

EVIDENCE BASE: Meetings with Environment-related bodies

This document provides notes of meetings held by members of the Neighbourhood Plan Environment policy team during 2015 with the following organizations:

- a. Surrey Hills AONB
- b. Open Spaces Society
- c. Horsley Countryside Preservation Society (Questionnaire)
- d. Surrey Wildlife Trust
- e. The Forestry Commission
- f. The Woodland Trust (Conference Call)
- g. GBC Conservation Officer

a) Meeting Note: Surrey Hills AONB Partnership,

Friday 11th September 2015 at 10.30 am in the Parish Office at the East Horsley Village Hall

Attendees: Tim Harrold (TE), *Advisory Board, Surrey Hills AONB Partnership*
David Foot (DF), Robert Taylor (RT), Tony Elliott TE, *EHNP Environment Policy Team*

Minutes of Meeting:

1. The main purpose of this meeting was to learn more about the policies of Surrey Hills AONB (“AONB”) towards conservation, biodiversity and development policies in general and to discuss issues of particular relevance to East Horsley and its Neighbourhood Plan. The AONB covers approximately 30% of the land area of East Horsley parish.
2. As an introduction TH gave out copies of the “Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan Executive Summary, 2014 – 2018” which explains its various promotional activities in recreation, farming, woodlands, biodiversity, heritage, etc. AONB is funded by 6 Local Authorities within its boundary, plus Natural England and SCC. It does not have a large permanent staff, just 6 permanent employees. Its Management Plan is statutorily adopted by the Local Authorities across its area. In planning matters, it has the same status as a National Park.
3. TH explained how the boundaries of the AONB were established and to what extent any expansion in East Horsley might be considered. He said that personally he had favoured a boundary line along the A246 but this was considered too ambitious, given the long and complex process involved in setting AONB boundaries. He recommended we make contact with Clive Smith, an AONB employee, who is involved in this issue, if we wished to make an application for extending the East Horsley AONB boundary. TH also explained that Natural England is presently conducting a review of the AONB boundaries, primarily in respect of the Areas of Great Landscape Value, but this does not directly involve East Horsley.
4. TH also mentioned ‘The Quiet Lanes Initiative’ which he believed might be relevant to some roads in East Horsley such as Chalk Lane.
5. The subject of housing development within the AONB was discussed. TH explained that in general development is limited to sites within the settlement boundaries of villages that are set within the AONB, typically on brownfield sites or as re-building work. Outside the settlement boundaries development is only approved in exceptional cases. TH cited the example of Ranmore Manor where several new dwellings were approved recently as part of a broader agreement with the owner to improve the overall appearance of the site. In planning matters, AONB acts as a consultant to the relevant Local Authority which has a statutory right to uphold the requirements of the AONB. TH also remarked that ‘Traffic is always an issue!’
6. There was a broad discussion about the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan (‘EHNP’) and issues relating to the AONB. TH remarked on the importance of the Lovelace heritage within East Horsley and that it represented a particularly important feature of the village in terms

history and defining the character of the community. He mentioned in particular the work done on restoring the Lovelace bridges and flint walls of the old Lovelace Estate. TH referenced Pevsner's famous guidebook which includes a detailed entry on Horsley Towers and its particular architectural value. TH also stressed the importance of the East Horsley Conservation Area and its role in protecting important key historical assets within the village.

7. TH said he was aware of several potential brownfield sites within East Horsley that might be considered for development. One possibility was the old railway sidings at Effingham Junction although it seems that British Rail still consider this to be a required operating site. He also wondered if part of the Newmarsh Farm site might be considered within the EHNP. In general, TH urged EHNP to resist considering further linear developments.
8. Concerning the woodlands sections within the East Horsley area of the AONB, most of which are owned by the Forestry Commission, TH was not aware of significant changes in their plans for this area. He explained that parts of the AONB woodlands did need to be cut back significantly for conservation reasons and that AONB had an initiative at present to encourage the greater use of wood and wood-chippings, eg. for fuel.
9. The significance of various sites within the Horsley's was discussed for their contribution to bio-diversity, including Wellington Meadow and the Sheepleas.
10. TH recommended we study the report issued by GBC in January 2007 called "Guildford Landscape Character Assessment & Guidance, Volume 1 Rural Assessment" which contains various references to the AONB in general, including East Horsley.
11. TH mentioned his contacts with a number of other Neighbourhood Plan areas, including Hook Heath, Worpleston and the South Downs National Park. He remarked that Ripley, Wisley & Ockham have recently launched a combined Neighbourhood Plan covering the Lovelace area. He also encouraged us to have contacts with NP groups in neighbouring areas such as Effingham and West Horsley since he believe we have many common interests as well as specific development issues which straddle parish boundaries.

