

---

## East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Representations

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
	EHNP17/1	I support the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan
	EHNP17/2	<p>Overall, I am heartily supportive of the EHNP. However, I would like to emphasise a few points and potential risk of misconceptions.</p> <p>Section 2, Local Economy "The 2011 Census indicates that of the 1,825 residents in employment at that time, 58% usually drove to work in a car, 20% took the train, 13% worked from their home, whilst just 5% walked to work". In my experience, the demographics and movement of people has changed significantly since 2011. I moved into the area in 2010 and commute into London by train. The increase in rail commuters has accelerated, reflecting a demographic shift towards the younger families, with more female commuters/workers. Therefore, Section 5 and 6 should state that any developments account for the need of the changing demographics of the community and the need to fund all infrastructure (including public transport) in line with housing and business growth</p> <p>Section 5.7 / Policy EH-H7 (a) East Horsley Design Code: Houses &amp; Bungalows: I hope others read the same ethos I read into the document as I do; about maintaining the character of the village does not mean the houses need to be a copy of existing designs, but allow continual evolution that is sympathetic to the "eclectic mixture of housing design styles" that already exists.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>[Name redacted]</p>

---

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
	EHNP17/3	[Representation withdrawn]
	EHNP17/4	These comments relate to East Horsley's Neighbourhood Plan submission version.

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
		<p>Page 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The definition of affordable housing</b> is not correct. Affordable housing is not “<i>A category of social housing offered at below market rates, as defined by government policy, and funded by contributions from developers</i>” <b>note social rented housing is a form of affordable housing.</b></li> <li>• An alternative would be, “Affordable housing is “social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing provided to specified eligible households whose needs are not met by the market”. Funded by a number of sources including a requirement placed on developers.</li> </ul> <p>Page 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The definition of building footprint</b> should make reference to Building(s) i.e any building on the plot.</li> </ul> <p>Page 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The timescale</b> after the words <i>such as revisions in national policy</i> add or “<b>changes in the new Local Plan.</b>” It needs to be taken into account that Counsel’s advice given to the team developing the plan was to await the new local plan before submitting the neighbourhood plan because of the closeness of the time frames. This plan is now out of date with the latest version of the submissive Local Plan e.g. the allocation of sites.</li> </ul> <p>Page 13 Policy EH-S1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is unclear what this policy is trying to achieve if it is to identify any of the special constraints affecting development within the parish it has omitted to mention the Thames Basin Heath SPA; SSCI Site of Nature Conservation Importance; SSSI Site of Special Scientific Interest; ancient woodland and the conservation area.</li> </ul> <p>Page 18 Policy EH-EN2.</p>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy includes the following sentence. "<i>In the context of this policy, arboreal significance shall be taken to include any mature healthy trees of ash, beech, common lime, elm, hazel, hornbeam, maple, oak, sweet chestnut, sycamore, willow or yew.</i>"</li> <li>• This is not an all inclusive list of current tree regarded by GBC as arboreal significance and those covered by existing TPO. One example is Scot Pine. An all inclusive list is needed or it should be just left as arboreal significance.</li> </ul> <p>Page 23 Housing Need.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Accordingly, the following core aims are proposed for the housing policies of the neighbourhood plan:”</li> <li>• a) “<i>to provide more smaller homes in the village</i>”. This is clearly what is required from the needs surveys and what the majority of villagers want but whilst the building of smaller home will help their number will continue to decline, for every new small home built at least one is being demolished to build a mansion in its place. The proposals should also include steps to retain existing smaller homes e.g. those less than 100sq m. This could be achieved and by the use of an article 4 provision in relation to permitted development. GBC have in the past been inconsistent in applying their current policy on small dwelling. and the restriction in replacement dwelling in the green belt. The issues of permitted development can be over come with the use of Article 4 .<b><i>This has been achieved in other local authority areas.</i></b></li> </ul> <p>Page 23 5.1 Housing Need</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reference is made to affordable housing under the heading housing need although a separate section 5.6 relates to specifically affordable housing. It would have been useful to have covered it under housing need heading as the demand for affordable housing in the village differs significantly from other locations in the Borough.</li> </ul> <p>Page 24 POLICY EH-H1: Housing Mix</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference is made to <i>Developments of 20 dwellings or more shall provide a mix of housing types (market &amp; affordable) which fall within the following ranges:</i></li> <li>• This could imply that affordable housing is only provided on sites of over 20 units it should be 10 in reference to affordable homes.