPP2 consultation document, was factually incorrect and will be corrected as a minor change³.

CLARITY ON CLIMATE CHANGE RESPONSE

- 7.7** There was a suggestion to add a reference to the Council's Climate Emergency targets and the Carbon Neutrality Action Plan in Paragraph 2.5 of LPP2. In addition, some specific re-wording of the DM1, would provide clarity and ensure consistency with the NPPF in by referring to Climate Change as part of provision f). It was also suggested that in DM1 provision h), it would be prudent to acknowledge 'mitigation compensation' in situations where adverse environmental impacts are deemed unavoidable.

Council Response: The Carbon Neutrality Action Plan was adopted by the Council in December 2020, two months after the draft LPP2 consultation document was published under Regulation 19. The Council agrees that minor changes, as suggested, to the supporting text and to provisions in Policy DM1 would provide more clarity on the on the Council's policy response to Climate Change, as part of DM1⁴.

LIGHT POLLUTION

- 7.8** Consider the impact of light on intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation and refer to dark skies and tranquillity.

Council Response: With regards to lighting, it is important that a balance is struck between safety and minimising the impact of lighting on landscapes

³ See MOD3 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (AQMA particulate matter)

⁴ See MOD4,5 and 6 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (climate change)

and wildlife. This issue is addressed in LPP2 Para 2.48 and Policy DM7: Safer Places.

8 Energy Efficiency (DM2)

- 8.1 There was generally strong support for the policy intentions of DM2: Energy Efficiency, however many commentators suggested they would prefer the Council taking a stronger, more aggressive stance in relation to climate change and reducing carbon emissions.

CLIMATE EMERGENCY DECLARATION

- 8.2 LPP1 policies on climate change need to be updated, as they were adopted before the Council's declaration of the Climate Emergency. Climate change aspirations should be properly embedded in all policies in LPP2.

Council Response: LPP1 was adopted in 2018 and therefore the Council should consider if a review within five years of adoption is needed. When this is being done, the Council will consider whether any changes are required to the strategic climate change policies in LPP1. The climate change policies in LPP1 apply to all development, therefore it is not necessary for climate change to be referred to in every policy.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY FOR BUILDINGS

- 8.3 There was a view that there needs to be a greater reduction in carbon emissions from buildings and new developments. Policy DM2 is not ambitious enough and needs to reflect the higher zero carbon targets for building announced by the Government in January and should give more explicit support to the establishment of renewable and low carbon energy generation developments.

Council Response: The higher targets announced by the Government will be introduced by changes to the Building Regulations and therefore do not need to be duplicated in LPP2. LPP1 Policy CC3 covers renewable energy development.

9 Water Supply and Wastewater Infrastructure (DM3)

- 9.1 There was support for Policy DM3 from relevant agencies (Southern Water/Environment Agency/Thames Water). Residents and other organisations made comments including concern at future investment by Thames Water to

deal with existing capacity issues across the Borough; that the policy should be strengthened and that the IDP evidence was out of date. Location specific issues with water supply and wastewater infrastructure were highlighted.

WATER EFFICIENCY STANDARDS FOR NEW HOMES

- 9.2** Suggest that the requirement for 110L water is referenced in DM3.

Council Response: The 110L requirement is covered by LPP1 Policy CC2. LPP2 does not need to repeat matters already addressed in LPP1.

CAPACITY AND SUPPLY

- 9.3** Some residents (particularly in Haslemere) report water supply issues and are concerned about the capability of the network infrastructure to accommodate proposed development. Seek funding from developers to upgrade water and wastewater infrastructure. Require a provision to stop connecting new dwellings to drainage system when there is no capacity.

Council Response: The Council has liaised with the relevant water and wastewater companies as part of this Pre-Submission Consultation. Developers have a right to connect new dwellings and therefore water supply and wastewater utility providers cannot stop development. DM3 will allow phasing conditions to be introduced if there are imminent concerns regarding network capacity. This will ensure development is built out at a rate where water providers can construct upgrades to the network if required ahead of need. Water supply and wastewater utility providers are entitled to levy infrastructure charges for new developments.

INCREASED FLOODING RISK

- 9.4** Dangers of flooding due to approval of excessive development, particularly relevant for Dunsfold. LPP2 does not go far enough to resolve infrastructure issues before development is approved.

Council Response: Flood risk management is covered in Policy CC4 of LPP1.

INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN

- 9.5** It was suggested that updating the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is a matter of priority. Concern that water and wastewater infrastructure capacity requirements are based on 2016 information. In 2016, the IDP stated that some

settlements, e.g., Milford and Witley, were already close to capacity. Since then, the housing numbers in Milford and Witley have increased from 380 to 480.

Council Response: The 2016 IDP was a key part of the evidence base that supported Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites (LPP1). The main part of the 2016 IDP detailed the background information supplied by the infrastructure providers on existing provision and future requirements, and an assessment of the implications for the Local Plan. The detail of the projects is then contained in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS) in the final section. An IDS update was published by the Council in July 2021. The 2021 IDS provides an update to the previous IDS, reflecting any changes to delivery of infrastructure since 2016. The 2021 IDS includes the prioritisation of the projects which will assist with the allocation and expenditure of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). It should be emphasised, however, that the schedule remains ‘a live document’ and continues to be updated as new data presents itself on project costs and timescales. The IDS it is not fixed to any specific point in time but will evolve as new information becomes available.

SURFACEWATER DRAINAGE

- 9.6** Residents report that surface drainage in Elstead is a problem. Based on advice from Thames Water, the Parish Council propose a specific policy in their neighbourhood plan which would prohibit discharge of surface water from new dwellings into the main sewer. Suggest a similar policy should be included in LPP2.

Council Response: The Council consider it has sufficient policies in LPP1 and LPP2 to deal with surface water. Thames Water has not expressed a concern in relation to LPP2. When ‘made’, Neighbourhood Plans will become part of the Development Plan; and therefore, will be used in the assessment of determining planning applications.

10 Quality Places Through Design (DM4)

- 10.1** There were comments of support for Policy DM4 alongside several suggestions for amendments to the supporting text and in the Policy. These included a specific reference to the impacts of cumulative development on the character of the area. Other suggestions included a clearer reference to active travel, groups that require special access (such as disabled and elderly), the historic environment, and sustainable development practices.

DESIGN STATEMENTS

- 10.2** Design will be at forefront of future planning changes. The four large settlements are unique, and their distinctiveness should be emphasised. Also,

large settlements have absorbed surrounding villages – crucial to use design statements.

Council Response: The Council recognises the importance of design statements and Para 2.25 sets out that the design policies in LPP2 should be used in conjunction with Town/Village Design Statements.

CUMULATIVE DEVELOPMENT EFFECTS AND THE ROLE OF DENSITY

- 10.3** There were suggestions that cumulative effects of development on the character of an area, should be strengthened to specifically make reference to edge of town areas, where building densities should reflect the character of the edge of town location.

Council Response: The policy sets out that regard to the cumulative effects of development on the character of the area. The NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location considering the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. NPPF para 124 sets out that planning policies should support development that makes efficient use of land by achieving appropriate densities.

HIGH QUALITY DESIGN

- 10.4** It was suggested that the term “high quality design” was too subjective, and there was a need for more guidance

Council Response: Guidance on what constitutes high quality design is set out in a range of other documents such as neighbourhood plans, town and village design statement, Conservation Area Appraisals, the National Model Design Code, and the Surrey Design Guide. Such detail would be inappropriate to include in a policy, but it is considered that the National Model Design Code could be mentioned⁵.

ACTIVE MODES OF TRAVEL

- 10.5** Suggested new policy wording to include specific reference to ‘active travel’ in relation to site permeability and wider access to community facilities and employment opportunities.

⁵ See MOD7 and 8 in ‘Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule’ (National Model Design Code)

Council Response: Agree that Policy Provision e) should reference active travel modes as this is not referenced elsewhere⁶.

REFERENCE TO ELDERLY POPULATIONS

- 10.6** Suggested new wording reflecting needs of growing elderly population: f) Facilitating opportunities for adaptable uses for various users over time, including for disabled and older people.

Agree that reference to disabled and older people will provide more clarity to Policy Provision f)⁷.

EMPHASIS ON THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

- 10.7** Historic England suggested strengthening heritage aspects of this policy by making clear reference to historic townscape character within various provisions.

Council Response: The Council recognises that heritage value and how we experience the historic environment is not solely related to individual heritage assets. Whilst LPP1 Policy HA1 and the policies contained within Chapter 4 of LPP2 provide the main policy response to issues concerned with heritage aspects, the Council considers that the suggested references are helpful and provide clarity⁸.

EMPHASIS ON CLIMATE CHANGE

- 10.8** Design requirements should provide more detail on climate change impacts in terms of sustainable building materials and energy saving practices including renewable energy generation.

Council Response: Requirements in relation to climate change, energy saving, and renewable energy generation are set out in Policy DM2 and LPP1 policies CC1, CC2 and CC3. It is not necessary to repeat requirements in LPP2.

11 Safeguarding Amenity (DM5)

PARKING PROVISION

- 11.1** No mention of provision of parking spaces.

⁶ See MOD12 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (modes of active travel)

⁷ See MOD13 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (special access needs)

⁸ See MOD9,10 and 11 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (heritage aspects)

Council Response: Policy DM9 e) of LPP2 addresses parking requirements of proposed development.

PROTECTION OF AMENITIES

- 11.2 Greater emphasis should be given to securing the amenity of existing occupants/ wording should be added to ensure that development does not fundamentally change the character of the area for existing occupants.

Council Response: Policy TD1 5) of LPP1 ensures the character and amenity of the borough are protected by maximising opportunities to improve the quality of life and health and well-being of current and future residents, e.g. provision of private, communal and public amenity space. It is not necessary to repeat requirements in LPP2.

NOISE

- 11.3 Require reference to noise impact on neighbours

Council Response: Policy DM1 in LPP2 states that development should avoid harm “by way of...noise”. It is not necessary to repeat requirements in LPP2.

MAINTENANCE OF LANDSCAPING

- 11.4 Development sign off should only happen when landscaping for whole development has been completed.

Council Response: Policy DM11 e) addresses the need for long term maintenance of landscaping.

SPACE STANDARDS (NDSS)

- 11.5 Flexibility is required to allow viability of a variety of schemes as minimum standards may be too restrictive in some circumstances. Suggest the standards should be guidance rather than policy.

Council Response: NPPF para 130 f) footnote 49 allows for the NDSS standards to be applied when it is justified; Council consider the requirement of the NDSS is justified by evidence as set out in the Space Standards Topic Paper November 2020. This is supported by LPP1 policy TD1.

12 Public Realm (DM6)

CYCLING

- 12.1** Part a) of DM6 in relation to legibility and links to the wider network, this should make specific distinction for cycling routes in addition to walking routes.

Council Response: Agree that Provision a) should reference “cycling routes”⁹.

TREE PLANTING

- 12.2** Feel the Policy would be improved by the requirement to include tree planting in the street landscape.

Council Response: Provision c) of the policy requires landscape treatment that is suitable for the location. This would include tree planting, where it is appropriate for the location.

