

# RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

In Jan/Feb 2017 West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group carried out an informal community consultation on the first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan. An Open House event was held in conjunction with a feedback survey that was available at the event and online. Respondents were asked if they supported the 15 policies within the Draft Plan (Yes or No) and were invited to leave comments.

The following table shows the level of support shown for each policy and lists all the comments received. The Steering Group has taken every comment in to consideration and is now in the process of updating the Draft Plan.

We would like to thank everyone who participated in the survey.

WHNPSG

## HOUSING & DESIGN POLICIES

### **WH1: Design Management in the Conservation Area**

#### **95% of respondents support this policy**

1. A conservation area is designated as such for specific reasons – not supporting conservation policy diminishes these reasons here and elsewhere.
2. If we need the village to grow there are probably some parts of the conservation area less important than others.
3. Less concerned with imposing view on building materials more so on preservation of green spaces and limiting green field development.
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.
5. Plus annual flooding of Ripley Lane. Say no to moving village boundary west in to Green Belt.
6. Some development providing same style as now and matching infrastructure.
7. Positive policy supporting new development providing proposals comply with the policy criteria.
8. I disagree with any development proposals in areas mentioned in 1 and 2.
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 not support such a large development proposed.

## RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

10. Include recommended densities Point 6 loss of mature trees and insert 'hedgerows' as this could be important for wildlife and to preserve the look
11. do not support the statements throughout the draft policies that begin: "Development proposals will be supported", even with the (weak) provisos. I do not support development of the Green Belt beyond actual local needs. My fuller comments will be submitted in a separate email.
12. But the policy is too restrictive in terms of following vernacular, something which very few do with accuracy, leading to false styles. I good policy but should be loosened. (For example the flint car wash at the shell garage is an extreme example).
13. I would prefer this to be more tightly drawn i.e. confining any development proposals to existing buildings/farms (brownfield areas), because this is a special area and within the Greenbelt.
14. I suppose this is better than nothing, but I am opposed to development proposals on the Green Belt. No extraordinary to need build on the Green Belt. Land to the east of Silkmore Lane is Green Belt.
15. Size has more visual impact than materials. Small houses needed. Materials not to be supported are glass and steel, Flat roofs not to be supported. Verges to be reinstated where they have become integrated into a property.
16. The third bullet point "Development proposals within the West Horsley Conservation Area or its setting, as shown on the Policies Map, will be supported provided Building materials include the use of red brick and tile hanging in the building construction including weatherboards, pebble dash, red clay tiled roofs and occasional use of knapped flint" is too narrowly prescriptive and excludes many uses of materials which would be equally suitable. Better to end the bullet point with something like ".....flint, or other materials which are in keeping with the locality."
17. I think it is also possible to have modern looking homes as long as they become part of the landscape.

# RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

## **WH2: Design Management in the Village Settlement**

### **90% of respondents support this policy**

1. Village character should always remain - otherwise you have no village.
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?
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.
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.
5. Please add OAK to the suggested trees that developers et al should plant - local saplings available.
6. Unconcerned with architectural rules provided numbers/extent of development is limited. Protection of natural resources very important.
7. No mention of flats - could still be 2-storey.
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.
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.
10. We also want small flats etc. that this policy would reject i.e. gardens front and rear. 2 examples are 1) primary school converted to flats; 2) flats next to the Methodist church. British Legion should be used for small properties.
11. It is better to develop within the settlement area and to prevent its enlargement.
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.
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.
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?
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.
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

## RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

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.
18. Planning decisions are made on a case by case basis taking in to account the specific constraints and opportunities of a site. New residential development should make the most efficient use of land whilst responding to local character and context. For this reason, policies should provide guidance rather than being overly prescriptive. With reference to criteria iv of the policy, density is an arbitrary figure which can be calculated in many ways, the suitability of the scheme should be determined on the appropriateness of its design, scale and layout within its immediate setting. In addition, it is noted that Area 7 and 8 contain sites which are currently proposed allocations in the emerging Guildford Local Plan. The housing numbers proposed would exceed this maximum density, therefore there is a risk that if these sites are allocated and the Local Plan is adopted, this policy will be in direct conflict with the proposed allocations and will therefore be superseded by the Local Plan. It is suggested that the policy is amended to remove the reference to a maximum density and seek instead to ensure that proposals reflect local character. Criteria ii is also too prescriptive in its requirements, it is suggested that reference to boundary treatments should be limited to ensuring that the proposals are reflective of the established character of the area and regard is had for material considerations such as the need to provide security. It is also noted that the description of West Horsley Place Character Area on p.26 states that it includes Squires Nursery and a small cluster of 3 to 4 houses in the south-westernmost corner off the A246. This however does not reflect the Character Assessment Areas policy map which clearly shows the garden centre and adjoining properties to be within Area 4 – The Street. We fully support that the garden centre and houses are included within Area 4 as they form part of the visual envelope of the settlement. It is suggested the description of the West Horsley Place Character Area is modified to remove the reference to Squires Garden Centre and the adjacent residential properties.
19. While supporting the policy it should not rule out well designed apartment buildings of no more than three-storeys which could provide accommodation for down-sizers or first-time buyers or renters.
20. Where there are houses bordering prospective areas of development, existing vegetation/ trees/ woodland should be retained to a sufficient degree to provide natural cover and a feeling that as little as possible has been disturbed.
21. Bullet point 5 blindly assumes that all trees are lovely and should be retained or replaced. That is not the case. Perhaps a further sentence should be added "This does not apply to Leylandii or where there is already an abundance of trees in the immediate vicinity."
22. 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.

# RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

## **WH3: Design Management within Rural Areas**

### **93% of respondents support this policy**

1. Not bothered by smaller dwellings on large plots being developed into larger dwellings. However, open to being persuaded if I'm missing key points on this.
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.
3. Except current attraction of the village is of its diversity. Limited design dictation for future development could lead to an unwelcome uniformity.
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.
5. There are occasions when a slightly larger building on a large plot should be accepted as non-detrimental.
6. To a point, but some fields can be developed.
7. Agree to protect AONB and High Value Landscapes.
8. I object to any development in the Green Belt (and I thought that GBC Conservative Councillors did too before the election).
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.
10. Intention does not guarantee effectiveness.
11. But subject, as above, to the restrictive use of brick and clay tiles.
12. I suppose this is better than nothing, but I am opposed to development proposals on the Green Belt. No extraordinary to need build on the Green Belt. Land to the east of Silkmore Lane is Green Belt.
13. The first sentence of the policy should read " Development proposals in the Green Belt will only be supported in exceptional circumstances and subject to the following conditions and provided-----".
14. With increase in population, foot paths and cycle tracks need to be included in the plans along with street lighting and resurfacing of roads to eliminate ALL the pot holes. This will mean renewing all drainage etc. as the cause of many potholes is due to flooding and the collapse of inadequate drainage in the first place.
15. See my previous comment saying that the prescriptions for building materials are too narrowly defined (in this case with reference to the fourth bullet point).
16. Not bothered by smaller dwellings on large plots being developed into larger dwellings.

# RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

## **WH4: Housing Mix**

### **87% of respondents support this policy**

1. It's not just the you who need affordable housing - so do the elderly. Oppose demolition of bungalows to make way for 5-bed houses.
2. Greatest amount of small affordable houses the better.
3. Too many youngsters are priced out of living in their home area.
4. Very important to have a mix - not only large detached.
5. Within reason - no overfill wanted.
6. We need more development such as Old St Mary's which has proved so successful.
7. However: Should a family who have bought (for instance) a two-'bed house, and want to extend (assuming it's viable) to accommodate a 3rd bedroom for another child, rather than have to move house and incur all the associated cost and issues, then this should surely be supported.
8. Essential to retain smaller houses. These need to be dispersed around the village - not all in one place.
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.
10. I do feel it is important to help address this issue affecting the country as well as our own sons/daughters. Bearing in mind other issues presented here today, in appropriate numbers, new affordable (well-built) housing should be provided.
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%
12. Need greater than 40% affordable homes.
13. Higher % of affordable
14. Tough to enforce. Detrimental to character of area.
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.
16. The housing needs from the evidence base are not correct. They are too high.
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.
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?
19. Same style as now.
20. Smaller houses for young families and affordable housing should be encouraged.

## RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

21. This policy is not only unrealistic but unnecessary. There is no proven local demand for this type of development.
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 prospect of ever getting a job. I also have an issue regarding what is affordable in such an affluent area. However, in principle I agree
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.
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.
25. Why exclude open market one bedroom properties? What does affordable actually mean?
26. Mention of homes for 'Key Workers' would be good in here - farm workers, game keepers etc Do we mean 'development boundary' or should that be 'Settlement Boundary' as that is what we would normally refer to? 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.
27. Having full regard to delivering will not necessarily deliver.
28. Plans to demolish small/med homes and replace them with larger houses must also be resisted.
29. New residential development is required to deliver a wide choice of homes to meet a range of accommodation needs. Whilst it is understood that the proposed policy is informed by a housing needs survey undertaken in 2014, this only provides a very limited insight into the overall housing needs within the borough and is some 3 years old. Whilst the supporting text can suggest a preference or need for a specific type or size of property, the policy itself should only refer to providing a mix which reflects the most up to date housing need. This will ensure compliance with the Local Plan, both current and emerging and National policy.
30. Restriction of bedrooms being built in current/older 2/3 bed properties in the village seems harsh bearing in mind families may have grown up in those houses in 20 years and require more accommodation. Formal planning should define the style and character of the build, whereas those not needing planning are more likely to have inappropriate style.
31. The suggestion that extensions to existing 2 and 2 bedroom properties seems harsh. What does 'be resisted' mean? I doubt that many younger family households and many a significant number of older households will be able to afford the houses described in this

# RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

document. So surely this means that housing development in West Horsley will revert to GBC planning rules so no change from today..... market rules apply!

32. Though supporting the policy, it should not exclude well designed small apartment buildings.
33. In an existing property originally of 3 bed-rooms where one bedroom has been utilised to create an upstairs bathroom, will this policy support the reinstatement of the 3rd bedroom by virtue of an extension to the property assuming it has sufficient room to enable this?
34. I would also support the development of one or two bedroom flats PROVIDED that any such flats are situated within units of accommodation which externally appear to be single dwellings, i.e. Four smaller flats within what looks like a four- or five-bedroom detached property. These should be a maximum of 1 or 2 storeys high.
35. Properties such as rented or shared ownership should remain as such so that they stay affordable.
36. "Affordable" housing is definitely desirable. However, it is only a short-term benefit if after the first sale of the property anyone can buy it. There should be rules about only being purchased by locals into perpetuity. As per the fifth bullet point in WH5 Rural Exception Housing.
37. I think consideration needs to be given to supporting a planning application where it enables an existing local family to remain in their property rather than needing to move as a result of a growing family, i.e. children or parents
38. However: Should a family who have bought (for instance) a two-bed house, and want to extend (assuming it's viable) to accommodate a 3rd bedroom for another child, rather than have to move house and incur all the associated cost and issues, then this should surely be supported.

## **WH5: Rural Exception Housing**

### **88% of respondents support this policy**

1. More development such as Old St Mary's.
2. Housing should be within walking distance of facilities where possible and be infill rather than extending boundary.
3. Like very much.
4. if this is required tougher restrictions would be good.
5. No new development should be supported unless the infrastructure is improved at the same time - roads, parking at local shops, parking at station etc.
6. Affordable housing, yes, but creating a 'local market' fraught with difficulties.
7. Good thinking.
8. Mix needs to be maintained from current housing mix, as WH4.
9. Limited though.



## RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

10. Agreed but WH Parish Council should foster good relations with local developers and social housing providers to enhance the implementation of such policy.
11. This is ridiculous invention.
12. I think it 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
13. Sometimes "affordable" housing can be an excuse for over-development.
14. There is little if no employment in the village so thus does that mean that these new properties would become open to social housing.
15. 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 housing
16. This policy could be used to justify further developments outside the new settlement area as it is finally decided by GBC in the Local Plan. It is likely that the constraining clause 'necessary to ensure delivery' could be abused by developers and unlikely that its veracity could be independently verified.
17. The policy should allow for new employment opportunities, rather than restrict to existing employment, which is little.
18. See my comments above. Additionally, renting for affordable allowed for in this policy, is fraught with difficulty. Who will oversee the pricing? The result will be not what local people want or need.
19. the policy should read "----- will be supported in exceptional circumstances provided"
20. I do not see legally how you would have a right to do this though. There does need to be some new families encouraged to move into the area or the fortunes of the village will stay dormant. This idea has been tried in Bookham for the very different reason that council housing was being replaced with new build for the people who already lived there. Because of the logistics, and the problems of building disruption and timescale, some residents have moved away anyway. As a trader, there are not enough families with younger children in the village and some of those who are here, already own property elsewhere but have moved back temporarily to stay with parents and rent their properties for the time being.
21. Whilst I understand that rural exception housing can be used to address a specific local need (rather than a borough wide need) I have concerns that such housing can be developed on safeguarded Green Belt land outside the defined village settlement. This means that Green Belt land would be continually under threat for potential development. As I understand it the Rural Exception sites proposed can only be 0.4 hectare each but there is no limit as to how many may be proposed around the village. There could therefore be numerous. I feel this is potentially a bad thing and, on balance, outweighs the benefits to having a local priority for allocation.
22. Excellent policy.

# RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

## COMMUNITY ASSETS, INFRASTRUCTURE & BUSINESS ECONOMY POLICIES

### **WH6: Community Assets**

#### **98% of respondents support this policy**

1. shops/surgery
2. Goodhart Rendell Hall is not fit for purpose.
3. Squire's Garden Centre
4. Medical, schooling, railway station car parking all need to be extended.
5. The Wheelhouse should be sold by the church and permission given to build a proper church hall next to/near the church. A small development of affordable housing could be built on Wheelhouse land. Goodhart Rendell should be upgraded /refurbished and open for more village activities.
6. Wheelhouse should be refurbished and maintained.
7. Post Office
8. Community facilities not only protected by extended to meet any population increase.
9. Need for more bus services. Need for a general store.
10. Yes, yes, yes. Maintaining these spaces is critical in ensuring the protection of the community and what makes it unique.
11. Except possibly Goodhart Rendell - where the rather tired and under used premises could have been replaced by a modern centre useful for a wider community use.
12. Add shops/post office in West Horsley.
13. Very necessary to protect these facilities for the future well-being of the village to allow development of cohesion in village.
14. Another GP surgery is needed offering facilities for minor ops, eye and hearing tests as trips to Royal Surrey is very costly and distressing for the elderly.
15. Medical
16. Then why was the replacement Goodhart Rendell building not accepted? It is now being left to become derelict.
17. Community halls and meeting places are vital for a thriving village and having a good range is important to meet the needs of many
18. Who would decide that an activity could be 'satisfactorily relocated'? That which is satisfactory to GBC may not be satisfactory to the local community.
19. The water trough on the A246?
20. But it didnt save the post office. Policies should actively promote new employment
21. Sport and/or educational amenities outside normal school hours at the Raleigh School e.g. keep fit, brownies, holiday courses etc.
22. Given the dilapidated state of the Goodhart Rendel Community Hall, I would support its removal in favour of increasing the use of the Village Hall and the site made available for 2 - 3 bed housing.

# RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

23. I work in two of those properties and provide a service for the children of the village. Higher rents on alternative new buildings would see me leave the village, as other such organisations have done already.
24. I would support the redevelopment of the existing Village Hall to provide better and more flexible facilities.
25. Goodhart Rendel needs TLC/money to maintain it as a community facility, otherwise it will decay further and fall down. There is a need for a creative strategy to be found here.

## **WH7: Education Provision**

### **97% of respondents support this policy**

1. As village school is oversubscribed where is primary school provision?
2. Very much so. Not long ago some local children had to travel many miles to school while outsiders were occupying places at the Raleigh.
3. Essential to retain excellent Raleigh School but needs to be accessible for whole village.
4. However, schools on main roads have been known to cause problems e.g. asthma
5. Important to build on the firm foundations we have.
6. If the school relocates provision for cars to pull off the road must be provided. Parked cars on east Lane twice a day would cause traffic chaos and make use of the road difficult for pedestrians and cyclists.
7. Why not provide proper walking/cycling routes to Raleigh now? Why wait to see if it relocates?
8. Move it anyway.
9. As long as it was not over development on the site.
10. Would it not be possible to build a 3rd floor at the school?
11. We should keep this local school in West Horsley.
12. The Raleigh is of sufficient size to meet local needs and does not need to expand further.
13. But I question where the pupils actually live who are admitted to The Raleigh - many are from Bookham/Effingham, adding to the local pupils. There is also a near empty school in Ripley.
14. This policy adds very little if anything. What does 'wholly appropriate in all circumstances' mean? Since relocation of the school would be development then of course it would be complementary to the other requirements of the NP, if that is approved and implemented.
15. I do not agree with the proposed move of the Raleigh onto a currently green belt site.
16. The school needs to be bigger and more accessible. My son is a former pupil and although he benefitted from being at the school, he did suffer when unable to be part of West Horsley community projects because we lived in Bookham. It should be more friendly and open to servicing a wider community.

## RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

17. I support the intention to support the provision of places for local children at their local school. I DO NOT support the expansion of the Raleigh School to three form entry as I consider it to be inappropriate for a village school. I DO NOT support the Raleigh school's current relocation aspirations to a site within the Green Belt off East Lane. I would suggest that the neighbourhood plan seeks to require the school to reassess and amend its admissions policy so as to give priority to local West Horsley children. I think further consideration should be given to the potential for existing concerns about continued access to senior education at the Howard of Effingham being compromised by proposed development in Bookham and Effingham meaning that, even at its current size, there is the potential for Raleigh educated children being unable to attend the Howard. To Support Expansion of the Raleigh without full consideration and resolution of the impact and implications to our children's senior education could, in my opinion, be very problematic. Education from 4-18 must be considered as a whole. I have concerns that the Raleigh school is aspiring to expansion without Surrey County Council agreement nor longer term SCC and GBC draft plans and policies.
18. Move The Raleigh School to a larger site.
19. Would like to see the Raleigh relocated to Manor Farm.
20. But sad where the school is moving to - those fields are a lovely break in the housing.
21. But unenforceable conditions.
22. Provision of enough on-site parking is vital. At present, Northcote Road and Crescent can be over-burdened (to the extent that we have to tell visitors/tradesmen not to come at school drop off or collection times) by off-site parking due to the numbers at The Raleigh and a lack of on-site parking.
23. Access to the new location must allow parents to pick up children and leave without disrupting normal traffic as happens in Northcote Crescent.
24. Although I would be concerned if the relocation was to be in the Green Belt - the school would have to provided 'very special circumstances' to justify such a development. I do not support three-from entry on the same site.

### **WH8: Local Buildings of Historic Interest**

#### **99% of respondents support this policy**

1. Some historic buildings are more historic than others so distinction must be made.
2. What about The Old House, The Street? (former workhouse?)
3. What our community values should not be influenced by what the council or country deems of value - it should be protected.
4. Britons Farm seems to have been omitted.
5. Sympathetic improvements are OK.
6. This will help to keep West Horsley as a rural village.

## RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

7. But WHPC must not try to block West Horsley Place and opera company - like it tried last time which was an error. Someone has to pay for it.
8. To include Grade I and II listed buildings in the village.
9. Stupid question.
10. Why is Lollesworth Lane not included?
11. The names of properties are also important to the history of the village and owners should be prevented from changing them.
12. Why not identify the other (43-18=25) listed buildings within West Horsley (WEST HORSLEY DESIGN STATEMENT section 5.1) as Local Heritage Assets?
13. But the list is too subjective. There is a listing system, and where buildings are not listed they should be notified to HE, or a local listing system introduced. This definitive list could overlook good buildings.
14. I should like to see the row of Victorian Cottages in Long Reach ( at The Street end of Long Reach) also protected. Also, the 6 pairs of artisan cottages built around 1936 that follow on the Victorian cottages and located either side of Woodside.
15. Should the Pincott Farm buildings be added?

### **WH9: West Horsley Place**

#### **94% of respondents support this policy**

1. However, I was surprised to see the opera house clearly visible from the A246.
2. With the caveat that it should be affordable for all.
3. More local facilities will reduce travel to/from other places for local people although it is understood there will also be an attraction that goes wide than Horsley.
4. Subject to review of specific proposals.
5. At present, I believe development is being conducted with local interests in mind.
6. Could the education element link to the Raleigh?
7. Brilliant idea.
8. Make access for the community and relevant resources.
9. Very much in favour - a wonderful new addition to our village.
10. As long as it does not become too large. The opera house is felling too many trees,
11. I believe it is important to support the idea of a cultural centre which has a local element and encourage the youth in performing arts and crafts and provides employment via current and new ventures
12. Very much for locals too.

## RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

13. Would be wonderful to have a community arts studio that can be rented by local working artists. I currently rent in Reigate and travel as there is nothing nearby.
14. I'm not sure what the impact is likely to be - or the benefit to the wider community
15. There is no need to support further development of WH Place over and above the approvals that it has already gained from GBC. Further development will be similarly judged against Green Belt policy.
16. I do not agree with this erosion of the green belt for this purpose.
17. Disagree strongly. There are strong listing and scheduling controls on WHP which will far outweigh any local policies. We are in danger of allowing inappropriate growth of the site by new buildings (the Opera House is not invisible in the Woods), by night time activity and noise, traffic, and ancillary activity. Important that the Mary Roxburge Trust is seen as distinct from Grange Opera. The policy should reflect what WHP is, parkland with agriculture and local employment, not a hub of activity.
18. These things are well served already in the area.

### **WH10: Employment**

#### **97% of respondents support this policy**

1. As long as they are small and don't involve parking of business vehicles.
2. I value small businesses and startups and believe they can be of tremendous value locally. Space and good internet access are key.
3. There are limited opportunities for this without building more sheds on farms as most redundant farm buildings are already developed. I would support modest sized shed construction to meet local demand for business use.
4. Smaller start-up businesses and cottage industries should be encouraged and often provide a better, more coherent contribution than housing. Also, the re-use of farm and agricultural buildings should be encouraged.
5. Good to have a mixture.
6. Terms are a bit restrictive. Any local employment would be welcome.
7. Encouraging more business spaces should not just be part of farm diversification.
8. New business development should be judged against Green Belt policy.
9. But not exclusively farm diversification - the document calls WH as place of rural character, but it is not; it is Metropolitan Green Belt with very little active agriculture (once horticultural and amenity land is accounted for)
10. There are places that are more suited to this. The sort of business that takes advantage of the suggested proposal do not bring people into the area. Industrial estates are not of any benefit other than the sale of the land, in my view.
11. Many small businesses operate from home. Facilities - clubs, meeting forums etc. should be encouraged for these people so that they can meet others in the same boat and cooperated where appropriate.

# RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

## ENVIRONMENT & LANDSCAPE POLICIES

### **WH11: Local Green Spaces**

#### **97% of respondents support this policy**

1. But there are insufficient sites identified.
2. Very limited number and size of green spaces - not consistent with the desire to maintain the "rural" nature of West Horsley.
3. One map shows a small space at the junction of East Lane and Heatherdene - this is NOT a public space - it belongs to Langton Cottage.
4. One map shows a small area of green space at the junction of Heatherdene and East Lane. This is not a public area but part of the garden of Langton Cottage which for road safety sight purposes has to be outside the border hedge.
5. List is small.
6. The green area at SW corner of Bell & Colvill roundabout where horse trough stands should be added to the list.
7. Need further Green Spaces identified and protected - land along East Lane and along Ockham Road North.
8. Ben's Wood area of local beauty.
9. This should be more comprehensive and should include Ben's Wood.
10. Ben's Wood should be preserved.
11. Build on Manor Farm but leave Long Reach and the football pitch.
12. This should go without saying. Is anyone seriously thinking that development of Parish land might be up for discussion?
13. The open green element makes the village what it is
14. Please add Ben's Wood.
15. Include the football pitch on Long Reach.
16. Farley's Close Other verges that may form a corridor of greenness along key roads Long Reach fields opposite the Football Club
17. The restricted list implies that all other areas are fair targets for developers.
18. Permissive path network at WH place
19. I question whether sites 6 and 7 meet the criteria for LGS, there is no public access and the owners' agreement is very doubtful. I should like to see added, Ben's Wood, the land around the Horsley Football Club, the Cricket Club and the Caravan Club's land
20. The field that runs alongside Long Reach House in Long Reach.
21. Several of these areas are too small to effectively put new housing on, unless it would be one or two expensive houses. In effect, the loss of beauty spots and urban spaces in the village would ultimately devalue other property and the village would fail because public transport is not good enough for lower income families to get to their areas of work. That needs improving.

# RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

## **WH12: Green & Blue Infrastructure**

### **97% of respondents support this policy**

1. Bus service?
2. Many people walk and cycle. No additional barriers to this. Hedges and paths must be retained.
3. I would like to see improved maintenance of footpaths and bridleways. Widening of some footpaths to make combined foot/bridle paths would be appreciated.
4. And a renewed attempt should be made to stop the Silkmore Lane BOAT being abused by motorcyclists and 4x4 drivers.
5. It would appear that these pathways etc. would be all that would be left of our countryside.
6. This seems overly onerous to small developments
7. The importance of drainage ditches hereabouts

## **WH13: Sustainable Urban Drainage**

### **98% of respondents support this policy**

1. If, and when, development of housing takes place they will need to improve drainage and increase public facilities.
2. Drainage and flooding are a problem. There needs to be a guarantee that any existing residents affected adversely by development can get assistance to remedy the problem.
3. Surface water and flooding is a particular concern in a number of locations.
4. There are now plenty of solutions, new and traditional, to mitigate flood risk.
5. The flooding within the Parish over many years has been an issue and I feel that it is currently acceptable. This must be maintained.
6. Very important.
7. The shame is no-one seems to be able to make SCC undertake their responsibilities of maintenance of our valuable existing drainage infrastructure.
8. Good thinking, especially permeable parking areas.
9. Whole heartedly! The field behind me floods my garden every year and there is plans for 100 houses on it.
10. With heavy rain the main sewer that runs parallel with Ockham Road North over flows and the man hole sites flooding the area/fields with untreated sewage and run off from houses. Many older properties discharge roof water direct to the sewer system. No more development until the old properties discharge to soak-aways.
11. In principal OK - but the policy needs to be much more viable.
12. There has been considerable drainage/flooding issues in the past within the Parish and this must be kept in mind with any proposed future development
13. Especially Green Lane.



# RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

14. It adds little to and may even confuse national and local policy
15. Serious work is required to fix the drainage problems in the village NOW, let alone before any additional development occurs.
16. All development proposals are required to demonstrate that they can adequately provide for both surface water and foul sewage. Whilst there can be preference for SUDs schemes, ultimately the drainage strategy should be the one considered most appropriate for the site by the relevant authority. It is considered this policy is too prescriptive, consequently the wording should be altered to remove the reference to the required SUDs features.
17. Poor drainage has prevented several new proposals for property in Bookham. Which has been a good thing. Current drainage had to be replaced first.
18. Overloading of foul sewers is a problem too.
19. I know that this is not the right place to make this comment, but somewhere it should be stated that all new developments should include cycle paths "separated from traffic flows" i.e. not just narrow bits at the edge of the road.
20. The land in WC07 (Long Lodge Farm) is often flooded during wet weather.
21. Land at the end of Nightingale Ave is particularly wet, even flooded, during any wet weather.

## **WH14: Biodiversity**

### **97% of respondents support this policy**

1. There needs to be a survey of trees in the village to increase protection. A massive oak taken down last year in a garden on Ockham Road. It was healthy - not causing issues.
2. Often put at the bottom of list of concerns. Most important resource.
3. In addition, existing trees and vegetation of this nature should be kept and not allowed to be removed for development. "Seek to avoid" is too weak a statement and should be stronger.
4. Ben's Wood (Manor Farm) and Pond are NOT shown on Map 9. This must be included as it supports an enormous amount of valuable wildlife.
5. This is very important to our children also.
6. Protect the openness of land on boundaries with Ockham and Ripley to form a buffer area and pathway for wildlife to move to the SSIs in the area.
7. To a point, but not crazy - it's not the Amazon Jungle!
8. Unenforceable.
9. Why is Ben's Wood not included within the protected habitat?
10. Bens Wood and its large pond is not included on Map 9 as deciduous woodland. Biodiversity adjacent to this has increased enormously.

# RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

11. It adds little to and may even confuse national and local policy
12. Ash is undesirable as it self-seeds too much.

## **WH15: Dark Skies**

### **96% of respondents support this policy**

1. The Street needs 2 or 3 street lights, especially in winter.
2. An absolute essential, especially as links (road and rail) are going to grow.
3. Very strongly supported. Essential to retain rural character and combat the environmental impact of too much light. This should also extend to how individual properties light their external walls and security lights. No more street lights.
4. Pleasantly surprised this is part of the plan.
5. No extended lighting required at all.
6. The present general policy of no street lighting should be continued in any new development unless health and safety over-rides as at Bell & Colvill roundabout.
7. Good thinking to insist on this being considered at planning stage.
8. When we moved here we could not believe how beautiful the night sky was without light pollution.
9. VIP
10. Light pollution is poor in many places. West Horsley is currently very good. Please, please keep it good.
11. The lack of lighting on Ockham Road North to the station is lethal, yet Glenesk School is lit up like a stately home even after 7pm. A few more lights required.
12. Whilst understanding this policy, the walk from the station to East Lane is unpleasant to say the least at night. I feel very vulnerable and will not attempt this in the dark. Particularly the section under the railway bridge. More lighting would improve this immeasurably.
13. No street lights on new developments please!
14. In particular, large buildings should ensure lighting is not left on overnight - such as local schools.
15. While the village gets bigger we need more lighting.
16. Prohibit road lighting.
17. Dark skies are an integral part to village life and we are currently lucky enough to live in a very low light pollution area and any new lighting regimes must take in to account the impact of night time light on both human and animal life
18. Not sure what this means. I would support suitably designed i.e. Victorian-type street lamps in the village so that it is safe to walk to local venues at night.
19. No street lights No more up lighters on houses restricted lighting on houses/roofs
20. BUT in the context that we are already blighted by M25 and other areas

## RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

21. Strongly support this policy - could there be some reference to encouraging the bodies which manage private roads to help implement this policy?
22. I think that minimising light pollution in the parish is very important. I DO NOT support the installation of any more street lighting within the village on any arterial routes and any new development must be designed so as to restrict light pollution to an absolute minimum - no street lighting within the estates created.
23. Does not go far enough. No street lights allowed
24. We should also resist any further street lighting.

# RESULTS OF SURVEY ON WEST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DRAFT PLAN POLICIES

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

1. I appreciate all the work that the steering group has undertaken on this matter and the effort put into it.
2. It is extremely good and thanks to all involved. The A24 6 is overlooked as a national traffic corridor, noisy, fast, and dissects the parish. Equally it is an opportunity for good access and connectivity with East Horsley. The relationship with East Horsley is hardly mentioned; the needed for connecting paths ( WH Place) , roads, and community assets. We have to accept we are not a rural community as found in most of the rest of the country. Area 1 is possibly the exception. Arts and Crafts architecture is not the benchmark for architecture hereabouts; it is one important style that is complemented by ' good design ' being more important. Modern housing is also important and Surrey is well known for that. The Annexes 1- 5 need to be included for full comment to be possible.
3. Regarding several of the places names in the list for possible development house small businesses. These need to be provided with somewhere to work or the village will become completely cut off from the opportunities that these businesses offer. Having and 'arts centre' does not work for those who really provide real, educational arts tuition, because there is not enough space to accommodate all such organisations, and expecting them to all share one facility is utopian and unfair to all of them. Then there are all the sports teams, Brownies, Cubs and Scouts organisations, Yoga, craft, baby craft, even the police use the community halls.
4. Basically, other than the shops in Horsley, the local halls and schools are where most of the local community can run small businesses in this village.
5. Excellent plan. Thank you to all who have obviously worked so hard on it. One other minor point. According to the Post Office, Pincott Lane is in fact "Pincotts Lane" even though that is not what is on the road sign.
6. Thank you for all your hard work so far.
7. This consultation is simply window dressing and wishful thinking on the part of WHPC and its steering group. I really cannot see WHPC ultimately having any influence over new housing schemes. It will be GBC who will have the final say, and we all know how perverse they are. Developers will build on their own terms or not at all. It will not be possible to dictate conditions in the way set out in this document. Cost will ultimately be the determining factor and we, the residents, will be forced to accept the outcome. I think you have wasted your time.
8. Very impressive document, well done to all involved. I am concerned that the "proposals will be supported..." wording in each of the policies will reduce the ability of locals and the PC to object to individual development proposals which may seek to take advantage of loopholes, overlooked exclusions or changing circumstances during the 20yr life of the Plan. Is an alternative wording possible? I also remain concerned that the PC are not challenging the GBC on the figures which underpin the housing numbers nor on the proportion of the housing which has been allocated to WH/EH (not a NP issue but nevertheless it's the elephant in the room).
9. Its looking pretty good!