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Summary

1. From my examination of the submitted Woldingham Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) and its supporting documents, including the representations made, I have concluded that, subject to the modifications I have recommended, making the Plan will meet the Basic Conditions.

2. In summary the Basic Conditions are that the Plan must:
   - Have due regard to national policies and advice;
   - Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
   - Be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan; and
   - Not breach, and otherwise be compatible with, European Union and European Convention on Human Rights obligations.

3. I have concluded that:
   - The Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – Woldingham Parish Council;
   - The Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated: and does not cover more than one neighbourhood plan area;
   - The Plan does not relate to “excluded development”;
   - The Plan can be modified to specify the period to which it has effect – to 2031; and
   - With the modifications I have recommended that the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

4. I recommend that, once modified to meet relevant legal requirements, the Plan should proceed to a Referendum. This is on the basis that I have concluded that, once modified, it can meet all the relevant legal requirements. To that end I have made recommendations to modify policies to ensure that making the Plan will meet the Basic Conditions.

5. In recommending that the modified Plan should go forward to Referendum, I have considered whether or not the Referendum Area should be extended beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates. I have concluded that it should not; the Referendum should be the same as the Neighbourhood Plan Area.
1.0 Introduction

1.1 Neighbourhood planning provides a welcome opportunity for communities to directly shape the future of the places where they live and work and to deliver the sustainable development they need. The Woldingham Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) is clearly a very comprehensive piece of work. The Plan is a credit to the hard work of all those involved in its preparation.

2.0 Appointment of the Independent Examiner

2.1 I have been appointed by Tandridge District Council with the agreement of the qualifying body (Woldingham Parish Council) to undertake this independent examination. I have been appointed through the Neighbourhood Plan Independent Examiners Referral Service (NPIERS).

2.2 I confirm that I am independent of the qualifying body and the local authority. I have no interest in any land affected by the Neighbourhood Plan. I am a chartered town planner with over thirty-five years’ experience in planning and have worked in the public and private sectors. I therefore have the appropriate qualifications and experience to carry out this independent examination.

3.0 The role of the Independent Examiner

3.1 The examiner must assess whether the Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions and other matters set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

3.2 The basic conditions are:

- Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan
- The making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development
- The making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority
- The making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, European Union (EU) obligations
- Prescribed conditions are met in relation to the neighbourhood plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the neighbourhood plan.
3.3 Regulations 32 and 33 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) require that the Neighbourhood Plan should not be likely to have a significant effect on a European Site (as defined in the Conservations of Habitats and Species Regulations 2012) or a European Offshore Marine Site (as defined in the Offshore Marine Conservation Natural Habitats etc. Regulations 2007) either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

3.4 In examining the Plan, I am also required, under Paragraphs 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, (TCPA) to establish whether:

- The neighbourhood plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body
- The neighbourhood plan has been prepared for an area that has been properly designated for such plan preparation
- The neighbourhood plan meets the requirements to i) specify the period to which it has effect; ii) not include provision about excluded development; and iii) not relate to more than one neighbourhood area
- The policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

3.5 The examiner must then make one of the following recommendations:

- The Plan can proceed to a referendum on the basis it meets all the necessary legal requirements
- The Plan can proceed to a referendum subject to modifications or
- The Plan should not proceed to a referendum on the basis it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.

3.6 If the Plan can proceed to a referendum with or without modifications, the examiner must also consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the neighbourhood plan area to which it relates.

3.7 If the Plan goes forward to a referendum and more than 50% of those voting votes in favour of the Plan then it is made by the relevant local authority, in this case Tandridge District Council. The Plan then becomes part of the ‘development plan’ for the area and a statutory consideration in guiding future development and in the determination of planning applications within the Plan area.
4.0 Compliance with matters other than the basic conditions

4.1 I now check the various matters as set out above in paragraph 3.4 of this report.

Qualifying body

4.2 Woldingham Parish Council is a qualifying body able to lead the preparation of a neighbourhood plan. This complies with this requirement.

Plan area

4.3 Woldingham Parish Council was designated as a qualifying body by Tandridge District Council on 14th May 2013 (see Basic Conditions Statement, para 1.2). The Plan relates to this area and does not relate to more than one neighbourhood area and therefore complies with these requirements.

Plan period

4.4 A neighbourhood plan must specify the period for which it is to have effect. The Plan clearly indicates within the document itself that it covers the period from 2016 to 2029. It is unusual for a Plan to state a commencement date in advance and there can be no certainty that the Plan will have followed all the procedures to enable it to be made during 2016. The Plan should be modified to simply state that it will cover the period to 2031 and I recommend accordingly. Once it has been so modified the Plan will meet this requirement.