13 Safer Places (DM7)

CONCEALMENT OF PRIVATE ACCESSWAYS

- 13.1** Consider there is an opportunity to use the Policy DM7 to ‘design-out’ and eliminate areas of visibility concealment near entrances, making safer entrances and egresses.

Council Response: Design requirements for entrances onto the highway and for the provision of visibility splays are set by Surrey County Council as the Highway Authority.

APPROPRIATE LIGHTING

- 13.2** There is potential for sites to cause an effect on the Dark Skies of the South Downs National Park. Suggest the policy reference downlighting in relation to landscape and wildlife.

Council Response: It is important that the safety of residents is balanced with minimising any impact on landscapes or wildlife. Appropriate lighting will differ with each site and should provide a solution to enable both aims to be met.

SECURITY DESIGN STANDARDS

- 13.3** There was a suggestion that Policy DM7 could be strengthened by referencing the ‘Secured by Design’ Police Standards. This was particularly in reference to some concerns about private parking courts with no natural surveillance and that this type of development should be avoided.

⁹ See MOD14 in ‘Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule’ (cycling routes)

Council Response: Provision b) of the policy already sets out that natural surveillance should be maximised. Para 2.25 states that design policies within the Development Plan should be used in conjunction any current or future Supplementary Planning Guidance including the National Model Design Code. The National Model Design Code follows the principles of ‘Secured by Design’ in relation to public spaces, and homes and buildings. The Council agrees that an additional reference to these guidance documents would provide clarity in this policy¹⁰.

14 Comprehensive Development (DM8)

TRIGGERS FOR COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT

- 14.1 The threshold for masterplans should be lower than 100 dwellings so that smaller settlements do not miss out on the value of this policy.

Council Response: Whilst Paragraph 2.53 sets out that masterplans will normally be sought for developments with a combined total of 100 homes or more, Policy DM8 sets out that the requirement will be considered on a site-by-site basis. Therefore, in some cases a masterplan may be sought for smaller developments. The Council acknowledge that this could be made clearer in the Policy’s explanatory notes in Paragraph 2.53 and have added a sentence to address any potential misunderstanding¹¹.

15 Accessibility and Transport (DM9)

HIGHWAY CAPACITY

- 15.1 Disagree with statement that local highway network is sufficient for the level of growth planned in local plans. Concern with traffic impacts from significant LPP1 strategic sites, particularly Dunsfold Park development.

Council Response: The Planning Inspector in the LPP1 Examination considered that the highway network has the overall capacity to accommodate the proposed level of growth across the Plan period with suitable local transport mitigation as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

WALKING AND CYCLING

- 15.2 Policy elements related to active travel and vulnerable road users should positively promote safety and active travel movements especially in relation to

¹⁰ See MOD15 in ‘Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule’ (Secured by Design guidance)

¹¹ See MOD16 in ‘Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule’ (masterplans under 100 dwellings)

access of public transport nodes. Suggest Policy DM9 should reference the Government's pedestrian and cycle infrastructure design guidance (LTN 1/20)

Council Response: DM9 b i) states that it "Complies with highways standards and guidance..." Guidance changes over time so a policy could become out of date if it refers to specific guidance which subsequently changes.

HEAVY GOODS VEHICLES (HGV)

- 15.3** Concern about HGV accessibility, particularly in rural areas, and how to better mitigate their traffic impacts. Suggest the purpose of travel plans, assessments and statements is to assess and mitigate the negative transport impacts, of development.

Council Response: The measures that are required by make the impact of HGVs acceptable are for the planning application stage and should be decided on a 'site by site' basis. Agree that the purpose of a Transport Assessment and a Travel Plan are primarily to determine whether a development would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or if the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe (NPPF para 109), therefore wording of supporting text should be amended in relation to transport impacts¹².

SAFEGUARDING OF THE GATWICK AERODROME ZONE

- 15.4** Request for new policy regarding aerodrome safeguarding consistent with the continued safe operation of Gatwick Airport, in response to the pending amendment to the aerodrome safeguarding zone.

Council Response: New policy not required as pre-existing consultation practices are already in place. The Council notes the pending amendment to the aerodrome safeguarding zone which will bring the entire Borough within the zone. The Council will continue to ensure the necessary consultation procedures are in place so that the airport operator and/or operator of technical sites are consulted on relevant proposals.

16 A31 Farnham By-Pass Improvements (DM10)

PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLIST CROSSINGS

- 16.1** Policy DM10: A31 Farnham By-Pass Improvements, makes no mention of the pedestrian/cycle crossing of the A31 between Red Lion Lane and Weydon Road which is inadequate.

¹² See MOD17 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' in relation to transport impacts

Council Response: Specific parameters for the Hickley's Corner Scheme have not been defined yet. Para 2.70 bullet point five sets out "Resolving community severance by improving connectivity across Farnham". This could potentially include improvements to the crossing between Red Lion Lane and Weydon Road.

OTHER MAJOR HIGHWAYS IMPROVEMENTS

- 16.2** Number of major highway improvements still being considered as part of the Farnham Infrastructure programme. Policy should be modified so that new development takes into account any of the proposed major highway improvements not just Hickley's Corner on the A31 Farnham By-pass.

Council Response: The A31 Hickley's Corner major highway improvements scheme will form part of any strategy that comes forward as part of the Farnham Infrastructure programme, so it is right to include it as a policy. Any other schemes are unknown at the time of writing the Local Plan Part 2.

17 Trees, Woodland, Hedgerows and Landscaping (DM11)¹³

TREE PROTECTION

- 17.1** Wording of policy appears to protect all trees regardless of their value. Suggest inclusion of "where appropriate" or clarify that only important trees, hedgerows etc. should be retained on grounds of merit.

Council Response: Although the Policy seeks to retain and protect trees it states that development "should" retain and protect trees which will ensure that the value of trees and groups of trees will be considered on case-by-case basis through the determination of a planning application.

POLICY EXCEPTIONS

- 17.2** No definition of "wholly exceptional circumstances" in explanatory footnote in para 2.79.

Council Response: The explanatory footnote accords with footnote 58 of the NPPF. The circumstances will be considered on a case-by-case basis through the determination of a planning application.

¹³ See MOD18 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (policy presentation)

BIODIVERSITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE

- 17.3** Given climate change emergency, the Policy should be strengthened to more actively seek an increase in biodiversity and to reduce carbon emissions. Should also refer to the Government's Nature Recovery Network policy paper. Suggest a Policy for Tree and Woodland Management to set minimum standards, terms of reference, targets for tree canopy cover on development sites, and have a robust requirement for tree replacement.

Council Response: Chapter 16 on the Natural Environment and Chapter 17 on Climate Change and Flood Risk Management of the adopted LPP1 forms part of the development plan along with the non-strategic policies of LPP2. There is no need to duplicate the policy requirements of this Policy in other policies. The policy wording seeks to facilitate tree and woodland management. The specific detailed requirement for individual sites is more appropriately dealt with at the planning application stage rather than as a blanket non-strategic policy requirement.

PRE-APPLICATION TREE AND HEDGE CLEARING

- 17.4** Policy should have stronger regard to the practice of pre-application removal of trees.

Council Response: The policy wording seeks to retain and adequately protect trees and therefore the proposed loss of any trees that results from development that needs planning permission is covered by the Policy. Policy DM12 covers breaches of planning control.

18 Planning Enforcement (DM12)

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS

- 18.1** Some parish councils suggested that policy enforcement should consider neighbourhood plans

Council Response: A 'made' neighbourhood plan forms part of the development plan and sits alongside the local plan prepared by the local authority. Policy DM12 states that enforcement action will be in accordance with the Development Plan (including neighbourhood plans) and the Local Planning Enforcement Plan.

LPP2 CHAPTER 3 - LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT

19 Settlement Boundaries

- 19.1 During the consultation, the Council received representations on matters related to specific settlement boundaries located in various locations in the Borough. These are listed below.

ALFOLD AND ALFOLD CROSSWAYS

- 19.2 Suggested that the boundary should be redrawn to include sites that have now been granted planning permission. Some recent permissions are missing as currently drawn. These include Alfold Garden Centre Land, north east of Dunsfold Road, and land east of Loxwood Road.

Council Response: As detailed in the Settlement Boundaries Topic Paper, only a 'factual update' has been completed for the Alfold settlement boundaries. It should be noted that the Alfold Neighbourhood Plan is not required to review the proposed settlement boundary further. The Settlement Boundary Topic Paper methodology states that the Council will "Include planning permissions and site allocations which physically relate to the settlement boundary." The Council do not consider that the referenced planning permissions are physically well related to the existing settlement boundary.

BRAMLEY

- 19.3 The boundary should be amended to mirror that in the submitted Bramley Neighbourhood Plan, and with the addition of the site at Birtley Courtyard which is also supported by the Parish Council.

Council Response: As detailed in the Settlement Boundaries Topic Paper only a 'factual update' has been completed for the Bramley Settlement Boundaries Topic Paper. This reflects the settlement boundary approved by the Examiner for the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan."

CHIDDINGFOLD

- 19.4 The boundary should reflect the approach set out in LPP1, which states that LPP2 will make the Green Belt changes. There was concern that no evidence has been provided for the departure from this approach.

Council Response: Following the adoption of LPP1, the NPPF was amended to allow detailed amendments changes to Green Belt boundaries through Neighbourhood Plans, where a need has been established through strategic policies. Since the Pre-Submission consultation the Chiddingfold Neighbourhood Plan has been approved at examination. The Neighbourhood Plan releases land from the Green Belt, and amends the settlement boundary, to provide suitable land to accommodate the minimum housing requirement specified in LPP1. The Council therefore proposes the removal of the Chiddingfold settlement boundaries from LPP2 as the 'made' Chiddingfold Neighbourhood Plan deals with this matter¹⁴.

CRANLEIGH

- 19.5** Cranleigh Neighbourhood Plan is likely to need to amend the settlement boundary to accommodate future growth.

Council Response: Para 3.7 of LPP2 states that “For settlements where the Parish or Town Council is carrying out the site allocations through its Neighbourhood Plan, any amendments to the settlement boundaries and, where relevant, Green Belt boundaries, in LPP2 are factual updates only. The Parish or Town Council may then decide to review the boundary as part of the Neighbourhood Plan to include further factual updates and site allocations”. As the Cranleigh Neighbourhood Plan is dealing with any residual allocations needed to meet the LPP1 housing requirement for Cranleigh, it will be for the Neighbourhood Plan to identify any changes to the settlement boundary arising from this.

DOCKENFIELD

- 19.6** The Parish Council supported amendments to the boundary to correct inaccuracies. However, they disagreed with one of the areas of proposed expansion (proposed change '2' as per the Settlement Boundaries Topic Paper), saying that the expansion area did not follow a physical feature and was inconsistent with the boundary drawn for other nearby dwellings.

Council Response: The proposed change '2' is considered appropriate as per the justification given within the Settlement Boundaries Topic Paper.

