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1. **Introduction**

This Consultation Statement supports the Submission Neighbourhood Plan and Sustainability Appraisal in accordance with the Community Engagement Statement and Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) regulations 2012. It contains the following:

a) Details of people and organisations consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan  
b) Details of how they were consulted  
c) A summary of the main issues and concerns raised through the consultation process  
d) Descriptions of how these issues and concerns have been considered and addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

2. **Compliance with Neighbourhood Development Plan regulation.**

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (Localism Act 2011) require a Consultation Statement to set out the consultations undertaken for the Neighbourhood Plan. In accordance with these Regulations and the local planning authority’s guidance on consultation, the preparation of the CR3 Neighbourhood Plan has involved residents, businesses and other organisations with interests in the four parishes in the preparatory stages for the Neighbourhood Plan.

Recent guidance from Department for Communities and Local Government (10 Sept 2013) states that: ‘the consultation statement submitted with the draft Neighbourhood Plan should reveal the quality and effectiveness of the consultation that has informed the Plan proposals.’

This Statement sets out details of events and consultations. It lists the activities in which the local community has been involved and the ongoing work of volunteers. The
aim of the consultations in the four parishes forming the CR3 area have been to ensure
that there is as widespread as possible understanding of the reasons for and content of
the Neighbourhood Plan.

This Statement demonstrates that there has been extensive community engagement
which has informed the community of the progress and content of the CR3 Neighbourhood Plan.

The CR3 Area consists of the 4 Parishes of Chaldon, Caterham Valley, Caterham on the
Hill and Whyteleafe and all are located within Tandridge District Council.

3.1 Formal structure and Management for Neighbourhood Plan

3.1 The Parish Councils resolved in 2012 to commence work on a Neighbourhood Plan
and applied for front runner funding through Tandridge District Council in November
2011. This was approved by Department of Communities and Local Government on
March 6th 2012.

This provided funding directly to the project to assist the preparation of the Plan and
various studies and papers to be prepared to contribute to the technical aspects of the
evidence base and assist with planning regulation. Additional funding was also
provided by each of the Parish Councils

3.2 Designation of Neighbourhood Area

The Plan began under the umbrella of the Caterham Community Partnership (CCP) and
the Parish Councils of Caterham Hill and Valley. Within weeks both Chaldon Village
Council and Whyteleafe Parish Council had become involved and as the Parishes were
located in CR3 postal area it was decided to name the association “The CR3 Forum”.
The area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan was designated by Tandridge District
3.3 The Steering Group

The Terms of Reference for the CR3 Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee are attached at Appendix A.

The Neighbourhood Plan is included as an agenda item at all Parish Council meetings and minutes of meetings are publically available.

The Steering Committee was appointed to approve the Plan at all its various stages of development. It is composed of members of the public and Parish Councillors from each of the four Parish Councils, the CBP (Caterham Business Partnership) and the CCP with its 1st meeting on 18th June 2012.

Seven work groups were established to focus upon issues of:


These work groups then included further volunteers who have a variety of skills and a commitment to the community with the chairman of each working group reporting directly to the Steering Group.

3.4 Tandridge District Council

3.4. Tandridge District Council has been consulted throughout the process and have assisted with information and data. The end result should reflect a combination of those things the Neighbourhood Plan can effect locally within the overall set of Regulations that govern the content and scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.

3.5 Cooperation with Neighbouring Parishes.

This has largely taken the form of notification during the various consultations that have been undertaken when details of the draft plan and the availability information available on the CR3 forum has been formally notified and comment requested. Details of Neighbouring Parishes consulted are contained in Appendix C.

4.1. Early Community Engagement

Website and Newsletters
Newsletters – CR3 Forum: The Caterham Chaldon & Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan and Parish Newsletters have been published:

- January 2013
- August 2013
- March 2014
- June 2014
- February 2015
- May 2015
- July 2015
- November 2015
- March 2016
- May 2016
- October 2016
- May 2017
- July 2013
- September 2013
- April 2014
- August 2014
- March 2015
- June 2015
- October 2015
- December 2015
- April 2016
- June 2016 x 2 editions
- April 2017

Tandridge Business News – June 2016

Social Media
- Facebook
- Streetlife
- Twitter

Parish & Village Councils
- Notice boards and twice yearly newsletters (newsletters delivered to 11000 residents in the Neighbourhood area)
Background/issues

For some time the residents of the CR3 area had voiced concern about the continual and often inappropriate development of the area. Against this background a group of local people – from business, from local councils and interested and concerned local residents – set up a group called ABC – “A Better Caterham“ which held a consultation with the general public to identify grievances and possible initiatives. From this a wider involvement developed into the Caterham Community Partnership involving strong links between Caterham Hill and Caterham Valley Parish Councils and eventually Chaldon and Whyteleafe Parish Councils too.

As a result of the ABC questionnaire it was decided to pursue the development of a Neighbourhood Plan and the Front Runner bid was successfully applied for. Throughout the process the public, through a variety of forums, has been invited to join in the research and eventual development of policies. It has been a learning process for the very many CR3 residents involved.

Household survey

Questionnaires to all CR3 residents – 11651 distributed, 1204 responses

Surveys were carried out by each Working Group (see relevant appendices)
Consultation with business organisations
Caterham Business Briefing; Economic Forum – 4th August 2015
25 delegates
Speakers from Gatwick Airport 2nd Runway bid
The Gatwick Diamond Business Partnership/C2C LEP
Caterham BID
Caterham CR3 Forum
Local Developers and their Agents

Open Day exhibitions
Caterham Public Consultation – 5th October 2013

Oct 5th Open Day
There was a good attendance and people were interested to see the work that is being done and to contribute towards it by commenting on some of the ideas and proposals that are evolving. Feedback of this kind is valuable as it helps to formulate the policies that will be drafted from the work done.

- Caterham Valley Annual Meeting – 15th May 2013 (Presentation by Random Greenway)
- Whyteleafe Village Public Consultation – 5th March 2014
- Chaldon Village Public Consultation – 12 April 2014
- Chaldon Council AGM – 20 April 2015 (Presentation by Random Greenway)
- Caterham on the Hill Public Consultation – 26th April 2014
Consultation with young peoples
School workshop – October 2012

(Permission given by de Stafford)

Consultation with local organisations and the public

- Photographic Competition
- Shop window display
- Stall outside Tesco on the Hill

(Tesco on the Hill)

- Stall outside Morrisons in Church Walk
• **Street Party – 2nd June 2013**

![Image of street party](Caterham_High_Street)

- From 1300h to 1800h, we spoke to people all the time. At the busiest we had four Forum members all talking and explaining.
- Over the period we have dealt with about 200 families.
- We were able to meet young families with children below school age.
- These people were interested in employment as well as education.

• **Carnival – 8th June 2013**

![Image of carnival](Whyteleafe_Fair)

• **Food Festival – 9th June 2013**
• **Chaldon Fair – 31st August 2015**
• **Whyteleafe Fair**
• **Group Workshop – 31st August 2013**
• **Party in the Park – 8th September 2013**
• Meet Caterham Business – 11\textsuperscript{th} October 2014
• Site assessment review with Stella Scrivener – 22\textsuperscript{nd} February 2014
• Workshop with SCC – 9\textsuperscript{th} May 2014, County Hall

(County Hall)
• Site Assessment Workshop – 22\textsuperscript{nd} April 2014
• Street Fair – 1\textsuperscript{st} June 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation Open dates</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 30\textsuperscript{th} June 2012 – in Church Walk</td>
<td>Tuesday 24\textsuperscript{th} July 2012 – JG &amp; EH NP Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 8\textsuperscript{th} August 2012 – NP at Tesco Hill</td>
<td>Monday 13\textsuperscript{th} August 2012 – JG &amp; CW met with Rosemary Banks at TVSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 2\textsuperscript{nd} February 2013 – NP Stand at Antiques evaluation day at Soper Hall</td>
<td>Tuesday 18\textsuperscript{th} September 2012 – Residents Questionnaire meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 5\textsuperscript{th} October 2013 – NP Workshop at Soper Hall</td>
<td>Monday 8\textsuperscript{th} October 2012 – Residents Questionnaire meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 5\textsuperscript{th} March 2014 – Whyteleafe consultation at St Luke’s Church</td>
<td>Saturday 10\textsuperscript{th} November 2012 delivering Residents Questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 12\textsuperscript{th} April 2014 – Chaldon consultation at Village Hall</td>
<td>Saturday 11\textsuperscript{th} January 2014 – NP Support Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 26\textsuperscript{th} April 2014 – CotH at Community Centre consultation</td>
<td>Saturday 22\textsuperscript{nd} February 2014 – Stella Scrivener, Planning Aid at Soper Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 21\textsuperscript{st} June 2014 – Caterham Valley consultation</td>
<td>Saturday 29\textsuperscript{th} March 2014 – all Workgroups at Soper Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 31\textsuperscript{st} May 2017 – NP stand at Street Party</td>
<td>Tuesday 17\textsuperscript{th} June 2014 – CR3 Forum AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 13\textsuperscript{th} May 2017 – NP open day at Church Walk</td>
<td>Tuesday 14\textsuperscript{th} October 2014 – Mapping meeting at Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 3rd June 2017 – NP open day at Church Walk</td>
<td>Monday 14\textsuperscript{th} December 2015 – CR3 Forum AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 4\textsuperscript{th} June 2017 – NP stand at Street Party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 10\textsuperscript{th} June 2017</td>
<td>NP open day at Church Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 17\textsuperscript{th} June 2017</td>
<td>NP open day at Church Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 24\textsuperscript{th} June 2017</td>
<td>NP open day at Church Walk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open day 17\textsuperscript{th} June 2017 in church Walk
4.2 Land Availability and Site assessments.

An important part of the preparation of the policies within the Neighbourhood Plan was to establish land availability within the CR3 forum area. Therefore the Steering Group in conjunction with the Housing Group arranged to consult with parish councils, developers and estate agents and with the general public to assess land availability through a Site Assessment programme. The Site Assessment Programme and Template was based on Planning Guidance and advice from Locality.

Details of Developers and Estate Agents written to during this process are given in Appendix E which also shows a template of letters sent to the parties.

A list of sites proposed by different parties following advertisements, letters and research by interested parties was prepared and each of these sites was assessed using a Site Assessment Template with visits to the different sites and desk top research. The draft Site assessments were then considered by the Steering Group before then being published on the CR3 forum website for the CR3 Neighbourhood Plan.

In total over 80 sites were assessed and are available on the CR3 Forum website for the public and land owners to read and comment on.

A similar programme was carried out to identify possible sites for Green Space designation. A Register and maps of 92 possible sites for Green Space designation is published on the website.

