STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND
 REGARDING THE EMERGING TANDRIDGE LOCAL PLAN

We are a group of parish councils and residents’ groups, (“Parties”) who wish to express our united opposition to the emerging Tandridge Local Plan (the Plan), the plans for development across the Tandridge District and the proposed Garden Community. The Parties would like to present a collective challenge to the Plan for the following reasons. The parties believe that:

- the Plan is deeply flawed and it fails many or all of the Government’s tests of soundness. It is not positively prepared; it is not justified; it is not effective; and it is not consistent with national policy.

- Tandridge District Council (“the Council”) has failed to maximise development in urban areas within Tandridge District, either with the number of sites selected or the densities proposed, nor has it maximised the full potential of brownfield land.

- there is no need for a Garden Community and the Council’s spatial strategy is both wrong and unjustified, as its own Sustainability Appraisal shows. A new Garden Community will unnecessarily destroy hundreds of acres of high-quality Green Belt land.

- the Council has failed to provide adequate justification for a large new settlement such as the proposed Garden Community at South Godstone.

- the Council has failed totally to demonstrate the ‘Exceptional Circumstances’ required to justify removing over 1000 acres of virgin land from the Green Belt.

- South Godstone is a highly unsuitable location for a new settlement of 4000 homes. The existing east-west rail line, which has very little patronage and does not even provide a direct service to London, does not make this scheme sustainable.

- the jobs claimed to come to the Garden Community are highly unlikely to materialise, making this simply a dormitory town with high levels of out-commuting. It will not be self-sustaining or sustainable.

- the Council’s own figures show that viability of the Garden Community is marginal at best. The scheme will not deliver the required level of affordable housing, nor potentially all the required infrastructure. Any increases in the cost of infrastructure will directly impact on viability and tip this over the edge, reducing the desired margins for the developers and thereby threatening the numbers of affordable housing and smaller homes.

- the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IPD), which is central to all this, is inadequate and unreliable. Major items of infrastructure are either un-costed or the costs keep changing, meaning this document lacks any credibility.

- there is no evidence that Jn 6 of the M25 can be upgraded in the timeframe required for delivery of the 1,400 homes proposed at South Godstone in the plan period. Therefore, the Plan is not deliverable. These 1,400 homes are part of the 4,000 houses overall designated for the proposed South Godstone Garden Community.

- the railway line serving South Godstone is a largely unused east/west shuttle, with no direct service to London. A direct service cannot be reinstated and commuters from South Godstone
will drive to stations on the East Grinstead line, one of the busiest in the country, where limited parking is available.

- it would be totally inappropriate to leave matters such as as the determination of ‘Exceptional Circumstances’ to a later Area Action Plan (AAP).

- crucially, there is little or no local support for a Garden Community. Analysis of various consultation results clearly shows large scale opposition to these plans, feedback that has been routinely ignored by the Council.

- the expected huge amount of additional traffic generated by the Garden Community will potentially push already high levels of air pollution beyond Government guidelines.

- TDC have not demonstrated any suitable mitigation for the increased traffic that will choke the smaller villages surrounding the Garden Community.

- indiscriminate development around Tier 1 and 2 settlements is proposed, despite evidence from Parish Council Housing Needs Surveys that this is not required.

For all these reasons, amid many others, the Parties agree that the Plan should be found to be unsound and should not therefore be adopted.

This SoCG does not alter the status of any individual Party’s other representations, which each remain valid in full. Nothing in this statement shall be construed as creating a partnership of any kind between the Parties or as appointing either Party as representative for any one or all the Parties, all Parties remain independent of the others and any other representations made are made individually.

**SIGNATORIES:**
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed by Lisa Siggery, Chairman, Crowhurst Parish Council</th>
<th>Signed by Mary Stuart-Menteth for Godstone Preservation Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<tr>
<td>Signed by Alex Rabbetts for Godstone Village Association</td>
<td>Signed by Andy Janaway, Vice Chairman, for and on behalf of South Godstone Residents’ Association</td>
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<tr>
<td>Signed by David Hughes for Tandridge Lane Action Group</td>
<td>Signed by Ivor Stamp, Chairman, Tandridge Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Signed by Vivien Hepworth, Chairman, Lingfield Parish Council