



# WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Open Event – 29 January 2017

Housing and Design Group Review of Comments

H&D 200217

OPEN EVENT 20 JANUARY2017 – HD COMMENTS ANALYSIS SHEETS

WH1 – CONSERVATION AREA	COMMENTS	REVIEW	ACTION
	1. A conservation area is designated as such for specific reasons - not supporting conservation policy diminishes these reasons here and elsewhere.	agreed	N
	2. If we need the village to grow there are probably some parts of the conservation area less important than others.	The CA is a relatively small area that is generally built upon. A very small area is green belt pasture along Ripley Lane.	N
	3. Less concerned with imposing view on building materials more so on preservation of green spaces and limiting green field development.	Refer to other policies, eg WHP 12	WHP 12
	4. I feel it would not be unreasonable for the occasional break away from "red tile clay" or flint design, if it were only the odd construction, the village would evolve.	Conservation area character assessment provides evidence of red clay tiles etc 9not to be confused with other village areas)	N
	5. Plus annual flooding of Ripley Lane. Say not to moving village boundary west in to Green Belt.	1. Flooding is highways matter. 2. Village boundary outside NP remit.	N
	6. Some development providing same style as now and matching infrastructure.	1. Development style stated in WHP2 as 'reflect the locale (vernacular) 2. Infrastructure outside NP remit	N
	7. Positive policy supporting new development providing proposals comply with the policy criteria.	ok	N
	8. I disagree with any development proposals in areas mentioned in 1and 2	Infrastructure – refer WH 12 [no proposed development Ripley Lane area]	N
	9. You obviously have not used Ripley Lane during the winter months when it can become a river and the volume of traffic the development would produce would make life more difficult than at present. There are no facilities available such as schools, surgery, public transport etc which means that everything will involve the use of cars etc and the infrastructure will	Knapped as written	N

OPEN EVENT 20 JANUARY2017 – HD COMMENTS ANALYSIS SHEETS

	not support such a large development proposed.		
	10. I think it's 'napped' rather than 'snapped' flint.	Knapped as written - WHP 1 iii	N
	11. Include recommended densities Point 6 loss of mature trees and insert 'hedgerows' as this could be important for wildlife and to preserve the look	Included - established hedgerows	Done

OPEN EVENT 20 JANUARY2017 – HD COMMENTS ANALYSIS SHEETS

WH2 – VILLAGE SETTLEMENT	1. Village character should always remain - otherwise you have no village.	agreed	N
	2. Slightly perturbed by statement 'density of housing will be as existing'. Given the criteria for the Government need for more housing – will this statement be regarded as not recognising the principle behind more housing?	Leave as is	N
	3. West Horsley village has already lost much of its character with the proliferation of very large houses where before there were several small bungalows which provided less expensive dwellings.	Agreed, hence policy to redress balance	N
	4. However, having a front garden is not always practical if the residents of a dwelling need parking for multiple vehicles, as is the case with us. I would much rather dwellings have enough space on their plot for the residents own cars plus those of guests, than cars being continually parked on the road or pavement.	Agreed	N
	5. Please add OAK to the suggested trees that developers et al should plant - local saplings available.	??? Refer to WH14 Biodiversity	WH14
	6. Unconcerned with architectural rules provided numbers/extent of development is limited. Protection of natural resources very important.		N
	7. No mention of flats - could still be 2 storey	Amend? Dwellings covers all arrangements	N
	8. I would like to see joining of N&S settlement areas so that the brown field site of Round Tree Farm can be sympathetically developed whilst maintaining the existing farmhouse. The old cattle barns are an eyesore.	Policies are nonspecific to areas.	N

OPEN EVENT 20 JANUARY2017 – HD COMMENTS ANALYSIS SHEETS

	9. Some single story buildings have been extended up very tastefully. This should be encouraged rather than developers knocking them down and replacing them with eye-sores.	Agreed?	
	11. It is better to develop within the settlement area and to prevent its enlargement.	Agreed	N
	12. I would prefer that the village settlement is not enlarged and so would be more flexible on development within the settlement and less flexible on enlarging the settlement area.	Limits land use.	N
	13. I do not believe that WHPC can realistically have any influence over housing construction design detail such as this. It will ultimately be determined by developers' budgets and acceptance of their proposals from GBC Planning Department.	Not true, hence neighbourhood plan	N
	14. Support, but does not seem compatible with development area proposals in the last two GBC draft local plans. What will happen if the next draft plan still contains proposals for 300+ houses in West Horsley?	WHPC to be advised of comment	WHPC
	15. The NP map boundaries should follow the existing village settlement boundary and NOT the proposed LP revised settlement boundary which encompasses rural green areas.	Comments? The NP boundary is the same as the Parish Boundary on settlements.	N
	16. There is a surplus of existing bungalows in the Parish occupied by an ageing population. Those existing units are now being extended and developed into two storey units -all under permitted development	Not sure there is a surplus	N
	17. I largely agree but not with section 2 and the attempt to restrict smaller dwellings being expanded. If they have sufficient room around them and impact no one then I don't see the need for any reason that they should be made larger if the owner has a need to do so.	Loss of small dwellings	N

