

**Attendees for the Hearing**

**Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan 2018 to 2033  
(Submission Version) – Examination**

**10:00am Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> March 2018**

**At**

**The Soper Hall, Harestone Valley Road, Caterham CR3 6HY**

**Independent Examiner  
Jeremy J Edge BSc FRICS MRTPI**

## Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan 2018 to 2033

### Attendees for the Hearing

**Anna Cronin**

Strategy Specialist  
Tandridge District Council

**Marie Killip**

Strategy Specialist  
Tandridge District Council

**Jeremy Webster**

Chair  
Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

For each topic, two further Steering Group Members (nominated by the Steering Group) may also contribute to the Hearing discussion and answer examination questions.

**Topic - Local Green Space**

**Hamish Watson**

HW Planning Ltd  
87 Earlsbrook Rd, Redhill, Surrey, RH1 6DR  
On behalf of Caterham School

**Mark Adams**

NHS Property Services Ltd  
99 Gresham St, London EC2V 7NG

**Jacque Andrews**

Partner  
Howard Sharp and Partners  
79 Great Peter Street  
Westminster  
London SW1P 2EZ  
On behalf of the Diocese of Southwark

**Nathaniel Raimi**

Assistant Design and Planning Project Manager  
L&Q  
29-35 West Ham Lane  
Stratford London E15 4PH

***Topic – Housing Development***

**Sue McGeown**

Caterham Business Improvement District  
By email only: [sue@caterhambid.co.uk](mailto:sue@caterhambid.co.uk)

**Taylor Cherrett**

Turley  
The Pinnacle  
20 Tudor Road  
Reading RG1 1NH  
On behalf of Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd

**Nick Chisholm Batten**

Associate  
AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited  
Aldgate Tower  
2 Lemn Street  
London E1 8FA

## **Agenda for Hearing**

### **Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan 2018 to 2033 (Submission Version) – Examination**

**Tuesday 10th March 2018**

**The Soper Hall, Harestone Valley Road, Caterham CR3 6HY**

- 1) Introductions and welcome**
- 2) Hearing Procedure**
- 3) Policy Topics and Associated Questions**

**Local Green Space**

**Housing Development**

- 4) Any other business.**

## Local Green Space

Local Green Space designation is a means by which planning policy may protect green areas or open spaces against development where they are of particular importance to local communities.

Local Green Space (LGS) comprise areas of land which can be identified on a map within Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans and designated for special protection. Once designated, Local Green Spaces receive protection consistent with national Green Belt policy.

Guidance in relation to the designation of LGS was first set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012 and has subsequently been refined in the revisions to the NPPF, last updated in June 2019), at paragraphs 99-101, as follows:

99. The designation of land as Local Green Space through local and neighbourhood plans allows communities to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them. Designating land as Local Green Space should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or updated, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.

100. The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:

- a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
- b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and
- c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

101. Policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with those for Green Belts.

Further advice is provided in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). This guidance is now like the NPPF, “dynamic”, to the extent that revisions are made from time to time as national planning policy evolves. In relation to LGS, the national policy can be considered as being stable to the extent that the PPG advice has remained unchanged since introduced in March 2014.

CCW Neighbourhood Plan Policy CCW18, referring to the management of proposed Local Green Spaces reads as follows:

### **POLICY CCW18: LOCAL GREEN SPACES**

The 33 areas (including three groups of areas) listed and mapped in Figure 8.7 and detailed in Appendix B and defined on the Policies Map are designated as Local Green Spaces. Local policy for managing development on a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts (NPPF 145); proposals for built development on will not be permitted unless it can be clearly demonstrated that it is required to enhance the role and function of that Local Green Space.

In relation to the proposals for LGS designation in the Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan, (CCWNP), in late 2019, to assist this Hearing, I requested that the information relating to the proposals for the designations of each of the 32 proposed sites in the Neighbourhood Area be assessed by reference to a template, reflecting the guidance in the NPPF to assist me in consideration of each proposed area for LGS designation in this examination. The Steering Group have carried out this assessment in a comparatively short period of time and I am most grateful to those involved in marshalling the evidence and explaining what has been done in seeking to demonstrate how each proposed area may satisfy the tests in the national guidance. This work has clarified to a large extent the activity undertaken. There remain some matters which I propose should be explored at the Hearing as set out below.

