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Issue: Are the proposed employment land allocations justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

September 2019
Notes:

1. The term ‘The Council’ or the abbreviation ‘TDC’ is used as shorthand for Tandridge District Council
2. The abbreviation LP is used for the submitted ‘Our Local Plan 2033’ (MD1)
3. All quotations are distinguished in italics and referenced in brackets
4. All references are to published LP evidence documents and the 2012 NPPF and associated 2014 PPG unless otherwise stated
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7.1 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.1.1 Some are. These are those proposed modifications initially set out in the submission Examination Library Document MD16 - 2019 and then reproduced in Part 1 Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications (Submitted January 2019) of Examination Document TED01 (prepared as part of the Council’s response to the Inspector’s initial questions (ID 2 and 3).

7.1.2 The Council’s view is that the remaining proposed modifications to SES01 do not go to the soundness of the Plan (these are proposed other or minor modifications identified through tracked changes in Examination Library Document MD1 - the Publication ‘Our Local Plan:2033’). The modifications are only suggested for the benefit of clarity / consistency with the wider plan and to assist in the interpretation of the policy. The intent and use of the policy is not altered by these modifications.
7.2 Are the requirements for financial contributions as set out under Infrastructure consistent with national policy for planning obligations and conditions as set out in the Framework, and are they justified?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.2.1 Yes, the Council considers the infrastructure requirements as set out in the policy to be reasonable and related in scale and kind to potential developments on the site, based on geographical proximity and the known infrastructure provision in the immediate vicinity of the site.
7.3 To be effective and to be consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 24 of the Framework, should the Policy be clear as to whether Use Class B1 (Offices) or other main town centre uses would be acceptable within the identified site boundary?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Question

7.3.1 The NPPF (Para.24) sets out a sequential approach that local planning authorities should apply to retail and other main town centre uses. This is applied locally and detailed within Policy TLP26 of the Local Plan. The approach for proposals for main town centre uses in the NPPF (para.24) is as follows:

“… They should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres, then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre location sites be considered.”

A definition of main town centre uses is contained in the glossary of the NPPF and it includes a list of retail, leisure and employment uses. Offices are included in this definition.

7.3.2 The Local Plan approach is to support the delivery of at least 15.3ha of B-class employment space and associated sui-generis uses with priority given to Use Class B1 (Offices) to be focused towards town centres, as far as is practicably possible (LP Policy TLP01). This approach is consistent with NPPF Para.24 and LP Policy TLP26, as the sequential test directs main town centre uses, such as B1 (Offices), to town centres before being located to edge of centre and out of centre locations. However, the LP policies do allow for the possibility of offices locating in the allocated employment sites. This is necessary as office opportunities in town centre are quite limited and land / buildings there are likely to be subject to competing, higher value residential use pressures for the foreseeable future.

7.3.3 In the particular case of SES01; the allocation is a strategic employment site already used as an office park. It offers large, high quality office units well provided with car parking. The site is not located within or on the edge of an existing town centre boundary. The location is not suitable for town centre uses other than B1 (Offices)

Document Reference TED11:
Tandridge District Council Hearing Statement Matter 7
due to the existing use and activity on-site and its limited accessibility by public transport. As this is a key strategic employment site, its employment uses should be protected and development for alternative town centre (or residential) uses would be resisted under the NPPF and the LP policies referred to above (ECRT4, Page 14, Para. 1.40).

7.3.4 Should the Inspector feel that clarification of this point is needed, the Council would consider additional / alternative wording to be included as a Minor or Other Modification to the Local Plan on adoption. Such a modification would be for the purposes of clarification and would not go to the soundness of the plan.

Evidence (for Qs7.1-3)

ECRT4 – Tandridge Economic Needs Assessment Update 2017
MD1 – Our Local Plan 2033 Submission 2019
MD16 – Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications 2019
TED01 – Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications (May 2019)

Supporting Papers

None
SES02: Hobbs Industrial Estate, Felbridge

7.4 What are the exceptional circumstances for the release of the site from the Green Belt?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Questions

7.4.1 The Council considers that there are site related exceptional circumstances that warrant release of this site from the Green Belt (GB1 and GB2). There are also strategic, development need, exceptional circumstances, as detailed in responses to Matter 2 questions (where they touch on employment land provision levels).

7.4.2 The Council’s conclusions in relation to this site’s performance against the four key Green Belt purposes are set out within the Green Belt Assessment but are summarised within GB2 (see note to Matter 4 responses covering the Council’s approach to Green Belt Purpose 5 – regeneration). In essence, it has been identified that this site does not serve any of the Green Belt purposes.

7.4.3 This is because the area to be excluded from Green Belt comprises previously developed land, containing notable levels of built form at the south-western end of the site. There are large buildings, hardstanding and outdoor storage and a small cluster at the north-eastern end (GB5). Furthermore, planning permission has been previously granted for further development on currently open areas of the site. These include an extant permission on undeveloped grassed land within the site for the erection of a building of 2345 sq.m for purposes falling within Class B8. The most recent application for this proposal was granted permission under reference TA/2010/807. It has since been the subject of a Certificate of Lawfulness for Existing Use and Development (TA/2017/1778) confirming its lawful implementation; as such the planning permission remains extant and lawful. More recently permission has been granted on another part of the site, comprising an open, grassed area, for the construction of hardstanding, the erection of 2.4m high palisade fencing and the use of this land for storage purposes (limited to a max of 5m in height) (TA/2017/687).