4.3 Consultation on Sustainability Appraisal

A Sustainability Appraisal report is a requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires Local Development Documents (this includes Neighbourhood Plans) to be prepared with a view to contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. It aims to predict and assess the environmental, social and economic effects that are likely to arise from the adoption of the CR3 Neighbourhood Plan and to ensure that the policies within it contribute to and promote sustainable development.
Due to the technical nature of both the process and content of this document the Steering Group appointed Levett-Therivel, Sustainability Consultants to carry out this work on their behalf.

The first stage of the Sustainability Appraisal was to prepare a scoping report to identify the sustainability issues within CR3 Area and set out the sustainability objectives and indicators for the Sustainability Appraisal of the Neighbourhood Plan. The scoping report was published for comment in accordance with Reg 4 and 12 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations, 2004 as part of a 5 week consultation period with statutory consultees from Appendix C.

The recommendations by these consultees were considered by the Neighbourhood Plan Committee and Levitt-Therivel and incorporated into the sustainability objectives. These in turn helped to determine how the Neighbourhood Plan addressed these and other issues through the Sustainability Appraisal which was published in draft alongside the Pre Submission Neighbourhood Plan. Both the Sustainability Appraisal October 2016 and the Policy Impact Matrix February 2016 are published and available for viewing on the CR3 forum website.

5. Developing and Testing the options

5.1 Pre Submission (Regulation 14) Consultation 15th April-10th June 2016

This consultation was based on the Pre Submission Plan Document 2015-2035 together with the supportive Group Reports, Site Assessments and Sustainability Appraisal. The consultation format was based on Regulation 14 Consultation.

People were consulted via email, CR3 Forum website, documentation in libraries and parish newsletters, together with advertisements in local newspapers.

Comments received to Pre Submission Consultations were recorded in the CR3 Forum gmail account and access was made available to Group members to read. The Comments were then assessed by Steering Group members and grouped into different categories. These were considered by Group members and policy changes were referred to Steering group for
approval and inclusion in the latest draft document. The groups of comments and responses are set out in Appendix B.

In addition to responses from the public, professional responses on behalf of land owners were received from SHW, Croudace and RPConsultancy

At the same time, letters were also written to Statutory Authorities and the draft for this letter, their details and responses are given in Appendix C. Responses were received from:


5.2 Consultation June 2016 to April 2017

In view of the wide ranging comments received from the earlier Consultations and the need for professional advice on Policies, the Steering Group postponed moving to the next stage to allow time for the Pre-Submission Statement to be modified and improved in response to public comments and advice from Planning Consultants and TDC. Discussions took place with Group members and the Steering Group on revisions to the Policies in the Pre-submission Plan Document. During this time there were also changes to the Steering Group which bought different views to the discussions.

During this period TDC consulted on the new Local Plan which provided considerable additional data relating to land availability and green belt assessment which needed checking and where required being referenced to data in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Also during this period meetings were held with TDC including with P Mason Head of Planning, Sarah Thompson Head of Planning Policy and Planning Control Officers in respect of Policies within the Pre Submission Document 2016 and subsequent revisions to Policies.

Professional advice was provided by AECOM and others. Draft Policies were submitted to TDC for comment and advice. Whilst much of this advice centred on Policies, it also included advice and then preparation of other documents required to complete the Neighbourhood Plan process.

These included preparation of documents on Local Green Spaces, Character Areas and updating the Sustainability Report.
This then evolved into the April 2017 CR3 Forum Draft Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2035, which went out to Regulation 14 Consultation in April 2017.

5.3 Regulation 14 Consultation April – June 2017

To be completed following analysis of comments received

6. Conclusion

Since its inception in 2012, the CR3 Forum has undertaken wide consultation with both the general public and statutory authorities. In addition to professional advice from Locality, AECOM and Quod Planning Consultancies, the Forum has sought advice and comment from Tandridge District Council.

Comments made through consultation and made directly to the Steering Group or its subsidiary Groups has been assessed and acted upon to produce the latest draft Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2035, April 2017. This is now based not only upon the Group Reports of 2015 but careful consideration of the consultations in 2016 and advice provided by AECOM and Tandridge District Council.

The draft dated April 2017 will be further considered and where necessary further changes made to respond to comments and ideas submitted in the April- June 2017 Regulation 14 consultation.

This Consultation Statement and the supporting Appendices are considered to comply with Section 15(2) of part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulat
Appendix A
The Terms of reference for the CR3 Neighbourhood Plan
Steering Group
CR3 Forum Constitution
1. **NAME AND AREA**

1.1. The name of the group shall be ‘The CR3 Forum’

1.2. The Area shall comprise the statutory areas of the Parish Councils of Caterham-on-the-Hill, Caterham Valley, plus Chaldon and and Whyteleafe Village Councils, as proposed and agreed in 2012 and as designated by Tandridge District Council on 18 July 2012. This is subject to any review proposed by The CR3 Forum and agreed under the terms of this constitution and as approved by statutory bodies from time to time or as adjusted by the Tandridge District council under its statutory powers.

1.3. The CR3 Forum comprises representation from the four (4) elected parish councils, together with the Caterham Community Partnership and the Caterham Business Partnership who were all equal participants in preparing and submitting the bid for Front Runner status to develop a local Neighbourhood Plan.

2. **PURPOSE**

2.1. The CR3 Forum is created for the express purpose of producing a ‘Neighbourhood Plan’ for promoting or improving the social, economic and environmental well-being of the neighbourhood, individuals living or working in the neighbourhood, and others with a commitment to the CR3 Forum Neighbourhood.

2.2. The CR3 Forum shall continue beyond the point of adoption of the Plan by the local planning authority for the purpose of monitoring its operation, effectiveness and for periodic review.

3. **OBJECTIVES**

3.1. To bring together all those serving or having an interest in the neighbourhood, in order to:

a. Strengthen networking and contacts within the neighbourhood;
b. Encourage strong joint working between development promoters, service providers and the neighbourhood;
c. Establish and further the business of the constituted forum to produce the neighbourhood plan;
d. Exchange information and views to aid decision-making (about local activities, priorities and services).

3.2 To develop a Neighbourhood Plan in order to:

a. Provide a strong spatial, social, environmental and economic context for any future development proposals;
b. Respect and enhance the existing environmental character of the area;
c. Develop and implement the highest possible standards in terms of sustainable development, engagement and consultation and local public services within the neighbourhood;
d. Set out for Surrey County Council (SCC), Tandridge District Council (TDC) and others the future spatial and infrastructure needs for a sustainable CR3 Forum neighbourhood;
e. Inform the priorities for the distribution of financial resources arising from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), Section 106, New Homes Bonus and any other relevant funding pots;
f. Encourage and maintain delivery of any adopted Neighbourhood Plan or neighbourhood development order(s);
g. Co-ordinate the involvement and response of the neighbourhood into any ‘higher’-level planning documents relevant to the neighbourhood and to ensure compatibility between the Neighbourhood Plan and other local plans, including those of neighbouring areas;
h. Working with others to maintain and improve open spaces, the public realm, sports, play and youth facilities in the neighbourhood;
i. Working with others to maintain, protect and improve woodland, trees and shrubs and rights of way through the neighbourhood;
j. Further any other aspects of the neighbourhood’s social, economic and environmental well-being.

3.3 To work constructively with others to develop and maintain a strong fit between the service needs of the neighbourhood and spatial planning in order to:

a. Maintain and improve the economic vitality of the community and the employability of its residents;
b. Promote synergy between neighbourhood service planning and spatial planning, particularly with regard to educational, health and environmental services.

4. SCRUTINY
4.1 The six founding organisations, making up the CR3 Forum, shall each assume
the role of scrutiny over the overall CR3 Forum’s activities and have the power to put an appropriate question and resolution to the Steering Group. As all of the 6 founding members are formal entities (4 Parish Councils and two partnerships with formal structures and elected participation), this provides oversight, plus the Neighbourhood Planning process itself includes District Council, and Inspector approval phases and finally a public referendum.

5. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY
5.1 The CR3 Forum is committed to inclusiveness reflecting the diversity of the neighbourhood. It will actively promote equality and encourage involvement from all sections of the community which shall be reflected in the membership of the Committee regardless of race, creed, religion, culture, ethnic origin, sex or sexual orientation, marital status, any kind of disability or chronic illness, age, class or gender reassignment.

5.2 The CR3 Forum will ensure there is an open, fair and transparent approach to encouraging nominations to the committees of CR3 Forum to ensure the make-up of the Committee in any one-year reflects, as far as possible, the diversity of people living and working within the neighbourhood.

5.3 The CR3 Forum’s communications and promotions will meet and reflect the diverse needs of those living or working in the neighbourhood.

6. ORGANISATION
A. MEMBERSHIP of the CR3 Forum
6.1 Participation in the Forum shall be open to all residents living in the CR3 Forum area, as well as all businesses operating in the area.

6.2 There are three classes of members:
1. Founder members (from each of the six organizations that have set up the CR3 Forum);
2. Ordinary members (i.e. residents of the area);
3. Organisational members.

A register of all members, whether Ordinary or Organisational, shall be held and updated regularly by the Project Coordinator to the Steering Group.

a. All individuals being members of each of the six organizations that have set up the CR3 Forum shall be Founder members;
b. All individuals who live, work in or have a commitment to the
neighbourhood shall be Ordinary members;

c. Organisational members are recognised for networks or organisations
who provide a service to others in the neighbourhood or who have a legitimate
business within it and who wish to be represented in the Neighbourhood Forum;

d. All Founder and Ordinary members shall have an equal vote of one vote per
member and can exercise this vote in person or by written proxy at the Annual
General Meeting (AGM) and any Extraordinary General Meeting (EGM) called.

e. All Organisational members will have one vote per organisation and can
exercise their vote through their representative or by proxy at the AGM
and any EGM called.

All voting shall be by a show of hands.

6.3 Caterham-on-the-Hill Parish Council shall act as the accountable body for the
CR3 Forum and as lead parish in any formal documents requiring such single body to
sign on behalf of the CR3 Forum

6.4 The Chairman of the Caterham-on-the-Hill Parish Council shall be the
Chairman of the CR3 Forum by default, in the event of no other Chairman being
elected by a show of hands at an Annual General Meeting of the CR3
Forum.

6.5 Meetings of the CR3 Forum shall be convened as and when the six groups
agree by simple majority to be necessary. At the least, there shall be an Annual
General Meeting held each year.

B. COMPOSITION AND MEETINGS OF THE FORUM STEERING GROUP

6.6 Under this constitution, The CR3 Forum delegates control of the process for
preparing the Neighbourhood Plan to a Steering Group, which shall comprise twelve
voting members, made up of two nominated representatives from each of the six
organizations making up The CR3 Forum.

6.7 Each of the six bodies shall have the power to appoint 2 voting
representatives to the Steering Group. The six bodies may vary their representatives
from time to time, as needed. All voting members of the Steering Group shall be
eligible to propose and vote for motions. Voting shall be by a show of hands.
6.8 The Steering group may invite additional members from local bodies, companies or individuals to join the Steering Group that they determine by a majority vote will add to the Steering Group’s ability to manage the overall exercise. Up to four (4) or more such additional voting members may be registered. Additional members may be for the duration of the exercise, or for shorter periods as needs arise.