- 1) Within the Neighbourhood Area, the developed areas of the settlements mainly fall within the defined settlement boundaries. With the exception of Chaldon which is “washed over” by the Metropolitan Green Belt, the Green Belt boundary abuts the settlement boundary. The NPPF accepts that there may be occasions where it may be appropriate for LGS sites to be designated where land is already designated as Green Belt. In terms of development management, as stated in Policy CCW18, the LGS sites will be managed consistently with designated Green Belt sites, what additional benefits, if any, would be achieved in relation to designating land as LGS which is already designated as Green Belt?
- 2) If there would be any additional benefits to be derived from designating Green Belt land as LGS, would these benefits be significant and why would this be the case?
- 3) In designating LGS, paragraph 99 of the NPPF explains that Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or updated, and that such spaces should be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period. Also, such designations should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. This indicates that in some instances a balance may need to be struck between competing land use options and opportunities. Furthermore, as advised in the PPG, the future management of land designated as Local Green Space will remain the responsibility of its owner. In striking the appropriate balance;
  - a. has the proposed designation of LGS sites adequately considered the needs and aspirations of landowners? and
  - b. what steps were taken to assess the future management arrangements with landowners during the site assessment period and have these been adequate?

## Housing Development

The Planning Practice Guidance in the revision dated 9<sup>th</sup> May 2019 under the heading; “Are housing requirement figures for neighbourhood areas binding?” advises, *“The scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body. Where strategic policies set out a housing requirement figure for a designated neighbourhood area, the neighbourhood planning body does not have to make specific provision for housing, or seek to allocate sites to accommodate the requirement (which may have already been done through the strategic policies or through non-strategic policies produced by the local planning authority). The strategic policies will, however, have established the scale of housing expected to take place in the neighbourhood area.*

*Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing. However, there is an expectation that housing requirement figures will be set in strategic policies, or an indicative figure provided on request. Where the figure is set in strategic policies, this figure will not need retesting at examination of the neighbourhood plan. Where it is set as an indicative figure, it will need to be tested at examination.”*

A key question is whether the emerging Local Plan sets out strategic housing delivery expectations for the CCWNP? Whilst the CCWNP claims that it does, I can find no reference to such a figure in the emerging Local Plan. If it transpires that there is no strategic policy requirement to provide the specific strategic quantity of housing within the Neighbourhood Area and if no indicative figure has been requested, (I have seen no evidence that this is the case) and in view of the likelihood that a review of the housing policies would be required if the emerging Local Plan is found sound, with or without modifications, then the CCWNP, if made, would then require revision to reflect the strategic policies of the Local Plan, including the strategic housing policies.

The second objective of the CCWNP concerning housing delivery is: *To support sustainable housing development with a range of design and size that will provide for the whole community, primarily located on brownfield sites.*

Paragraph 4.4 of the Submission draft Plan explains that;

“The emerging Local Plan sets an overall target of 6,056 dwellings to 2033 to be delivered across the district predominantly through a combination of site allocations in Tier 1 settlements, contributions from Tier 2 settlements, and the development of a new garden village. The Neighbourhood Plan supports this strategy and seeks to contribute towards it by addressing the housing needs of the area whilst ensuring that development does not have an unacceptable impact on the local infrastructure.

This will be achieved by:

- Prioritising the use of brownfield sites and only permitting greenfield development on the edge of the settlements in exceptional circumstances, with clear and strict guidance on what is appropriate;
- **providing for at least 1,300 new dwellings in the period 2015 to 2033 on strategic sites in accordance with Tandridge District Council's emerging Local Plan;**
- ensuring that the overall quantum of development does not put an unacceptable strain on infrastructure capacity;
- encouraging small-scale residential developments that are sympathetic to their surroundings;

- ensuring that new developments include a mix of housing to meet the needs of local people, taking into account the current and projected demographic of the parish; and
- providing well-designed dwellings that are sympathetic to the character of the settlement.”

Paragraph 4.6 of the Submission draft Plan notes that Caterham on the Hill, Caterham Valley and Whyteleafe are ‘Urban Tier 1 Settlements’ and are considered to be the most sustainable locations for development. Chaldon is classified as a ‘Limited or Unserviced Settlement’ covered by Green Belt designation.

### **CCWNP Anticipated Housing Delivery and Policy CCW2**

Reflecting the strategic approach in the emerging Local Plan, Draft Policy CCW1 directs new housing development, including changes of use, to sites within the settlement boundaries in the Neighbourhood Area through redevelopment of previously developed land (brownfield sites). The CCWNP explains that the evidence base for the assessment of need spans the period 2015 – 2033. I note that this is beyond the life of the CCWNP which is 2018-2033. This is said to be to coincide with the Local Plan timescales and assessment.