¹⁴ See MOD19 and 20 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (Chiddingfold Settlement Boundary)

ELSTEAD

- 19.7** A developer stated that the boundary should be amended to align with the Green Belt boundary at the Croft, so that all of the houses are then within the boundary.

Council Response: The Settlement Boundaries Topic Paper recommends that built and commenced development, following the adoption of Local Plan 2002, which physically relates to the settlement boundary, should be included in the settlement. A 27-dwelling development was permitted at the Croft in 2005. Therefore, in response to the comment and in accordance with the Topic Paper methodology, the Council consider that the settlement boundary should be amended to include the aforementioned dwellings¹⁵.

FRENSHAM

- 19.8** Move settlement boundary in Shortfield Common, to include Dial House and land for use for housing (related to Dial House omitted site promotion)

Council Response: As detailed in the Settlement Boundaries Topic Paper, only a 'factual update' has been completed for the Frensham settlement boundaries. The Council do not consider that the property at Dial House is physically well related to the settlement. Therefore, in accordance with the Topic Paper methodology, the area suggested is not a proposed to be included within the settlement boundary.

GODALMING

- 19.9** The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) suggested that Land at Binscombe should revert back to Green Belt and AGLV designations. There was also a suggestion that the carpark of the former Westbrook Mills should be removed from the Green Belt as the other half has been included in the settlement boundary, and the car park is brownfield land adjoining the settlement.

Council Response: Land at Binscombe was removed from the Green Belt in LPP1. LPP2 does not propose to change this. The Topic Paper states that LPP2 will define a settlement boundary for Godalming which is concurrent with the Green Belt boundary. Any changes to the Green Belt in LPP2 through the creation of a defined settlement boundary, should only be minor to ensure it follows physically defined features. The Council do not consider that it would be minor a revision to include the car park at Westbrook Mills.

¹⁵ See MOD21 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (settlement boundary adjustment at Elstead)

HASLEMERE

- 19.10** There were many consultation responses made on the proposed settlement boundary at Haslemere. Most of these comments relate to the southern boundary, where the built-up area extends and abuts to protected landscapes designations of AONB and AGLV. Other comments suggested some minor adjustments to the settlement boundary to rectify small inaccuracies, such as the boundary line not accurately drawn on a driveway in Map 17c of the Settlement Boundaries Topic Paper¹⁶.

Boundary Contrary to the Emerging Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan

- 19.10.1 Many respondents did not agree with the proposed change to the settlement boundary to include the Red Court site (DS06). It was suggested that altering the settlement boundary by ‘rounding-off’ impacts negatively on the character of the town. These respondents felt that the boundary should be amended to match the boundary proposed in the emerging draft of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan (HNP), stating that the boundary deviation was inconsistent with the Para 172 of the NPPF, due to the non-justification of “very special circumstances”.

Council Response: Since the consultation on the Pre-Submission version of LPP2, an application for residential development on the land at Red Court (WA/2020/2013) has been refused. The refusal of the planning permission included the grounds that the proposal would result in harm to the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside and fail to respect the landscape character of the Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). The proposal was also considered to harm the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Accordingly, the proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies RE1 (Countryside beyond the Green Belt) and RE3 (Landscape Character) of the Local Plan Part 1 (2018), along with guidance contained in the NPPF. A main modification is proposed to remove DS06 from the Pre-Submission Plan through the Addendum to the Pre-Submission LPP2 Plan in order to reflect this ¹⁷, as a result the Haslemere Settlement Boundary will be amended. All of the sites proposed for allocation in Haslemere are either previously developed land or lie within the existing settlement boundary. As a consequence, there is no conflict with the settlement boundary as proposed in the HNP.

¹⁶ See MOD22 in ‘Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule’ (Haslemere settlement boundary minor adjustment)

¹⁷ For more information see ‘Annexe 1 -Addendum to the LPP2 Pre-Submission Plan’

South Haslemere Boundary and Longdene House

- 19.10.2 There was general support for the settlement boundary along the southern sections at Scotland Lane to Sturt Farm Rd, between Midhurst Rd and Sturt Rd, and on Hedgehog Lane. However, developers suggested that the area adjacent to Longdene House should be included within the settlement boundary, as it is adjacent to the settlement and contiguous with the Sturt Farm development, further stating that the Longdene House is previously developed land (PDL) and benefits from several planning permissions.

Council Response: The Council do not consider that the granted planning permission at Longdene House is physically well related to the settlement. Therefore, in accordance with the Settlement Boundaries Topic Paper methodology, the area adjacent to Longdene House is not a proposed to be included within the settlement boundary. The planning permissions granted at Longdene House have been in/around the area that already contains buildings so a change to the settlement boundary in response to this is not necessary.

MILFORD/WITLEY

- 19.11 In previous iterations of the Plan, Site Allocation DS14 known as the ‘Secretts’, was not within one of the broad locations that LPP1 identified by an asterisk as having the potential for removal from the Green Belt and was not, therefore, included as a proposed allocation in earlier draft versions of LPP2. As a result, a number of the objections to the proposed allocation of the Secretts site in the Pre-Submission version of LPP2 have been focussed on it being inconsistent with the strategic policies set out in LPP1.

Council Response: The Council’s legal advice on whether any Green Belt sites lying outside the LPP1 ‘asterisked’ areas could be considered for removal from the Green Belt in LPP2 detailed that there is nothing in law to prevent the Council from considering sites outside the broad areas identified in LPP1. It also detailed if the Council considered a site outside of these areas, then there would need to be clear and cogent reasons for doing so. The evidence and rationale which has supported the selection of the proposed site allocations within LPP2 is detailed within the Housing Numbers, Assessments and Allocations Topic Paper and Green Belt Topic Paper. “

FARNHAM

- 19.12 It was suggested LPP2 should show the settlement boundary as per Map A: Built-Up Area Boundary in the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan (FNP). One developer suggested that the boundary for Badshot Lea should be expanded to include Land to the West of St George’s Road, Badshot Lea.

Council Response: The made FNP has designated a Built-Up Area Boundary. and forms part of the development plan. Therefore, this is not a matter for LPP2, and it is unnecessary for the FNP Built-up Area Boundary to also be mapped in LPP2.

HAMBLEDON

- 19.13** Support from the parish council that Hambledon was not within a settlement boundary, as is it is rural and almost completely within AONB and Green Belt.

20 Development within Settlement Boundaries (DM13)

- 20.1** Overall support for DM13 for prioritising the efficient use of land within settlement boundaries, helping further protect areas of AONB, AGLV and Green Belt constraints.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

- 20.2** It was suggested that for some rural settlements with no housing allocation, a presumption in favour of new development should not be acceptable unless exceptional circumstances are demonstrated. This would include infilling inside/outside the settlement boundary. It was also suggested that Policy DM13 should refer to previously developed land. Some respondents suggested that regard should also be had to whether a village has met its housing allocation, and that there should be differentiation in this policy regarding medium and smaller villages.

Council Response: Development within the defined settlement will be assessed in accordance with DM13. Policy DM13 does not preclude development outside of the defined settlement boundaries. However, as per Supporting Text in para 3.2 of LPP2 “Outside of settlement boundaries, whether the principle of development is acceptable will be determined on a case-by-case basis through consideration of factors including a site’s relationship with the defined settlement, and the sustainability of its location”. The housing allocation set in LPP1 Policy ALH1, is the minimum number of homes requires in each parish. Settlement boundaries are used to identify the substantially built-up settlement area of a town or village; these are locations which are considered to be sustainable locations for growth. The Council do not consider it is necessary to differentiate between the size of medium and smaller villages within DM13. Wording within Policy states “development will be permitted, subject to compliance with other policies in the Development Plan.”. The Spatial Strategy Policy SP2 in LPP1 already differentiates between development in larger villages compared with smaller villages.

21 Extensions, Alterations, Replacement Buildings & Limited Infilling in the Green Belt (DM14)

PERCENTAGE GUIDELINES

- 21.1 One developer suggested that more detail was required to explain the proposed percentage guidelines which apply to extensions (40%) and replacement (10%) residential buildings.

Council Response: The percentage guidelines are intended to support the essential characteristics (openness and permanence) of the Green Belt. Each application will, however, be considered on its own merits, considering factors such as how isolated a site is and the scale and mass of the original building. Developments which exceed these guidelines may be acceptable in some circumstances. Where a building is outside of but visually well related to the settlement boundary, the Council will decide on a case-by-case basis whether it is appropriate to apply the percentage guidelines. This approach conforms to the NPPF and is considered reasonable and sufficient.

APPLY DM14 IN ALL RURAL AREAS, NOT JUST THE GREEN BELT

- 21.2 Dockenfield Parish Council suggested applying all the policy provisions to AONB areas and all rural parishes

Council Response: The NPPF sets out that the essential characteristics of the Green Belt is its openness and permanence. Policy RE2 of Local Plan Part 1, in accordance with national policy, sets out that most forms of development in the Green Belt will be inappropriate other than in very special circumstances. Characteristics of the Green Belt are not the same as characteristic of the AONB. Policy DM14 is a direct response to NPPF policy on certain forms of development in the Green Belt. There is not an equivalent national policy relating to such development in rural locations outside the Green Belt.

REINSTATE THE OLD POLICY

- 21.3 Frensham Parish Council suggested DM14 should be amended as per the RD2 policies in 2002 Local Plan (referring to RD2 Extensions of Dwellings in the Countryside and RD2A Replacement of Dwellings in the Countryside).

Council Response: RD2 policies of the Local Plan 2002, applied to extensions both within and outside the Green Belt. The new NPPF has now altered the Supporting Text and parameters for development outside the Green Belt, in which LPP2 must accord.

LIMITED INFILLING

- 21.4** One respondent suggested that DM14 (c) was not clear. Whilst the NPPF does not define limited infilling the supporting Text, Para 3.17 of LPP2, states that each case will be determined by the degree to which a scheme may be considered to be in the village, which is not the same as infilling of a gap in a row of development. The test is a visual one: does the site seem to be within the village or part of the wider countryside beyond? DM14 (c) should be amended to follow the wording of the Julian Wood v The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Gravesham Borough Council.

Council Response: Policy DM14 sufficiently follows the definition of “limited” in “limited infilling” as contained in NPPF Para 149(e). The approach adopted by the Council is reasonable, and sufficient. It is also supported by case law. The case law in Julian Wood demonstrates that whether or not infilling is limited is a question of planning judgment, capable of being influenced by a number of factors.

22 Development in Rural Areas (DM15)

IMPACT OF REMOTE HOME WORKING

- 22.1** Notion of homes being isolated from services and facilities must recognise technological changes and the way we live our lives post pandemic. Does not reflect NPPF para 84. Policy DM15 a) also needs rewording to consider that occupiers no longer need to travel or do so unsustainably. Suggest changes to the policy to recognise some rural development is appropriate to support tourism, agriculture etc.

Council Response: Policy DM15 is consistent with para 79 of the NPPF that states that planning policies should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless specific circumstances are met. Policy wording needs to be sufficiently flexible to consider each application on its own merits. Strategic Policy EE1 of the adopted LPP1 promotes a strong rural economy through certain types of development and forms part of the development plan for decision making. Policy EE1 and DM15 are intended to help support a prosperous rural economy as per Para 84 of the NPPF.