7.4.4 Furthermore, the site is one of only three large, well-performing, business / industrial sites with good access to the strategic road network. It forms part of the main reservoir of employment generating land capacity in the District (ECRT4).
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7.4.5 Together these factors are considered to represent the exceptional circumstances needed to justify the release of this site from the Green Belt.

7.4.6 It is relevant to note that in former national planning guidance (PPG2 Annex C) a site of this kind could be treated as a *major developed site in the Green Belt* and this would have allowed scope for quite significant new development / redevelopment. Under the NPPF this approach is no longer specified at national level, so a local policy response has to be considered. Removal of the site from Green Belt is therefore necessary to support continued employment generating land provision in an established location.
7.5 Is the proposed Green Belt boundary justified and consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 85 of the Framework?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Questions

7.5.1 Yes. The Council considers that the Green Belt boundary is justified. The Green Belt boundaries largely comprise existing site boundary treatment in the form of fencing. This is partially bounded by Ancient Woodland, with a public footpath along the southern boundary. It is considered that the Green Belt boundaries are readily recognisable and reasonably permanent and the Council considers that as general site boundaries they have been successful in containing development pressures to date.
7.6 To be effective and to be consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 24 of the Framework, should the Policy be clear as to whether Use Class B1 (Offices) or other main town centre uses would be acceptable within the identified site boundary?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.6.1 See response to Q.7.3. Similar principles apply.

7.6.2 SES02 is an existing strategic employment site that contains a mix of business / employment premises predominantly of a ‘shed’ / industrial nature. Uses include airport and car parking, scaffolding, waste crane operations and workshops. The site is not located within or on the edge of an existing town centre boundary. The location is not suitable for town centre uses other than B1 (Offices) due to the existing use and activity on-site and its limited accessibility by public transport. As this is a key strategic employment site, its employment uses should be protected and development for alternative town centre (or residential) uses would be resisted under the NPPF and the LP policies referred to in Qs 7.3.1 – 7.3.4 above (ECRT4, Page 14, Para. 1.40).
7.7 Are the requirements for financial contributions as set out under Infrastructure consistent with national policy for planning obligations and conditions as set out in the Framework and are they justified?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.7.1 See response to Q7.2. Similar principles apply.
7.8 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.8.1 No. The Council’s view is that the proposed modifications to SES02 do not go to the soundness of the Plan (these are proposed other or minor modifications identified through tracked changes in Examination Library Document MD1 - the Publication ‘Our Local Plan:2033’). The modifications are only suggested for the benefit of clarity / consistency with the wider plan and to assist in the interpretation of the policy. The intent and use of the policy is not altered by these modifications.

Evidence (for Qs 7.4-8)

ECRT4 – Tandridge Economic Needs Assessment Update 2017

GB1 – Green-Belt Assessment (Part-3) Exceptional Circumstances and Insetting 2018

GB2 – Green Belt Assessment (Part-3) Appendix 1 2018

GB5- Green Belt Assessment (Part-2) Appendix 2 Area for Further Investigation 2016

MD1 – Our Local Plan 2033 Submission 2019

Former national planning guidance - PPG2 Annex C

Planning application TA/2010/807 for the ‘Erection of building to be used for purposes falling within class B8 (storage and distribution) together with 12 car parking spaces and associated turning area and landscaping. Approved.
https://tdcplanningsearch.tandridge.gov.uk/Planning/Planning/Planning?reference=2010-807

Certificate of Lawfulness for Existing Use or Development (TA/2017/1778) ‘Confirmation that the development permitted under TA/2010/807 is lawful. Lawful.
https://tdcplanningsearch.tandridge.gov.uk/Planning/Planning/Planning?reference=2017-1778

Planning application TA/2017/687 for the ‘Change of use of land for open storage.’ Approved.
https://tdcplanningsearch.tandridge.gov.uk/Planning/Planning/Planning?reference=2017-687
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Supporting Papers

None
SES03: Lambs Business Park, South Godstone

7.9 What are the exceptional circumstances for the release of the site from the Green Belt?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Questions

7.9.1 The Council considers that there are site related exceptional circumstances that warrant release of this site from the Green Belt (GB1 and GB2). There are also strategic, development need, exceptional circumstances, as detailed in responses to Matter 2 questions (where they touch on employment land provision levels).

7.9.2 The Council’s conclusions in relation to this site’s performance against the four key Green Belt purposes are set out within the Green Belt Assessment but are summarised within GB2 (see note to Matter 4 responses covering the Council’s approach to Green Belt Purpose 5 – regeneration). In essence, it has been identified that this site does not serve any of the Green Belt purposes.

7.9.3 This is because the area to be excluded from Green Belt comprises previously developed land, with the eastern section of the site predominantly developed. This part of the site contains buildings used for commercial purposes and ranging in age, size and style, as well as hardstanding. Land to the west of the site contains soft landscaped and quarried areas (GB5).

7.9.4 Furthermore, the site is one of only three large, well-performing, business / industrial sites with good access to the strategic road network. It forms part of the main reservoir of employment generating land capacity in the District (ECRT4). This site is particularly well located in relation to the Garden Community proposal (SGGC) and designation of this site for employment and exclusion from Green Belt can support that development. In addition, the site promoter is proposing a Green Technology Park development. This represents a significant opportunity for higher-value, higher density and higher-skills based employment, making a major contribution to meeting employment needs and achieving the Council’s economic development aspirations. In itself this development proposal could be taken as an exceptional circumstance.
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7.9.5 Together these factors are considered to represent the exceptional circumstances needed to justify the release of this site from the Green Belt.

