

Mr A Evans
Director
RPS Planning & Development
140 London Wall
London
EC2Y 5DN

If calling please ask for
Lesley Westphal

E-mail: lwestphal@tandridge.gov.uk

Fax:

Our ref: PA/2018/1008

Your ref:

Date: 25.5.18

Dear Mr Evans,

Reference No. PA/2018/1008

Site : r/o Old Cottage, Station road, Lingfield

Proposal : Development of site for residential development

I write further to our meeting in April regarding the submitted details proposing the development of this site for residential purposes. Apologies for the delay in replying, but I considered it important to include the views of the County Historic Buildings Officer, given the location of the site within the Conservation Area and its close proximity to a number of listed buildings.

The site lies wholly within the Green Belt albeit it adjoins the village boundary along part of the eastern, southern and north- eastern boundaries. Part of the south- easternmost corner of the site is identified in the updated surface water flood map as being subject to flooding as a 1:1000 year event and the north- easternmost corner, around the public footpath that runs through the site, as subject to surface water flooding as a 1:30/1:100 and 1:1000 year event. Lingfield itself is identified as a Large Rural Settlement and the site is identified as lying within the Gatwick Safeguarding Zone. The majority of the site lies within the Lingfield Conservation Area and listed buildings lie in a group around St. Peter and St. Paul's church within the village to the north west and around New Place to the north east.

In terms of current policy designations, the site is identified in the 2016 HELAA by Appendix 4 Unavailable and Unsuitable Sites under reference LIN030. It is identified as unsuitable and the explanation is given that:

The site lies within the Lingfield Conservation Area and is adjoined by listed buildings and structures. Given that the character of the Conservation Area is largely free from development, to develop up to 100 homes in this area would likely to have such an impact as to significantly affect the character of the area. Consequently the site is not seen as a suitable area to accommodate development.

The site is not identified in the emerging Local Plan Sites Consultation document 2016 as a Green Belt Site within an Area for further Investigation.

The Draft Submission Plan will be reported to Planning Policy Committee on 3rd July when the updated Sites Consultation document will be available. As Mark explained, at this stage it is anticipated that the Submission Draft Local Plan will be available before Xmas with a PLI held early next year. Obviously should you submit a planning application at any point during this process, the weight to be given to the existing development policies and those emerging will be in a state of change with different weight accorded to existing and emerging policies as the process proceeds. I can only suggest that you keep track of these changes and if you require any clarification regarding the weight that officers will attach to the existing/emerging policies please contact this office.

During our meeting we discussed a number of issues and I will endeavour to summarise our advice below.

The Site

Does not include the parcel of land that lies to the west of the site – between the site and the adjacent public house. The development proposed would appear to sterilise the use of this site and it would make better development sense if it could be included in the development of the adjacent land should that proceed. I understand that you will look into the possibility of including this land within the wider site.

Principle of Development:

At present, as identified above, this site is not identified as having development potential: it lies within the Green Belt and the 2016 HELAA expresses concern regarding the impact of development of the site upon the Lingfield Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings. In your accompanying letter you consider the benefits of other sites that have been put forward for development within the local area and consider their merits in Green Belt terms compared to the site we discussed. The site is still considered to fulfil the purposes of the Green Belt. Should an application of the type discussed be submitted, unless the site designation changes, the development would be considered inappropriate development. Such development would be refused unless very special circumstances could be demonstrated that would clearly outweigh the harm to the green belt by virtue of inappropriateness and any other harm(s) identified. Given the scale of development proposed there would be a very clear harm to the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes behind the designation of the site as Green Belt.

Historic Environment:

Given the high level assessment of the impacts of development upon the adjacent historic environment referred to in the HELAA, the submission of a planning application would provide the first detailed assessment of the impact of such development and accordingly I have sought comments from Surrey's Historic Buildings Officer (HBO). Based upon his knowledge of the site and details provided in the pre-app he considers that this, in principle, would appear to be a sensible place for an enlargement of the settlement. The heritage concern is considered to be less with the Conservation Area and more with the setting of New Place and other listed buildings. Given that New Place was very much on the edge of Lingfield, both now and more particularly when it was built, the quasi rural character of the area is important and how that can be acknowledged by any application.

It is suggested that the setting of New Place could best be assured by retaining the existing hedgerow with the new development, including the footpath set inside of this. The Historic Buildings Officer also comments that consideration will need to be given as part of a detailed scheme as to how visitors and pedestrians travelling between the station and the

village would know the appropriate route to follow and it may be that a second hedge between the new footpath and the development would be a good idea. The retention of existing hedgerows and potential for new planting is welcomed from a heritage and bio diversity point of view. These comments however have been made based upon photos and the details of the pre-application enquiry made and should the site proceed further, a more thorough investigation would be made by the HBO, who has requested that he be involved in any discussions going forward.