</li> </ul>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the supporting text 5.2 states <i>Homes for First Time Buyers, typically 1 or 2 bedroom apartments or 2 bedroom houses with smaller room sizes and lower cost specifications</i>. It is unclear if the policy is suggesting that affordable housing is to be built with lower cost and specification or only that for first time buyers. Also it could be concluded that no affordable family housing is envisaged other than firsts time buyers.</li> <li>• In the supporting text 5.2 states <i>Family Homes (3 &amp; 4 beds) 25% – 35% of all dwellings</i></li> <li>• This implies that 2bed is not appropriate for a family home yet elsewhere in the plan the need for smaller home is clearly made.</li> </ul> <p>Page 36 Policy EH-H7b Design code Apartments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Developments of apartments will be supported . Where?</i></li> <li>• The policy appears to be silent in respect on conversions of large houses into apartments. This could well be a future trend and clarification should have been included.</li> </ul> <p>Page 36 Policy EH-H7c New Roads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• iv ) <i>Along the roadside in front of houses choose grass verges rather than tarmac pavements. If paving is to be used it should be permeable where possible to encourage natural drainage and limit surface water flooding. It is not the flooding that is of concern it is the run off causing flooding elsewhere. (A sloping drive will prevent local flooding)</i></li> </ul> <p>Page 37 Residential rebuilds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>However, given current house prices, re-building costs and prevailing stamp duty rates, such developments can be economically attractive for home owners.</i></li> <li>• It is not clear what this statement means /infers. It is not the home owners who are demolishing and re building, in most cases smaller home are bought by developers often at above market price and then rebuilt but much larger.</li> </ul>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
		<p>Page 38 Policy EH-H8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential re-building on a site containing one or more existing homes will be supported within the applicable settlement area providing the resultant Plot Ratio of the new development is in keeping with the average Plot Ratio of dwellings in the vicinity of the site.</li> <li>• This encourages properties to be built to a similar scale to surrounding properties but make no reference to the scale of the increase from the building it replaces. ( in some cases this has been up to 4 times larger).</li> <li>• It also assists in destroying the character of the village with it variety of size of homes and the varied streetscape.</li> </ul> <p>Page 38 POLICY EH-H9: Residential Infilling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• c) The resultant Plot Ratio of the new development is in keeping with the average Plot Ratio of dwellings in the vicinity of the site. (Plot Ratio is defined as the ratio between the gross area of the total building footprint divided by the area of the plot on which the new dwelling is to be located.)</li> <li>• This could be seen to encourage the development of properties of a similar size, as developers would wish to achieve maximum property size. It could also discourage a pair of semi-detached (smaller units) being introduced) in a row of much larger homes.</li> </ul>
	EHNP17/5	These comments relate to East Horsley's Neighbourhood Plan submission version.

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
		<p>Page 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The definition of affordable housing</b> is not correct. Affordable housing is not “<i>A category of social housing offered at below market rates, as defined by government policy, and funded by contributions from developers</i>” <b>note social rented housing is a form of affordable housing.</b></li> <li>• An alternative would be, “Affordable housing is “social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing provided to specified eligible households whose needs are not met by the market”. Funded by a number of sources including a requirement placed on developers.</li> </ul> <p>Page 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The definition of building footprint</b> should make reference to Building(s) i.e any building on the plot.</li> </ul> <p>Page 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The timescale</b> after the words <i>such as revisions in national policy</i> add or “<b>changes in the new Local Plan.</b>” It needs to be taken into account that Counsel’s advice given prior to submitting the plan was to await for the new local plan before submitting the neighbourhood plan because of the closeness of the two time frames. This plan is now out of date with the latest version of the submissive Local Plan e.g. the allocation of sites.</li> </ul> <p>Page 8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our Village 2nd paragraph final sentence. Frank Chown was not an architect he was in fact a builder and surveyor.</li> </ul> <p>Page 13 Policy EH-S1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is unclear what this policy is trying to achieve if it is to identify any of the special constraints affecting development within the parish it has omitted to mention the Thames Basin Heath SPA; SNCI Site of Nature Conservation Importance; SSSI Site of Special Scientific Interest; ancient woodland and the conservation area.</li> </ul>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