4.5 Excluded development

The Plan does not include policies or proposals that relate to any of the categories of excluded development and therefore meets this requirement.

4.6 Development and use of land

Neighbourhood plans often contain aspirations and objectives that signal the community’s priorities for the future of their local area. However, the neighbourhood plan should only contain policies relating to development and use of land. The Woldingham Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) commendably differentiates between ‘Land Use Policies’ and objectives which are described as ‘Community Policies’.

4.7 Subject to the contents of this report, which recommends some modifications be made to ensure that the policies in the Plan meet the basic conditions, this requirement can satisfactorily be met.
5.0 The examination process

5.1 I commenced preparation for the examination of the plan in November 2015 following my appointment and briefing with the Plan documents.

5.2 The presumption is that the neighbourhood plan will proceed by way of an examination of written evidence only. However the Examiner can ask for a public hearing in order to hear oral evidence on matters which he or she wishes to explore further or to give a person a fair chance to put a case.

5.3 I am required to give reasons for each of my recommendations and also provide a summary of my main conclusions.

5.4 I am satisfied that I am in a position to properly examine the Plan without the need for a hearing.

5.5 I made an unaccompanied inspection of the Plan area on 27th November 2015.

6.0 The examination documents

6.1 In addition to the legal and national policy framework and guidance (principally The Town and Country Planning Acts, Localism Act, Neighbourhood Plans Regulations, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Policy Guidance) and the development plan, I have had regard to the following principal documents that were furnished to me:-

- Consultation Statement, August 2015.
- Basic Conditions Statement, August 2015.
- Bundle of 39 representations submitted as a result of Regulation 16 Consultation. (Document WNP 16)

I have also been furnished with a comprehensive set of other associated documents. All documents are listed in the Appendices. All relevant documents and representations have been fully considered in the preparation of this Report.
7.0 Compliance with the basic conditions

7.1 National policy advice

The main document that sets out national policy is the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) published in 2012. In particular the Framework explains that the application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development will mean that neighbourhood plans should support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans and plan to positively support local development.

7.2 The Framework also makes it clear that neighbourhood plans should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area. In other words neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. They cannot promote less development than that set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies. (NPPF, paragraph 184).

7.3 The Framework indicates that plans should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. (NPPF, paragraph 17).

7.4 The Basic Conditions Statement (Table A, pages 7-9) explains how the Plan policies have been informed by the guidance set out in the Framework. The Basic Conditions Statement reviews each Policy and explains how the Plan achieves important elements of national policy.

7.5 I am satisfied that the Neighbourhood Plan has appropriate regard to national policies and advice, subject to the modifications set out in this report being made.

7.6 Sustainable development

The Basic Conditions Statement (Table B, pages 10-11) explains how the Plan will meet the three sustainability objectives.

7.7 The Basic Conditions Statement (paragraph 4.3) concludes that the Plan has good performance on sustainability issues. I agree with that conclusion and I am satisfied that the Neighbourhood Plan will make a positive contribution to the achievement of sustainable development, subject to the modifications recommended in this report being made.
The Development Plan

7.8 A basic condition is that the neighbourhood plan should be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan. The Framework (at paragraph 184) states that neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. The Local Plan is defined in the Glossary at Annex 2 to the Framework and includes current core strategies.

7.9 The development plan comprises the Tandridge Core Strategy (2008) and Tandridge Detailed Policies DPD (2014). (See Appendix 2.)

7.10 The Basic Conditions Statement (Table C, pages 12-14) explains how the Plan is compatible with development plan policies.

7.11 I agree with the analysis in the Basic Conditions Statement and I am satisfied that the Neighbourhood Plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan, subject to the modifications set out in this report being made.

EU Obligations

7.12 Tandridge District Council has prepared a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Opinion on behalf of Woldingham Parish Council.

7.13 The Opinion considers, at paragraph 2.2, whether it is necessary for the Plan to have been the subject of an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Directive. No such Assessment has been undertaken in relation to the Plan, because there will be no significant effect on a European site. I agree with that judgement and I conclude that the Plan is compatible with EU Obligations in this regard.

7.14 Paragraph 6.3 of the Screening Opinion concludes that SEA is not required. Paragraph 4.3 of the Screening Opinion reports on the conclusions of the consultation with the three Statutory Consultees to this process. The Statutory Consultees do not disagree with the conclusion of Tandridge District Council that SEA is not required for the Plan.
I agree with that conclusion and I am satisfied that the Neighbourhood Plan is compatible with EU obligations.