6.9 Guests may also be invited to attend Steering Group Meetings on a one off, or repeat basis, such as chairs of any of the CR3 Forum’s working groups, local councilors, individuals, residents groups, council officers, businesses, land owners, developers, service providers, other local groups, professional advisers, or any other person(s) that the Steering Group deems may assist the project. Guests will not be entitled to vote.

6.10 Attendance at and participation in the Steering Group meetings shall be open to any interested party, for so long as they are not disruptive to the operation of the Steering Group. General attendees will not be entitled to a vote.

6.11 The Steering Group shall elect its own officers (including a Chair, Deputy Chair(s), Treasurer, and Project Coordinator). If vacancies arise due to one of the nominated representatives standing down or being asked to retire, the relevant organization must appoint a replacement no later than that organisation’s next meeting. Where there is a vacancy due to the retirement of a co-opted member, the Steering Group can co-opt new members of the Steering Group at their next meeting.

6.12 The Steering Group shall meet on a regular cycle at least once per month and shall publish the dates of their meetings. Providing that the Steering Group meets at least once per month, they can meet additionally as often as is necessary to steer the plan-making process and such other purposes as it determines.

6.13 The Steering Group will undertake its work as it sees fit and may delegate powers on specific matters to such persons as it sees fit.

6.14 Overall a Steering Group Meeting may:
i. Receive and comment on reports from working groups
ii. approve the annual report and accounts where relevant
iii. adopt constitutional amendments.
iv. Set overall directions, policy and make applications for funding
v. Set and amend the overall project timing
vi. Appoint consultants and agree partnership arrangements with those
necessary to complete the Neighbourhood Plan

vi. Agree press releases, or delegate routine information to be carried out on its behalf, through its Project Coordinator, or those managing the CR3 Forum web site

6.15 The Chair of the Steering Group:

i. have a casting vote on elections and resolutions

ii. act on behalf of the CR3 Forum and represent it externally

iii. a. may incur expenditure on behalf of the CR3 Forum which is of such extreme urgency that it must be done at once, whether or not there is any budgetary provision for the expenditure, subject to a limit of £100 with the agreement of one voting member from one of the Founder members. The Project Coordinator must be advised and the item raised at the next Steering Group meeting.

b. is authorised to sanction any necessary expenditure, under an appropriate budgetary provision, outside of Steering Group meetings up to £50 per item in any one month. The Project Coordinator must be advised and the expenditure raised at the next Steering Group meeting.

c. The Chairman of the Steering Group can call an extraordinary meeting of the Steering Group at any time.

iv. interpret the constitution. The Chair’s interpretation may be overturned by two-thirds of those present at the Steering Group

v. approve payments via the accountable body (Caterham Hill Parish Council)

6.16 The Treasurer, shall:

i. be responsible for maintaining the accounts of the CR3 Forum

ii. be responsible for presenting an annual budget with assistance from the Steering Group.

iii. submit a detailed summary of the accounts to every Steering Group Meeting.

6.17 A paid Project Coordinator shall be appointed and shall:

i. be responsible for organising meetings, maintaining the minutes and Constitution of the CR3 Forum and making them available to members

ii. Fulfill the role of CR3 Forum Project Coordinator as detailed in 6.11

6.18 Caterham-on-the-Hill Parish Council shall act as the accountable body for the CR3 Forum and as lead parish in any formal documents requiring such single body to sign on behalf of the CR3 Forum.

6.19 Funds received from central Government or from the District Council shall be
deposited into the Caterham-on-the-Hill Parish account. The Parish Council will release the funds to the CR3 Forum upon request. Cheques or other financial transactions of the CR3 Forum must require two signatories and follow such processes that are set up and approved via the Steering Group from time to time. Items that have been approved by the Steering group may be paid directly by the accountable body/Treasurer. The Caterham Hill Parish Council shall provide fully receipted records, backed up by copies of the minuted records of Steering Group approval of such expenditure electronically, to the CR3 Forum Council Steering Group on a calendar quarterly basis.

6.20  Steering Group Officer elections. There shall be an annual election of Steering Group officer positions. Any Steering Group member may stand for election, for any of the Officer positions. Nominations shall be open from the meeting prior to elections being held and comply with any rules set by the Steering Group at that time.

6.21  The quoracy shall be least a third of the voting members of the Steering Group. All Parish/Village councils should have 2 members on the Steering Group with 1 reserve for situations when 1 of the original members is unavailable. The quoracy of the Steering Group can be varied at any time by the Committee. Any inquorate meeting can proceed with the agenda items and the decisions thereof shall be carried over to the following meeting. The Project Coordinator shall be responsible for calling all meetings and ensuring that a record of each meeting is held and distributed with any other Committee business. The meeting shall be chaired by a person it elects from amongst its members, if normal procedure cannot be followed.

6.22  A member of the Steering Group who fails, without informing the Project Coordinator of their non-attendance, of a minimum of one-third of the meetings during any continuous period of 12 calendar months or to attend two consecutive meetings shall at the end of the period automatically cease to be a member unless the Committee has previously decided otherwise or shall decide within two months of such date.

6.23  The relevant Parish/Village Council would be notified of the non performance of a member of the Steering Group and request a replacement be identified.

C.  COMPOSITION AND MEETINGS OF THE FORUM WORKING GROUPS
6.24  The CR3 Forum has divided up the project into seven (7) Working Groups, to
tackle the necessary consultation and evidence gathering. These Working Groups are answerable and shall report to the Steering Group.

6.25 These groups shall be open to anyone who wishes to contribute to the CR3 Forum activities, including members of the Steering Group and other Working Groups. In the first instance, new contacts will be routed via the chairs of each working group.

6.26 The Working Groups shall meet monthly or as they otherwise decide and will provide guidance to the Steering Group on key decisions.

6.27 The Working Groups shall elect a chair who shall also be allowed to invite guests.

6.28 Meeting dates of Working Groups should be advertised as widely as possible.

7. AFFILIATIONS, OPERATIONS AND INDEPENDENCE
7.1 'CR3 Forum' shall not be affiliated to any political party or organisation.

7.2 The 'Neighbourhood Plan" (NP) role is to produce Planning Policies to be applied overall. In addition the NP may make forward looking statements of a visionary nature, to set guidance within which policies have been proposed.

The CR3 Forum is to make the plan in the first place and therefore, at least until the plan is made, shall not express any views on any particular planning application (other than those it makes itself) prior to the completion of the Neighbourhood Plan.

7.3 Individual Forum Members, such as the Parishes, or other founder bodies can comment on any planning applications during local statutory process but not in the name of the Forum. Permission to cite evidence and work on the Neighbourhood Plan however, either before or after any referendum, is likely to be freely given. Exceptionally, the Steering Group may agree that a comment be made by the CR3Forum itself. Any such decision to go via the Chair, be agreed by the Steering Group and be minuted accordingly, including the grounds for making a comment.

7.4 All members of the Forum shall act in meetings of the Forum in the best interests of the Forum and the residents of the area and shall follow the good governance guidelines set out in the attached guidance (or any updating thereof) - http://www.goodgovernancecode.org. uk/
7.5 The Forum shall act in accordance with best practice in the preparation of
neighbourhood plans and in accordance with Government guidance for such preparation
and shall seek to work collaboratively with the Local Planning Authority to achieve
this. The CR3 Forum shall also have a duty to cooperate with neighbouring areas and to
consult where feasible.

8. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS
8.1 Constitutional amendments shall require a majority (other than to comply
with the law)

8.2 The Constitution shall be reviewed annually

8.3 Following the creation of a Neighbourhood Plan, including approval by an
Inspector and a local referendum, the CR3 Forum shall, via its Steering Group, review its
status and role, in order to determine how best to deliver the adopted plan. Such an
outline plan to be communicated at the time of the referendum taking place.

9. DISTRIBUTION OF WIND-UP
9.1 A majority of the members of the Steering Group shall decide the distribution of
any money in the event of a wind-up. Any assets / money remaining shall go to local
community-based organisations.
Appendix B Issues arising from Consultation 15th April-10th June 201

How the issues and concerns have been considered

The table below summarises the main issues and concerns raised during both rounds of consultation. These are organised into Groups, comments with responses to the comments and how the neighbourhood plan policies have aimed to address these.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>COMMENTS ADDRESSED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>• Density of building</td>
<td>General Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Oversupply of retirement accommodation</td>
<td>Before discussing housing findings and policies, it is important to understand how and on what advice the HG Report is formulated and how this is then translated into the Housing Section of the Pre-Submission Summary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of infrastructure to support new developments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintaining the character and balanced mix of housing</td>
<td>The Housing Group Report was based on wide range of desk top research, advice from Planning Consultants including Locality, examination of how TDC prepare their own Planning documents and the information available (inc Hearn Report, SHLAA, HELLA and annual monitoring documents) and examining other NPs emerging and approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building in the brownfield sites and not the greenbelt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• TDC planning should give serious consideration to the more reasonable numbers in the CR3 Housing report</td>
<td>Early on in the preparation and from early resident surveys and consultation, it was clear that the importance of housing and housing numbers was a major issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Policy H01 is dangerous. TDC ‘s LP may use this against us which could mean using G Belt.</td>
<td>Locality and Planning Guidance provide guidance on the need for assessment of Housing Need. See Locality document. Locality: Housing Needs Assessment at Neighbourhood Plan A toolkit for neighbourhood planners. General advice is that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We should revisit the housing numbers because 99% negative to L Plan and its OAN. This may reduce the OAN and we should then reduce our quota.</td>
<td>where the existing Local Plan is out of date or being reassessed, the NPs should carry out their own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The first relates to the Neighbourhood Plan's (NP) Housing Policy HOI - New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing

- which sets an objective of 1,050 new units between 2015 and 2025 and a further 1,510 new units between 2025 and 2035.

• the CR3 postcode is actually providing double the housing which it should. This is manifestly not right and should be re-visited.

• Furthermore, the housing built in the CR3 area since the mid-1990s has mostly been constructed without any significant upgrading of the general infrastructure. Specifically, over the recent 20 year period, the number of houses in Caterham on the Hill has increased by 34%.

• This growth has been in the form of both major developments such as Oakgrove and a host of back garden developments. A vast majority of the latter have been allowed by the Council despite the fact that their construction was contrary to TDC’s policy DP8 (Residential Garden Land Development).

• The target of 2,560 over the next 20 years set in the NP would mean that house building would have to be

assessment. This has led to desktop analysis of census data, TDC annual monitoring, site assessments and study of land availability all with a view to providing sustainable evidence on supply and demand both in the past and likely in the future specifically for CR3 area.