		<p data-bbox="651 328 943 355">Page 18 Policy EH-EN2.</p> <ul data-bbox="663 395 2085 564" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="663 395 2085 496">• The policy includes the following sentence. <i>In the context of this policy, arboreal significance shall be taken to include any mature healthy trees of ash, beech, common lime, elm, hazel, hornbeam, maple, oak, sweet chestnut, sycamore, willow or yew.</i></li> <li data-bbox="663 501 2085 564">• This is not an all inclusive list of current tree regarded by GBC as arboreal significance and those covered by existing TPO. One example is Scot Pine. And all inclusive list is needed or it should be just left as arboreal significance.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="651 608 931 635">Page 23 Housing Need.</p> <ul data-bbox="663 675 2085 879" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="663 675 2085 702">• “Accordingly, the following core aims are proposed for the housing policies of the neighbourhood plan:”</li> <li data-bbox="663 707 2085 879">• <i>a) “to provide more smaller homes in the village”</i>. This is clearly what is required from the needs surveys and what the majority of villagers want but whilst the building of smaller home will help their number will continue to decline, as for every one built at least one is being demolished to build a mansion in its place. The proposals should also include steps to retain existing smaller homes e.g. those less than e.g 100sq m. This could be achieved and by the use of an article 4 provision in relation to permitted development. <b><i>This has been achieved in other local authority areas.</i></b></li> </ul> <p data-bbox="584 919 904 946">Page 23 5.1 Housing Need</p> <ul data-bbox="663 986 2085 1086" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="663 986 2085 1086">• No reference is made to affordable housing under the heading housing need although a separate section 5.6 relates to specifically affordable housing. It would have been useful to have covered it under housing need heading as the demand for affordable housing in the village differs significantly from other locations in the borough.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="584 1126 1055 1153">Page 24 POLICY EH-H1: Housing Mix</p> <ul data-bbox="663 1193 2085 1326" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="663 1193 2085 1257">• Reference is made to <i>Developments of 20 dwellings or more shall provide a mix of housing types (market &amp; affordable) which fall within the following ranges:</i></li> <li data-bbox="663 1262 2085 1326">• This could imply that affordable housing is only provided on sites of over 20 units it should be 10 in reference to affordable homes.</li> </ul>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the supporting text 5.2 states <i>Homes for First Time Buyers, typically 1 or 2 bedroom apartments or 2 bedroom houses with smaller room sizes and lower cost specifications</i>. It is unclear if the policy is suggesting that affordable housing is to be built with lower cost and specification or only that for first time buyers. Also it could be concluded that no affordable family housing is envisaged other than firsts time buyers.</li> <li>• In the supporting text 5.2 states <i>Family Homes (3 &amp; 4 beds) 25% – 35% of all dwellings</i></li> <li>• This implies that 2bed is not appropriate for a family home yet elsewhere in the plan the need for smaller home is clearly made.</li> </ul> <p>Page 36 Policy EH-H7b Design code Apartments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Developments of apartments will be supported where.</i></li> <li>• The policy appears to be silent in respect on conversions of large houses into apartments. This could well be a future trend and clarification would be useful.</li> </ul> <p>Page 36 Policy EH-H7c New Roads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• iv ) <i>Along the roadside in front of houses choose grass verges rather than tarmac pavements. If paving is to be used it should be permeable where possible to encourage natural drainage and limit surface water flooding. It is not the flooding that is of concern it is the run off causing flooding elsewhere. (A sloping drive will prevent local flooding)</i></li> </ul> <p>Page 37 Residential rebuilds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>However, given current house prices, re-building costs and prevailing stamp duty rates, such developments can be economically attractive for home owners.</i></li> <li>• It is not clear what this statement means /infers. It is not the home owners who are demolishing and re building, in most cases smaller home are bought by developers often at above market price and then rebuilt but much larger.</li> </ul>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
		<p data-bbox="584 328 853 355">Page 38 Policy EH-H8</p> <ul data-bbox="658 395 2085 603" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="658 395 2085 496">• Residential re-building on a site containing one or more existing homes will be supported within the applicable settlement area providing the resultant Plot Ratio of the new development is in keeping with the average Plot Ratio of dwellings in the vicinity of the site.</li> <li data-bbox="658 501 2085 568">• This encourages properties to be built to a similar scale to surrounding properties but make no reference to the scale of the increase from the building it replaces. ( in some cases this has been up to 4 times larger).</li> <li data-bbox="658 572 2085 603">• It also assists in destroying the character of the village with it variety of size of homes and the varied streetscape.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="584 708 1133 738"><i>Page 38 POLICY EH-H9: Residential Infilling</i></p> <ul data-bbox="658 778 2085 986" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="658 778 2085 879">• <i>c) The resultant Plot Ratio of the new development is in keeping with the average Plot Ratio of dwellings in the vicinity of the site. (Plot Ratio is defined as the ratio between the gross area of the total building footprint divided by the area of the plot on which the new dwelling is to be located.)</i></li> <li data-bbox="658 884 2085 986">• This could be seen to encourage the development of properties of a similar size, as developers would wish to achieve maximum property size. It could also discourage a pair of semi-detached (smaller units) being introduced) in a row of much larger homes.</li> </ul>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