7.9.6 It is relevant to note that in former national planning guidance (PPG2 Annex C) a site of this kind could be treated as a major developed site in the Green Belt and this would have allowed scope for quite significant new development / redevelopment. Under the NPPF this approach is no longer specified at national level, so a local policy response has to be considered. Removal of the site from Green Belt is therefore necessary to achieve the planning objectives noted above.
7.10 Is the proposed Green Belt boundary justified and consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 85 of the Framework?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Questions

7.10.1 Yes. The Council considers that the Green Belt boundary is justified. The Green Belt boundaries comprise the railway line along the northern side of the site, whilst for the remainder of the site it comprises the site’s boundaries, which are predominantly treelined, with the western boundary defined by a line of trees located on an embanked area. It is considered that the Green Belt boundaries are readily recognisable and reasonably permanent and the Council considers that they have been successful in containing development pressures to date.
7.11 To be effective and to be consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 24 of the Framework, should the Policy be clear as to whether Use Class B1 (Offices) or other main town centre uses would be acceptable within the identified site boundary?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Question

7.11.1 See response to Q7.3. Similar principles apply.

7.11.2 SES03 is an existing strategic employment site that comprises an existing business park which offers a range of units of medium size and also a former claypit. The site is not located within or on the edge of an existing town centre boundary. The location is not suitable for town centre uses other than B1 (Offices) due to the existing use and activity on-site and its limited accessibility by public transport. As this is a key strategic employment site, its employment uses should be protected and development for alternative town centre (or residential) uses would be resisted under the NPPF and the LP policies referred to in the response to Qs 7.3.1 – 7.3.4 above (ECRT4, Page 14, Para. 1.40).
7.12 Are the requirements for financial contributions as set out under Infrastructure consistent with national policy for planning obligations and conditions as set out in the Framework, and are they justified?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.12.1 See response to Q7.2. Similar principles apply.
7.13  Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Question

7.13.1 No. The Council’s view is that the proposed modifications to SES03 do not go to the soundness of the Plan (these are proposed other or minor modifications identified through tracked changes in Examination Library Document MD1 - the Publication ‘Our Local Plan:2033’). The modifications are only suggested for the benefit of clarity / consistency with the wider plan and to assist in the interpretation of the policy. The intent and use of the policy is not altered by these modifications.

Evidence (for Qs 7.9-13)

ECRT4 – Tandridge Economic Needs Assessment Update 2017
GB1 – Green-Belt Assessment (Part-3) Exceptional Circumstances and Insetting 2018
GB2 – Green Belt Assessment (Part-3) Appendix 1 2018
GB5- Green Belt Assessment (Part-2) Appendix 2 Area for Further Investigation 2016
MD1 – Our Local Plan 2033 Submission 2019
Former national planning guidance - PPG2 Annex C

Supporting Papers

None
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What are the exceptional circumstances for the release of the site from the Green Belt?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Questions

The Council considers that there are site related exceptional circumstances that warrant release of this site from the Green Belt (GB1 and GB2). There are also strategic, development need, exceptional circumstances, as detailed in responses to Matter 2 questions (where they touch on employment land provision levels).

The Council’s conclusions in relation to this site’s performance against the four key Green Belt purposes are set out within the Green Belt Assessment but are summarised within GB2 (see note to Matter 4 responses covering the Council’s approach to Green Belt Purpose 5 – regeneration). In essence, it has been identified that this site does not serve any of the Green Belt purposes.

This is because the area to be excluded from Green Belt comprises previously developed land, containing notable levels of development. There are considerable numbers of buildings, which are substantial in scale and are linked to widespread hardstanding and outdoor storage areas.

Furthermore, the site is one of only three large, well-performing, business / industrial sites with good access to the strategic road network. It forms part of the main reservoir of employment generating land capacity in the District (ECRT4).

Together these factors are considered to represent the exceptional circumstances needed to justify the release of this site from the Green Belt.

It is relevant to note that in former national planning guidance (PPG2 Annex C) a site of this kind could be treated as a major developed site in the Green Belt and this would have allowed scope for quite significant new development / redevelopment. Under the NPPF this approach is no longer specified at national level, so a local policy response has to be considered. Removal of the site from Green Belt is therefore necessary to support continued employment generating land provision in an established location.
7.15 Is the proposed Green Belt boundary justified and consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 85 of the Framework?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Questions

7.15.1 Yes. The Council considers that the Green Belt boundary is justified. The Green Belt boundaries comprises the former minerals and tile works site boundaries. It is considered that the Green Belt boundaries are readily recognisable on the ground and reasonably permanent.
7.16 Does the allocation constitute major development within the Surrey Hills AONB? Would the proposed allocation conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Questions

7.16.1 The Council accepts that the site falls within the designated landscape. In arriving at the allocation, the Council worked closely with the Surrey Hills AONB unit and took advice on this proposed allocation.

7.16.2 Paragraph 116 of the NPPF (2012) states that “Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that they are in the public interest.” However, it does not define ‘major development’.

7.16.3 The associated Planning Practice Guidance (PPG Reference ID: 8-005-20140306) states:

Whether a proposed development in those designated areas should be treated as major development, to which the policy in paragraph 116 of the Framework applies, will be a matter for the relevant decision taker, taking into account the proposal in question and the local context.

7.16.4 The Council is fully cognisant of the fact that this site is located within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; noting this in the site description for Policy SES04. The Council’s Landscape Capacity and Sensitivity Study (2016) (LAN17) took its siting in the AONB into account, noting that, whilst potential for mitigation would be difficult, various measures would help.