OPEN EVENT 20 JANUARY2017 – HD COMMENTS ANALYSIS SHEETS

<b>WH3 – RURAL AREAS</b>	1. Not bothered by smaller dwellings on large plots being developed into larger dwellings. However, open to being persuaded if I'm missing the point on this	No comment	N
	2. Character is important, size and density of development can detrimentally impact on the feel of a town/village. I do think it is a mistake however to state that proposals will be supported provided a "subjective" requirement is met because developers etc will claim it has been whereas locals may disagree.	Objective requirement will very case by case.	N
	3. Except current attraction of the village is of its diversity. Limited design dictation for future development could lead to an unwelcome uniformity.	Agreed, stipulations are too specific.	N
	4. I agree with most of policy but disagree with Parish Council and GBC rejection of infill development on enclosed pieces of land which are either outside the Settlement Area or of green field just because of 'Green Belt'. It would be better to build on these small areas than sacrifice farm land with we need to feed our country	No comment	N
	5. There are occasions when a slightly larger building on a large plot should be accepted as non-detrimental.	No comment	N
	6. To a point, but some fields can be developed.	No comment	N
	7. Agree to protect AONB and High Value Landscapes.	No comment	N
	8. I object to the idea of any development in the Green Belt area (and I thought that GBC Conservative councillors did too before the election)	Remove Green belt reference in heading	Done

OPEN EVENT 20 JANUARY2017 – HD COMMENTS ANALYSIS SHEETS

	<p>9. This to me now reads that we will support development in the Green Belt providing it meets certain criteria. I'm sure it is not meant to be this, but I could not support development in the Green Belt unless 'very special circumstances' in line with the NPPF are provided and proven.</p>	<p>Remove Green Belt reference in heading</p>	<p>Done</p>
--	--	---	-------------

OPEN EVENT 20 JANUARY2017 – HD COMMENTS ANALYSIS SHEETS

WH4 – HOUSING MIX	1. It's not just that you who need affordable housing - so do the elderly. Oppose demolition of bungalows to make way for 5-bed houses.	agreed	N
	2. Greatest amount of small affordable houses the better.	agreed	N
	3. Too many youngsters are priced out of living in their home area.	Agreed+	N
	4. Very important to have a mix - not only large detached.	agreed	N
	5. Within reason - no overfill wanted.	No comment	N
	6. We need more development such as Old St Mary's which has proved so successful.	Unique in village	N
	7. However: Should a family who have bought (for instance) a 2 bed house, and want to extend (assuming it's viable) to accommodate a 3 <sup>rd</sup> bedroom for another child, rather than have to move house and incur all the associated cost and issues, then this should surely be supported.	Likely to happen anyway but not to change policy	N
	8. Essential to retain smaller houses. These need to be dispersed around the village - not all in one place.	Agreed	N
	9. There needs to be some warden controlled housing that older people of the village can go to so that they can remain in the village.	Raised at open day. Did HN survey identify no demand for this? HN Survey 2014 noted that no one indicated that they had a supported housing need. Reference Page 28.	Checked see reference
	10. I do feel it is important to help address this issue affecting the country as well as our own sons/daughters.	Noted	N



OPEN EVENT 20 JANUARY2017 – HD COMMENTS ANALYSIS SHEETS

	Bearing in mind other issues presented here today, in appropriate numbers, new affordable (well built) housing should be provided.	Noted	N
--	--	-------	---

OPEN EVENT 20 JANUARY2017 – HD COMMENTS ANALYSIS SHEETS

WHP4 – HOUSING MIX	11. I feel that extending existing properties should be acceptable as the assumption is that families will remain in the village rather than being forced to move. Also to have a min 40% Affordable Housing will possibly lower the current property values. I feel that min 40% could allow too many, we should look to have a max 20%	Limit on extensions enables retention of small homes. Percentage comments noted	N
	12. Need greater than 40% affordable homes. have an issue regarding what is affordable in such an affluent area. However, in principle I agree	No comment	N
	13. Higher % of affordable encouraged.	Noted	N
	14. Tough to enforce. Detrimental to character of area.	Noted	N
	15. With regard to Affordable Housing it is vital that these are reserved for WH residents and their families and that for example Westminster City Council cannot buy in to our village and expel the unwanted from their city.	Not likely	N
	16. The housing needs from the evidence base are not correct. They are too high.	Survey findings	N
	17. Big need for smaller properties - 2-bed semis, terrace etc. For younger people and for senior citizens to downsize. No permission for extending up and back which removes housing from this category.	Agreed	N
	18. "Affordable" rapidly becomes unaffordable! Also a McCarthy & Stone or Churchill development would allow senior citizens to have 1/2 bed independent living apartments. Has this been discussed?	Noted. Refer to WH 5	N
	19. Same style as now.	Agreed	N