The CCWNP’s assessment of housing need is based upon the anticipated population growth in the Neighbourhood Area between 2015 and 2033. This is thus anticipated to be an increase of 6,102 inhabitants over this 18-year period, an average of 339 persons/pa. The CCWNP further explains that the total net new dwellings to meet unconstrained housing demand over the 18 - year assessment period is 2,560 dwellings, (CCWNP paragraph 5.4). This figure is sub-divided into two periods:

- 1) 2015 – 2025, where the likely demand is said to be 1,216 dwellings (122 dwellings per annum); and
- 2) 2025 – 2033, where the likely demand is said to be 1,344 dwellings. The annual average demand would therefore be 168 dwellings per annum over this 8-year period.

If achieved, the average occupancy would be approximately 2.4 persons per dwelling reflecting the CCWNP’s ambition of providing more smaller dwellings in the Neighbourhood Area to meet demographic need.

In relation to housing delivery in the period 2003 - 2015, the CCWNP explains at paragraph 5.6 that the delivery of net new homes from the Neighbourhood Area averaged 119 net new units per annum, contributing at least 46% of the total figure for the District during that period. The CCWNP (paragraph 5.5) explains that this level of delivery is likely to continue at least over the first 10 years of the neighbourhood plan period.

The anticipated housing delivery within the Neighbourhood Area between 2015 - 2033 as identified in the CCWNP in paragraphs 5.8 -5.11 may be summarised as follows:

Emerging Local Plan site allocations in the NP area	176 dwellings
Emerging Local Plan, One Public Estate policy	82 dwellings
Caterham Town Centre Masterplan initiative	190 dwellings
Brownfield housing sites in the Neighbourhood Area (at least)	<u>1,348 dwellings</u>
Sub total	1,796 dwellings



Compared with the unconstrained housing demand over the Plan period in the Neighbourhood Area of 2,560 dwellings, there therefore appears to be an unexplained shortfall of 764 dwellings, or thereabouts.

Table 5.2 in the CCWNP seeks to explain the extent to which brownfield development sites are anticipated to be brought forward within the Plan period, focusing mainly on the period 2015 – 2025. This is not fully consistent with the housing delivery expectations outlined in the CCWNP in paragraphs 5.8-5.11.

In the light of some uncertainty regarding the brownfield housing sites likely to come forward over the Plan period and the actual evidence of housing delivery in the period 2015, 2016 and 2017, I requested that Tandridge District Council and the Steering Group might liaise over the housing delivery that has taken place over this period. The preparation of a Statement of Common Ground concerning housing delivery estimates in the Neighbourhood Area may assist in clarifying housing delivery expectations over the Plan period and whether such expectations are likely to meet housing need. I note that the recent Annual Monitoring Reports prepared by Tandridge District Council and the Steering Group, that in the period from April 2015 identify district-wide housing delivery over the 4 years from April 2015 as indicated below:

Net number of dwellings completed Year	Net Completion Total Per Year	Cumulative Total	Cumulative Total 2015-2019	Average 2015-2019
April 2015 – March 2016	322	2,547	322	
April 2016 – March 2017	228	2,775	550	
April 2017 – March 2018	332	3,107	882	
April 2018 – March 2019	244	3,351	1,126	281.5

The District-wide AMR net housing completions have averaged just over 280 dwellings pa over the last 4 years. The CCWNP notes that in the period 2003-15, delivery of net new homes from the Neighbourhood Area averaged 119 dwellings pa, contributing at least 46% of the total figure for the District. The CCWNP (paragraph 5.5) explains that this level of delivery is likely to continue at least the first 10 years of the Neighbourhood Plan period, that is to 2028. This would suggest that the District-wide net housing completions over this period might average approximately **259 dwellings pa**. The District-wide AMR housing completions over the last 4 years have demonstrated an annual average net completion rate of about **281 dwellings pa**. This would suggest that housing delivery in the Neighbourhood Area is exceeding expectations cumulatively by about **22 dwellings pa, or 8.5% pa**, including windfalls.