Site Layout/Design:

At this stage the submitted information relates to the layout and building mass with no specific detail of house design.

In view of the fact that most of the site lies within the Lingfield Conservation Area any application would need to clarify how that part lying within the CA responds to that environment and character. I note your references to the development at New Place Gardens as potentially a development form that could be acceptable on this site. Given that that site is outside the Conservation Area I am not clear what it is about that site that you particularly consider would enhance the Conservation Area. If this simply refers to the use of two storey housing with pitched/hipped tiled roofs and brick and tile hung elevations then this is not an assessment with which I would disagree. However as part of any submission you would be expected to provide a heritage assessment that would clarify the significance of the various heritage assets forming part of and sited around the site and the impact of the scheme upon their significance, with full consideration of the proposed scheme and its impacts.

The layout would need to ensure that local standards in respect of garden sizes (minimum length of 10m's) and facing distances, as contained within Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (TLP) are complied with - both in respect of the separation between proposed development and between existing/proposed development. We have no specified standards regarding the distance which a new dwelling should be set back from an existing boundary, but looking at those houses which have a flank wall adjacent to garden boundaries of houses fronting Town Hill, I would recommend that sufficient distance is retained to allow a good boundary planting screen where it does not already exist and sufficient room to protect any existing boundary trees and hedgerows that already exist along that boundary.

As a result of the level changes on this site as it moves away from Station Road I am concerned about the three storey element proposed and the potential impact that could have on views of the church when seen from the south/south eastern boundaries of the site. The idea of adapting the design of this corner building to reflect the influence of the nearby oast and the spire of St.Peters is an interesting idea, that could provide an attractive focal point, but given my comments below regarding the proposed affordable housing mix this will need to be re-considered, such as may change this design idea. I note that your site analysis identifies the view from Station Road to the Church as of importance, but am concerned that the tallest building on the site could detract from this view, although this may be a moot point given my previous comment.

We discussed the general design approach and I believe we all agreed that the scheme should seek to provide a development where the individual houses or areas respond to their individual siting/circumstances rather than a homogenous and repetitive design across the site. The example I gave was the Caterham Barracks site where houses in the individual cul de sacs and roads each take a slightly different design approach that reflect

their position within the site and respond to, for instance, any adjacent greenspace or landscape feature. Whilst this would clearly be a site of a different character than the Barracks site, the principal of this approach is what I think any scheme on this site should aim for.

You indicate that the northernmost part of the site offers potential for a discrete development character and I wonder, given its position as almost the closest point to the village, if this could be the location for a bungalow/chalet bungalow type development? From the Council's perspective there is no preference as to how such house types are located within the site, but I would encourage the provision of this type of accommodation somewhere on the site, as we discussed.

Density:

Policy CSP19 identifies a density range of 30-40dph for rural areas, including larger rural settlements.

However Policy CSP18 requires that new developments should be of a standard that must reflect and respect the character, setting and local context. Policy DP20 advises that there will be a presumption in favour of development proposals which seek to protect preserve and wherever possible enhance the historic interest, cultural value, architectural character and visual appearance and setting of the District's heritage assets and historic environment. Accordingly in this instance since the site lies largely within a conservation area the quality of the development and impact upon the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings must be considered and it may be therefore that the density range described by this policy cannot be achieved.

Housing Mix:

Policy CSP 7 refers to the housing balance and advises that a housing mix should be identified that reflects the needs for the particular area within which it is situated as set out in any local housing Need surveys and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

One issue that we discussed is the potential for bungalows or chalet/bungalows on the site. It is noticeable how popular these types of home are for residents and this scheme should make provision for those in the area potentially looking to downsize from existing homes. Experience in other village locations suggest that such people have slightly different requirements than the younger families who generally buy smaller homes. Certainly it seems, and you confirmed this during our conversations, that bungalows remain a very popular addition to most residential schemes.

I refer below to our wish to encourage compliance with the lifetime homes initiative and discussions regarding a scheme in which I have been previously involved suggested that chalet bungalows can offer a longer term home for the elderly than just a bungalow....the suggestion being that if permanent care is needed on site, accommodation provided in the roofspace could be utilised by a carer enabling the resident and carer to each have separate accommodation within the one house. This is just a thought, but may be a means of extending the potential mix of units on the site to address differing housing needs. I hope this is something which you would investigate/consider further.

Affordable Housing:

Core Strategy Policy CSP4 requires that upto 34% of the dwellings on a site of this size be affordable.