SUBSTANTIAL BUILT FORM IN THE COUNTRYSIDE

- 22.2** Milford and Witley site allocations in LPP2 are contrary to para 3.33 in that it is allocating Green Belt sites where there are reasonable alternatives. Para 3.33 should include a list of documents that should be considered including the various other landscape character assessments.

Council Response: Paragraph 3.33 of LPP2 does not restrict substantial development in rural areas but recognises the potential harmful impact of it on the countryside. It explains the context for the criteria in Policy DM15 but is not policy itself. There is no requirement for the Local Plan to list other evidence or policy documentation that would be a material consideration in the determination of a planning application. Their omission does not imply they are not material.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

- 22.3** Policy applies to all development outside settlement boundaries. Suggest referring to the setting of the South Down National Park (SDNP). Also suggest that DM15 includes requirement to protect and contribute to Green Infrastructure Network and connection to SDNP.

Council Response: LPP1 sets out the strategic policies that forms part of the development plan. Strategic Policy RE3 vii) of LPP1 states that consideration will be given to development that affects the setting of the South Downs National Park. Strategic Policy NE2 of LPP1 relates to Green and Blue Infrastructure. It is not necessary to repeat requirements in LPP2.

RURAL HOUSING CAP

- 22.4** View allocation of housing numbers to village as a “cap”. Any future requirements should be by consultation.

Council Response: Capping the number of dwellings for any specific settlement would be inconsistent with para 60 of the NPPF and strategic Policy ALH1 of the adopted LPP1 which states that each parish is allocated a minimum number of homes.

23 Dwellings for Rural Workers (DM16)

- 23.1** Definition of rural worker should be clarified to enable effective enforcement.

Council Response: Paras 3.39 and 3.40 of LPP2 set out the definition of “functional need” and “rural enterprise” which provide sufficient clarity as to how the policy will be implemented. The paragraphs are in accordance with the NPPG on “Housing needs of different groups”.

LPP2 CHAPTER 4 - PROTECTING PLACES

24 Haslemere Hillside (DM17)

POLICY TOO RESTRICTIVE

- 24.1 Policies are becoming more restrictive and some of them go beyond their statutory limits. For example, the way Policy DM17 is worded would prevent development at the vacant Prep School in Haslemere.

Council Response: Policy DM17 does not seek to prevent development but instead to ensure that the wooded appearance of the hillside is retained as it is important to the setting of the Conservation Area.

TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

- 24.2 Make TPOs on trees that contribute to the Haslemere Hillside designation.

Council Response: There are several existing TPOs on trees within the Hillside Areas and trees within the Haslemere Conservation Area are protected. The need to make further TPOs will be managed on a case-by-case basis and should not be imposed by a blanket policy for the area.

CLIMATE CHANGE

- 24.3 Importance of trees combatting climate change and therefore there should be no reduction of Godalming Hillside.

Council Response: Adopted LPP1 Policy RE3 sets out that development will not be acceptable in the Godalming Hillside unless it can be demonstrated that it would not diminish the appearance of the wooded hillside area or result in loss of tree cover to the detriment of the area. It is not necessary to repeat requirements in LPP2.

25 Farnham/Aldershot Strategic Gap (DM18)

RETAIN THE ORIGINAL GAP

- 25.1 The gap should be retained in full or made larger. In addition, it conflicts with FNP11 in the FNP and leaves Badshot Lea Village's identity vulnerable and unprotected from development pressure.

Council Response: LPP1 sets out the basis for a more focused Strategic Gap based on the findings of the Local Landscape Designation Review 2014. A detailed assessment was undertaken and is set out in the Strategic Gap Topic

Paper. The change to the extent of the Strategic Gap does not undermine Policy FNP11 as in those areas no longer covered by the Strategic Gap, Policy FNP11 will continue to be applied as they are outside of the Built-Up Area Boundary. The purpose of the Aldershot/Farnham Strategic Gap is to prevent coalescence between Farnham and Aldershot rather than between the distinct areas of Farnham. The prevention of coalescence between the distinct areas of Farnham is covered by Policy FNP11 in the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan.

FIT FOR PURPOSE

- 25.2** The Strategic Gap contains land which neither performs the purpose of a Strategic Gap nor contributes to it.

Council Response: Each segment of the Strategic Gap was assessed and those which perform the purpose of the Strategic Gap were included in the revised Strategic Gap. A detailed assessment was undertaken and is set out in the Strategic Gap Topic Paper.

POLICY SUCCESSION REFERENCE

- 25.3** LPP2 should confirm that 2002 Local Plan Policy C4 is replaced by Policy DM18.

Council Response: Para 1.1 of Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) states that together with LPP1, LPP2 replaces the current Local Plan. Whilst a schedule of superseded policies may be helpful, there is no obligation to explicitly set out for each policy in LPP2 that it intends to supersede another policy and to state that fact/and identify the policy, in order to meet regulation 8(5) of the Local Planning Regulations 2021.

26 Areas of Strategic Visual Importance

ADDITIONAL SITES

- 26.1** Consider ASVI along A31 corridor between Badshot Lea and Runfold. Particularly as the restoration of the Runfold landfill is proceeding well with Runfold North now in aftercare and substantial tree planting having taken place.

Council Response: LPP1 sets out that the role of LPP2 is to make detailed amendments to the existing ASVIs to address any anomalies that have arisen since the original designation and LPP2 does not consider additional areas for designation ASVIs.

FARNHAM NP DESIGNATIONS

- 26.2** The NP identified some ASVI areas that include areas of ‘High Landscape Sensitivity and High Landscape Value’ which is protected in the FNP. Suggest LPP2 maps and references this.

Council Response: The Farnham NP has been made and forms part of the development plan – it is therefore unnecessary for the FNP designations to also be mapped in LPP2.

REMOVAL OF SITES

- 23.2** It was suggested that the ASVI land to the south of Monkton Lane, Farnham should be removed as an ASVI designation, and a more detailed review of the precise boundaries of the ASVI should be undertaken.

Council Response: A detailed review of the ASVIs was undertaken in line with the strategy in the adopted LPP1 and is set out in the ASVI Topic Paper. LPP1 set out that LPP2 would only make detailed amendments to the Farnham ASVIs to address any anomalies that have arisen since the original designation. The ASVI land to the south of Monkton Lane accords with this approach and therefore a removal is not required.

27 Local Green Space (DM19)

PROMOTED AND OMITTED SITES

- 27.1** Several representations suggested additional areas should be designated as Local Green Spaces.

Council Response: A thorough assessment was carried out which is contained within the Local Green Space Topic Paper, resulting in the inclusion of the sites within the policy. Parish Councils may include LGSs within their neighbourhood plans.

28 Development Affecting Listed Buildings, and/or their Settings (DM20)

- 28.1** General support of this policy from Historic England and other local groups. No specific detailed representations were made to Policy DM20.

29 Conservation Areas (DM21)

- 29.1** Policy DM21 is supported by Historic England as well as other local groups. Some representations were made to specific site allocation policies, suggesting that more emphasis was required on development adjoining Conservation

Areas and the need for proposals affecting heritage assets to have regard to Conservation Area Appraisals.

30 Heritage at Risk (DM22)

LOCAL LIST OF ASSETS AT RISK

- 30.1 When defining risk, it should be made clear whether risk needs to be pre-defined for an asset to fall under the terms of the policy. Suggest reference in Policy DM22 to a list or register of local features vulnerable to risk, this strengthens the policy in terms of measuring its implementation effectiveness.

Council Response: LPP1 Policy HA1, describes the need to target for improvements “those heritage assets identified at risk or vulnerable to risk. The Council is compiling a local list of heritage assets at risk. This project is ongoing. It is considered that reference to this list in the Policy is not required to meet policy objectives.

31 Non-Designated Heritage Assets (DM23)

- 31.1 Policy DM23 is supported by Historic England and other local groups.

32 Historic Landscapes and Gardens (DM24)

SPLIT INTO TWO POLICIES

- 32.1 It was suggested that this policy should be split into two distinct policies, one for designated Registered Parks and Gardens and another for other historic landscapes. A Grade I Registered Park will be accorded similar significance and planning weight as a Heritage Asset to that of a Grade I Listed Building or a Scheduled Monument.

Council Response: Response: In Local Plan 2002 the designations were separated out, but one of the aims of LPP2 is to reduce the number of policies and to avoid repetition

33 Archaeology (DM25)

SCHEDULED MONUMENTS

- 33.1 Suggested a separate policy for Scheduled Monuments protection and another for archaeological resources; Suggest adding extra wording to ensure that an archaeological field evaluation will be required if the initial assessment is determined as ‘inconclusive’. Also highlights that term ‘Scheduled Monument/Scheduled Ancient Monument’ is used inconsistently and inaccurately. The correct term is “Scheduled Monument” and should be changed accordingly.

Council Response: A separate local policy or distinction for the protection of Scheduled Monuments and another for archaeological resources, is not required to meet policy objectives. Minor modification required to give clarity to when an archaeological field evaluation is required by adding “inconclusive or” and to remove the word “Ancient” from any reference to a Scheduled Ancient Monument throughout LPP2¹⁸.

¹⁸ See MOD23 and 24 in ‘Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule’ (archeology)

LPP2 CHAPTER 5 - ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

34 Employment Sites (DM26)

PROTECTION OF EXISTING EMPLOYMENT SITES

- 34.1 Should protect existing commercial/ employment sites in Haslemere. Problem of having a four-town Borough policy

Council Response: The protection of existing commercial and employment sites is covered by LPP1 Policies TCS1 and EE2. It is not necessary to repeat requirements in LPP2.

NEW EMPLOYMENT

- 34.2 The Employment Land Review suggests additional employment allocations are required in the plan period, so it is very disappointing that LPP2 does not seek to allocate further sites for this use.

Council Response: The vision for economic growth is set out in the strategic plan which is LPP1. Policy EE1 sets out how development to meet economic needs will be delivered, which includes strategic allocations for employment floorspace at Dunsfold Aerodrome and Water Lane, Farnham

REMOTE WORKING

- 34.3 There should be commitment to significantly improve broadband speeds to enable more agile and modern employment practices and support changing employment needs.

Council Response: LPP1 Policy CC2 requires that all new buildings are provided with the highest available speed broadband infrastructure. Upgrades to existing broadband infrastructure, including superfast broadband projects, are included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

35 Development within Town Centres (DM27)

IMPACT OF TOWN CENTRE TRAFFIC

- 35.1 Current air pollution in Farnham puts people off from walking. Need to reduce flow of traffic through the town centre to make it more attractive.

Council Response: Adopted LPP1 Policy ST1 on Sustainable Transport will ensure that development schemes are consistent with the objectives and actions within the Air Quality Action Plan. The Council's Air Quality Action Plan

is produced as part of its duty under the Environment Act 1995. It outlines the work that the Council and a range of partners are undertaking to reduce the air quality problems identified in the designated Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) and to meet the Government objective for NO₂. The major cause of the elevated NO₂ levels is road traffic emissions and the actions in the plan concentrate on tackling emissions from this source. An AQMA has been identified in Farnham to help address issues of air quality.