OPEN EVENT 20 JANUARY 2017 – HD COMMENTS ANALYSIS SHEETS

	<p>20. Smaller houses for young families and affordable housing should be encouraged.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>N</p>
	<p>21. This policy is not only unrealistic but unnecessary. There is no proven local demand for this type of development.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>N</p>
	<p>22. While I have no issue with affordable housing I am concerned that at least 40% is not a helpful number - we want to promote a thriving village life and support those that live in the community - providing either jobs or means to travel to jobs (rail and bus links). If they are in place then by means the number works but I have lived in a village with no transport links where housing was provided to those without means to travel - and therefore no protect of ever getting a job. I also have an issue regarding what is affordable in such an affluent area. However, in principle I agree</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>N</p>
	<p>23. The present housing stock are mainly detached and thus not affordable to everyone. To achieve affordable housing the type of property that needs to be built would not be in line with the properties already in the village. This would result in the village losing its identity and have a serious impact on the substantial house prices that residents have paid in order to live in a rural countryside environment. This build would also severely impact on the local wildlife which is already under great pressure.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>N</p>
	<p>24. I am concerned with instating a policy which forces a growing family to move rather than be able to improve and extend their property for the betterment of the village. I disagree with the proposed scale of affordable housing in a village with poor transport links and few local jobs.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>N</p>
	<p>25. Why exclude open market one bedroom properties? What does affordable actually mean?</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>N</p>

OPEN EVENT 20 JANUARY2017 – HD COMMENTS ANALYSIS SHEETS

	<p>26. A. Mention of homes for 'Key Workers' would be good in here - farm workers, game keepers etc B. Do we mean 'development boundary' or should that be 'Settlement Boundary' as that is what we would normally refer to? C. I would like to see some reference to discouraging the demolishing of bungalows - we always have to make a comment on these when considering planning applications in the Parish Council so it would be helpful to have a more-weightier stance from the NP.</p>	<p>A. Farm Workers legislation (agricultural Regulations 1976) covers this. B. Development boundary changed to Settlement Boundary. – done C. this is a WHPC policy on a case by case basis.</p>	<p>Done</p>
--	--	--	-------------

OPEN EVENT 20 JANUARY2017 – HD COMMENTS ANALYSIS SHEETS

<b>WH5 – RURAL EXCEPTION HOUSING</b>	1. More development such as Old St Mary's.	No comment	N
	2. Housing should be within walking distance of facilities where possible and be infill rather than extending boundary.	No comment	N
	3. Like very much.	No comment	N
	4. As question WH4. [see WH4/11]	No comment	N
	5. If this is required tougher restrictions would be good.	No comment	N
	6. No new development should be supported unless the infrastructure is improved at the same time - roads, parking at local shops, parking at station etc.	Infrastructure Policies – done	Done
	7. Affordable housing, yes, but creating a 'local market' fraught with difficulties.	NPPF and GBCLP dictates.	N
	8. Good thinking.	Noted	N
	9. Mix needs to be maintained from current housing mix, as WH4.	WH4 would apply	N
	10. Limited though.	Noted	N

OPEN EVENT 20 JANUARY2017 – HD COMMENTS ANALYSIS SHEETS

	11. Agreed but WH Parish Council should foster good relations with local developers and social housing providers to enhance the implementation of such policy	No comment	N
	12. This is ridiculous intention.	No comment	N
	13. I think is important to allow the older generation to downsize (if they wish) which frees up larger housing for families to move up to freeing the smaller houses for 1st time buyers of children raised in the village and provide additional housing for those young people wishing to stay in the village	No comment	N
	14. Sometimes "affordable" housing can be an excuse for over-development. probably be used to satisfy the housing waiting list	GBC HWL does not apply to these schemes	N
	15. There is little if no employment in the village so thus does that mean that these new properties would become open to social housing.	Infrastructure Policies – done	Done
	16. We all know that these houses will not be offered to those with a local connection but will probably be used to satisfy the housing waiting list	Infrastructure Policies – done	Done

OPEN EVENT 20 JANUARY2017 – HD COMMENTS ANALYSIS SHEETS

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND ACTIONS:

POLICY	TITLE	ITEM	COMMENT	ACTION
WH1	Conservation Area - 11	3	Refer to other policies, eg WHP 12	WHP 12
		11	WH1 vi add ...and established hedgerows...	Done
WH2	Settlement Areas - 17	5	??? Refer to WH14 Biodiversity	WH14
		14	WHPC to be advised of comment	WHPC
WH3	Rural Areas - 9	8	Remove Green belt reference in heading	Done
		9	Remove Green belt reference in heading	Done
WH4	Housing Mix - 26	9	Raised at open day. Did HN survey identify no demand for this? HN Survey 2014 noted that no one indicated that they had a supported housing need. Reference Page 28.	HD Check done
		26	B. Development boundary changed to Settlement Boundary. – done	Done
WH5	Rural Exception Housing - 16	6	Infrastructure Policies – done	Done
		15	Infrastructure Policies – done	Done
		16	Infrastructure Policies – done	Done

Note: 22.02.17 – ☐. items WH1/3 & WH2/8 forwarded email to E&L, Catherine Young. ☐ Item WH2/14 emailed comment to WHPC, Charles Hope