7.16.5 The Council is satisfied that, given it is a site of long-standing and the potential for mitigation as set out in the landscape evidence, development proposals could be designed such that they do not constitute major development within the AONB in terms of the NPPF policy. Evidence in the form of recent planning applications supports this view. An example of this is a recently refused application for a warehousing and distribution centre (DPD Depot) at this location (TA/2018/1792). The refusal was on Green Belt grounds alone; as the scheme was not considered, in the context of the
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existing substantially developed site, to have, major development, or generally unacceptable, AONB landscape impacts.

7.16.6 To guide the development management process the Council has included clause IV. of policy SES04. The assessment of any application will also be supported by TLP33 and other relevant policies.
7.17 To be effective and to be consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 24 of the Framework, should the Policy be clear as to whether Use Class B1 (Offices) or other main town centre uses would be acceptable within the identified site boundary?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.17.1 See response to Q7.3. Similar principles apply.

7.17.2 SES04 is a strategic employment site that is used for large scale open storage. The site is not located within or on the edge of an existing town centre boundary. The location is not suitable for town centre uses other than B1 (Offices) due to the existing use and activity on-site and its limited accessibility by public transport. As this is a key strategic employment site, its employment uses should be protected and development for alternative town centre (or residential) uses would be resisted under the NPPF and the LP policies referred to in Qs 7.3.1 – 7.3.4 above (ECRT4, Page 14, Para. 1.40).
7.18 Are the requirements for financial contributions as set out in V. consistent with national policy for planning obligations and conditions as set out in the Framework and are they justified?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.18.1 See response to Q7.2. Similar principles apply.

7.18.2 An application for a warehousing and distribution centre (DPD Depot) has previously been submitted (TA/2018/1792) at this location. This application was refused but it recognised that upgrades to the access point onto the A25 would be required, as identified in criterion V.

7.18.3 The Council’s transport modelling (INF12, INF16) indicate increased flows through the Wolfs Row junction on the A25 which will need to be mitigated for and as such the requirement at Criterion V. has been included in the policy wording and the IDP (INF1).
7.19 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Question

7.19.1 Some are. These are those proposed modifications initially set out in the submission Examination Library Document MD16 - 2019 and then reproduced in Part 1 Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications (Submitted January 2019) of Examination Document TED01 (prepared as part of the Council’s response to the Inspector's initial questions (ID 2 and 3).

7.19.2 The Council's view is that the remaining proposed modifications to SES04 do not go to the soundness of the Plan (these are proposed other or minor modifications identified through tracked changes in Examination Library Document MD1 - the Publication 'Our Local Plan:2033'). The modifications are only suggested for the benefit of clarity / consistency with the wider plan and to assist in the interpretation of the policy. The intent and use of the policy is not altered by these modifications.

Evidence (for Qs 7.14-19)

ECRT4 – Tandridge Economic Needs Assessment Update 2017
GB1 – Green-Belt Assessment (Part-3) Exceptional Circumstances and Insetting 2018
GB2 – Green Belt Assessment (Part-3) Appendix 1 2018
GB5- Green Belt Assessment (Part-2) Appendix 2 Area for Further Investigation 2016
INF1 – Tandridge District Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2019
INF12 – Tandridge District Strategic Highway Assessment Mitigation 2018
INF16 – Tandridge District Strategic Highway Assessment Scenarios 2A F 2018
LAN17 – Tandridge Landscape Capacity and Sensitivity Study Oxted North 2016
MD1 – Our Local Plan 2033 Submission 2019
MD16 – Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications 2019
TED01 – Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications (May 2019)
Former national planning guidance - PPG2 Annex C

https://tdcplanningsearch.tandridge.gov.uk/Planning/Planning/Planning?reference=2018-1792

Supporting Papers

None
IES01: Snowhill Business Centre, Copthorne

7.20 What is the purpose of the allocation? Given that the site is situated in the Green Belt and national policy in paragraph 89 of the Framework sets out that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as being inappropriate other than in the listed exceptions, would the Policy be effective in providing for the intended employment development? In terms of paragraph 154 of the Framework, does the Policy provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.20.1 Yes. The policy clearly indicates the terms of decision making for the site. The purpose of the allocation is to identify the site as an Important Employment Site (IES) which should be retained for employment generating land uses (business use classes) and that, potentially, could be further developed. The Council’s policy is that, whilst it takes account of the Green Belt designation of the site (washed over), it will encourage development that would be NPPF inappropriate, so as to enable employment generating land uses to continue and grow, (but only within the defined site). This is an appropriate local application of NPPF Green Belt policy. Effectively the policy sets out the Council’s view that, subject to the specific impacts of new development or redevelopment, NPPF very special circumstances, (generally in the form of local economic development benefits - local contribution to business and economy - IES policy wording - and, more specifically, in terms of the characteristics of the site as mentioned in the policy), could justify development and / or intensification of the site’s built coverage and uses. This policy is important to underpin business confidence that the site can accommodate changing needs and growth. This is particularly important given the limited opportunities for employment development in the District.

7.20.2 As highlighted in LP Para.23.13; in the Economic Needs Assessment Update (2017) (ECRT4) it was recognised that for IES sites ‘some operational flexibility may be required’. However, the site is not proposed to be released from the Green Belt as the site specific exceptional circumstances required to do so are not considered to exist.
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7.20.3 Any application for development should be considered against the national policy and the LP as a whole. NPPF Para.89 of the Framework does allow for proportionate extensions and replacement of buildings within the Green Belt as well as ‘limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development’. Therefore, there is some scope for some appropriate development on this IES within the Green Belt. In addition, whilst the economic importance of this site would not always supersede Green Belt considerations, the policy highlights that case and site specific very special circumstances may exist to justify a level of development that is inappropriate in NPPF Green Belt policy terms.