## Questions:

- 1) In relation to paragraph 4.4 of the CCWNP, this states:  
 “The emerging Local Plan sets an overall target of 6,056 dwellings to 2033 to be delivered across the district predominantly through a combination of site allocations in Tier 1 settlements, contributions from Tier 2 settlements, and the development of a new garden village.” The text of the CCWNP then confirms support for this strategy, “...and seeks to contribute towards it by addressing the housing needs of the area whilst ensuring that development does not have an unacceptable impact on the local infrastructure. **This will be achieved by:..... providing for at least 1,300 new dwellings in the period 2015 to 2033 on strategic sites in accordance with Tandridge District Council's emerging Local Plan;....**”. Please could the derivation of the provision for at least 1,300 new dwellings be explained and an indication given where these strategic sites are identified? (I can find no reference to this dwelling figure in the emerging Local Plan in relation to the CCWNP).
- 2) Concerning the reference to the development of a new garden village in Tandridge District Council’s administrative area in the period up to 2033, what contribution is expected to be made in terms of housing completions in the period from 2025 when the garden village completions is expected in the period 2025 – 2033? (see CCWNP paragraph 4.7)
- 3) How has the delivery of a garden village in the district been taken into account in assessing the need to deliver new housing in the Neighbourhood Area during the life of the Neighbourhood Plan?
- 4) Is it correct to say in paragraph 4.8 of the CCWNP that site HSG06 has been released from Green Belt designation? Is the inclusion of this site as a housing allocation in fact contingent on the determination of the Local Plan examination?
- 5) Tandridge District Council’s Regulation 16 comments concerning Figure 4.1 of the CCWNP confirm that the boundaries of Local Plan site HSG08 156-180 Whyteleafe, Road Caterham as shown on this map appear to differ slightly from that in the Local Plan There also appears to be a boundary discrepancy on Local Plan site HSG 09 Land at Fern Towers, Harestone Hill. Please could these matters be clarified?
- 6) Accepting that the housing evidence and analysis to inform housing policy CCW2 covers the period 2015-2033, since the Plan period covers the period 2018 – 2033, should the housing delivery expectations for the Plan be re-calibrated to cover the period 2018 – 2033?
- 7) If so, having regard to actual net new housing stock defined in recent evidence including the Annual Monitoring Reports for 2015, 2016 and 2017 and associated demographic changes which have taken place in those three years and any changes that may be anticipated relating to the expected population in the Neighbourhood Area (if any) at the end of the Plan period in 2033, what are the resultant revised housing delivery expectations in the Neighbourhood Area during:
  - a) the revised first housing delivery period of 2018 -2025; and
  - b) the revised second housing delivery period of 2025 – 2033?

- 8) In relation to the CCWNP text at paragraph 5.9 and Table 5.2 is there an anomaly? Paragraph 5.9 refers to 82 dwellings being delivered in the Plan period in the Neighbourhood Area, whilst Table 5.2 indicates the figure may total 150 dwellings?. Please indicate what the delivery expectation is expected to be and when housing delivery is anticipated to be completed. The Statement of Common Ground, if completed should resolve this point.
- 9) Tandridge DC in its Regulation 16 consultation response raised concerns as to how these sites have been identified, or how or whether they have been assessed for suitability for housing and infrastructure requirements, including flood risk and drainage. I am hopeful that these matters will be clarified in the Statement of Common Ground being prepared, but if not, please can the Steering Group provide further written details for consideration at the Hearing for discussion. I am concerned that TDC's Regulation 16 comments in respect of the sites in Table 2 of the CCWNP are that there is an absence of a detailed assessment of infrastructure requirements and suitability for housing development resulting in an artificial perception of capacity and deliverability. I further note that in relation to the Local Plan examination, TDC has already carried out the necessary assessments in relation to the Local Plan housing sites. Where other sites are being advanced by the CCWNP, I would expect that evidence to justify housing capacity and deliverability to be available to justify the inclusion of such sites in Table 5.2. Please could this information be provided in the Statement of Common Ground, or alternatively by the Steering Group and TDC at the Hearing?
- 10) Please could the matter of double counting be clarified as raised by Rydon Homes and Tandridge, concerning Table 5.2? Again, I am hopeful that the Statement of Common Ground will clarify this point.
- 11) Objection has been raised by the Caterham Business Improvement District (Caterham BID) in relation to CCWNP paragraph 5.14, containing Policy CCW2 (Housing Development) and Table 5.2 (Brownfield site development for housing). The substantive points raised by the BID, relate to matters concerning the consultation process, parking provision but not the amount of housing within the Caterham Town Centre Final Masterplan, which in any event is a framework document and which was adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) by the District Council in March 2018. I would be interested to know if there are any further details to the Caterham BID's planning objection to Policy CCW2 and what these comprise?
- 12) In relation to SEA, Berkeley Strategic in its Regulation 16 consultation response has queried the selection of the assessment of reasonable alternatives in relation to Policy CCW2. I would like to understand why the choice between the "reasonable alternatives was made:
  - Option 1: Facilitate the future development of greenfield sites in the Neighbourhood Plan area; and
  - Option 2: Focus future development on previously developed sites in the Neighbourhood Plan area,

Would an intermediate option incorporating the merits of a mixed approach involving predominantly brownfield and some greenfield development have been more appropriate as a reasonable alternative? (see paragraphs 4.3-4.5 of the CCWNP, where development exclusively on brownfield land is not necessarily anticipated, but is nonetheless a priority).