FACILITIES IN PUBLIC AREAS

- 35.2** Apply provision c) of Policy DM27: Development within Town Centres, to all development related to public facilities provision.

Council Response: The focus of Policy DM27 is specifically on development, which is suitable within town centres, therefore it would not be appropriate to set out a requirement for all types of development within this policy.

PARKING

- 35.3** Housing schemes should have own parking. Parking provision in towns is inadequate.

Council Response: The requirements for parking for new development are set out in the Waverley Borough Council Parking Guidelines. Para 5.19 of LPP2 states that where the density of housing is increased, an under-provision of parking spaces within town centres may be supported if there is evidence that this will encourage other sustainable transport modes and contribute to the objectives of sustainable development.

36 Access and Servicing (DM28)

- 36.1** Area designated in Haslemere seems unnecessarily large versus the area currently used. Suggest the site to the rear of Boots could be used for downsized housing.

Council Response: The rear servicing areas set out in the 2002 Local Plan have been retained. Selection and allocation of housing sites in Haslemere is fully detailed in Chapter 7: Housing Sites.

37 Advertisements (DM29)

- 37.1** General support for policy DM29 advocating that advertisement displays respect the interest of public safety, historic character, and amenity.

38 Telecommunications (DM30)

PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

- 38.1 It was suggested that the policy was impractical as many proposals for telecommunications masts and towers can be made as part of prior approval permitted development rights

Council Response: Not all telecommunications infrastructure has permitted development rights and therefore any proposal requiring a planning application would be expected to comply with the first part of Policy DM30.

UTILITY PROVIDERS SHARING MAST SITES

- 38.2 Encourage sharing of mobile masts by providers. Avoid residential areas for siting of masts and minimal impact; use retail and industrial buildings first as a preference. Favourable consideration given to sensitively designed structures that address issues of lack of signal in rural areas.

Council Response: Paragraph 115 c) of the NPPF sets out that applications should include evidence that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting antennas on existing buildings, masts, or other infrastructure. Paragraph 114 of the NPPF sets out that local planning authorities should not impose a ban on new electronic communications in certain areas or require a minimum distance between new electronic communications development and existing development.

CONSERVATION AREAS

- 38.3 Add reference to Conservation Areas to the policy wording.

Council Response: The policy refers to 'Historic environments' which encompasses Conservation Areas and therefore it is unnecessary to mention them separately in the policy.

39 Filming (DM31)

LIGHT POLLUTION

- 39.1 Ancillary services to filming in the Green Belt, AONB or Dark Areas should only be allowed low level intensity lighting.

Council Response: The Council will ensure that appropriate conditions are placed on any permissions for filming to ensure adverse impacts on sensitive landscapes are mitigated. Where they cannot be mitigated then planning permission is unlikely to be granted.

40 Tourism and Recreation (DM32)

- 40.1** Comments highlighted the importance of the retention of pubs and hotels and of parking facilities to tourism as recognised in the Policy. Other comments highlighted the importance of sustainable green tourism and concern that provision of new holiday homes was not sustainable in Dunsfold Parish.

Council Response: Comments noted. DM32 deals with tourism and recreation in general and each application will be determined against the criteria on a case-by-case basis.

41 ‘Downs Link’ Corridor (DM33)

- 41.1** There was a general level of support for Policy DM33, advocating a future light railway connection between Dunsfold Park and Guildford Railway station.

42 Access to the Countryside (DM34)

OMITTED PATHS

- 42.1** Suggestion to amend Map 42: Long Distance Rights of Way and the Downs Link, to include the Serpent Trail long distance path which starts in Haslemere. In addition, include the section of footpath from Farnham to Thursley known as the Greensand Way.

Council Response: Agree mapping does not include Serpent Trail and this should be corrected. The section of footpath referred to as Greensand Way is not officially part of the Greensand Way long-distance footpath which runs from Haslemere to Hamstreet¹⁹.

PRIVATE RIGHT OF WAY

- 42.2** Policy should go further by setting targets for improvement/maintenance of PROWs and encourage formalising paths via registration process.

Council Response: The issue of PRoW maintenance is not a planning matter and therefore cannot be covered by LPP2. Surrey County Council manages designation of the county’s PRoWs.

¹⁹ See MOD25 in ‘Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule’ (Serpent Trail long distance path)

LPP2 CHAPTER 6 - HOUSING POLICIES

43 Reuse and Alterations to Large Buildings (DM35)

LOSS OF FIVE OR MORE 'NET' DWELLINGS

- 43.1 The policy is unclear on the Council's position on the amalgamation of dwellings. Further clarification is sought as to whether or not the policy means net dwellings when it says that it will "...resist any amalgamation of dwellings that would result in the loss of 5 or more dwellings".

Council Response: The Council agrees that this policy is not clear and that a minor change is required to clarify this oversight. This is especially relevant as many large houses are often subdivided into smaller dwellings. The policy should be amended to read that "the Council will resist any amalgamation of dwellings that would result in the loss of 5 or more net dwellings"²⁰.

EMPHASIS ON 'HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE' AND 'WASTE PROVISION'

- 43.2 Historic England suggested that due to the assumption that many large buildings will be of historic character, it was therefore prudent to add a reference to heritage value to elevate the issue, e.g. "In considering such proposals, the Council will have particular regard to the impact of the development on neighbour amenity, 'heritage significance' and parking space provision". Similarly, Cranleigh Parish Council sought to elevate the importance of 'waste provision', by clearly referencing it in the policy wording.

Council Response: Whilst both heritage and waste are dealt with in other dedicated Local Plan policy areas, the suggested additional details helpful and will serve to provide further linkage to other areas of the plan²¹.

44 Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding (DM36)

FIVE PERCENT MINIMUM REQUIREMENT

- 44.1 Many respondents were concerned that having a 5% minimum requirement on development proposals of 20 or more additional dwellings, would put viability at more risk and could compromise deliverability. Some thought that this threshold was excessive and would lead to significant over-delivery, whilst others thought that the threshold should be increased, suggesting that 5% of larger sites will not address the demand for Self and Custom Housebuilding.

²⁰ See MOD27 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (net dwellings)

²¹ See MOD26 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (heritage and waste aspects in the reuse/alteration of large buildings)

Council Response: Policy DM36 will assist the Council in granting sufficient planning permissions to meet the demand for self and custom build plots in the Borough, as evidenced by the Waverley Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Register. The 5% is a minimum requirement. In certain cases, the option to negotiate the 5% requirement may be considered by the Council, provided applicants present robust evidence clearly stating how the policy requirement makes their proposal 'unviable'. This is a reasonable approach and an effective way of generating significant numbers of plots where there is established demand. Policy DM36 was screened for viability testing in the LPP2 Viability Report.

LPP2 CHAPTER 7 - HOUSING SITES

45 Housing Sites in Haslemere

45.1 HASLEMERE KEY SITE, WEST STREET (DS01)

Support

- From the Environment Agency endorsing the policy's reference to SPZ and avoiding development within a functional flood plain.

Suggestion

- Some considered that a more intensive use of this site (i.e., a greater minimum number of dwellings as proposed), would help relieve more pressure off of greenfield sites in and around the settlement, and make the development more viable and attractive for developers.

Concern/Objection

- The loss of car parking and commercial premises. Both considered important components of town centre health and vitality. Additionally, there was no viable alternative identified offered for the displacement of car parking.
- Site constraints and the likelihood of being delivered. Some suggested that the site is undeliverable, having first been allocated over 20 years ago, with complex ownership and no development partner. Also concerns that the site has no SPA mitigation.
- The potential for too many dwellings (40 dwellings minimum) causing harm to the character of historic environment
- The development will impact on heritage assets due to its proximity to the conservation area and listed buildings (Historic England).

Council Response: The Council considers this site to be suitable, available, and achievable within the Plan period. Policy DS01 considers parking and specifies that development will retain at least existing parking capacity, unless it can be demonstrated there is sufficient parking space capacity in the area or additional capacity can be provided at an alternative location within walking distance of the town centre. DS07 also states that development will be subject to the retention and provision of additional retail and other town centre uses within the site along existing and any proposed street frontages. This is in accordance with LPP1 Policy TCS3. In the Pre-Submission version of LPP2 the site was allocated for at least 40 dwellings. In light of some of the concerns raised regarding the proposed yield for this site, the Council consider a reduction of the yield to at least 30 dwellings is appropriate. Accordingly, a main modification will be made to the Plan

through the Addendum to the Pre-Submission LPP2 Plan in order to reflect this²². Council will work with other landowners to unlock the potential of this site, making use of Compulsory Purchase powers if necessary. Provision e) of Policy DS01 states that the allocation is subject to the demonstration that development will not have a likely significant effect on protected habitats sites; this may include the need for mitigation and/or SANG provision. The heritage assets are identified as key constraints, and provision b) of the policy specifically relates to impact on the heritage assets. This allocation is subject to ensuring the preservation or enhancement of the historic environment through the layout and design of any proposals. The Council considers that this can be achieved within the redevelopment of the site. Some minor changes have been made to Provision d) to reflect changes to the NPPF in relation to the phrasing of heritage conservation²³.

45.2 CENTRAL HINDHEAD, LONDON ROAD, HINDHEAD (DS02)

Support

- From Natural England and Thames Water, insofar as there were no concerns about (potential for) SPA mitigation and water/wastewater infrastructure capability.

Council Response: Support noted. This site is within the Hindhead Concept Area, where a limited specified amount of development can come forward despite its proximity to the Wealden Heaths SPA.

45.3 LAND AT ANDREWS, PORTSMOUTH ROAD, HINDHEAD (DS03)

Support

- From Natural England, insofar as they had no concerns about (potential for) SPA mitigation as long as the development being undertaken was for a high dependency care home (C2 Use). Support from Thames Water, as there were no water/wastewater infrastructure capability issues identified.

Concern/Objection

- That the site does not deliver C3 housing, in meeting the housing requirement specialist housing should be in addition to C3 housing.

Council Response: The Housing Delivery Test (HDT) allows the Council to consider C2 housing to meet the housing requirement provided that the contribution from this type of housing accords with the HDT Measurement

²² For more information see 'Annexe 1 -Addendum to the LPP2 Pre-Submission Plan'

²³ See MOD33 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (DS01)

Rule Book. A minor modification is required to specify that the allocation is for a 'high dependency' care home²⁴.

45.4 LAND AT WEY HILL YOUTH CAMPUS, HASLEMERE (DS04)

Support

- A number of representations supported this site provided that the existing uses were relocated, the proposed development was low-level, and the existing screening was retained. Support from Thames Water, as there were no water/wastewater infrastructure capability issues identified.

Suggestion

- Natural England recommended the need to consider the impact on the adjacent ancient woodland and the need for SPA mitigation.
- Revise and update the red line proposal map to exclude the Scout building.
- The site should be used for affordable housing and not appropriate for Custom Self Build housing.