7.20.4 The text in Policies IES01-IES07 states that ‘the Council will actively encourage and support the regeneration, enhancement and protection of Important Employment Sites for their local contribution to business and economy.’ It is therefore considered to meet the requirements of NPPF Para.154 of the Framework by ensuring that decision makers give due consideration to the economic importance of the sites when considering a proposal against other policy considerations.

7.20.5 It is relevant to note that in former national planning guidance (PPG2 Annex C) a site of this kind could be treated as a major developed site in the Green Belt and this would have allowed scope for quite significant new development / redevelopment. Under the NPPF this approach is no longer specified at national level, so a local policy response has to be considered. A local policy for an established employment site in the Green Belt is therefore useful to support continued employment generating land provision.

7.20.6 In terms of Policy IES01 for Snowhill Business Centre, the site was recommended to be protected for employment uses as part Economic Needs Assessment Update (2017) (ECRT4) as it offers high quality small office accommodation in a reasonably commercially attractive location. ECRT4 also identified a small area of unused land to the east of the site which may provide an opportunity for further small scale development. The Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement 2016 (September 2017) specifically seeks to support start-up businesses as part of the aim to attract and retain businesses in the area.
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7.21 To be effective and to be consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 24 of the Framework, should the Policy be clear as to whether Use Class B1 (Offices) or other main town centre uses would be acceptable within the identified site boundary?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.21.1 See response to Q.7.3. Similar principles apply.

7.21.2 IES01 is considered an important employment site that provides a range of small-scale business units. The site is not located within or on the edge of an existing town centre boundary. The location is not suitable for town centre uses other than B1 (Offices) due to the existing use and activity on-site and its limited accessibility by public transport. As this is an important employment site, its employment uses should be protected and development for alternative town centre (or residential) uses would be resisted under the NPPF and the relevant LP policies (ECRT4, Page 14, Para. 1.40).
7.22 Are the requirements for financial contributions as set out under Infrastructure consistent with national policy for planning obligations and conditions as set out in the Framework and are they justified?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.22.1 See response to Q.7.2. Similar principles apply.
7.23 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Question

7.23.1 No. The Council's view is that the proposed modifications to IES01 do not go to the soundness of the Plan (these are proposed other or minor modifications identified through tracked changes in Examination Library Document MD1 - the Publication 'Our Local Plan:2033'). The modifications are only suggested for the benefit of clarity / consistency with the wider plan and to assist in the interpretation of the policy. The intent and use of the policy is not altered by these modifications.

Evidence (for Qs 7.20-23)

ECRT4 – Tandridge Economic Needs Assessment Update 2017
MD1 – Our Local Plan 2033 Submission 2019
The Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement 2016 (September 2017)
Former national planning guidance - PPG2 Annex C

Supporting Papers

None
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IES02: Brewer Street, Bletchingley

7.24 What is the purpose of the allocation? Given that the site is situated in the Green Belt and national policy in paragraph 89 of the Framework sets out that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as being inappropriate other than in the listed exceptions, would the Policy be effective in providing for the intended employment development? In terms of paragraph 154 of the Framework, does the Policy provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.24.1 Yes. The policy clearly indicates the terms of decision making for the site. See response to Q7.20. Similar principles apply.

7.24.2 In terms of Policy IES02 for Brewer Street in Bletchingley, the site was recommended to be protected for employment use in ECRT4 as it ‘offers good quality office and industrial units in the front area, with some potential intensification towards the rear.’ The site is mainly occupied by smaller local businesses and is suitable for start-ups. In addition, some of the main occupiers include businesses in the plasma research development sector and a highly specialist veterinary hospital. The site is therefore considered to be an important employment site by virtue of the unique nature and innovation of the businesses occupying the site. The Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement 2016 (September 2017) specifically seeks to build on and develop industry expertise and to support innovative projects and start-ups in the area.

7.24.3 It is acknowledged that the inclusion of this site as an IES, part of which is in the Conservation Area, could be controversial due to perceived land use conflicts. However, overall its development will not detract from conservation objectives.
7.25 To be effective and to be consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 24 of the Framework, should the Policy be clear as to whether Use Class B1 (Offices) or other main town centre uses would be acceptable within the identified site boundary?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Question

7.25.1 See response to Q.7.3. Similar principles apply.

7.25.2 IES02 is considered an important employment site that provides a range of small-scale office and industrial units as well as a highly specialist veterinary hospital and a plasma research centre. The site is not located within or on the edge of an existing town centre boundary. The location is not suitable for town centre uses other than B1 (Offices) due to the existing use and activity on-site and its limited accessibility by public transport. As this is an important employment site, its employment uses should be protected and development for alternative town centre (or residential) uses would be resisted under the NPPF and the relevant LP policies (ECRT4, Page 14, Para. 1.40).
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7.26 Is IES02 consistent with paragraphs 133 and 134 of the Framework in seeking development to be ‘sensitive’ to the Brewer Street Conservation Area?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Questions

