



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CR3 FORUM STEERING GROUP
WEDNESDAY 1ST AUGUST 2018
1900h, SALMONS, SALMONS LANE, WHYTELEAFE CR3 0HB**

Chairman: Jeremy Webster (JW)

Attendees: Edwards Howard (EH), John Cheetham (JC), Julian Palmer (JP),
Chris Windridge (CW), Geoff Duck (GD), George Dennis (GDe)

Apologies: Jenny Gaffney (JG), Cherie Callender (CC), Mike Smith (MS)

Visitors: Annette Evans (AE), Alun Jones (AJ)

Clerking: Maureen Gibbins (MG)

1. Minutes of last meeting. Matters arising not in this agenda.

The minutes of the meeting held on 17th July were approved and signed by the Chairman of the meeting

2. Cross Referencing TDC and NP policies to understand gaps and omissions

AE confirmed any gaps will be identified as she goes along. The spreadsheet currently shows the new Local Plan Policies in red and she is checking the old plan against the new one following the updates implemented by the District Councillors. The Local Plan Policies are also being checked against the NP policies. MS updated the housing policies before the current changes were implemented so will need to do some further updating. MS has been doing this but H001 and H002 need further work due to recent developments.

The Core Strategy Policies have retained the protection for wooded areas. Character Assessments are very important. NPPF 2 makes a substantial reference to Density as an important issue.

The SG felt it was clear that developers will be obliged to refer to NP Policies.

All local green spaces must be designated.

GD confirmed that there will be a greater emphasis on evidence in Planning Committee.

The NP has to refer to numbers and density but making clear these are dictated by the LP.

Action: GDe and MS to work on policies H001 and H002 and to report back at next meeting. In particular, to look at the presentation of numbers and density.

Action: GDe to look at design policies and to consider any alterations.

3. AECOM Meeting Output

AECOM were receptive to making corrections and alterations, which they hope to do without any further financial requirement from CCWNP.

In particular AECOM will:

- 3.1. Ensure there is clear linkage between the Design Guidelines and the Neighbourhood Plan and vice versa.
- 3.2. Note areas where the emerging Tandridge Local Plan affects the AECOM draft.
- 3.3. Note where TDC have made changes which require the NP Design Guidelines to be stronger.
- 3.4. Assist in drafting the Design Guidelines to take account of density optimization changes indicated in NPPF2, where "character" and "local factors" will need to be taken into account.
- 3.5. Split their current area character areas to take account of the different needs of Chaldon, Whyteleafe and Caterham Valley.
- 3.6. Ensure that existing "Tailored" planning guidance is not removed by the introduction of more recent guidance in the Guidelines: e.g. Harestone and Kenley Airfield.
- 3.7. Ensure that sites/areas within town centre, e.g., those affected by the Masterplan are adequately covered in the Design Guidance.
- 3.8. Pay attention to work on "Green Corridors" which highlight the value of the green fringes around existing parish/settlements. Maps are available to assist with this to demonstrate that the sum of the parts reveals more than simply looking at individual elements.
- 3.9. Amend typos and photo descriptions where necessary.

Action: Ben Castell re the above 3.1 to 3.9. by the end of August. CW to expedite.

Action: Parish Councils to look at the Heritage Assets listed in the Design Guidance and ensure that any additions are brought forward to Aecom , via the SG.

Action: Once the document has been returned and approved, **JW** will take the document to Piers Mason and Keith Jecks and speak with them on the basis of Character Assessments.

4. Appointment of Consultants to assist

CW confirmed that £6k has been allocated to the NP by Locality for the SEA and SA and this funding will be transferred to Caterham on the Hill.

JP enquired whether, if the full sum was not needed for the SEA and SA, could the balance be reallocated. CW confirmed that would need to be confirmed by Locality following a new application.

A decision is still awaited regarding the provision of technical support from Locality.

5. Approve such Site Assessments as may be to hand.

Mr & Mrs Brent are site assessing Whyteleafe Road and JW is site assessing 40 Stanstead Road – Sandiford House.

6. PR

It was agreed there needs to be PR on Social media, Surrey Mirror, Caterham & District Independent, County Border News and other media outlets suggested by Steering Group members.

Paul Hooper is the website maintainer.

Action: JW to publish the words attached re the work of the NPSG.

Action: JW and MG to speak with PH regarding the updating of the site and the CCWNP domain. It was agreed there needs to be a structured PR plan.

7. Budget/Finances/Locality Bid

7.1 JW reported there is £8k in bank plus £6k from Locality.

7.2 It will be necessary to hire a consultant sometime in early September to polish the plan and guide the Steering Group through the examination process.