Concern/Objection

- Whether or not 40dph could be achieved without compromising the area's character
- The Haslemere Scout Group were concerned that the red outline on the map inaccurately included the Scout building which is not moving. Therefore, need to reissue map excluding the Scout building; this is misleading to the community.
- Historic England objected to the allocation as there is no assessment of the impact on the St Christopher's Church (Grade II).

Council Response: Since the publication of the Pre-Submission version of LPP2, the Scouts Group have signed a new long-term lease. This portion of the site is therefore no longer considered available for development. Accordingly, the site boundary has been amended and the yield/density figures adjusted accordingly to 34 dwellings (a change from 40 dwellings). The Council consider that the revised yield is appropriate and can be delivered within the Plan period. Accordingly, a main modification will be made to the Plan through the Addendum to the Pre-Submission LPP2 Plan in order to reflect this²⁵. A proportion of affordable housing will be required in accordance with LPP1 Policy AHN1, as will Custom and Self-Build housing in accordance with emerging LPP2 Policy DM36. This site is not considered to form part of the setting of the Grade II listed church, due to the a) the

²⁴ See MOD34 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (DS03)

²⁵ For more information see 'Annexe 1 -Addendum to the LPP2 Pre-Submission Plan'

separation distance, and b) the presence of modern development styles between the site and the church.

45.5 HASLEMERE PREPARATORY SCHOOL, THE HEIGHTS, HILL ROAD, (DS05)

Support

- Support from water utility providers, insofar as there were no water/wastewater infrastructure capability issues identified.

Suggestions

- To reduce and increase the number of dwellings on the site with reference made to site constraints, traffic impacts, and to previous refusals.
- That the 5% self-build component was inappropriate due to the scheme being predominately apartments.

Council Response: In June 2021, the site gained planning permission via appeal (WA/2018/1771) for the erection of 25 dwellings following the demolition of the existing school buildings and existing dwelling (net 24 dwellings). Accordingly, a main modification will be made to the Plan through the Addendum to the Pre-Submission LPP2 Plan in order to reflect that the factual update to the net yield (24 dwellings) for this allocation.²⁶

45.6 RED COURT, SCOTLAND LANE, HASLEMERE (DS06)

Support

- There was support from the site promoter with suggestion of a minor boundary change as well as reference to promotion of a larger site in a new Policy. There was some local support including those suggesting it was more appropriate than the Royal School site which others have suggested as an alternative.

Suggestions

- To provide a Site-Specific Development Brief

Concern/Objection

- The sustainability appraisal process
- Contrary to the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan
- Exacerbate existing water supply issues
- Impact on AGLV/candidate AONB
- Impact on ecological value/biodiversity
- Impacts on highways and inadequacy of local roads

²⁶ For more information see 'Annexe 1 -Addendum to the LPP2 Pre-Submission Plan'

- The location of the site outside the settlement boundary
- An available alternative brownfield sites and likely increases in windfall sites
- Contrary to the declaration of a climate change emergency
- Inadequate infrastructure (water supply and drainage network capacity)
- Proximity to listed buildings (Historic England)
- Proximity to the South Downs National Park
- Noise and light pollution impacts including on Dark Skies
- Contrary to national and local policies
- Contrary to significant local objection
- Premature planning application

Council Response: Since the consultation on the Pre-Submission version of LPP2, an application for residential development on the land at Red Court (WA/2020/2013) has been refused. The refusal of the planning permission included the grounds that the proposal would result in harm to the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside and fail to respect the landscape character of the Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). The proposal was also considered to harm the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Accordingly, the proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies RE1 (Countryside beyond the Green Belt) and RE3 (Landscape Character) of the Local Plan Part 1 (2018), along with guidance contained in the NPPF. Since the consultation, two previously developed sites: the Royal School and the Old Grove, High Pitfold have been promoted for housing development in LPP2. It is considered that appropriately designed redevelopment of these well screened sites that respects the character of the AONB, would be more in line with the spatial strategy in LPP1 than the development of Red Court, where it is considered that the development of this greenfield site would result in harm to the countryside and the AGLV that the site lies within as well as to the setting of the AONB. Accordingly, a main modification will be made to the Plan through the Addendum to the Pre-Submission LPP2 Plan in order to reflect the removal of this site²⁷.

45.7 FAIRGROUND CAR PARK, WEY HILL, HASLEMERE (DS07)

Support

- From water utility providers, insofar as there were no water/wastewater infrastructure capability issues identified.
- From local community organisations as the site is brownfield land and aligns with the emerging draft HNP.

²⁷ For more information see 'Annexe 1 -Addendum to the LPP2 Pre-Submission Plan'

- Mixed use development on the proviso that an appropriate level of car parking spaces is retained. This will help regenerate and boost the vitality of the Wey Hill area.
- Natural England support the site providing there are no likely significant effects on protected habitat sites.

Suggestions

- Natural England indicate the site will need appropriate SANG provision.

Concern/Objection

- Existing commuter and retail parking provision needs replacing before developing the site.
- The site being Common Land and that provision will be required elsewhere.
- Historic England objected to the allocation as there is no assessment of the impact on the St Christopher's Church (Grade II).

Council Response: In the Pre-Submission version of LPP2 the site was allocated for at least 55 dwellings. In light of the potential of the site as part of a mixed-use development and the need to retain existing car parking capacity, the Council consider that a yield of at least twenty dwellings is more appropriate²⁸. Accordingly, a main modification will be made to the Plan through the Addendum to the Pre-Submission LPP2 Plan in order to reflect this. The Policy will continue to require at least existing parking space capacity is retained, unless it can be demonstrated there is sufficient parking in the area or additional capacity can be provided. It is also recognised and addressed in Provision c), that the allocation is subject to the demonstration that development will not have a likely significant effect on protected habitats sites; this may include the need for mitigation and/or SANG provision. The site was deregistered and released as Common Land in 2018 and replacement land was provided to replace the released land. A factual update is required²⁹.

45.8 THE OLD GROVE, HIGH PITFOLD, HINDHEAD (DS08)

Support

- From the Surrey Hills AONB Board stating they had no concerns with the brownfield site, subject to design minimising landscape impact and possible mitigation.

Suggestions

²⁸ For more information see 'Annexe 1 -Addendum to the LPP2 Pre-Submission Plan'

²⁹ See MOD35 of the Minor Modification Schedule (DS07)

- The water and wastewater infrastructure provider suggested that the site may not be connected to the public network and would require further investigation. Sewers may not be mapped, so work would need to be undertaken by the developers to understand the points of connection and for Thames Water to assess network capacity.
- Site promotor suggested that the site could be expanded to include the whole of the Old Grove site, therefore increasing the number of dwellings and delivery of specialist care accommodation.

Concern/Objection

- Site is within or adjoins the AONB/AGLV.

Council Response: The site is already proposed for an allocation in the Pre-Submission version of LPP2 for 18 dwellings on part of the site. However, since the consultation on the Pre-Submission LPP2 was carried out, more of the site is now available which currently provides specialist residential care accommodation and a range of specialist services. The site is being promoted for 40 dwellings as a result of the proposed intensification and reconfiguration of the existing C2 accommodation. The site is within the AONB, however the redevelopment of the site which is already comprehensively covered by built form will not have a detrimental impact on the national landscape designation. This assessment is confirmed the Council's landscape consultant who has assessed the site and concluded that the overall sensitivity in landscape terms is 'Low sensitivity'. The site lies within 5km of the Wealden Heaths SPA (Phase I and II). Proposals for residential development must demonstrate that there will not be a likely significant effect on the SPA. In response to this promotion, the Council consider that a larger site area and dwelling yield, of at least 40 dwellings, is appropriate and that the new proposed yield can be delivered within the Plan period³⁰. Accordingly, a main modification will be made to the Plan through the Addendum to the Pre-Submission LPP2 Plan in order to reflect this. In addition, the redevelopment of this larger site would require main modifications to the Policy DS08 to cover:

- a) Re-provision of at least the current number of existing bed spaces (Use Class C2).
- b) Protection and enhancement of existing trees, hedgerows, and vegetation, including along the site boundary to the A3 and High Pitfold.
- c) Conservation and enhancement of the setting of nearby heritage assets (also added as a key constraint to the policy).

³⁰ For more information see 'Annexe 1 -Addendum to the LPP2 Pre-Submission Plan'

45.9 NATIONAL TRUST CAR PARK, HINDHEAD ROAD, HASLEMERE (DS09)

Support

- From water utility providers, insofar as there were no water/wastewater infrastructure capability issues identified.
- From the Surrey Hills AONB Board stating they had no concerns with the brownfield site, subject to design minimising landscape impact and possible mitigation.

Suggestion

- Natural England recommends the development considers the impact on ancient woodland.

Concern/Objection

- Site access is not suitable
- Landscape harm and the impact on the AONB
- Proximity to important habitats as the site abuts important habitats and wildlife corridors
- Historic England objected to the allocation as there is no assessment of the impact on the Grade II Listed Branksome Conference Centre (now called Jamina Ahmadiyya).

Council Response: The site is in current use as a car park and garden area with glasshouse and enclosing walls located as part of a conferencing/educational facility, Jamia Ahmadiyya UK. The car park remains in use but at a much-reduced occupancy. The site is located on a highpoint, accessed via a private access road which form part of the wider estate and is completely contained by a mature landscape framework, set within extensive largely unmanaged woodland. The majority of the site is previously developed land. The site is within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Landscape Study (2020) assess that the site has 'Low Sensitivity' to development'. It is assessed that redevelopment of the site would not be of significant impact to the landscape character of the wider area due to the site's containment. The site lies within 5km of the Wealden Heaths SPA (Phase II). Proposals for residential development must demonstrate that there will not be a likely significant effect on the SPA. A factual update is required to include a policy reference to that the site is within the setting of a listed building; this will provide clarity for proposals to consider the conservation and enhancement of the setting of heritage assets. Also, clarity on that 13 dwellings is a maximum proposed yield³¹.

³¹ For more information see 'Annexe 1 -Addendum to the LPP2 Pre-Submission Plan'

45.10 HATHERLEIGH, TOWER ROAD, HINDHEAD (DS10)Support

- From Natural England, insofar as there were no concerns about SPA mitigation

Suggestions

- Thames Water recommend the Developer and the Council liaise with them at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. The wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Local upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development.

Council Response: The site is suitable for residential intensification as there are no significant physical constraints on the site. In May 2021, the site gained planning permission (WA/2020/0171) for the erection of six dwellings following the demolition of the existing dwelling. A factual update is required to reflect this permission within the policy³².

45.11 34 KINGS ROAD, HASLEMERE (DS11)Support

- From Natural England and Thames Water, insofar as there were no concerns about (potential for) SPA mitigation and water/wastewater infrastructure capability.

Concern about

- The LAA states 5 dwellings is an acceptable yield, yet there was a planning application submitted for 1 dwelling.

Council Response: In May 2021, the site gained planning permission (WA/2020/0881) for the erection of a building to provide six flats following the demolition of the existing dwelling. A factual update is required to reflect this permission within the policy³³.