7.26.1 Yes. The Council has had regard to this site’s location within the Brewer Street Conservation Area. To guide the development management process, the Council has included clause III of Policy IES02 in order to provide direction to decision makers with regards to key matters to be taken into consideration. The assessment of any application will also be supported by LP Policy TLP43: Historic Environment. Moreover, the adoption of the LP will necessitate the replacement of a number of existing policies as set out Appendix 2 of the LP and will include the partial replacement of Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2 Detailed Policies 2014-2029. Appendix 2 lists existing policies which are to be replaced either in full or in part; this is reflected in the strike-through version of the Local Plan Part 2 (OTH4). Policy DP20: Heritage Assets is shown as being retained in full; accordingly, the assessment of any application will also be supported by this policy.
7.27 Are the requirements for financial contributions as set out under Infrastructure consistent with national policy for planning obligations and conditions as set out in the Framework and are they justified?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.27.1 See response to Q.7.2. Similar principles apply.
7.28 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Question

7.28.1 Some are. These are those proposed modifications initially set out in the submission Examination Library Document MD16 - 2019 and then reproduced in Part 1 Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications (Submitted January 2019) of Examination Document TED01 (prepared as part of the Council’s response to the Inspector’s initial questions (ID 2 and 3).

7.28.2 The Council's view is that the remaining proposed modifications to IES02 do not go to the soundness of the Plan (these are proposed other or minor modifications identified through tracked changes in Examination Library Document MD1 - the Publication ‘Our Local Plan:2033’). The modifications are only suggested for the benefit of clarity / consistency with the wider plan and to assist in the interpretation of the policy. The intent and use of the policy is not altered by these modifications.

Evidence (for Qs.7.24-28)

ECRT4 – Tandridge Economic Needs Assessment Update 2017
MD1 – Our Local Plan 2033 Submission 2019
MD16 – Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications 2019
OTH4 – Amended Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014 to 2029; 2018
TED01 – Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications (May 2019)
The Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement 2016 (September 2017)
Former national planning guidance - PPG2 Annex C

Supporting Papers

None
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IES03: Cophall Farm, Copthorne

7.29 What is the purpose of the allocation? Given that the site is situated in the Green Belt and national policy in paragraph 89 of the Framework sets out that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as being inappropriate other than in the listed exceptions, would the Policy be effective in providing for the intended employment development? In terms of paragraph 154 of the Framework, does the Policy provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Questions

7.29.1 Yes. The policy clearly indicates the terms of decision making for the site. See response to Q7.20. Similar principles apply.

7.29.2 In terms of Policy IES03 for Cophall Farm, ECRT4 recommends that the ‘site is considered to be commercially attractive and it is recommended that it is protected for employment uses and that further use of the site for airport car parking is resisted.’ Along with the Gatwick Airport Parking there are various occupiers of the site, and the quality of the site is considered to be good. The Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement 2016 (September 2017) specifically seeks ‘to secure and support the retention of employment land necessary to provide a mix and choice of high quality sites and locations.’
7.30 To be effective and to be consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 24 of the Framework, should the Policy be clear as to whether Use Class B1 (Offices) or other main town centre uses would be acceptable within the identified site boundary?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.30.1 See response to Q.7.3. Similar principles apply.

7.30.2 IES03 is considered an important employment site that is used for predominantly industrial purposes with airport car parking and other employment uses, including mechanics and scaffolding. The site is not located within or on the edge of an existing town centre boundary. The location is not suitable for town centre uses other than B1 (Offices) due to the existing use and activity on-site and its limited accessibility by public transport. As this is an important employment site, its employment uses should be protected and development for alternative town centre (or residential) uses would be resisted under the NPPF and the relevant LP policies (ECRT4, Page 14, Para. 1.40).
7.31 Are the requirements for financial contributions as set out under Infrastructure consistent with national policy for planning obligations and conditions as set out in the Framework and are they justified?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.31.1 See response to Q.7.2. Similar principles apply.
7.32 **Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?**

**Response to Inspector's Issues / Question**

7.32.1 No. The Council's view is that the proposed modifications to IES03 do not go to the soundness of the Plan (these are proposed other or minor modifications identified through tracked changes in Examination Library Document MD1 - the Publication 'Our Local Plan:2033'). The modifications are only suggested for the benefit of clarity / consistency with the wider plan and to assist in the interpretation of the policy. The intent and use of the policy is not altered by these modifications.

**Evidence** (for Qs.7.29-32)

ECRT4 – Tandridge Economic Needs Assessment Update 2017

MD1 – Our Local Plan 2033 Submission 2019

The Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement 2016 (September 2017)

Former national planning guidance - PPG2 Annex C

**Supporting Papers**

None
IES04: Systems House, Blindley Heath

7.33 What is the purpose of the allocation? Given that the site is situated in the Green Belt and national policy in paragraph 89 of the Framework sets out that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as being inappropriate other than in the listed exceptions, would the Policy be effective in providing for the intended employment development? In terms of paragraph 154 of the Framework, does the Policy provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Question

7.33.1 Yes. The policy clearly indicates the terms of decision making for the site. See response to Q7.20. Similar principles apply.

7.33.2 In terms of Policy IES04 for Systems House in Blindley Heath, the site is recommended to be protected for employment use in ECRT4 as it ‘is considered to be of reasonable commercial quality’. The site is a mixed employment site comprising three showroom type units, with a broadcasting engineering unit on the southern part of the site.

7.33.3 The site is close to the Garden Community proposal (SGGC), which is at the next settlement to the north of Blindley Heath along the A22. Its continued employment use can support SGGC. The Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement 2016 (September 2017) specifically seeks to ‘establish policies that focus on opportunities to enable people to live and work locally’ and to ‘develop and maintain strategies and standards for securing more sustainable forms of development and a more efficient low carbon economy’.
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7.34 To be effective and to be consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 24 of the Framework, should the Policy be clear as to whether Use Class B1 (Offices) or other main town centre uses would be acceptable within the identified site boundary?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.34.1 See response to Q.7.3. Similar principles apply.

