ITEM 1. OVERVIEW OF CURRENT STATUS OF THE LINGFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

LL: Lingfield Neighbourhood Plan (LNP) has re-started having stalled. A rough pre submission draft has been prepared and a few policies need tweaking. Consultant Jon Dowty of O'Neill Homer has given us a work schedule of what remains to be done. We have not yet worked out a timeline but have a critical meeting July 2 to progress work.

ST: It would be useful to have a timeline.

ITEM 2: TANDRIDGE LOCAL PLAN AND LINGFIELD SITE

CH: The site (HSG12 formerly LIN 030) chosen for Lingfield was not in the Draft Local Plan published in 2016. In view of this, may we put forward other sites in lieu and would any alternatives be considered to be in addition to LIN 030?

ST: Only in addition to. (When pushed further ST agreed that we could identify those sites for the future e.g. 6-12 years).

CH: Can we have a discussion and challenge this?

ST: Only by representation during the consultation period 16 July - 28 August. (Basically, we are stuck with LIN 030 unless there is enough opposition).

CH: How did you arrive at that site since it was not part of the original consultation (on the draft Local Plan 2016)?
ST: Through the HEELA process which applied to all sites. Following that we also made a landscape assessment which ruled out all the other sites in Lingfield.

(ST agrees here that HSG12/LIN 030 was not part of the original consultation and repeats that the July period "is the opportunity to consult")

CH: Why did LIN 030 suddenly appear?

ST: TDG get new information and sites all the time, so they assess them.

CH: Could this be changed?

ST: No, as TDC have come so far and it would take time (completely at odds with previous point).

CH: What about alternatives?

ST: Where are the alternative sites?

(ST is handed copy of the LNP Community Engagement 2016 with sites showing that LIN 030 was least preferred of the sites published in the HEELA docs. The other sites were LIN 05, LIN 20, LIN 33. A short discussion ensures about Lingfield House and the Garth where the owner is in the process of evicting a squatter.

AW: Why did the same consultant who ruled out LIN 030 rule it back in - and rule out sites originally approved?

ST: Evidence shows that the sites which were [later] ruled out were not suitable as they were [for example] 'rich in landscape' and other things. The change was also due to additional land being submitted (that of Lord Lingfield).

AW: Where is the road access?

ST: It is not a requirement of the Local Plan to give details of the planning application. Strategic Assessment suggests that Town Hill access would not be detrimental. (There was a general protest at this assessment of Town Hill as suitable. ST later went on to suggest that if a site is reliant on the road network
and this could be considered a "severe" risk in the NPPF - i.e. a number of people have to die on a modelled survey - the access could be challenged in court as part of the challenge to the planning application.

CH: Why can we not have a new meeting now to discuss the sites?

ST: We can't wait for the Neighbourhood Plans to be finished forever. If every NP wanted to make changes it could be another year's worth of work. Even if we had had that discussion, we might not have agreed.

CH: Basically you are riding roughshod over local communities.

BS: The big problem is that the site was ruled out.

LL: The LNP was looking at the Amber Sites (in the 2016 consultation some sites that were considered 'deliverable & developable' were coloured amber).

ST: You did not come forward at this stage. We have always co-operated.

CH: We had no reason to talk to you because the sites we were considering were Amber. Why did you not come to us (to notify the change of LIN 030 to Amber)?

ST: The change was recent - one or two months ago.

CH: We also want a 'recent' change in that case and a reconsideration by TDC. The alternative sites we would suggest were ones marked Amber on the website, so we did not suggest them as they were already known and being considered.

ST: TDC would have considered the sites and assessments if the LNP had been in place but the Local Plan can trump the LNP - and Tandridge could still have put forward the new site.

(ST when pushed admits "There should have been a discussion as it was a new site").
**AW:** In any other case of a Neighbourhood Plan in the District have other sites been ruled out and then put back in this way, or is LIN 030 unique in this respect?

**ST:** No other sites were ruled out then overturned.

---

**ITEM 3:**

**POSSIBLE CHANGES TO THE NPPF IN RELATION TO THE GREEN BELT RELEASE**

**ST:** The new NPPF is due end July. Draft suggests that NPs could release Green Belt after the Local Plan has given general consent for broad locations for this potential release. There would have to be Very Special Circumstances as for example the Marriott Lingfield which was allowed due to the importance of the racecourse. The LNP can generate policies that ensure Very Special Circumstances are taken into consideration however these must be in conformity with the Local Plan (LP).

**CH:** Will the revised NPPF make a difference to the powers of the NP?

**ST:** It is likely that that the NP would be able to specify which Green Belt could be released if they identified a strategic site.

**CH:** Does that mean we can refuse a site?

**ST:** No.

---

FOLLOWING the above we departed from the Agenda for a general discussion of the forthcoming NPPF, site identification and the Garden Village plus some other matters including Listed buildings in Lingfield where LL pointed out a
number of Buildings of Character were omitted from TDC's list and ST replied they would need to be assessed on a case by case with no certainty they will be included.