Whilst it is correct that the NP does not need to set targets, it was considered even more dangerous to allow TDC to set a target for CR3 in the new Local Plan without reference to findings and policy in the Neighbourhood Plan. The Planning Guidance indicates that Local Plans must take into account NPs or other Policy documents which are emerging or better still which have been approved and made. The current NP is ahead of the new LP which may take anything from 2-5 years to be completed. In the event that the CR3NP is made, TDC would have to take it into account when setting housing targets and show good reason why those within the NP were inappropriate.

It should also be pointed out that when an earlier draft HO1 Policy was submitted to sequential testing by Consultants it was criticised as a statement not a policy.

The current Core Strategy which forms the present Local Plan is already considered to be out of date as it was written and completed before the NPPF. Whilst the targets within this do currently apply, they are already being challenged by developers on the grounds that they have not been prepared in accordance with NPPF and are not OAN assessments. Whilst TDC continue to maintain the illusion within their annual monitoring that they are meeting these targets, it is very unlikely that they will receive support at appeals and hence their rush now to produce a new Local Plan.

It was on this basis that the Housing Group looked at both supply and demand within the CR3 area and the policies HO01 and HO02 were formulated in the Pre Submission Summary

Following the Consultation and its comments, both HO01 and HO02 have been reconsidered and revised.

OAN Demand and Land availability Supply

The Housing Group prepared an OAN
equivalent to 27% of the total Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) of 9,400 which appears in the first draft of the TDC's updated Local Plan.

- Taken together, these developments have led to a substantial rise in the population, fuelled in part by inward migration from neighbouring areas including Epsom, Wandsworth and Croydon.

- Yet, as noted above, the NP says that the CR3 postcode represents 29% of the total urban area of Tandridge. However, in Section 1.239 of the back-up Housing document, it states that the overall CR3 area is 42% of Tandridge. There is clearly an error somewhere here.

- In the NP, the authors have identified many sites which together would allow a possible 1,050 new dwellings to be built in the next 10 years in the CR3 postcode area. It will have come as a surprise to the residents in 137-141 Whyteleafe Road that the; compact estate is identified as "imminent" or "started". Development began in 2008 based on the latest census data and planning guidance. This differs from that used in Local plan in that the data was for the parishes within CR3 alone and provides a picture of population and household growth from 2001 to 2014. As explained in the Housing Group Report 2015 this data can then be used to provide a projection into the future. The annual growth percentage used is 1% based on the previous 10 years but reference is made to this being higher due to the amount of housing built in the last 10 years and growth rates of 5.2% and 7% for earlier 10 year periods. Reference is also made to census data and TDC monitoring data which shows the greater than its size proportion of housing built in the CR3 area compared with the whole of Tandridge. The Housing Group Report contains full details which are abbreviated in the Pre Submission Summary.

Land availability, Supply was the opposite side of the equation and in conjunction with the Steering Group a wide ranging search for available land suitable for development was conducted and Site Assessments prepared from sites submitted for consideration. In addition both the HELAA and previous SHLAA were researched for available sites. The latter and desktop research provided a list of available sites currently with planning approval or already designated for housing. To these sites was added an estimate of available (2015-2025) sites from the Site Assessment list culminating in the Summary of Available Sites in the Housing Group Report pages 59-60. It is unfortunate now in hindsight this was not included in the body of the Pre Submission Summary so easy reference could be made when considering the figures used in formulating HO01. It will now be included in its updated form in the body of the Neighbourhood Plan. This Summary is an ongoing project that was originally drawn up for the period 2013-2033. It does contain sites which have completed before 2015 and comments to this effect are noted. The Summary is being corrected and updated.
move in the latter part of that year.

Under not considered developable in the next 5 years is the site identified as 156-180 Whyteleafe Road (Reserved Housing land). Whoever wrote the Neighbourhood Plan should have been aware that the Reserve Housing status was lost by Tandridge's Planning Department. This should have been known to at least some of the authors of the Plan since they were involved in the appeal relating to this land. Not only is this site deliverable in the next five years, but Charles Church and Chartwell have already submitted the relative planning applications.

In case the NP's authors are not aware, plans are also well advanced to re-develop the housing in Ninehams Gardens.

- What is not clear from the Plan is where the 1,510 new dwellings units would be built in the decade 2025 and 2035.
- Better research by the authors on the above matters would have avoided the accuracy of the

The stance the CR3NP is taking is based on providing a supply which largely matches delivery in previous years and is proportional to the urban area of CR3 within TDC. Further the NP goes on to show where and how this can be met in the next 10 years by identifying brownfield sites (see preceding paragraph) which in many cases already have planning approval or are likely to get planning approval which will meet this proposed supply within the period 2015-2025. The CR3 NP also identify further sites which may become available in the period 2025-2035 and has also reduced the target for this period on the basis of less sites being available and policy constraints based on the preservation of existing green belt boundaries and character of the area.

The supply rates for 2020-35 are below those necessary to meet OAN assessment based on the constraints that exist on future development particularly within existing green belt boundaries and existing densities. This may alter with TDC Green Belt Boundary Survey.

It should also be borne in mind that the current Core Strategy has become out of date long before 10 years have run from 2008 and there are already calls for the current NPPF to be revised from politicians and planners. Thus 10 years is a very long time in planning terms for policy not to need revision or to remain valid. It will be necessary to continue to monitor and update as necessary policy within the NP into the foreseeable future.

Policy HO1 sets an overall target for the first 10 years at 1050 at an annual rate of 130 net new units for the period 2015-20. This by mathematics sets a lower rate of 80 net units for the following 5 year period. This continues as the proposed rate for the period 2026-2035 and in both cases is lower than current house delivery. The final part of the Policy also provides for the target to be spread over the whole period so that if more units are built in any one year this reduces the rate throughout the period and the value of the increased rate is not lost.

It is again unfortunate that there has been confusion over these figures which
Neighbourhood Plan being brought into question.

- The NP identifies certain brownfield sites including Caterham Hill and Caterham Valley libraries and the Chaldon Road Community Recycling Centre. It is interesting to note that the Caterham Hill Library and the Chaldon Road Community Recycling Centre are now identified for closure, yet they had previously been subject of campaigns to keep them open, albeit that their closure was not on the cards.

It is evident that these extra brownfield sites would not be able to take anything near the 1,510 units required by NP Policy HO1. One has therefore to ask where the balance would be constructed.

- The NP will be subject to a referendum later this year. Before this happens, the NP’s authors should come clean and say where the 1,560 house would be built in the period 2025 - 2035. It would be wrong to put the NP to the vote when it does not say where the additional houses required an addendum to be added to the Pre Submission Summary. For this we should apologise.

By putting forward these targets which are also based on an OAN assessment for the CR3 area, the CR3NP is maintaining a high level of contribution to the future TDC target based on all these factors. In the current circumstances this is an increase on that currently demanded by the Core Strategy but is in line with a proportional response both to CR3 OAN and Hearn OAN for TDC. Importantly it is evidence based.

Thus the CR3 policy HO1 is based on making a positive contribution to TDC based on not only its urban size, but also an OAN assessment for CR3 and in line with its previous contribution in the past. However in doing this the CR3NP has also identified brownfield sites which will meet this target without contributions from the Green Belt. This is a much better defence than relying on TDC or allowing developers to say that no targets have been set and therefore the sky’s the limit.

Density
This is dealt with in HO02 by reference back to existing density levels and requiring proposals which increase local density more than 10% being required to justify this in terms of impact on the locality and environment, the provision of open space and amenity and quality of design. Policy HO02 has been reviewed.

Infrastructure
This is also dealt with by other Groups but the Forum has become aware of the dichotomy that exists between residents’ perception of an infrastructure deficit and what statutory authorities are prepared to confirm or own up to. The current evidence base with the exception of flooding is that there are no major infrastructure problems preventing development.

This is why Policy HO02 refers to demonstrating how the density of the residential development satisfies the guidelines set down in the Neighbourhood Plan, relating to public transport and accessibility of local amenities and services. Further Policy HO05 refers to developments of 5 dwellings or more must demonstrate...
would be constructed. The failure to identify where all this additional housing would be built would leave the CR3 area open to excessive house building over the next couple of decades. This is despite the fact that more than 70% of the residents say that this is not what they want and almost 85% of people being against the release of green belt land.

- It has been made clear to me on more than one occasion that the NP would be subservient to the Tandridge Council Local Plan. As such, it would be overridden by any Tandridge Local Plan which might eventually be adopted.

It will be interesting to see if the NP is passed in the referendum and if so, how much of it eventually survives, particularly in the light of the need for serious upgrading of the local infrastructure.

- Housing already full, no more needed here.
- Targets queried. Brownfield sites need to be identified. Govt pressure may alter GB boundaries and stronger wording needed.
- HO05 Too woolly, needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green Belt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is agreed that the Government has indicated that unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the “very special circumstances” justifying inappropriate development on a site within the green belt. However recent appeal decisions based on lack of 5 year supply have led to some ambiguity on interpretation and the use of brownfield designation to farm buildings and existing estates within the green belt also adds to possible greenspace development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By presenting the present policies the NP is establishing that a reasonable increase in net new housing over the next 10 years is possible from brownfield sites and that there is not likely to be an unmet housing need within the CR3 area.

This subject is also covered by other Groups but under Housing the main safeguards arise from:

- HO01 By providing a list of brownfield sites which will meet the requirements of an OAN supply proportionate to the CR3 area, this obviates the necessity of building on the green belt.
- HO05 By supporting the use of brownfield sites first and requiring any applicant wishing to develop green field sites to demonstrate that there are no available and suitable brown field sites, will direct development to brownfield development without being restrictive.

Whilst these Policies are specific to housing, other policies within the NP also support the retention of green space land.

It should be noted that only the District Local Plan can alter Green Belt boundaries or remove Green Belt status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies HO02, HO06 and HO07 deal with the retention and improvement of character and there is some overlap with other Group Policies. These Policies will be reviewed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Planning Guidance and Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tightening up.

- H006 and 007 could contradict. Define “larger”.
- I would argue that all of the areas described are suburban rather than urban. Urban would suggest that there are blocks of flats over 5 storeys in height and this is not the case.
- These targets would exceed the delivery of net new units from 2003-2013 at 1194. It seems unlikely that the same number of brownfield sites will become available during the next 10 years (2025-2035) and therefore the targets will only be achieved by use of higher densities, alteration of green belt boundaries and building on current green belt land.
- Alterations to the Green Belt should only occur if they are close to sustainable modes of transport. The redevelopment of the Surrey National Golf Club, Chaldon, in my mind is not sustainable.
- What I would like to understand is why isn’t Warlingham, Oxted and Lingfield being forced to increase/exceed their housing targets? Oxted has a train constrains the use, unless special circumstances can be proven, of over-supply in previous years as a reason for reducing the OAN supply going forward. The special circumstances must be on going.