7.34.2 IES04 is considered an important employment site that is a mixed employment site comprising showroom and engineering units. The site is not located within or on the edge of an existing town centre boundary. The location is not suitable for town centre uses other than B1 (Offices) due to the existing use and activity on-site and its limited accessibility by public transport. As this is an important employment site, its employment uses should be protected and development for alternative town centre (or residential) uses would be resisted under the NPPF and the relevant LP policies (ECRT4, Page 14, Para. 1.40).
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7.35 Are the requirements for financial contributions as set out under Infrastructure consistent with national policy for planning obligations and conditions as set out in the Framework and are they justified?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.35.1 See response to Q.7.2. Similar principles apply.
7.36 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Question

7.36.1 No. The Council's view is that the proposed modifications to IES04 do not go to the soundness of the Plan (these are proposed other or minor modifications identified through tracked changes in Examination Library Document MD1 - the Publication 'Our Local Plan:2033'). The modifications are only suggested for the benefit of clarity / consistency with the wider plan and to assist in the interpretation of the policy. The intent and use of the policy is not altered by these modifications.

Evidence (for Qs.7.33-36)

ECRT4 – Tandridge Economic Needs Assessment Update 2017

MD1 – Our Local Plan 2033 Submission 2019

The Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement 2016 (September 2017)

Former national planning guidance - PPG2 Annex C

Supporting Papers

None
IES05: Redhill Aerodrome Industrial Area, South Nutfield

7.37 What is the purpose of the allocation? Given that the site is situated in the Green Belt and national policy in paragraph 89 of the Framework sets out that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as being inappropriate other than in the listed exceptions, would the Policy be effective in providing for the intended employment development? In terms of paragraph 154 of the Framework, does the Policy provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Questions

7.37.1 Yes. The policy clearly indicates the terms of decision making for the site. See response to Q7.20. Similar principles apply.

7.37.2 In terms of Policy IES05 for Redhill Aerodrome, the site is recommended to be protected for employment use in ECRT4 as it ‘is performing well for businesses relating to the aviation industry and benefitting from the proximity to the airfield.’ The majority of stock on site is reasonable with very few poor quality units, and accessibility to the site is good with sufficient parking on site for current uses. The Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement 2016 (September 2017) specifically seeks to ‘plan for continued economic growth building on the opportunities already identified in local authority and LEP plans to secure a knowledge based economy’.
7.38 To be effective and to be consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 24 of the Framework, should the Policy be clear as to whether Use Class B1 (Offices) or other main town centre uses would be acceptable within the identified site boundary?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.38.1 See response to Q.7.3. Similar principles apply.

7.38.2 IES05 is considered an important employment site that is primarily taken up by aviation-related industries and services. The site is not located within or on the edge of an existing town centre boundary. The location is not suitable for town centre uses other than B1 (Offices) due to the existing use and activity on-site and its limited accessibility by public transport. As this is an important employment site, its employment uses should be protected and development for alternative town centre (or residential) uses would be resisted under the NPPF and the relevant LP policies (ECRT4, Page 14, Para. 1.40).
7.39 Are the requirements for financial contributions as set out under Infrastructure consistent with national policy for planning obligations and conditions as set out in the Framework and are they justified?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.39.1 See response to Q.7.2. Similar principles apply.
7.40 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Question

7.40.1 No. The Council's view is that the proposed modifications to IES05 do not go to the soundness of the Plan (these are proposed other or minor modifications identified through tracked changes in Examination Library Document MD1 - the Publication 'Our Local Plan:2033'). The modifications are only suggested for the benefit of clarity / consistency with the wider plan and to assist in the interpretation of the policy. The intent and use of the policy is not altered by these modifications.

Evidence (for Qs.7.37-40)

ECRT4 – Tandridge Economic Needs Assessment Update 2017
MD1 – Our Local Plan 2033 Submission 2019
The Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement 2016 (September 2017)
Former national planning guidance - PPG2 Annex C

Supporting Papers

None
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IES06: Paddock Barn Farm, Godstone Road, Caterham

7.41 What is the purpose of the allocation? Given that the site is situated in the Green Belt and national policy in paragraph 89 of the Framework sets out that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as being inappropriate other than in the listed exceptions, would the Policy be effective in providing for the intended employment development? In terms of paragraph 154 of the Framework, does the Policy provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.41.1 Yes. The policy clearly indicates the terms of decision making for the site. See response to Q7.20. Similar principles apply.

7.41.2 In terms of Policy IES06 for Paddock Barn Farm, the site is recommended to be protected for employment use in ECRT4 as the southern part of the site ‘provides an opportunity for further industrial or warehouse uses and should be protected for employment uses.’ The southern (roadside) part of the site, which comprises small industrial units with an abandoned warehouse, is considered to potentially provide a development opportunity. The northern part of the site contains traditional general employment uses and relates more poorly to the main road. The Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement 2016 (September 2017) specifically seeks to ‘co-ordinate employment land policies to secure and support the retention of employment land necessary to provide a mix and choice of high quality sites and locations.’
7.42 Would the proposed allocation conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Questions

7.42.1 Yes. The Council is fully cognisant of the fact that this site is located within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; noting this in the site description for Policy IES06. The Council's Landscape Capacity and Sensitivity Study (2016) (LAN12), also took this into account, and considered this site in two parts (Parts A and B). In allocating this site, the Council has had regard to the outputs of LAN12 and has worked with the Surrey Hills AONB Unit. Accordingly, it has only allocated the part of the site which the LAN12 indicates has a medium capacity to accommodate employment development and which includes mitigation measures.