I have also considered whether the Plan complies with the European Convention on Human Rights, particularly in terms of Article 8 (privacy): Article 14 (discrimination) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (property) under the meaning of the Human Rights Acts 1998 and I am satisfied that the Plan is compatible with all these provisions.

**Neighbourhood Plan preparation and public Consultation**

In 2011 the Parish Council held a public meeting at which the relevance of Neighbourhood Planning was discussed.

In 2012 the Parish Council endorsed the earlier decision to have a Neighbourhood Plan for the Parish.

Work continued in 2013 including:

- Meetings of a working group of councillors;
- The distribution of publicity leaflets;
- Meetings with representatives of local groups;
- Meetings with professional advisors;
- Interactive workshop seeking residents views;
- Residents survey;
- Holding an open Forum in October 2013;
- Results of Survey published in the Parish Council Newsletter in November 2013;
- Meeting of local businesses in November 2013.

From January to April 2014 the Project Groups met regularly.

The Annual Parish Meeting was held in May 2014 and focused on progress with the Neighbourhood Plan.

The Parish Council published an enquiry for land (call for sites).

A Steering Group was established in June 2014. Regular progress reports were published in the Woldingham Magazine, the Parish Council Minutes and Newsletter and on a new webpage on the Village Website.

An afternoon drop in session was held in July 2014.

A Planning Workshop was held in August 2014.
8.10 A supplementary consultation on minimum plot size and downsizing was held in early 2015.

8.11 A Twitter account was established and views of younger residents were canvassed in late 2014 by means of a peer-to-peer enquiry passed among young residents using their mobile phones.

8.12 Consultation in the Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) Consultation Plan ran between 7th April and 29th May 2015.

8.13 Publicity for the Pre-Submission Consultation Plan included:

- The draft plan was delivered to every household;
- The draft plan was available on the Neighbourhood Plan web pages with a link to Survey Monkey;
- Drop in events were held in the Village Hall;
- The policies were discussed at the Annual Parish Meeting on Thursday 21st May.

8.14 A total of 141 responses were received from statutory consultees (10), the general public (128) and local agents (3).

8.15 As a response to the comments received, the Parish Council prepared a document for distribution in August 2015 to publicise the opportunity to respond to the forthcoming Regulation 16 consultation.

8.16 I am satisfied that the neighbourhood planning process has been open and engaging giving residents and businesses opportunities to become involved and influence plan making.

9.0 The Land Use Policies

9.1 One of the basic conditions is whether, having regard to national policies, it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan. The National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) “the Framework” sets out core planning principles. The first bullet point in paragraph 17 of the Framework states that plans:

- “Should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made within high a high degree of predictability and efficiency.”
Policy L.1.A: General Character.

9.2 I have had regard to Policies L.1. A (1) to (8) as a whole. In places I believe that the Policies contain too much detail which detracts from their clarity such that the current wording does not comply with paragraph 17 of the Framework.

9.3 I agree with the submission made by Mr King on behalf of the Woldingham Association (dated 21st September 2015) that this Neighbourhood Plan is the ideal policy document to incorporate plot size parameters because they apply only to Woldingham. I have had regard to the comments made by the District Council in this respect. A large part of the unique quality of Woldingham derives from objectives of William Gilford in creating a village with a spacious and sylvan character. I have also had regard to the content paragraph 53 of the Framework in this regard.

9.4 I have concluded that there is evidence to support a local policy on plot size parameters and I do not believe that such a policy conflicts with the Basic Conditions.

9.5 I recommend that Policy L.1.A be re-worded as follows:

A. General Character

Proposals for development:

1) Should retain or enhance the spacious, sylvan character of Woldingham and its setting;
2) Should respect and preserve views from and towards Woldingham;
3) Should allow the landscape to remain as the dominant feature, in which buildings should be subservient in terms of visual prominence;
4) Should not formalise road treatments: subject to considerations of safety, roads that do not currently have pavements should be retained as such;
5) Should not require the inappropriate or progressive subdivision of curtilages (subdivision will be inappropriate where it results in curtilages of less than 0.2 ha or where it involves the further subdivision of part of an already subdivided curtilage);
6) Should not include tandem development or development in depth involving the formation of cul-de-sacs;
7) Should maintain plot frontage widths of a size which is not below those prevailing in the road; and
8) Should place buildings informally without defining road edges (except in The Crescent and the Core Fringe Character Area).

9.6 Policy L.1.F: seeks to link the number of parking spaces to the number of bedrooms in the dwelling. I am not convinced this proposal is clear nor is it appropriate within the context of paragraph 17 of the Framework.