I provide contact details for the Housing Department below, but am advised that in general terms we have a need for 2 and 3 bedroom homes – the three bedroom units being houses rather than flats. We have less of a need for one bedroom units although a small number *may* be acceptable – but unless the site itself comprises 1 bed flats the make up of the units for the affordable market should represent the mix across the site. It would not appear that the site would have any private 1 bed flats so I would suggest that that illustrative mix of affordable housing needs to be re-considered.

It is impossible to appreciate the spread of affordable vs. open market units across the site from what has been provided thus far, apart from the proposed one bed units, but I would not wish to see all the affordable units grouped together – although my colleagues in Housing will advise, I am sure, that smaller groupings of affordable (depending on their tenure) would be preferable from their perspective. I understand that the shared ownership units are not the issue, but that it is easier to group the social rented units into small clusters for ongoing management purposes.

Bio-Diversity:

As a minimum we would expect the site to have been the subject of a desktop survey with additional studies carried out as suggested by the study, but given the size of the site and the various ‘green’ areas proposed around the site, it should be considered as an opportunity to improve the bio diversity if at all possible of the area. Can I suggest that it would be worth taking advice in this respect if indeed you have not already done so and perhaps contact Surrey Wildlife Trust for a discussion, since we would consult them as part of any submitted planning application

Neighbour Amenities:

The layout will need to ensure that local standards in respect of garden sizes (minimum length of 10m’s) and facing distances as contained within Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (TLP) are complied with both in respect of the separation between proposed development and between existing/proposed development. Regarding the relationship between existing and proposed units please see my comments above.

Impact upon Landscape:

Although the site does not lie within an Area of Great Landscape Value or an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty it is nevertheless a prominent site on the edge of the village – the open boundary along Station road and rising land levels giving the site the potential to have a significant impact upon the adjacent land to the south/and east. You advised that a landscape appraisal has been carried out by LDA Design and that has been used I assume to inform the layout which was shown to us. That appraisal should form part of any application submission.

The landscape character plan (pg 18) identifies a number of features that the scheme should adopt to complement the landscape and all of these approaches are supported. I also think it is the correct approach to locate the detached more spaciouly laid out housing around the southwestern corner of the site to encourage views into the site and to soften the edge of the scheme where it meets the countryside. The location of the SUDS public open space in this corner is particularly welcome as a much softer interface between the scheme and countryside These comments are made of course against the background that the site is in the Green Belt and therefore the impact of such development is still considered harmful in definitional and openness terms and inappropriate..

Highways:

The County Highways Authority carry out their own formal pre-application process and their contact details are provided below.

Parking:

Please refer to our Parking Standards SPD regarding levels of provision and the respective sizes of parking spaces, garages, etc. I would specifically draw your attention to garage sizes – since if they are below the minimum size they would not be considered as contributing to the parking provision.

Given the proximity of the site to Lingfield Station there may be scope for a discussion regarding parking levels in the context of the potential impact upon the Conservation Area – but this will be a matter for guidance from the County Highways Authority, so I would suggest that you seek their guidance on this issue from the outset.

Sustainable development (NPPF)

Core Strategy policy CSP14 would be applicable ie a minimum percentage saving in CO2 emissions – 20% through on site renewable energy.

Archaeology:

An Area of High Archaeological Potential lies adjacent to the site and any sites over 0.4ha require the submission of an archaeological desktop study. Contact details for the County Archaeological Unit Department are contained below if you need to discuss this further with them...although I note your assessment that the site would have low archaeological potential.

Lifetime homes:

www.lifetimehomes.org.uk We encourage compliance with this standard

Infrastructure Requirements:

We discussed potential contributions that would be sought associated with such a development, in addition of course to affordable housing and of course the CIL contribution.

The local Doctors surgery has been identified as requiring enlargement and improvement and a contribution would be sought towards those works, likewise given the proximity of the site to the Station and the importance of maintaining and improving the station as part of the sustainability objectives for this location a contribution would be sought to upgrade the station particularly in relation to Mobility Impaired Access. The footpath that runs through the site from the village to the station could be improved and we discussed briefly works to improve the surface as well as improvements to the signage. It was further discussed that some on- site provision of amenity/open space should be provided, but there may also be scope to provide enhanced provision at Jenners Field and/or Talbot Road and this would form part of any ongoing discussion..

An issue that has been raised since our meeting , as a result of Local Plan consultations with the Parish Council, concerns the provision of parking for users of the station. I understand that there is currently insufficient parking available, off street, for users of the station and it has been suggested that given the proximity of this site to the station, that some parking could be accommodated within this site. Such an approach is clearly at the earliest stages of consideration and I would anticipate would be clarified and firmed up as part of the Local Plan process. However, I raise it here so that its potential can feature in

your early considerations of the site. In terms of taking this forward it would not seem appropriate to place the spaces within the Conservation Area and the central part of the site, rather along the Station Road frontage would appear to provide good and direct access to the Station. However this could developed if a scheme is submitted for the site.