Surya Hotels Ltd	EHNP17/6	<p data-bbox="584 328 1581 357">Please see attached on behalf of Surya Hotels Ltd, as owners of Thatchers Hotels site</p> <p data-bbox="584 395 1079 424">[Text of representation reproduced below]</p> <p data-bbox="584 462 1012 491"><b>East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan</b></p> <p data-bbox="584 529 1001 558"><b>Submission Version Consultation</b></p> <p data-bbox="584 596 1164 625"><b>Representations on behalf of Surya Hotels Ltd</b></p> <p data-bbox="584 663 2112 839">Whilst Surya Hotels are pleased that the Neighbourhood Plan recognises the potential for residential development at the Thatchers Hotel site they consider that policy EH-H6 does not fully recognise the constraints which apply here and that as such it does not provide a satisfactory basis for sustainable development as defined by the NPPF. Coupled with fact that both this policy &amp; general policies of the plan do not fully conform with the strategic policies of the Development Plan ( being the existing GLP), the Basic Conditions set out in the relevant legislation are not fully satisfied.</p> <p data-bbox="584 877 1312 906">In this respect key considerations can be identified as follows:</p> <p data-bbox="584 944 893 973"><u>Number of units proposed</u></p> <p data-bbox="584 1011 2083 1082">It is understood that the unit numbers used in the policy derive from an application of a 30dph benchmark. Whilst it is indicated that more detailed justification for the figure is given in the Evidence Base this is very limited in practice.</p> <p data-bbox="584 1120 2051 1190">In particular, the figure fails to take account of the effect of incorporating the Frank Chown building within any development scheme which, as a conversion, will necessarily have the effect of increasing as opposed to decreasing density.</p> <p data-bbox="584 1228 2029 1299">Equally the desire for ‘high quality apartments’ and ‘terraced cottages’ ( supporting text p31) is somewhat at odds with this density figure.</p> <p data-bbox="584 1337 1989 1366">It is also noted that representations from GBC at the initial consultation stage noted the likely scope for more dwellings.</p>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
		<p>Clearly the number of dwellings achieved will be very dependant upon scheme specifics and this needs to be recognised.</p> <p><u>Housing Mix</u></p> <p>The plan is somewhat confused in this respect given the reference to apartments and cottages whilst at the same time requiring the housing mix at Thatchers to be complaint with general policy EH-H1. There is clearly a tension here which needs to be resolved.</p> <p>Significantly, the GLP no longer contains a housing mix policy.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted that the NPPF encourages planning for a mix of housing, the thrust is towards a choice of quality housing and a flexible approach.</p> <p>In these circumstances it is clear that the proposed policy is insufficiently flexible in requiring a wide range of needs to be satisfied within a single scheme, with the requirement applying to the Thatchers site irrespective of scheme size.</p> <p>This inflexibility is further emphasised when the need to incorporate bungalows through policy EH-H2 is considered.</p> <p>The latter policy clearly represents a very particular constraint on layout &amp; is entirely at odds with the acknowledged need to maximise the efficient use of land.</p> <p><u>Other Site Specific Requirements</u></p> <p>The desire to keep the Chown Building in any redevelopment is acknowledged &amp; in this respect the Parish will be aware that recent proposals considered at appeal aimed to do this.</p> <p>Whilst any development on the Thatchers site will recognise the need to achieve satisfactory pedestrian linkage to the existing village it is inappropriate for this policy to specify that linkage should extend beyond the proposal site.</p>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
		<p>Given that land fronting the A246 is currently within the green belt &amp; outside the settlement limit it is (correctly) not with the policy area. It may of course subsequently (pursuant to the changes inherent within the emerging local plan) be incorporated within a site wide scheme but can for the moment only be governe by general plan policies.</p> <p>In any event, the evidence base does not support the specific link proposed in EH-H6.</p> <p><u>Policy Changes</u></p> <p>Policy EH-H6</p> <p>It is suggested that, against the background outlined, criterion a) of Policy EH-H6 should be reworded to make it clear that the quantum of housing refers to the new build ( as opposed to conversion ) element of any scheme &amp; that it is a guideline figure only .</p> <p>Thus:</p> <p><i>a) The provision of new build homes (market and affordable) to be located within the existing settlement area. Pending full consideration of a detailed scheme and the available development area consequent upon any retained built component 22 units is specified as a guideline figure.</i></p> <p>Criterion b) should reflect the need for flexibility, thus:</p> <p><i>b) Compliance with the housing mix ranges proposed in Policy EH-H1 or, by way of justified exception, a mix directed to meeting a specific housing need consistent with a sustainable community.</i></p> <p>Criterion f) should be deleted.</p> <p>Policy EH – H1 should be amended :</p>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
		<p><i>Developments of 20 dwellings or more shall generally provide a mix of housing types ( market and affordable) as listed below or , by way of justified exception., a mix directed to meeting a specific housing need consistent with a sustainable community.</i></p> <p>Policy EH-2 ( bungalows) should be deleted.</p>