³² See MOD36 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (DS10)

³³ See MOD37 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (DS11)

46 Housing Sites in Milford and Witley

46.1 A number of comments were made regarding Land at Milford Golf Course allocated in LPP1. Other comments raised concerns about the impacts of development on highway infrastructure, on the level of housing needed generally and on the release of Green Belt sites.

46.2 LAND AT HIGHCROFT, MILFORD (DS12)

Support

- From Natural England and Thames Water, insofar as there were no concerns about (potential for) SPA mitigation and water/wastewater infrastructure capability.

Suggestion

- Seven additional dwellings are too many; the site could accommodate up to three

Concern/Objection

- Site is within WHSPA 1km and WHSAC 2km so development would be detrimental to wildlife, trees, and vegetation
- Site is within Water SPZ2 and would be difficult to avoid contamination due to building works
- Residents have rejected expansion proposals in the past and weren't notified this time by the leaseholder
- Busy road causes problems with residents accessing the village centre; a situation that would be further exacerbated by this proposed development.

Council Response: The majority of the site is within the rural settlement of Milford, a small part of the site is currently in the Green Belt. The Green Belt Site Appraisal (2020) assessed that development would have a 'limited impact' on the Green Belt. Therefore, it is proposed to make a minor amendment to the Green Belt boundary through Local Plan Part 2 so that it follows an established tree line on the southern boundary of the site. The Environment Agency did not raise any concern with this site allocation with reference to the SPZ2 and potential for contamination, no concern has been raised by Natural England regarding the site's proximity to WHSPA 1km and WHSAC 2km. The Council consider that the current proposed yield is appropriate and can be delivered within the Plan period.

46.3 LAND AT WHEELER STREET NURSERIES, WITLEY (DS13)

Support

- From water utility providers, insofar as there were no water/wastewater infrastructure capability issues identified.

Suggestion

- Natural England indicate the site will require SPA mitigation
- The trees to the north of the plot should be preserved with TPOs and all structures built to the south of this

Concern/Objection

- Historic England state that potential impacts on the adjacent Witley Conservation Area and listed buildings are not assessed.

Council Response: This site is partially previously developed land and is in an area indicated in Local Plan Part 1 as being suitable for release from the Green Belt. The Green Belt Site Appraisal (2020) assessed that development would have a 'moderate to limited impact' on the Green Belt. As a result, the site is proposed to be removed from the Green Belt through Local Plan Part 2. It is recognised and addressed Policy DS13, that the allocation is subject to the demonstration that development will not have a likely significant effect on protected habitats sites; this may include the need for mitigation and/or SANG provision. Trees, woodland, hedgerows, and landscaping development will be expected to comply with Local Plan policies including the emerging LPP2 Policy DM11. The site does lie adjacent to the Wheeler Street Conservation Area and listed buildings, which are not mentioned in the key constraints. As the development would form part of a site to the south (which is closer in proximity to the heritage assets) that has been permitted for housing, it is considered that development could be achieved without negative impacts to the heritage assets. However, the Council agree that a policy reference to the heritage key constraints provides a useful factual update and provides clarity for proposals to consider the conservation and enhancement of the setting of the adjoining heritage assets, including the Wheeler Street Conservation Area³⁴.

46.4 LAND AT SECRETTS, HURST FARM, MILFORD (DS14)Support

- From the site promoter, although they suggest that capacity should be increased, as agreed at Full Council, and that the dwelling yield should be expressed as a minimum.
- The opportunity for placemaking and creation of a better-defined village centre.

Suggestion

- Natural England indicate that the site will require SPA mitigation

³⁴ See MOD41 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (DS13)

- Local upgrades may be required to the water and wastewater networks to meet demand from the development.
- That the Council release to the public their legal advice on the approach to this site and the associated Green Belt release.
- Clarity is sought over provision of a 'new local centre' and reference to a DPD for the site should be deleted

Concern/Objection

- The allocation being contrary to LPP1
- Inconsistent approach and justification for Green Belt release
- Evidence base not being strong enough
- The lack of agreement to access proposed SANG capacity
- Traffic increase impacts and pressure on local infrastructure
- Several respondents, made detailed comments on evidence base documents, including the Sustainability Appraisal and Landscape (Visual Impact) Assessments.
- Historic England state that site area covers part of the Milford Conservation Area and includes a single listed building, and that these have not been assessed.

Council Response: This site is in the Green Belt and is not in one of the broad areas indicated in Local Plan Part 1 as being potentially suitable for release from the Green Belt. However, the Green Belt Site Appraisal Report (2020) assessed that the harm to the Green Belt for this site is judged to be 'Moderate to Limited'. This reflects the partly developed character of the site which currently compromises its physical and visual openness which will not be substantially altered by residential development, proximity to the developed edge of Milford. This appraisal also reflects the opportunity to create an outer edge to the built extent of the village in this location. As a result, of this and weighing up the merits of this site in relation to other promoted sites in Witley, the site is considered to be suitable for removal from the Green Belt and for housing development. The principle of removing land from the Green Belt to meet the housing required for Witley parish is clearly set out in LPP1. Policy RE2 of LPP1 states that the changes to the Green Belt will be made in LPP2 with the boundaries to be defined following consultation with local communities. The site has a very strong measure of community support expressed by the Parish Council. The findings of the Green Belt assessment carried out in 2020 which looked at the impact that development would have on land at a more detailed scale than the Green Belt evidence gathered for preparing LPP1 also concluded that the site could be taken forward for further consideration along with five other sites. Its location is outside the AONB or AGLV, unlike some of the sites within the broad locations identified for removal from the Green Belt in LPP1. It is also located further away from the Wealden Heaths SPA than some of the sites in

the 'asterisked' areas and has identified mitigation through the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). These important considerations provided clear and cogent reasons to proposing the site for allocation in LPP2. In response to the omitted heritage aspects of the policy, the Council have added references to the conservation area and the listed building into the policy³⁵. In addition, a minor factual update is required for the site boundary to remove the listed building located adjacent to Meadow Lane on the Portsmouth Road. This change is required to reflect that the actual site boundary and correct the boundary error³⁶. Other minor modifications are required to ensure consistency with the NPPF and other proposed allocations and grammar changes³⁷.

³⁵ See MOD42 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (DS14)

³⁶ See MOD40 and 43 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (DS14 site boundary adjustment)

³⁷ See MOD42 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (DS14)

48 Gypsy and Traveller Sites

TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE

- 48.1** A comment was received suggesting that the Plan ignores the needs of Travelling Showpeople. The evidence of need from 2010 should be referenced and the Council should work with neighbouring authorities to ensure the need is met.

Council Response: The GTAA identifies a need for 2 additional Travelling Showpeople plots during the plan period. The need arises from a single site within the Borough. Planning Officers have subsequently liaised directly with the household that was surveyed, who has confirmed that there is no longer any need for additional travelling showpeople plots.

OMITTED TRAVELLER SITES

- 48.2** One site promoted for Gypsy and Traveller pitches was not processed in the call for sites and assessed in the subsequent LAA.

Council Response: The Council were unable to assess this site as we were not aware it had been submitted as part of the Call for Sites until sometime after the Call for Sites had closed. The proposed site allocations meet the need for gypsy and traveller pitches arising from the known need as identified in the GTAA and a proportion of the unknown need. The Council has decided not to allocate this site because the other site allocations are more preferable because they are intensifications of existing gypsy and traveller pitches. This site is an extension to an existing gypsy and traveller pitches and therefore less preferable for allocation based on the sequential approach set out in Policy AHN4 of LPP1. A factual update is required to update traveller 'housing' numbers, i.e., pitches and plots, to the 1st April 2021³⁸.

HERITAGE ASSETS

- 48.3** Heritage England recommended that Gypsy and Traveller sites should be assessed for potential impacts on historic environment where appropriate

Council Response: The proposed site allocations comprise intensifications of existing Gypsy and Traveller sites and comprise modest numbers of additional pitches on each site. Consideration has been given to the historic environment. The sites with the largest number of additional pitches are not located close to any listed buildings or historic parks.

³⁸ See MOD57 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' ('housing' numbers factual update)

TOPIC PAPER

- 48.4** Figures in topic paper are four years old and need revising as they are out of date.

Council Response: The Council has based the number of pitches allocated for in LPP2 based on the evidence in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) published in 2018. As detailed in the Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations Topic Paper which accompanied the Pre-Submission version of LPP2 the Council has adjusted the number of pitches proposed for allocation to reflect the number of pitches which have been granted planning permission since the GTAA was published. The Council considers that the figures used to calculate the future need for gypsy and traveller pitches during the plan period represent the most up to date data available and recent planning permissions have been taken into account when generating the number of pitches needed during the plan period.

DISTRIBUTION OF SITES

- 48.5** The additional pitches should be distributed more evenly around Waverley.

Council Response: The Council's approach to the allocation of sites is based on the strategy set out in Policy AHN4 of LPP1. This adopts a sequential approach to the allocation of gypsy and traveller sites. When allocating sites in LPP2, the Council has prioritised the allocation of sites which are intensifications of existing gypsy and traveller sites. It just so happens that the majority of these sites are located in the western part of the Borough. Policy AHN4 does not specify that gypsy and traveller pitches should be evenly distributed across the Borough. It is also noted that since 1 April 2017 the majority of planning permissions granted for additional gypsy and traveller pitches across the Borough have been for sites in the eastern part of the Borough.

FARNHAM SITES

- 48.6** Allocation of sites seems to be inappropriate and includes the expansion of an existing site that is in within even the reduced Aldershot and Farnham Strategic gap which contravenes policy and should be removed.

Council Response: The allocation of Gypsy and Traveller sites follows the sequential approach established in Policy AHN4 of LPP1. Some of the site allocations are within the Farnham and Aldershot Strategic Gap and comprise intensifications of existing Gypsy and Traveller sites.

- 48.7** **BURNT HILL, PLAISTOW ROAD, DUNSFOLD (DS15)**

Support

- From water utility providers, insofar as there were no water/wastewater infrastructure capability issues identified.
- No objections from the Surrey Hills AONB.

Suggestions

- Natural England recommend that the development considers the impact on the adjacent woodland, as per Para 175 of the NPPF. They also indicated that the site could impact Chiddingfold Forest SSSI, and therefore there must be a demonstration that there will be no adverse impact as part of the assessment process.

Concern/Objection

- Occupiers have undertaken unlawful development and therefore this allocation should be removed.

Council Response: Amended wording is proposed in DS15, to incorporate the recommendations of Natural England in respect of impact on ancient woodland and SSSI³⁹. When allocating sites in the development plan for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation consideration is given as to whether a site can meet the identified need for additional pitches rather than any historic unlawful development.

48.8 LAND WEST OF KNOWLE LANE, CRANLEIGH (DS16)Support

- From Natural England and Thames Water, insofar as there were no concerns about (potential for) SPA mitigation and water/wastewater infrastructure capability.
- For the dwelling capacity to be no more than 2 pitches, given the sites isolated, rural location.

48.9 MONKTON FARM, MONKTON LAND, FARNHAM (DS17)Support

- From water utility providers, insofar as there were no water/wastewater infrastructure capability issues identified.