7.3 In the meantime, noting that examiners focus on format, punctuation and highlighting which is where a “retired” Inspector can advise. Locality will be asked to identify an Inspector Grade person to look at the Plan to ensure it meets procedural requirements. If this person is not available from Locality it was agreed that the finance will need to be found to hire a person.

Action: CW to ask Locality re the provision as stated in 7.3

Action: JW will ask for 3 candidates to be identified and interviewed to undertake the work described in 7.2

Action: Parish support both financial and practical in terms of supporting the NP is required; as also is a development their understanding of the monitoring and auditing function the Parishes will lead post NP approval.

Therefore, it will be necessary for JW , as Chair, plus others on the SG , to talk deeply to the Parishes at meetings in September about current progress and SG needs.

8. Revised Project Plan

GD will update the project plan and share at the next meeting.

9. Re-designation of NP area update

The Re-designation of the NP area was reported in the County Border News on 18th July and any comments/objections have to be submitted by 31st August.

10. AOB

GDe reported there may need to be an update to the Statement of Consultation to ensure the public comments have been considered and cross checking has been undertaken.

JW highlighted that a new person is required to act as a bridge for the Steering Group. All are requested to submit suggestions to JW.

U06 to be drafted by GDe

CW reported that he has a student available for work if needed.

EH expressed concern regarding some Heela sites which are really sensitive. In exceptional circumstances some sites will be taken out of the green belt. EH confirmed he is uneasy about the statement.

Action: EH will email his concerns. These are now attached to the minutes and require comment at the next SG meeting.

JW confirmed that Caterham on the Hill are holding an extra meeting on 29th August for review of the Local Plan.

11. Time date place next meeting

Wednesday 15th August - 7pm, 17 Colburn Avenue

Thursday 30 August - 7pm, 17 Colburn Avenue

Meeting over at 2035

Appendix 1

Message from SG to be pushed out on Social Media

“ Tandridge Council is now consulting on its future housing plans for the district, including substantial development plans for Hill and Valley in Caterham. We do not know yet but it is possible that the Tandridge Plan will be subject to criticism that its housing targets are too low when the plan is examined, probably in January 2019 and there may be more pressure on us to take more housing, as this is a government priority.

Local parish councils in Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe have been worried for some years that, if the bulk of new housing comes in an unplanned way into places where there is already a lot of pressure of local roads and services, these parishes will become less attractive places to live.

Therefore we are creating the final version of our **Neighbourhood Plan** which contains detailed policies and guidance for developers. If we can get this accepted by Tandridge and a Professional Examiner and then pass it through a local referendum , we will have a blueprint to better manage future pressure from development.

As the Chair Of the Steering Group that is finalising your Neighbourhood Plan, I will do my best to ensure you are kept up to date on progress in the coming months.

In the meantime, please respond to the Tandridge Council’s Request for feedback about the new Local Plan on <http://consult.tandridge.gov.uk/portal> or by E Mailing localplan@tandridge.gov.uk.

You can visit the Neighbourhood Plan Website on info@cr3forum.org.uk

Please be assured that your local parish councillors will be responding with their own feedback on the Tandridge Local Plan.”

Jeremy Webster

Appendix 2

EH concerns re Heela sites.

At the end of the SG meeting on Wednesday I mentioned possible problems in the future with references to the future of Green Belt boundaries in the HELAA assessments of the draft Local Plan. The assessments describe several sites as “overall the site is considered to be suitable (for development) although the GB designation would have to change in order for it to be developed’.”

I felt that although accurate this statement could cause a feeling of unease to residents and that an asterisk or some other marker could perhaps be added to the description of each of the sites ‘protected by GB legislation’ referring the reader to a paragraph at the foot of the page which states briefly the current position of TDC on the GB. In essence this would be a short version of policy TLP03 in the Green Belt section.

Suggested paragraph.

¶The draft Tandridge Local Plan is very protective of the Green Belt. It states that although Green Belt represents 94% of land in the District more than 93% can remain, defended by national and local Green Belt policies. Further alterations to Green Belt boundaries will only be needed for the development of the South Godstone Garden Community. (See Policy TLP03, page 44-45 of Local Plan.)

.....

Although this seems straightforward I am aware that on page 50 of the *TDC Green Belt Assessment, Part3*, it is suggested that there is justification in exceptional circumstances for the release of Green Belt land for a list of 15 housing sites and 3 employment sites!

I would be most grateful for your comments.