Relevant planning policies

Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008:

CSP1 Location of Development, CSP2 Housing Provision, CSP4 Affordable Housing, CSP7 Housing Balance, CSP11 Infrastructure and Services, CSP12 Managing Travel Demand, CSP13 Community sport and recreation facilities and services, CSP14 Sustainable Construction, CSP15 Environmental Quality, CSP17 Biodiversity, CSP18 Character and Design, CSP19 Density, CSP21 Landscape and Countryside, CSP22 the Economy

Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014:

DP1 Sustainable Development, DP4 Alternative Use of Commercial and Industrial Sites, DP5 Highways Safety and Design, DP7 General Policy for New Development, DP9 Gates Fences Walls and other Means of Enclosure, DP10 Green Belt, DP13 Buildings in the Green Belt, DP19, Bio diversity, Geological Conservation and Green Infrastructure, DP21 sustainable Water Management, DP22 Minimising Contamination, Hazards and Pollution

National Policy: National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

Section 1, Building a Strong competitive economy

Section 2, Supporting a prosperous rural economy

Section 4, Sustainable Transport

Section 6, Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

Section 7, Requiring good design

Section 9, Promoting Green Belt Land

Section 10 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Section 11 Conserving the natural environment

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

National and Local Validation List requirement

1App form

Archaeology: site over 0.4 ha: Desktop study

Local Validation Checklist

Affordable Housing Statement

Biodiversity checklist

Biodiversity Report (probably desktop sufficient)

Contamination Report: SI report

Design and Access Statement (major development)

Drainage strategy –need for FRA for sites over 1 ha

Drawings including streetscene/sections through the site to clarify levels change

Draft Planning Obligation – aff housing, play area, management of landscaping/play area, infrastructure contributions

Heritage Significance Assessment

Landscape impact Assessment

Lighting Assessment

Parking Provision (within Planning statement)

Planning Statement

Renewable Energy Assessment

Street Scenes

Transport Assessment:

Tree Survey /Arboricultural Assessment

Community Infrastructure Levy Additional Information Requirement form and CIL

Assumption of Liability form

Sustainable Drainage Statement

Relevant consultees advice and contact details

Surrey County Archaeology: Heritage Conservation Team, Surrey County Council

Tel: 01483 518773

Surrey Highways – Ms Toni Walmsley Macey, tdctan@surreycc.gov.uk 01372 833 988

Surrey Wildlife Trust – Mr K. Anckorn - ken.anckorn@surreywt.org.uk or 01483 795472

Crime Reduction/Crime Prevention Adviser – Mr M. Howells –

howells14615@surrey.pnn.police.uk or 0845 125 222.

Community Infrastructure Officer – Ms M. Ngaluafe - MNgaluafe@tandridge.gov.uk or 01883 732880.

Tree Officer: Mr A. Durkin - adurkin@tandridge.gov.uk or 01883 732863

Lead Local Flood Authority: SUDS@surreycc.gov.uk

Environment Agency: <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/environment-agency>

Housing Development Officer: Pete Trowbridge: ptrowbridge@tandridge.gov.uk 01883 732922

Identified developer contributions

CIL is a non-negotiable charge on development and is calculated as pounds per square metre based on the net level of development proposed. For residential development CIL will be charged at £120 per square metre and the charging schedule was adopted by the Council on 24th July 2014. The Council's validation requirements now require that every planning application includes the required Levy forms. More details are available on the Council's website at

<http://www.tandridge.gov.uk/Planning/planningpolicy/currentpolicy/cili.htm>

Applicants may also wish to carry out a self-assessment of their CIL liability early in the process by using the Council's online CIL Calculation Tool and paying particular attention to lawful use, if the development involves demolishing and/or converting of existing buildings.

Our Historic Buildings Advisor has asked to be involved in discussions going forward about how this site may be developed and I would suggest that if you decide to take this site forward, presumably when you know if it will form part of the emerging Local plan in July, that a meeting is arranged to discuss in more detail how the site may be progressed. By that point, if the site is identified in the emerging local plan any anticipated constraints or scales of development would have been identified to inform such discussions.

I must inform you that the discussion at our meeting was on an informal basis and cannot be held as binding upon the Council or its Members. These comments are made without the benefit of formal consultation with other bodies, other than as referred to in our meeting.

Chief Executive – Louise Round

Planning applications can now be submitted on the internet either through our Planning Interactive Service at <http://e-access.tandridge.gov.uk/planning/aup.asp> or via the Planning Portal's website at www.planningportal.gov.uk .

Yours sincerely,

L Westphal

Lesley Westphal
Major Planning Applications and Project Officer