Suggestions

- Natural England, RSPB, and others indicated that the site is within 400m 5km of the TBHSPA and will need therefore need mitigation. Natural

³⁹ See MOD46 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (DS15)

England recommended that stronger wording regarding mitigation was required e.g., for SANG/SAMM contributions.

Council Response: A mitigation strategy is proposed by way of SANG and SAMM as per amended wording⁴⁰.

48.10 SOUTH OF KILN HALL, ST GEORGE'S ROAD, BADSHOT LEA (DS18)

Support

- From water utility providers, insofar as there were no water/wastewater infrastructure capability issues identified.

Suggestions

- Natural England, RSPB, and others indicated that the site is within the 400 metre – 5km buffer zone of the TBHSPA and will need therefore need mitigation. Natural England recommended that stronger wording regarding mitigation was required e.g., for SANG/SAMM contributions.
- As an alternative to this site, include pitches on the south side of A31 west of Coxbridge roundabout.
- Historic England recommended that Gypsy and Traveller sites should be assessed for potential impacts on historic environment where appropriate

Concern/Objection

- Undermines DM18 (Farnham/Aldershot Strategic Gap) and many others listed under key constraints

Council Response: A mitigation strategy is proposed by way of SANG and SAMM as per amended wording⁴¹. Whilst the site lies within the Strategic Gap, the site is an existing Gypsy and Traveller pitch, and the proposals are to intensify the use of the site. A factual update is required to include a policy reference to the site being in proximity of a heritage asset⁴².

48.11 LAND OFF BADSHOT LEA ROAD, BADSHOT LEA, FARNHAM (DS19)

Support

- From water utility providers, insofar as there were no water/wastewater infrastructure capability issues identified.

Suggestions

- Natural England, RSPB, and others indicated that the site is within the 400 metres – 5km buffer zone of the TBHSPA and will need therefore need

⁴⁰ See MOD47 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (DS17)

⁴¹ See MOD48 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (DS18 – SPA mitigation)

⁴² See MOD49 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (DS18 – heritage asset)

mitigation. Natural England recommended that stronger wording regarding mitigation was required e.g., for SANG/SAMM contributions.

Concern/Objection

- The site is unavailable for extension and would undermine the comprehensive development of the wider mixed-use proposal. The landowner is bound by two legal agreements to incorporate the land into wider development proposals.

Council Response: A mitigation strategy is proposed by way of SANG and SAMM as per amended wording⁴³. The red line boundary of the wider mixed-use proposal excludes the majority of the proposed site allocation. This would not preclude the development of the site to provide additional Gypsy and Traveller pitches. The proposed mixed-use development is not a site allocation in either LPP1 or LPP2 and there is currently no indication planning permission will be granted in the short term.

48.12 OLD STONE YARD, TONGHAM ROAD, RUNFOLD (DS20)

Support

- From water utility providers, insofar as there were no water/wastewater infrastructure capability issues identified.

Suggestions

- Natural England, RSPB, and others indicated that the site is within the 400 metres – 5km buffer zone of the TBHSPA and will need therefore need mitigation. Natural England recommended that stronger wording regarding mitigation was required e.g., for SANG/SAMM contributions.

Council Response: A mitigation strategy is proposed by way of SANG and SAMM as per amended wording⁴⁴.

⁴³ See MOD50 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (DS19)

⁴⁴ See MOD51 in 'Annexe 2 - Minor Modifications Schedule' (DS20)

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

49 Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

URBANISATION AND RECREATIONAL DISTURBANCE ON THE WHSPA

- 49.1 Several respondents disagreed with the LPP2's HRA assessment on the effect of urbanisation and recreational disturbance on the Wealden Heaths Special Protection Area, claiming there was no evidence to justify the Council's approach. Respondents, including the RSPB, consider that all new residential development is likely to have an effect on the SPA and therefore should provide or contribute to avoidance measures.

Council Response: LPP2 allocates only two sites (DS02 and DS03) at which development is expected to come forward within 400m of Wealden Heaths Phase 2 SPA. Natural England has confirmed that DS02 is in the Hindhead Concept Statement Area and that up to 100 dwellings could be within 400m of the SPA in this area in accordance with the Hindhead Avoidance Strategy (2011) and its bespoke mitigation requirements. Natural England has also confirmed that provided DS03 is a high dependency care home mitigation would not be needed as residents would be unable to recreate on the SPA. There are no sites allocated within 400m of Wealden Heaths Phase 1 or Thames Basin Heaths.

The need or otherwise for a strategic (i.e., applicable to all net new residential dwellings) approach to recreational pressure around Wealden Heaths Phase 1 and Phase 2 SPAs was debated at length during the Examinations for the Waverley Local Plan Part 1, the East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy and East Hampshire Local Plan Part 2 and the Inspectors in all three cases determined that such an approach was not required. Natural England has affirmed in discussions over the LPP2 HRA that they do not consider development pressure around either Phase 1 or Phase 2 of the Wealden Heaths SPA to require every net new dwelling to be mitigated. As set out in the court ruling in *R (Hart District Council) v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government* [2008], the competent authority (Waverley District Council) is obliged to give 'considerable weight' to Natural England's opinion on HRA matters.

While some parcels of the Wealden Heaths Phase 2 SPA have more existing housing within 5km than others, when each SPA is looked at as a whole there is a very clear difference in pressure between Wealden Heaths and Thames Basin Heaths. There are approximately 300,000 existing dwellings within 5km of the

Thames Basin Heaths SPA, compared to c. 31,000 within 5km of each of the Wealden Heaths Phase 1 SPA and Phase 2 SPA, and Thames Basin Heaths SPA is much more fragmented and thus more vulnerable to edge effects. Even adjusting for the larger overall size of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, the density of houses per hectare of SPA is more than twice what one finds at Wealden Heaths Phase 1 or Phase 2.

Moreover, for Wealden Heaths Phase 1 in particular the main settlements are a long way from the SPA, whereas at the Thames Basin Heaths very large settlements such as Woking, Guildford, Bracknell, Aldershot, and Farnborough all lie within 2km of the SPA and are often adjacent to it. Finally, for a number of Thames Basin Heaths SPA authorities (such as Surrey Heath and Rushmoor) there are few other areas of natural greenspace available for recreation, which is not the case around either part of the Wealden Heaths. Most importantly, the scale of planned development is an order of magnitude lower around Wealden Heaths than it is around Thames Basin Heaths.

TRAFFIC AND AIR QUALITY MODELLING (NEW GUIDANCE NOTE)

- 49.2** There have been substantial changes in air pollution policy since LPP1 was adopted. Natural England recommended that the Council provide an updated review of these issues as a result of these changes. Natural England broadly agree and support the HRA but need further justification regarding potential likely significant effects of air pollution upon the integrity of TBH and SPAs - in particular, the in-combination assessment. They agreed with the Council's conclusion that an in-combination effect is unlikely. However, they seek further justification and demonstration of the process as set out in the Natural England Guidance note.

Council Response: The Council commissioned some additional work in the Habitats Regulations Assessment to assess the impact of the development on the proposed allocated sites on the air quality of the SPAs and SSIs. The findings are that a direct adverse effect due to NO_x, ammonia or acid deposition is not expected to arise due to growth 'in combination' and certainly not due to LPP2. However, the technical report does make some recommendations with regard to some air quality improvement measures relating to electric vehicle charging, public transport, some of which could be delivered through the implementation of policies in LPP1.

50 Sustainability Appraisal

- 50.1** In general terms, quite a sizeable proportion of responses were made raising concern that the SA had not adequately considered reasonable alternatives on critical matters related to the delivery of housing sites and their associated

effects. Many of the critical matters raised were directly related to the Local Plan's approach taken in the Borough's spatial and housing strategies.

Council Response: As noted in the SA, an assessment of reasonable alternative spatial strategies was undertaken as part of consideration of LPP1. LPP1 has now been adopted, and the SA of LPP2 does not revisit the assessment of these alternatives. The alternatives considered in LPP2 focus on the consideration of the sites for potential allocation, including Gypsy and Traveller sites.

Climate Change Mitigation Objectives (SA methodology)

- 50.2** It was suggested that higher, more aspirational, site assessment scores for more sustainable forms of development would be helpful. Developments that only meet the minimum sustainability requirements (i.e., Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes) should receive the lowest SA score of 'major adverse effects' (- - -) for the objective of promoting climate change mitigation.

Council Response: In order to ensure robustness and fairness all sites were subject to consistent consideration against a series of sustainability Objectives using a high-level desktop-based approach. This approach did not consider the potential for applying Code for Sustainable Homes (or any equivalent / similar code) on an individual site as it is considered this would be best addressed via DM Policies. The supporting text to Policy DM2 Energy Efficiency notes Code for Sustainable Homes and notes that all development should seek to maximise energy efficiency and reduce carbon emissions through its design etc. Policy DM2 was considered within the SA and it was considered that implementation of this Policy would have major beneficial effects across six sustainability Objectives, including in relation to reducing carbon emissions and promoting climate change mitigation and resilience. See Table 9-3 of the SA Report for further details.

Climate Emergency (SA methodology)

- 50.3** It was suggested that Objectives 3 and 4 in the SA, under underplayed the requirement for urgent action following the declaration of a climate emergency.

Council Response: In September 2019, councillors within Waverley Borough voted to adopt the Climate Emergency motion, which sets out the council's aim to become carbon-neutral by 2030. To reach this, an action plan and strategy were adopted by Full Council in mid-December 2020. The SA document for Regulation 19 consultation was produced prior to this adoption in November 2020, but nonetheless noted that a small number of additional Policies have been added to address specific issues which have come to the fore in the intervening period – notably the declaration of a climate emergency by WBC. As a result, the main change to the draft LPP2 is the addition of a specific policy requiring a level of energy efficiency above that currently required by the Building Regulations, alongside a policy relating to water supply and

wastewater infrastructure. WBC consider that this is consistent with the overarching policies in LPP1. In addition, a paragraph has been added in the supporting text to Policy DM1: Environmental Implications of Development to acknowledge the Council's climate change emergency declaration. Policy DM1 has been updated to include reference to minimising damage to the environment caused by greenhouse gases and to avoiding negative impacts on biodiversity and delivering biodiversity net gain. Policy DM7 now requires new development to make appropriate provision of electric vehicle charging points in line with Surrey County Council Parking Guidance and any subsequent guidance. In light of the additional Policy measures to recognise the climate emergency and in order to ensure consistency with sites previously assessed through the SA process (for example at Reg. 18) , it was considered not necessary to update the SA Objectives to reflect as it was considered that any issues arising at a site would be addressed through Policy.

Waverley Borough Council
The Burys,
Godalming,
Surrey,
GU7 1HR

Tel: 01483 523 000

For more information visit:
www.waverley.gov.uk/

The logo for Waverley Borough Council features a large, dark blue, rounded shape on the right side of the page. A smaller, light teal circle overlaps the top-left corner of this shape. The word "Waverley" is written in a white, cursive script font across the middle of the dark blue shape. Below it, the words "BOROUGH COUNCIL" are written in a white, uppercase, sans-serif font. A white curved line underlines the word "Waverley".

Waverley
BOROUGH COUNCIL