It is agreed that Planning Practice Guidance Para.044 does imply that once an OAN is calculated other constraints can be considered before a supply target is set. The supply indicated for the period 2015-2025 not only is close to the CR3 OAN but also proportionately correct for the urban area of CR3 against TDC OAN calculations, further it is also matched by identified brown field sites largely with planning permission. It would not be sensible therefore to identify a supply below these figures. The supply of net new units at 130pa is 650 net new units for the period 2015/20 and 80 pa net new units is 400 net new units for the period 2020/25 giving a total of 1050 net new units for the 10 year period 2015/25.

For the period beyond 2025, the supply is less clear and there currently exists green belt, character and future infrastructure constraints to be accounted for and which suggest that a lower level of delivery can only be provided. For this reason delivery from 2020 to 2035 is reduced to 80 net new housing units pa for this period. This provides 400 new units in the period 2020/25 and 800 in the period 2026/35.

In total this provides for 1850 net new units over 20 years, 1050 in period 2015/25 and 800 in period 2026/35.

It should be borne in mind that one is trying to estimate supply for 10 to 20 years in the future. Much will depend on changes in circumstances and planning law over the prior period and this makes any need or supply for this period less accurate to predict. Review of the NPPF is due and the present Core Strategy approved in 2008 is already out of date in less than 7 years. This suggests that any Plan beyond the next 10 years will need review.

Whilst the figures used in Policy HO01 are evidence based, the policy will be reviewed in light of comments. The next draft should be clear that the
station. Lingfield has a train station. Warlingham has a good bus route. Why is CR3 taking the brunt. We should be stricter in the approach with Tandridge Council.

- Policy HO05 is fairly woolly - applicants must demonstrate that there are no available and suitable brownfield sites in the ward and surrounding wards or you could say in the main suburban towns. A housing report shall be submitted with any application to demonstrate that they have reviewed and applied to buy alternative brownfield sites before assessing green field sites.

- Policies H006 and H007 could contradict one another. On one hand H006 is seeking to protect the existing character, plot widths etc (lets use Whyteleafe Road re developments of existing 4/5 houses as an example) and H007 is seeking to promote the subdivision of units and efficient use of land which to a developer means building on existing open space. How do you define a larger property?

- Policy H008 should be reworded to read on sites which figures relate to the period 2015-2035 and on how these are calculated for 2015-2025 and 2026-2035. The table of sites are available for future development based on future net new units anticipated should be included in next Draft.

Policy HO05, H006 and H008 will be reconsidered in light of comments and policies will be rationalise or combined if this seem to provide better clarity and rigidity.

Affordable homes
The comments on the draft Policy HO08 are noted and it is agreed that this policy must comply with the similar Policy in the current Core Strategy. However HO08 differs by strengthening appraisal parameters and making financial contributions a last resort. Policy revisions will also relate type and mix of affordable housing to local need.

The actual wording will be reconsidered for the final draft taking into account comments made.

Neighbourhood Plan and Emerging Local Plan
As previously explained the Neighbourhood Plan is in a more advanced stage than the emerging Local Plan and it is hoped following a successful referendum will be in place long before the new LP is adopted. As an emerging NP planners working on the emerging LP are obliged to have regard of the NP and its policies. It is therefore important that the NP is adopted as soon as possible as this will increase its influence for planning decision makers.

However it will be important that the NP has a review process so that once the new LP is adopted, it can ensure that its Policies remain compatible. It’s a fact of planning life that all Planning Policy is in need of constant review.

Conclusion
Consultation provides a direct interface with the public, business and developers, it is important that not only are comments registered but that they are used to progress the NP forward to a more robust and acceptable format. Housing is no exception to this and all comments will be considered against the respective Policies.
measure 0.4 ha or are capable of accommodating 10 or more dwellings……

- An acceptable gross profit margin for appraisal would be 15% of net sales value. This should be 20% rather than 15%. The repayment clause does not need to be added to the s106 agreement. It's at the Council's discretion.
- No more development in the CR3 area
- enjoyment of natural light should not be diminished by the development of adjacent land
- the plan that suggested building a new settlement away from the hill must make the most sense for any reasons. It could have new schools doctors shops and employment with in it so it would be self supported so not over stretching our resources in Caterham
- I probably have different views on social housing - in my view it is a bad idea
- We note that there are a few policies that are repeated throughout the document, and there is reference to sites in the text but no sites have been allocated. For example,
under housing, the reference to 12 brownfield sites is made to meet the Objectively Assessed Need, but there is no information on these sites. As such, we suggest the plan is reviewed to make it more concise and provide clarity.

- The proportion of Tandridge’s housing target that comes from the North of the district, particularly the Hill, is a long-standing area of sensitivity. I’m sure there are options elsewhere, particularly in Oxted, but the locals are well organised and tend to be older with more time on their hands to campaign and lobby so they get spared. I think your idea of a new settlement is a good one, but the obvious questions are ‘where’ and ‘would you get planning permission as it’d probably be Green Belt’

- We probably have different views on social housing. In my view it’s a bad idea if it means a below-market lifetime rent, because it provides a disincentive to tenants to improve their financial position and such properties can be occupied by people who misrepresent their
true circumstances, deliberately make them bad to be awarded such properties or who continue occupying them even when they can afford to pay market rents or buy. I know government policy is addressing many of these concerns, but in the meantime I think we have sufficient social housing on the Hill and the priorities should be to increase the stock of small to medium-sized homes reflecting the mix of demand, both to buy and to rent (on the basis that housing benefit may be used to enable those on low incomes to occupy 'market rent' properties).

• For the avoidance of doubt, to precis my response to both the Tandridge Local Plan and this NP, for me to support the NP in a referendum I will need to see specific identification of sites for potential development and a reconciliation to the housing target. Furthermore I will need to see conditions relating to local services in the Housing Policies. These will need to be quantified and measurable so that future Planning decisions can
impose these conditions on developers and that we, the local inhabitants (who have been subjected to decades of under investment in services, visibly roads, medical services, and school place availability) can assess whether they are being observed, if necessary on a decision by decision basis.

• In terms of housing (which seems to be biggest concern for people locally), I don’t think the plan stands up to scrutiny. To have an OAN of about 130 units of new housing each year and then suggest only 80 are provided in the years beyond 2018 (or later) isn’t really sustainable. There seems little point in having an OAN and then ignoring it. I appreciate that’s not necessarily a popular view. But if the plan is to be respected by those that will make wider decisions (Tandridge DC etc.) then it needs to accept the OAN ‘target’. As it stands, I’m not persuaded the plan will act as a “counterweight” to the Tandridge-wide plan.

• It’s difficult to see how the housing requirements of CR3
will be met without building somewhere within AGLV. Again, I realise that may not be popular but it has to be preferable to building on Green Belt or AONB land. The forum could look at AGLV land and determine those areas where the least damage will be caused, rather than what comes across as a (if you’ll forgive the expression) NIMBY approach. That’s not to diminish people’s genuine concerns. But a more positive/active approach may actually be more productive. What is actually needed are flats and houses that are in the reach of younger people for sale or rent. Although this is a wider issue it is not helped by the current policy on development of retirement flats, luxury apartments and 4/5 bedroom houses which in turns attracts people in and forces local young people away. Lack of supply and increase in demand of affordable housing. Why do we need yet another retail unit at Pinewood House when there are empty shops in Westway, both High Streets and Church Walk.

- The CR3 plan has also made the same errors as the Neighbourhood Plan in that
you have assumed that that the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) for housing must be met in full (p.21-22 of the NP Pre-submission Plan, and p.74 of the Housing Group Report). But Para 044 of the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) says: "However, assessing need is just the first stage in developing a Local Plan. Once need has been assessed, the local planning authority should prepare a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period, and in so doing take account of any constraints such as Green Belt, which indicate that development should be restricted and which may restrain the ability of an authority to meet its need."

Obviously the fact that 94% of Tandridge is Green Belt is a very large constraint, which should greatly restrict development in comparison to
the OAN. Secondly, the CR3 Forum have said that, in order to meet its housing target, building on the Green Belt will need to take place. Page 56 para 52 of the NP's Housing Report says: "the targets will only be achieved by use of higher densities, alteration of green belt boundaries and building on current green belt land." But PPG para 034 says the following: "Unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the "very special circumstances" justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt."

In other words, the Government says that meeting the OAN is unlikely to be a reasonable justification for building on the Green Belt - the Government would rather that a lower housing target was set, with no building on the Green Belt.

Thirdly, the CR3 Forum states on p.19 of the Pre-Submission Plan and p.54 para 44 of the Housing Report that "The terms of reference set by Central Government also do
not allow for previous over supply to be taken into account when assessing future targets based on objectively assessed needs." However PPG para 036 says the following: "Household projections are based on past trends. If a Council has robust evidence that past high delivery rates that inform the projections are no longer realistic - for example they relied on a particular set of circumstances that could not be expected to occur again - they can adjust their projections down accordingly." So in summary, the Neighbourhood Plan should NOT use the Objectively Assessed Needs process to dictate the size of its housing target. The NP should NOT envisage building on the Green Belt in order to meet any housing targets. The NP should refer to recent levels of house building in CR3 to argue against the setting of excessive targets. Above all, the NP SHOULD NOT set a target for new house building, for the reasons set out above.

• I would like to state that our
CR3 area cannot support anymore house building. We do not have the infrastructure and amenities to support an influx of people associated with over 2500 new homes. There must be no use of green belt land for such a money making idea.

- The Neighbourhood Plan is seeking to identify its own Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAN) and make a case for a local level of housing provision to meet that need. However, the emerging Tandridge Local Plan has undertaken its own OAN for the district and this will be a major consideration in setting the housing requirement and spatial approach contained in the Local Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan will need to have regard to this and therefore it is premature to reach conclusions regarding housing numbers for the Neighbourhood Plan area if the plan policies are to remain up to date upon adoption of the Local Plan. As a result there may be need in addition to that identified by the CR3 Forum for further land release
to accommodate the housing requirement. This could require a review of the policies proposed in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Comment addressed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design</td>
<td>• Protection of heritage assets</td>
<td>GSHD 01 and 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building on green belt is detrimental and must not be undertaken</td>
<td>GSHD 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Protection of green spaces, wooded hillsides and ridges</td>
<td>GSHD 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Green belt must not continue to disappear and must be maintained.</td>
<td>GSHD 03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wildlife corridors</td>
<td>GSHD 02 and 03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Valuable chalk downland must be maintained</td>
<td>GSHD 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poorly designed buildings, poor urban environment and poorly maintained in the streetscape</td>
<td>GSHD 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Better design with integrated amenity space</td>
<td>GSHD 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No infrastructure.</td>
<td>GSHD 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any new building should be in keeping with surrounding areas</td>
<td>GSHD 02, 03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Constant noise due to increased development</td>
<td>All GSHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased pollution and road noise due to increased development and thus more vehicles</td>
<td>GSHD 02,03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tragic loss of trees and wildlife</td>
<td>GSD 05, 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continued development is to the detriment of residents in the area and reduces quality of life</td>
<td>Local Green Space Designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It will be vital that all of the policies and statements in the CR3 NP are in line with the PC's own stance on issues affecting the parish. In particular, I would expect the plan's content on important matters including housing provision, protection of open spaces and defence of the Green Belt to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reflect the PC’s position on these issues.