Gladman Developments Ltd	EHNP17/7	<p>Please find detailed representations attached</p> <p>[Text of representation reproduced below]</p> <p><b>RE: East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation</b></p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>This letter provides Gladman Developments Ltd (Gladman) representations in response to the submission version of the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan (EHNP) under Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. This letter seeks to highlight the issues with the plan as currently presented and its relationship with national and local planning policy.</p> <p><b>Legal Requirements</b></p> <p>Before a neighbourhood plan can proceed to referendum it must be tested against a set of basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The basic conditions that the EHNP must meet are as follows:</p> <p>(a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order.</p> <p>(d) The making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>(e) The making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of</p>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
		<p>the authority (or any part of that area).  (f) The making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.</p> <p><b>National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance</b></p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. In doing so it sets out the requirements for the preparation of neighbourhood plans to be in conformity with the strategic priorities for the wider area and the role in which they play in delivering sustainable development to meet development needs.</p> <p>At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread through both plan-making and decision-taking. For plan-making this means that plan makers should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. This requirement is applicable to neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>The recent Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) updates make clear that neighbourhood plans should conform to national policy requirements and take account the latest and most up-to-date evidence of housing needs in order to assist the Council in delivering sustainable development, a neighbourhood plan basic condition.</p> <p>The application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development will have implications for how communities engage with neighbourhood planning. Paragraph 16 of the Framework makes clear that Qualifying Bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should develop plans that support strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing development and plan positively to support local development.</p> <p>Paragraph 17 further makes clear that neighbourhood plans should set out a clear and positive vision for the future of the area and policies contained in those plans should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. Neighbourhood plans should seek to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, jobs and thriving local places that the country needs, whilst responding positively to the wider opportunities for growth.</p>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
		<p>Paragraph 184 of the Framework makes clear that local planning authorities will need to clearly set out their strategic policies to ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. The Neighbourhood Plan should ensure that it is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area and plan positively to support the delivery of sustainable growth opportunities.</p> <p><b>Planning Practice Guidance</b></p> <p>It is clear from the requirements of the Framework that neighbourhood plans should be prepared in conformity with the strategic requirements for the wider area as confirmed in an adopted development plan. The requirements of the Framework have now been supplemented by the publication of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).</p> <p>On 11th February 2016, the Secretary of State (SoS) published a series of updates to the neighbourhood planning chapter of the PPG. In summary, these update a number of component parts of the evidence base that are required to support an emerging neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>On 19th May 2016, the Secretary of State published a further set of updates to the neighbourhood planning PPG. These updates provide further clarity on what measures a qualifying body should take to review the contents of a neighbourhood plan where the evidence base for the plan policy becomes less robust. As such it is considered that where a qualifying body intends to undertake a review of the neighbourhood plan, it should include a policy relating to this intention which includes a detailed explanation outlining the qualifying bodies anticipated timescales in this regard.</p> <p>Further, the PPG makes clear that neighbourhood plans should not contain policies restricting housing development in settlements or preventing other settlements from being expanded. It is with that in mind that Gladman has reservations regarding the EHNP's ability to meet basic condition (a) and (d) and this will be discussed in greater detail throughout this response.</p> <p><b>Relationship to Local Plan</b></p>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