9.7 I recommend Policy L.1.F: should be redrafted to read as follows:-

Where planning permission is required, parking, garaging and ancillary buildings should be well integrated into the plot and its landscaping. They should be visually subservient and should not obscure or dominate the house frontage or approach, and should be softened with adjacent planting.

Policy L.1.C: Built form and design

9.8 It is not clear in Policy L.1. C (1) what is meant by a coherent design nor does the policy specify what would detract from neighbouring properties. I do not believe this wording meets the test of paragraph 17 of the Framework.

9.9 I recommend that Policy L.1. C (1) should be deleted in its entirety.

Policy L.1.D: Neighbouring and local amenity

9.10 Policy L.1.D (2): is over prescriptive and would be very difficult to enforce. I do not believe this policy meets the test of paragraph 17 of the Framework.

9.11 I recommend that Policy L.1.D (2) be redrafted to read as follows:-

(2) Should avoid light pollution by keeping any lighting for which permission is required to a minimum.

Policy L.2.3: Historic Core Character Area (Area F)

9.12 Within Policy L.2.3 some confusion arises by reference to the Conservation Area which actually extends over a number of Character Areas. The design advice in Policy L2 is already detailed. To provide more clarity, in accordance with paragraph 17 of the Framework, I believe some guidance can be removed.

9.13 I recommend that Policies L.2.3 (b) (c) and (d) be deleted in their entirety.
Policy L4: New dwellings suitable for downsizing

9.14 The Woldingham Association comments as follows in relation to Policy L4:

1. The Association does not believe there is a mandate for the Policy.

2. The Association does not believe the Policy is deliverable in the longer term. The Association refers to previous retirement accommodation built in Woldingham which can now be purchased by anyone.

3. The Association is concerned that Policy L4 is a conflict with other policies in the Plan aimed at restricting higher density development.

4. The Association does not believe the Policy will promote a sustainable pattern of development (paragraph 27) and expresses concern (paragraph 28) that older residents may become isolated.

9.15 In a letter dated 2nd October 2015 (representation ID 28) a local resident expresses similar concerns that the Policy will not be deliverable.

9.16 In its undated Representations on the Submission Plan (Ref. ID 24 TDC), the District Council, whilst being supportive of the Policy in principle, also expresses concerns as follows:

Paragraph L4.8 (a-f) page 23.
The Council is slightly concerned that the restrictions on this policy will result in no sites coming forward.

The District Council raises concerns over the enforcement of the Policy.

9.17 In the Report to Planning policy Committee of 17th September 2015 (Document WNP 21) similar concerns are expressed as follows:-

“The policy and supporting text seek to provide dwellings that could be brought (sic) by the older people already in Woldingham so that they can downsize from their existing property, which again the Council is supportive of. However, there is concern that the policy itself may not generate any sites that are financially viable, and the enforcement of this policy could be difficult.”

9.18 The Implementation of the proposed Policy is explained in Paragraph L4.8 of the Plan.
9.19 There is a requirement that no two adjacent sites will be developed under this policy. This requirement makes the Policy somewhat arbitrary. There is no evidence of any planning criteria which could be used to choose which of two adjacent, similar, plots should be selected for intensification. Similarly it would be difficult in planning terms to limit the scheme to a maximum of 10 dwellings [(Paragraph L4.8 (c)] over 15 years. If one plot is deemed acceptable for intensification in land use planning terms then it would be highly arbitrary for the Parish Council to seek to determine that another, similar, next door plot was not acceptable simply because the initial quota had been used up.

9.20 It has to be acknowledged that neither the Parish Council nor the District Council is the final decision maker. There is, therefore, some risk that decisions which appear arbitrary would be challenged at appeal. The process of challenge at appeal could undermine the efficiency of the process and bring the Neighbourhood Plan, as a vehicle for efficient policy making, into disrepute. In my opinion that would be contrary to the requirements of Paragraph 17 of the Framework that states that planning policies should allow decisions to be made with:

"a high degree of predictability and efficiency".

I believe proposed Policy L4 could result in arbitrary and unpredictable decisions which would not be consistent with government policy and not meet the Basic Conditions test in this regard.

9.21 Paragraph L4.12 (page 260) of the Submission Plan explains a cascade mechanism so that any unsold dwellings would be offered to a wider and wider set of prospective occupants. This seems to me to somewhat undermine the objective of the Policy in the first place.