- The Random sell off of green belt produced pockets of land for development and will in my view produce more “Brookside” style “cul de sac” developments which do not properly link to the village high street or the context of the heritage of the village.
- “Neighbourhood Environmental Land” is the term used in the Appendices: Section 6 Urban & Rural Design and Heritage Appendix 11 (p750) to support Policy URD9.
- The actual Neighbourhood Plan Policy URD9 itself makes no reference to any specific or formal ‘green space’ protection.

GS HD 02 and Local Green Space Designation

Response to 2016 Public Consultation Comments

The 2017 version of the Neighbourhood Plan has been significantly revised from the original. This reflects public comment (received in the 2016 consultation), changing circumstances with regard to the emerging TDC Local Plan, and professional advice over making policies planning-compliant.

Green space policies

The original version had very little addressing green space protection (as specifically referenced in one of the 2016 comments). This was because the majority is already statutorily-designated as Green Belt and thus addressed nationally via NPPF.

However two factors have since been taken into account.

Firstly, (and consistent with previous consultations for the current TDC Core
Strategy and Local Plan) there was a high level of public concern about protecting the Green Belt and green infrastructure.

Secondly, Tandridge District Council has introduced a Green Belt boundary review as part of the new emerging Local Plan. Much of the significant (but vulnerable) green infrastructure that presently surrounds, threads through and separates our settlements is being considered for removal from the Green Belt or development within it.

As a result, green space policies have been added. They do not directly address Green Belt planning issues, which are beyond the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. They set general principles and presumptions that apply to all green spaces and infrastructure. They are supported by detailed implementation criteria. These define priorities that apply locally, when considering applications to develop green spaces.
Where these spaces are also Green Belt, the criteria help determine whether very special circumstances exist that justify development. Local Green Space designations are also proposed (as per NPPF).

Heritage policies
Following the planning consultant’s comments the text was simplified and unified into two main criteria-based policies. GSHD 01 sets out an integrated approach to safeguarding both the natural and historic environment. GSHD 05 describes the principles of designing development to safeguard local historic character and heritage.

Design policies
Planning advice was received that the original draft was not fully compliant, presenting design guidance and associated codes and regulation as policy. The policies have therefore been re-drafted to present key locally-relevant goals, each supported by detailed implementation criteria.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leisure and &amp; Community</th>
<th>These five points back up the Neighbourhood Plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Playground, Miller Centre and Caterham School facilities are included in the LC Appendices. Museum has been added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These two points back up N Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N Plan back up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referred matter for TDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queens Park is included in LC Appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaldon Village Hall is included in LC Appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Added to Library Appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incuded in Appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Back up for N Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC08 is now part of Green Spaces Policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- do not support LC14 - we already have good sports facilities in Caterham and I don't see the need for a new purpose built facility.
- do not support LCA6 - we do not need our own crematorium. I am also against an incinerator being built within the CR3 area
- Request “The N Plan will resist the demolition of churches for residential use, unless being replaced elsewhere in the local area, and support the development of any property for community purposes. It will support change of use and the extending of premises subject to compliance with other policies in the N Plan to maintain or increase Places of Worship and/or buildings for community use”
- LCA2 I don't consider this relevant to the plan
- LCA4 - unrealistic and De Stafford routinely provides daytime access for swimming. Village now part of the Tandridge Centre.
- LCA6 Is there really sufficient demand locally?
- LC10 I find very unrealistic. Aspirational but might actually impede refurbishment etc.
- As a young couple in our late 20’s who have just moved to the lovely area of Caterham, we feel that the town centre would be improved and attractive to other young people like ourselves if there was a lively bar
- consideration it was decided to retain this as LC8 because of predicted increase in population. Crematorium has been removed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Support for Caterham Dene Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concern re insufficient health provision and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HE02 in the NP highlights the extreme usefulness of the Dene Hospital in local health services and its importance in Health Service provision in the CR3 area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This wording has been inserted into N Plan.

These two policies have been removed.

Public demand requested this.

Policy removed.

This is more relevant to the Caterham Town Design Statement.
| Overstretched GP practices | Support for more GP surgeries | Prefer not to lose the Dene Field -
Policy HE01 addresses the need to expand 2 of the 4 General Practices in the CR3 area. The Plan also highlights the problem of increasing numbers of elderly patients over 85 years of age and the resultant increased pressure on GP services. Policy HE01 gives support for another GP surgery within any future new development scheme in the CR3 area. The NP does not envisage support for a complete loss of the Dene Field, even if there is some development of the Dene Hospital site, (Policy HE02).

| Education | Lack of schools in CR3 area. | Support innovative policy for the 6th form college. 
University technical college or 6th form college is needed. 
Educational land to be kept for educational purposes. 
Support for more schools. |
---|---|---|
The Education section of the NP addresses all of the comments we have received. The data collected from primary and secondary schools and from an analysis of population growth in the CR3 area predicts a possible need for a new secondary school in the future, (Policy HE09). Policy HE05 supports expansion of the de Stafford secondary school and this would include re-establishment of the de Stafford 6th form. Policy HE06 is supportive of a 6th form college or University Technical College to enhance the employment of young people in the CR3 and adjacent areas. Policy HE11 states that the NP will resist any application for a change of use of educational land. The data collected on population growth and our inspection of most of the schools in the CR3 area suggests that there may be a requirement for an expansion of primary schools, private schools, and an increase in nursery school provision, (Policies HE04, HE07, HE08, HE09)).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Comment addressed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transport | **PARKING**  
1. Parking is always an emotive subject, and the plan reports: "an almost unanimous view of attendees that day-long parking should be removed from residential roads."  
2. *An “almost unanimous view” perhaps means that those who are retired or work from home strongly disagreed. A small but rising percentage maybe. There are no details.*  
3. “The Neighbourhood Plan will support the strongest use of road marking to deter the all-day parking in residential roads.”  
4. Before giving any support to that, I’d want to know what “strongest use of road marking” means. What sort of road marking will "deter" all-day parking as opposed to prohibit it? I can only think of a per-hour charge for parking outside one’s own home on a residential street. Completely unacceptable.  
5. Residents’ permit schemes are usually introduced very benignly, with some notional annual fee. But, with no regulation of fees, they quickly escalate to eye-watering levels.  
6. From recent national news:  
7. "UK councils have increased the cost of resident parking permits by an average of 51% since 2011, research has found"  
8. An investigation by car insurance firm Esure also revealed that more than half of local authorities have expanded the number of parking zones which require payment in the past two years (guardian 23 May 2016) | 1-8 The underlying premise of the parking element of the plan is that the car is here to stay and that with the hilly terrain, a sizeable elderly component in the population, vulnerable bus services and the attraction to all ages (both commuting and at leisure) of 4 stations in TfL Zone 6, we need to accommodate the car by providing affordable off-street parking to attract drivers to our transport access points, shops and businesses in CR3 rather than trying to price it out of the locality. It is estimated that over 90% of those who commented on Transport aspects of the plan favoured moving hazardous, congesting and polluting parking off residential streets. The suggestion (italicised opposite) that those commenting were an |
elderly or home-working minority is therefore not supported.

The remaining comments effectively support the plan's approach.

| 9.  | Air pollution from vehicles          | 9-17 points are all fundamental to the plan and all are addressed in the Transport section |
| 10. | Traffic Noise                       |
| 11. | Parking & Congestion                |
| 12. | Insufficient public transport       |
| 13. | Support for air quality monitoring  |
| 14. | Support better transport, access and parking |
| 15. | Lack of parking                     |
| 16. | Volume of traffic                   |
| 17. | Lack of public transport in the early evening |
| 18. | From Highways England: Re Section 5 116 - yellow box zone - A22 at this point is not SRN so cannot provide any funding. SCC are responsible. Revise to “A22 at this point is SCC responsibility”. |
| 19. | Road surfaces and parking are poor. Poor infrastructure. |
| 20. | Parking is scarce and dangerous     |
| 21. | Doctors Lane itself is very narrow in places meaning much of it enables only traffic to pass one way and not just before its junction with Church Lane. |
| 22. | Public Transport provides a very restricted service in the area and local bus services do not run |

22. Surrey CC public consultations have resulted in successive bus
evenings, weekends and bank holidays.

23. TFL particularly supports the intention of policies T01 and 2 and if the forum have any queries regarding our TA Best Practice Guidance or relating to TFL bus services in the area, please do get in touch

24. T02 and T03 apparent contradictions here

25. TA8 ambitious and unclear if safety of cyclist been considered. Not mentioned as an issue to consider in 5.159.

26. TA10 Who is going to pay for this?

27. The road layouts of newer developments simply do not mesh with the core layout of victorian streets.

28. The existing highway infrastructure particularly around Westway Common cannot cope with the traffic that currently uses these roadways often congested one way and particularly around the dump at times on the weekend.

29. Car parking in the town and village centres is limited, increased traffic to the railway station will create additional congestion and difficulties as commuters in the locations of the proposed site will need to drive

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>timetable revisions aimed at tackling these issues where viable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


24. T02 refers to new building developments, T03 refers to all parking facilities.

25. TA8 Safety issues implicit but noted for specific mention.

26. Just an aspiration. Not costed

27. Specifics not supplied by commenter.

28. Solution proposed in form of one-way system.

29. Addressed in notes on following sheet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comments from Consult 2016</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. I think the idea of a cycle hire scheme is pointless. It's too hilly here.</td>
<td>30. Not borne out author's experience overseas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31. I think reinstating a viable bus link between the Hill and the station is crucial</td>
<td>31. Covered both in early feedback to SCC and in Community Bus proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>1. Power grids at maximum and water supplies inadequate for current needs</td>
<td>1. The utilities companies are statutory consultees on all planning applications. Utilities Policies aim for self-sufficiency on all developments. Policies U01, U03 and U05 for Power and Water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Recycling facility to be relocated to a more appropriate site</td>
<td>2. Policy U07 refers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Future utility requirements not considered</td>
<td>3. See response 1 above. The title of U01 is Adequate &amp; Self-Sufficient Utility Services for the duration of the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Approval should be sought for fracking following a impact statement from Sutton &amp; East Surrey Water Company</td>
<td>4. Policy U04 on Fracking point 4 states that arrangements are made via the local water company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Sewage and Flooding is an worrying issue</td>
<td>5. Covered in U06 and U08 in discussion with the local Flood Action Groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. New developments should provide adequate provision for utilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Chaldon Road Recycling Site should be retained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. From Lee Dance, Head of Water Resources South East Water -- “The public water in the N Plan area is supplied by Sutton and E Surrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Water and waste by Thames Water”.  