		<p>At the time of writing, the current development plan that covers the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan area and the development plan which the EHNP will be tested against is the Saved Policies of the Guildford Local Plan 2003, saved by a direction by the Secretary of State in 2007.</p> <p>The Council is progressing work on the new Local Plan to 2034 having recently consulted on the Proposed Submission Local Plan between June and July. It is anticipated that it will be submitted to the Secretary of State for examination by an Independent Inspector in December this year. Whilst the proposed strategy of this plan is clear the housing requirement in the emerging Local Plan is the subject of significant objection. The soundness of this plan has already been questioned at the Waverley Local Plan Examination in Public and it is possible that further residential allocations will be made in East Horsley to meet the Boroughs housing requirements.</p> <p>The EHNP should ensure due regard is paid to this possibility and that as much flexibility is drafted in to the policies of the plan to minimise any conflict with the emerging Local Plan as Section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:</p> <p>‘if to any extent, a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approached, or published (as the case may be).’</p> <p><b>East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan</b></p> <p>This section highlights the key issues that Gladman would like to raise with regards to the content of the EHNP as currently proposed. It is considered that some policies do not reflect the requirements of national policy and guidance, Gladman have therefore sought to recommend a series of alternative options that should be explored prior to the Plan being submitted for Independent Examination.</p> <p><b>Policy EH-EN1</b></p>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
		<p>Whilst noting that this policy is supported by reasons for why it is considered the designation of the proposed Local Green Spaces (LGS) are justified in regards to Paragraph 77 of the Framework, several of the proposed LGS designations already benefit from a higher level policy protection, that of Green Belt or Areas Of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Gladman question the necessity of these designations. It is considered unnecessary to add a further policy designation to these parcels and they should be removed from the plan.</p> <p><b>Policy EH-H1 Housing Mix</b></p> <p>This policy sets out requirements for housing mix over the course of the plan period, citing the Household Survey undertaken in 2015 as evidence. This Household Survey only captured a snapshot in time and as housing needs can change over time Gladman suggest that to ensure flexibility wording is added to this policy which states ‘or as evidence from the latest housing market assessment indicates’. This will ensure that the plan can respond flexibly to any changing needs rather than being limited to what is considered to be rigid housing mix requirements.</p> <p><b>Policy EH- H2 Bungalows</b></p> <p>This policy seeks for all development proposals for 20 or more dwellings to contain 10% dwellings as bungalows. Gladman would like to see flexibility added to this policy which would state ‘unless a viability assessment demonstrates this would render a scheme unviable.’ This is because Paragraph 173 of the Framework states that:</p> <p>‘To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.’</p> <p>Due to the nature of constraints around East Horsley including a requirement for all developments greater than 20 dwellings to contain at least 10% of dwellings as bungalows is not likely to be considered an effective use of land in line with the requirements of the Framework.</p>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Representation
		<p><b>Development Sites and Housing Needs</b></p> <p>Noting the wording for the proposed development sites states that ‘planning permission will be granted’ Gladman remind the Parish Council that it is not the function of Neighbourhood Plans to decide planning applications and suggest this is modified to state that development of these sites will be supported.</p> <p>Further, having considered the Housing Needs Assessment as part of the evidence base to support the plans preparation Gladman suggest that text is added to ensure sufficient flexibility. Gladman suggests text stating ‘Development on the proposed allocations in this plan and any further Local Plan allocations will be supported to meet housing needs’. This would help the longevity of the plan for the reasons set out earlier in this representation.</p> <p>Gladman do not consider the Housing Needs Assessment to be a true reflection of housing needs in East Horsley. . It is stated that using historic trends East Horsley has grown slower than the Borough of Guildford and this is used as justification to reduce the level of development in many of the proposed scenarios rather than considering what may be the reasons for this, such as the village having been washed over by Green Belt. Gladman believe that had sufficient land been available outside of the Green Belt, East Horsley would have grown at the same rate as Guildford Borough as a whole and this should not therefore be a consideration in the Housing Needs Assessment. Removing this factor from the scenarios in the Housing Needs Assessment would result in a different conclusion, that more housing should be proposed for East Horsley.</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b></p> <p>Gladman recognise the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that these must be consistent with national planning policy and the strategic requirements for the wider authority area. Through this consultation response, Gladman has sought to clarify the relation of the EhNP as currently proposed with the requirements of national planning policy and the wider strategic policies for the wider area.</p>

---

<b>Respondent Organisation</b>	<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>Representation</b>
		Gladman is concerned that the plan in its current form does not comply with basic condition (a) and (d) as the Plan does not conform with national policy and guidance. Gladman hopes you have found these representations helpful and constructive. If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me or one of the Gladman team.

Report run at 10 Nov 2017 09:58:59. Total records: 7.