9.22 I also have concerns as to the difficulty of enforcing Policy L4 should a breach occur. I share the concerns of the District Council in this respect. The properties will be open market housing, albeit that occupancy would be limited to certain categories by way of a Section 106 Agreement. The question remains as to who would identify any possible breach and would the enforcing authorities be willing to take action in the event of a breach. The proper remedy for any breach would be for the occupier to cease occupation of the dwelling and move elsewhere. That could be perceived by the enforcing authority as being an unduly onerous sanction, leading to a reluctance to enforce. There is already some discussion as to whether it would be the Parish Council or the District Council which would be the enforcing authority. If breaches of occupancyn went unchallenged it would undermine the purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan.
9.23 I have considered whether it would be possible to modify the policy to comply with the Basic Conditions. I have concluded that the Policy is flawed in its basic conception and that I am unable therefore to recommend any changes which would make it comply.

9.24 I have such severe concerns regarding the formulation and operation of proposed Policy L4 that I believe it does not meet the Basic Conditions and as such I recommend that the Policy be deleted in its entirety.

Policy L7: Parking at Woldingham Station

9.25 Policy L7 as currently drafted states that any additional car parking facilities at Woldingham Station should be for the exclusive use of local residents. In my opinion the local restriction contained within this Policy is over-prescriptive and would be very difficult to enforce in planning terms. This policy does not meet the test of efficiency and predictability required by paragraph 17 of the Framework. Policy L7 has generated some comment. For the avoidance of doubt, I believe the Policy would meet the test of paragraph 17 of the Framework if it were to be modified to explicitly refer to the other policy considerations which would apply to such a proposal.

9.26 I recommend that Policy L7 be redrafted as follows:

Policy L7: Parking at Woldingham Station

Proposals to improve the accessibility of Woldingham Station, including by means of increased provision for car parking, will be supported, provided that they comply with other relevant policies of the Neighbourhood Plan, the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Policy L8: Broadband and mobile communications.

9.27 Policy L8 (2) is over prescriptive in that it requires that the proposal take into account the views of the local community. The Framework, at paragraphs 45 and 189 encourages applicants to engage with the local community.

9.28 I recommend that Policy L8 (2) be redrafted to read:

(2) Consultation with the local community on the placement of the proposed apparatus is encouraged.
Policy L9: Local Green Spaces

9.29 Policy L9 designates 8 sites as Local Green Space in accordance with paragraph 76 of the Framework. Policy L9 is highly commendable so far as it goes. However, paragraph 76 of the Framework states that:

“By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances.”

I believe that to be consistent with the expectations of the local community, in accordance with the Framework, an additional sentence should be added to draft Policy L9 stating how development might be regulated.

9.30 I recommend that Policy L9 be redrafted to read:

Policy L9: Local Green Spaces

The Neighbourhood Plan designates the following sites as Local Green Spaces in accordance with Paragraph 76 of the National Planning Policy Framework: The Glebe; The Green; The Crescent; Angell’s Field; Hedley Field; The Recreation Field; Madeira Walk; Saxonwold (see Map D on page 33). Proposals for development of land designated as Local Green Space will not be permitted except in very special circumstances.

9.31 I have recommended changes to the policies were necessary to meet the basic conditions. These changes may well require consequential changes be made to the supporting text and I recommend accordingly.
10.0 Conclusions and recommendations

10.1 The Plan is a highly commendable document that will help to guide growth and sustainable development. It is a credit to all those who have clearly worked very hard to produce a readable and exceptionally well-presented Plan. Where I have identified shortcomings, it has been possible to recommend modifications.

10.2 From my examination of the submitted Neighbourhood Development Plan, within its legal and policy context, and its supporting documents, including all the representations made, I have concluded that, subject to the policy modifications I have recommended, making of the Plan will meet the Basic Conditions.

10.3 I have concluded that:-

- The Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – Woldingham Parish Council;
- The Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated; and does not cover more than one neighbourhood plan area;
- The Plan does not relate to 'excluded development';
- The Plan should specify the period to which it has effect – to 2031, and
- Subject to the changes that I have recommended, the policies are properly drafted and relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

10.4 I recommend that, once modified to meet relevant legal requirements, the Plan should proceed to a Referendum. This is on the basis that I have concluded that, once modified, it can meet all the relevant legal requirements.

10.5 In recommending that the modified Plan should go forward to Referendum, I have considered whether or not the Referendum Area should be extended beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates. I have concluded that it should not; I recommend that the Referendum Area should be the same as the Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Paul McCreery, B.Sc., M.Phil., FRTPi.
Independent Examiner
Principal, PMC Planning.
12th January 2016
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