9. Flooding  
10. Flood risk map does not include Chaldon or parts of Caterham  
11. do not support the suggestion that the refuse and recycling area in Chaldon Road should be relocated. This is an essential local service and the removal of this facility would result in increased flytipping which is already a problem.  
12. deliver a flood mitigation strategy including measures to increase the flow-rate along the Bourne culvert as outlined in the Utilities section of the Plan (URD01 & URD02 refer). We also support the policy U06 but wish to see account taken of the strategic infrastructure needs over the whole period of the plan (25 years).  
13. stop development in areas prone to flood unless sufficient mitigation is brought in for each and every development (U08)  
14. If ever you need any reasons for the halting of development in CR3, you need look no further than look at the events of today, 07/06/2016, when the Hill flooded for the 2nd time in 2 years. It is clear that the area cannot take any more development and that the facilities cannot cope with the current situation  

6. Policy U01 applies in general and the subsequent policies require this.  

7. This is not our policy as the current site has severe limitations although the position is convenient for some people. Comment 2 contradicts this comment and is indicative of the difficulty in having the perfect answer.  

8. Understood.  
9. See response 5  
10. Flood risk map area enlarged but could be better.  
11. See response7. Fly tipping is predominately DIY and builders waste which is not accepted at Chaldon Road any more.  
12. The Neighbourhood Plan covers the whole period of the plan from a planning perspective. It is not a strategic development document or one that specifies what needs to be done for a specific location.  
13. Policy U08 requires that plans are scrutinised against the tightest flood zone level
14. Agreed. However this is a planning document and the events would have been mitigated if proper enforcement of policies and maintenance by the utility companies had taken place. Having a good plan is of no use unless it is enforced. The Flood Action Group is in the best place to achieve this in association with the local planning authority.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polic</th>
<th>Summary of the key issues/concerns</th>
<th>Review notes CR3</th>
<th>3 Policy Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Employment</td>
<td><strong>1. No more commercial development</strong></td>
<td>Retention of facilities for employment and the local economy to be maintained so far as possible, to ensure that the town is attractive to residents and business.</td>
<td>Balanced Residential &amp; Employment = NPPF. CR3 Business &amp; Employment “Introduction”. Specific. BE01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2. More business needed</strong></td>
<td>The plan seeks to encourage new start-ups whether as mobile, home based, live/work units, shared hubs, or individual premises. A new enterprise park is also a strategic objective, either in existing commercial space or other suitable land.</td>
<td>Balanced Residential &amp; Employment = NPPF. CR3 Business &amp; Employment “Introduction” Specific. BE02/BE03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3. Encourage development of office space in CR3</strong></td>
<td>See above, subject to demand/needs</td>
<td>As above Specific. BE01/BE03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4. Bespoke shops</strong></td>
<td>To be encouraged, via Masterplan, Town Design Statement &amp; BID</td>
<td>Supported via Caterham Town Design Statement &amp; Masterplan policies, which are endorsed. Specific. Part of BE04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5. Encourage new business</strong></td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>As above Specific. BE01/BE02/BE03/BE04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6. Current commercial stock is outdated and does not encourage business demand</strong></td>
<td>Regenerate existing spaces and consider a new Enterprise location.</td>
<td>As above. Specific. BE02/BE03/BE04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7. CR3 loses employment opportunities and there is a risk that the area becomes a dormitory town</strong></td>
<td><strong>A core concern, due to permitted development rights. The central area ‘s town Masterplan needs to balance, retail, residential and business. Outside the town centres, other mixed urban/rural locations are vulnerable to increasing residential</strong></td>
<td>As above. Specific. BE01/BE02/BE03/BE04/BE05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Significant commercial spaces must be protected</td>
<td>Yes, see above. Should a more specific test be proposed similar to the affordable housing ratio e.g. 40% on significant size development? For example brownfield site development will have a general presumption in favour of continued use. Proposals for active employment sites must demonstrate that overall there is no employment loss locally. Availability of alternative sites or premises on broadly similar terms, where businesses seek to continue to operate, should be provided in mitigation.</td>
<td>As above. Specific. BE01/BE02/BE03/BE04/BE05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Self sufficient parking for new businesses</td>
<td>RESPONSE REQUIRED</td>
<td>This is a gap we need to close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Encourages conversion of business to residential if commercial is not feasible</td>
<td>Generally yes, or seek new sustainable business in modern sectors. PD rights achieve this, provided the brownfield site is not sustainable for the existing use or user.</td>
<td>PD rights achieve this, provided the brownfield site is not sustainable for the existing use or user, or identified for another commercial use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Support the need to regenerate Caterham Town Centre with a good mixed economy. Central to this is the need to provide adequate parking. Caterham does not have a 24 hour car park</td>
<td>Agree. Masterplan, Town Design Statement and overall business policies intended to support this.</td>
<td>As above. Specific. BE03 &amp; BE04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Issue of concern is the inclusion of a Business Park within the NP. There has been no indication of location and we consider that this would also have a negative bearing on the CR3 area i.e. traffic congestion and air pollution.</td>
<td>Any business park is intended to be for sustainable modern sectors, e.g. those involved with Internet, communications, technology, creative media, professional services or education-which are growth sectors. Only sites with good road/rail and comms</td>
<td>As above. Specific. BE03 &amp; BE04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Stop to the loss of commercial (employment) space particularly where we wish to maintain mixed use in and around the village centre (BE06 and E02 refer)</td>
<td>See above. The reference to Village is taken to mean Caterham Hill particularly. However it also applies to other locations around the CR3 Area, including parts of Caterham Valley, Whyteleafe and the various local shopping parades in CR3.</td>
<td>Specific/ BE05 (was BE06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Prevent the net loss of car parking spaces in the centre of Whyteleafe (BE06 refers)</td>
<td>RESPONSE REQUIRED</td>
<td>This is a gap we need to close. Matter also covered by consultations by Tandridge for Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Increased parking and public transport, development of a Business/Technology/Science Park in the area as long as it does not create more problems with parking</td>
<td>Yes and see above. Any locations to be considered with great care. Transport and parking considered elsewhere in the CR3 Forum Neighbourhood Plan, Caterham Town Design Statement and Masterplan.</td>
<td>As above Specific. BE03 &amp; BE04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>The decline in local employment in favour of housing expansion is a significant trend here and in many commuter towns and suburbs</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Introduction section and evidence supports this statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>If we could attract interesting and well paid jobs locally, that would boost a lot of household incomes considerably, make the community more equal,</td>
<td>Agree. See above</td>
<td>Introduction section and evidence supports this statement. Specific. BE02/BE03/BE04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Revitalising our retail offer would be a good way of doing this,</td>
<td>Agree. Also see Masterplan, Town Design Statement and BID</td>
<td>As above Specific. BE04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Business centre has been suggested in the draft plan but I think it would be good also to have tangible help such as consultancy, a venture fund, bank support etc</td>
<td>Excellent ideas and will be considered for action plans, if NP is passed.</td>
<td>Develop these ideas further as part of action plan, whether for start-ups, Business &amp; Technology park, or Town Centre regeneration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I think it's a shame the Rose and Young site</td>
<td>Planning consents given for a hotel/ground floor</td>
<td>A key site. CPO enquiry/action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is going to be a hotel and retail rather than an office. Currently it may be that companies don't want to relocate to Caterham but it may be that the coming Thameslink service would change that

| is going to be a hotel and retail rather than an office. Currently it may be that companies don't want to relocate to Caterham but it may be that the coming Thameslink service would change that | Beefeater plus another large retail unit via CPO, and mixed residential and retail by owned. Planning enquiry to review. Thameslink upgrade shelved for the time being, however if Masterplan succeeds that may enhance chances, especially if parking and mixed business/residential use of Town Centre boosted. | imminent. Masterplan has opportunity to enhance the attractiveness of Caterham for Business, Retail, Services AND Residents. |

21. The decline in local employment in favour of housing expansion is a significant trend here and in many commuter towns and suburbs. I'm against it for what I think is an interesting reason. A year or two ago, Tandridge got a lot of publicity in the national media because it turns out to be the district with the highest proportion of women of working age who choose not to work and are not claiming benefits, resulting in stereotypes in the media about Stepford Wives. If an area is within commuting distance of great jobs in London, is an attractive place to bring up kids but has a rubbish local employment market, then one person may well commute to the capital (or Gatwick or points around the M25) while the other ends up not doing much because childcare concerns make it difficult for that person (usually a woman, but not always) to commute and the local jobs barely cover childcare costs. If we could attract interesting and well paid jobs locally, that would be an interesting comment. Broadly the Neighbourhood Plan supports rebalancing the local economy by growing and attracting start ups and other small and Medium sized businesses (SME’s)

The major reason for this strategy is to reduce the dependency on commuting to London and other centres, instead of local jobs. The trend contributes to parking issues and congestion near stations, peak hour traffic and poor footfall during the day affecting the retail and other business, from either sex, although the statistics support the comment in terms of balance between them.

In the end if we can increase higher value jobs for both sexes locally that would be a significant benefit.

| The decline in local employment in favour of housing expansion is a significant trend here and in many commuter towns and suburbs. I'm against it for what I think is an interesting reason. A year or two ago, Tandridge got a lot of publicity in the national media because it turns out to be the district with the highest proportion of women of working age who choose not to work and are not claiming benefits, resulting in stereotypes in the media about Stepford Wives. If an area is within commuting distance of great jobs in London, is an attractive place to bring up kids but has a rubbish local employment market, then one person may well commute to the capital (or Gatwick or points around the M25) while the other ends up not doing much because childcare concerns make it difficult for that person (usually a woman, but not always) to commute and the local jobs barely cover childcare costs. If we could attract interesting and well paid jobs locally, that would be an interesting comment. Broadly the Neighbourhood Plan supports rebalancing the local economy by growing and attracting start ups and other small and Medium sized businesses (SME’s) | See left and above. Specific. BE01, BE02, BE03, BE04 & BE05 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
22. Another is encouraging entrepreneurship. A business centre has been suggested in the draft plan. Higher house prices are a potential barrier, as currently a lot of couples who want to retain two good careers wouldn't consider Caterham but instead would like to stay in London where house prices are so much higher.

23. On business/employment opportunities, I was interested to read the section on support for a business centre. This sounds good. What was not clear to me (sorry if I missed this) is what is the key requirement. Without a site identified, there seems little prospect of being able to get support from those bodies that hold the key to the necessary funding and other support.

24. While the CR3 plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall policy (BE01)</th>
<th>Specific BE02, BE03, BE04 &amp; BE05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See left and above:

- Further as part of action plan, whether Business & Technology park or Town Centre regeneration.
- Specific CB02, CB03.

See left and above:

- Develop these ideas for start-ups, businesses and technology park or Town Centre regeneration.
- “Other” services are an excellent idea and this is well taken.