7.42.2 The Council is satisfied that there is scope for the development of this site, and that given the potential for mitigation as set out in the landscape evidence, development proposals could be designed to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. To guide the development management process, the Council has stated within Policy IES06 that proposals will be supported where they are sensitive to the Surrey Hills AONB. The assessment of any application will also be supported by TLP33 and other relevant policies.
7.43 To be effective and to be consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 24 of the Framework, should the Policy be clear as to whether Use Class B1 (Offices) or other main town centre uses would be acceptable within the identified site boundary?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Question

7.43.1 See response to Q.7.3. Similar principles apply.

7.43.2 IES06 is considered an important employment site that comprises two parts, with part of the site comprising small business / industrial units and the other part being largely vacant land containing a vacant building. The site is not located within or on the edge of an existing town centre boundary. The location is not suitable for town centre uses other than B1 (Offices) due to the existing use and activity on-site and its limited accessibility by public transport. As this is an important employment site, its employment uses should be protected and development for alternative town centre (or residential) uses would be resisted under the NPPF and the relevant LP policies (ECRT4, Page 14, Para. 1.40).
7.44 Are the requirements for financial contributions as set out under Infrastructure consistent with national policy for planning obligations and conditions as set out in the Framework and are they justified?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Questions

7.44.1 See response to Q7.45. The Council’s proposed Main Modifications would remove the infrastructure requirements for this site / policy as they are not related in scale to the likely size of developments here.
7.45  Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.45.1 Some are. These are those proposed modifications initially set out in the submission Examination Library Document MD16 - 2019 and then reproduced in Part 1 Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications (Submitted January 2019) of Examination Document TED01 (prepared as part of the Council’s response to the Inspector’s initial questions (ID 2 and 3).

7.45.2 The Council’s view is that the remaining proposed modifications to IES06 do not go to the soundness of the Plan (these are proposed other or minor modifications identified through tracked changes in Examination Library Document MD1 - the Publication ‘Our Local Plan:2033’). The modifications are only suggested for the benefit of clarity / consistency with the wider plan and to assist in the interpretation of the policy. The intent and use of the policy is not altered by these modifications.

Evidence (for Qs.7.41-45)

ECRT4 – Tandridge Economic Needs Assessment Update 2017
LAN12 - Tandridge Landscape Capacity and Sensitivity Study Caterham Valley 2016
MD1 – Our Local Plan 2033 Submission 2019
MD16 – Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications 2019
TED01 – Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications (May 2019)
Former national planning guidance - PPG2 Annex C

Supporting Papers

None
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IES07: Priory Farm, South Nutfield

7.46 What is the purpose of the allocation? Given that the site is situated in the Green Belt and national policy in paragraph 89 of the Framework sets out that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as being inappropriate other than in the listed exceptions, would the Policy be effective in providing for the intended employment development? In terms of paragraph 154 of the Framework, does the Policy provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Questions

7.46.1 Yes. The policy clearly indicates the terms of decision making for the site. See response to Q7.20. Similar principles apply.

7.46.2 In terms of Policy IES07 for Priory Farm in South Nutfield, it is recommended in ECRT4 that employment generating uses are supported and protected as the site is of ‘good quality small office and retail units, with reasonable location and is fully occupied.’ The building stock and environmental quality is generally very good, and there is sufficient on-site parking for the businesses and clients / customers. The site is fully occupied by small businesses and provides suitable accommodation for start-ups. The Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement 2016 (September 2017) specifically seeks to support start-up businesses as part of the aim to attract and retain businesses in the area.
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7.47 To be effective and to be consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 24 of the Framework, should the Policy be clear as to whether Use Class B1 (Offices) or other main town centre uses would be acceptable within the identified site boundary?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.47.1 See response to Q.7.3. Similar principles apply.

7.47.2 IES07 is considered an important employment site that comprises a number of small buildings under a variety of retail and office uses. The wider site and surrounds provide a rural economy offer with businesses and facilities based around the theme of rural life and all contributing to it acting as a destination location for rural food, retail, small businesses and days out. The site is not located within or on the edge of an existing town centre boundary. The location is not suitable for town centre uses other than B1 (Offices) due to the existing use and activity on-site and its limited accessibility by public transport. As this is an important employment site, its employment uses should be protected and development for alternative town centre (or residential) uses would be resisted under the NPPF and the relevant LP policies (ECRT4, Page 14, Para. 1.40).
7.48 Are the requirements for financial contributions as set out under Infrastructure consistent with national policy for planning obligations and conditions as set out in the Framework and are they justified?

Response to Inspector’s Issues / Question

7.48.1 See response to Q.7.2. Similar principles apply.
7.49 Are the proposed Modifications necessary for soundness?

Response to Inspector's Issues / Question

7.49.1 No. The Council's view is that the proposed modifications to IES05 do not go to the soundness of the Plan (these are proposed other or minor modifications identified through tracked changes in Examination Library Document MD1 - the Publication ‘Our Local Plan:2033’). The modifications are only suggested for the benefit of clarity / consistency with the wider plan and to assist in the interpretation of the policy. The intent and use of the policy is not altered by these modifications.

Evidence (for Qs.7.46-49)

ECRT4 – Tandridge Economic Needs Assessment Update 2017
MD1 – Our Local Plan 2033 Submission 2019
The Gatwick Diamond Local Strategic Statement 2016 (September 2017)
Former national planning guidance - PPG2 Annex C

Supporting Papers

None