There are several sites that could be suitable, however the point made about the wrong sorts of units, the problem is not primarily about office space but the tenant mix. The NP seeks to rebalance this.
| has a limitation on the numbers of units I would question some of the preferred sites. If the Texaco garage goes, there will be constant congestion at the other garage, this is already busy and we will lose a local facility in terms of car maintenance all while we are adding to the population and the number of cars. If the recycling facility goes, will Surrey County Council actually provide a new facility or will we find ourselves having to travel to Earlswood as we do now if you have a bag of soil or stones from the garden. The more facilities that go locally will only increase traffic in an already congested area. | Texaco- list of sites. Point re increasing dependency on a single petrol station noted. Recycling Centre. Current Surrey Consultation. Similar potential dependency on fewer sites locally and an impact on congestion noted. Both sites provide local employment as well as a service to residents and business. They are part of the area’s facilities and infrastructure that we seek to maintain and improve – within the bounds of economic sustainability. | seeks to protect key sites, especially active employment ones. Against this the government has introduced PD rights, which have been used to gain residential conversion. Where there are sound arguments to retail a service or site, we anticipate the Neighbourhood Plan will provide resistance over and above the current status quo, however we cannot block all sites and local comment at the time of any planning application will continue to be vital. |
Appendix C  List of Statutory Consultees 15th April to 10th June 2016

*** replied

*** returned

Bletchingley Parish Council
Burstow Parish Council
Caterham on the Hill Parish Council
Caterham Valley Parish Council
Chaldon Village Council
Chelsham & Farleigh Parish Council
Chief Officer, East Surrey CCG ***
Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partners
Cowden Parish Council
Crawley Borough Council
Crowhurst Parish Council
Crowhurst Parish Council
Director of Commissioning, Surrey & Sussex Area NHS
Dormansland Parish Council
East Sussex County Council
Edenbridge Parish Council
EE Ltd
Elmbridge Borough Council
English Heritage- Historic England
Environment Agency
Felbridge Parish Council

Forest Row Parish Council

Godstone Parish Council

Greater London Authority

**Head of Primary Care, Surrey & Sussex Area**

**Head of Public Health Commissioning, Surrey & Sussex Area**

**Healthwatch Surrey**

Highways Agency

**Highways England**

Homes and Communities Agency

Horley Town Council

Horne Parish Council

Kent County Council

Limpsfield Parish Council

Lingfield Parish Council

London Borough of Bromley

London Borough of Croydon

Mid-Sussex DC (Neighbourhood Planning)

National Grid c/o Entec UK Ltd

Natural England

Network Rail

**NHS East Surrey CCG**

Nutfield Parish Council

Outwood Parish Council
Oxted Parish Council

Planning Issues

Public Health Consultant, East Surrey
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
Runnymede Borough Council
Salfords & Sidlow Parish Council
Sevenoaks District Council
South East Water
Southern Water

Surrey County Council Environment and Infrastructure
Surrey County Council Planning
Sutton & East Surrey Water plc

Tandridge District Council
Tandridge Parish Council
Tatsfield Parish Council
Thames Water Planning Services
The Coal Authority
The Marine Management Organisation
The National Trust - London and South East
Three
Titsey Parish Council

Transport for London
Secretary of State for Transport
Surrey Wild Life Trust
Surrey AONB Board
Vodafone and 02

Warlingham Parish Council
Waverley Council
Wealden District Council
West Sussex County Council
Westerham Parish Council
**Whyteleafe Village Council**
Woldingham Parish Council
Worth Parish Council
Orange PCS
T-mobile
3G
From: Caterham Valley Parish Council

Sent: Tuesday, May 2, 2017 3:00 PM

To:

Subject: Regulation14 Consultation

Dear Consultee,

The CR3 Forum Neighbourhood Plan is commencing the Reg 14 consultation, by which we mean the Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation and publicity of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2015, para (b).

The Consultation commences on Saturday 29th April 2017 and closes at 23:59 on Saturday 17th June 2017.

This email is to make you aware that the Plan can be inspected through the website www.cr3forum.org.uk and we very much look forward to your comments, in due course.

Comments are to be submitted to cr3forum@gmail.com

or to

CR3 Admin at Salmons, Salmons Lane, Whyteleafe, Surrey CR3 0HB

Do please contact us if you have any questions.

Maureen Gibbins

Project Co-ordinator
Appendix D  Steering Group, Editorial and Workgroup Meetings.

Steering Group Meetings

18th June 2012  16th July 2012
13th August 2012  13th September 2012
15th October 2012  21st November 2012
16th January 2013  20th February 2013
18th April 2013  22nd May 2013
20th June 2013  1st August 2013
27th August 2013  23rd September 2013
4th November 2013  9th December 2013
29th January 2014  13th February 2014
25th February 2014  18th March 2014
3rd April 2014  22nd April 2014
27th May 2014  24th June 2014
22nd July 2014  18th August 2014
17th September 2014  14th October 2014
18th November 2014  15th December 2014
19th January 2015  23rd February 2015
31st March 2015  29th April 2015
29th June 2015  15th July 2015
17th August 2015  12th October 2015
20th January 2016  29th February 2016
21st March 2016  4th April 2016
18th April 2016  1st June 2016
1st July 2016  25th July 2016
22nd August 2016  5th September 2016
19th September 2016  4th October 2016
17th October 2016  14th November 2016
5th December 2016  9th January 2017
23rd January 2017  10th February 2017
20th February 2017  6th March 2017
20th March 2017  5th April 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19th April 2017</td>
<td>15th May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th June 2017</td>
<td>21st June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th July 2017</td>
<td>26th July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th August 2017</td>
<td>30th August 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th September 2017</td>
<td>2nd October 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sundry Meetings not attended by all Steering Group:

- 22nd February 2014 S Scrivener Planning Aid
- 8th May 2014 A Skippers Anne Skippers Planning
- 26th February 2015 CIL Presentation Tandridge District Council
- 8th June 2015 Workshop with S Thompson Tandridge District Council
- 21st July 2014 Meeting with Surrey County Council
- 2nd October 2014 Meeting with Tandridge District Council
- 11th March 2016 Meeting with S Gyimah MP
- 4th April 2016 Discussion with S Thompson Tandridge District Council
- 15th August 2016 D Carlisle AECOM
- 5th September 2016 D Carlisle AECOM
- 27th September 2016 Meeting with P Mason Tandridge District Council
- 28th March 2017 with Charlotte Parker and Tom James TDC
- 19th July 2017 with Sarah Thompson and Peter Bond TDC
- 31st August 2017 with Sarah Thompson and Peter Bond TDC
- 19th July 2017 Meeting with Officers Tandridge District Council.

**Editorial Meetings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24th July 2015</td>
<td>4th August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th August 2015</td>
<td>1st September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st September 2015</td>
<td>25th September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th October 2015</td>
<td>26th October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st November 2015</td>
<td>24th November 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workgroup meetings**

Housing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leisure &amp; Community – full meetings and sub group meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6th September 2012</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15th November 2012</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21st March 2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25th May 2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25th July 2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31st August 2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23rd October 2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18th November 2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14th January 2014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25th February 2014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26th March 2014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6th May 2014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11th June 2014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30th July 2014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24th September 2014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4th November 2014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4th February 2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26th February 2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9th April 2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11th June 2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23rd July 2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26th August 2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18th November 2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4th February 2016</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business/Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>24th September 2012</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28th November 2012</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17th January 2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd September 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education & Health**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18th October 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th January 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd May 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th July 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th September 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd November 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th April 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th June 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th August 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th September 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transport**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20th September 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th December 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th February 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th April 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd June 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th August 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th April 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th November 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th January 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th March 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th April 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th August 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th September 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd June 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Urban Design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22nd October 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th January 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th March 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd April 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st May 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th June 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd July 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th August 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th September 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th April 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th December 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th February 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd April 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th May 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th May 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th June 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th July 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th August 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th November 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Utilities**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th April 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th February 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th April 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th August 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E   List of Developers and Estate Agents

Mr E Bance
Asprey Homes Limited
Mega House
Crest View Drive
Petts Wood, Kent, BR5 1BY

Mr S Jones MNEA
Bidwells
79 High Street
Caterham
Surrey CR3 5UF

The Buxton Group
Cedar House
91 High Street
Caterham
Surrey CR3 5UH

Chartwell Land And New Homes
The Old Workshop
15a High Street
Old Oxted, Surrey
RH8 9LN

Alison Walker
Planning Manager
Croudace Homes Ltd
Croudace House,
Tupwood Lane,
Caterham,
Surrey CR3 6XQ

Mr R Fung
Cubitt & West
53 Croydon Road
Caterham
Surrey
CR3 6PD

Hamptons International
29 Station Avenue
Caterham,
Surrey,
CR3 6LB

Miles Leslie
Linden Homes
Linden House,
Guards Avenue,
Caterham,
Surrey,
CR3 5XL

Mr M Hansen
Martin & Co
79 High Street
Caterham
Surrey
CR3 5UF

S Newland
W R Newland Limited
129 Croydon Road,
Caterham,
Surrey,
CR3 6PE

Mr Mr P Gottelier
Rayners Estate Agency
96 High Street
Godstone
Surrey,
RH9 8DP

Nigel Greenhalgh - Managing Director
Village Developments plc,
East Wing, Harewood House,
Outwood Lane, Outwood,
Surrey, RH1 5PN

Mr A Steen
White & Sons
39-41 Station Road East
Oxted
Surrey
RH8 0BD

Ms M Williams
W S Planning & Architecture
Europe House
Bancroft Road
Reigate
Surrey
RH2 7RP
Draft letter:

Dear Mr

Re: CR3 Neighbourhood Plan

Progress has now been made with the Housing Group Report so that a draft Report setting out many of the parameters and the facts on housing in the CR3 area has now been completed. The next stage in the process is to look more closely at land and property availability in the CR3 area that may be suitable for residential development (or other land uses) over the next 15-20 years to meet the "objectively assessed need" of CR3 for this period.

The present main planning document available is the regularly updated SHLAA by Tandridge District Council. This has been used in the current draft to assess available unit supply. However for our Report to be sustainable we would like to draw up a similar document specifically for the CR3 and for a slightly longer time scale 2014-2024 and relate this to the housing needs now being assessed in the Neighbourhood Plan.

The majority of those sites currently in the Tandridge SHLAA already have planning approval and are already included in meeting existing Core Strategy targets. We are seeking sites beyond these which can be assessed within the Neighbourhood Plan on suitability and timing together with parameters that would permit future development. These latter parameters may evolve from policies within the CR3 Neighbourhood Plan and based on criteria set within the plan.

By meeting these and those within the new Tandridge Detailed Policies DPM, future planning applications would enjoy a smoother passage through to planning approval under current planning legislation. Conversely sites that are not included within the Neighbourhood Plan or which are unable to comply with its policies, will face a sustainable challenge in the future once the Neighbourhood Plan is approved.

We would therefore urge you to put forward possible sites for consideration in the Neighbourhood Plan. If you have any queries please contact me,

Thank you,

M A Smith

Chairman of Housing Group

In addition during the 2016 consultation, the following made representations on the Neighbourhood Plan generally and in relation to specific sites.