RT/12.09.15

b) MEETING NOTE: OPEN SPACES SOCIETY

Date: 29th September 2015

Present: Colin Sandford (CS), local representative of OSS,
Robert Taylor (RT), NP Environment Team.

Points arising:

1. OSS is the oldest conservation group in England. Their main aim is the promotion of open green spaces, including common land and woodland, as well as footpaths and Rights of Way. OSS have a statutory right to be consulted by the Planning Inspector on any proposed change in the status of Registered Common Land or Public Rights of Way.
2. RT described the present strategy of the NP team in relation to Local Green Space designations and the rationale for selecting particular sites. CS said he thought our approach sounded very sensible given the geography of East Horsley. He also confirmed that to his knowledge there was no Registered Common Land within East Horsley parish. Effingham Common was the closest such site and OSS are in discussions with the Effingham NP team on this matter.
3. In reviewing the various woodland areas, RT pointed out the situation at Frenchlands Copse where a Settlement Boundary change is proposed and mentioned the well defined path going around this wood. CS thought this path could be considered as a Public Right of Way and proposed to view the location for himself as soon as possible.
4. RT described the broader work of the NP team. CS indicated he would like to be kept generally informed about our progress and was willing to help us if there was anything specific we needed from his organisation in future.
5. CS read and completed the V&O questionnaire. He thought the present tense language of the Vision was confusing, but agreed with the contents when they were properly explained. He thought the Objectives were essentially 'Motherhood' and had no reason to disagree with any of them.

RT/29.09.15

c) HCPS Questionnaire with responses

16.12.15

Questions submitted by the NP Environment Team are shown in Blue, the HCPS responses in black

1. Background

1.1 When was the Society formed?

It was formed in the late 1950's.

1.2 How many members do you have currently?

Our membership covers 1287 households.

1.3 Approximately what proportion of your members are from East Horsley?

There are 840 households in East Horsley.

1.4 What are the objectives of HCPS?

- ❖ Conserving the best of the Horsleys and its environment
- ❖ Promoting high standards in planning and local amenities
- ❖ Providing a forum for awareness of local issues
- ❖ Maintaining good links with our neighbours

1.5 What are your main activities today?

Promoting awareness of our wonderful countryside through the provision & funding of education, displays, notice boards, booklets, talks

Walks – Countryside walks

Heritage trails– looking at & learning about some of our old buildings

Developing walk maps e.g. the Diamond Jubilee Trail

Monitoring rights of way

Permissive paths – last year we cleared a new permissive way in West Horsley

Publications – Books and Quarterly Magazines covering local history and countryside

Monitoring planning applications and disseminating information on these applications and Local Plans

Activities including the funding of construction work towards the conservation of local historical buildings, walls, bridges etc.

Activities towards upgrading footpaths & gates particularly to allow access for those with disabilities

Contributing to the funding of seats, information boards, way markers etc

2. Conservation

2.1 What approach does HCPS take towards conservation in East Horsley?

The HCPS works towards conserving the ambience of the village; this involves taking a vigilant approach.

2.2 What are your main priorities for conservation in East Horsley currently?

The care of our precious green spaces – monitoring and volunteering

Monitoring planning developments

Maintenance of the Diamond Jubilee Trail & other footpaths & bridleways

Promoting awareness of our historical buildings and our wonderful countryside

2.3 What policies do you think should be included in the EHNP towards conservation?

To protect our greenbelt and open spaces

The Society took the lead the purchase of Great Ridings Wood & the Forest which were put into the safe hands of East Horsley Parish Council and leased to the Woodland Trust & Surrey Wildlife Trust respectively.

The Society has also worked hard towards saving some of our wonderful green areas such as Wellington Meadow –ownership is in the hands of East Horsley Parish Council for safekeeping.

3. Planning

3.1 In general what involvement does HCPS have in the planning process?

HCPS disseminates information on local planning applications and Local Plans to members & residents.

HCPS comments on applications and Local Plans when appropriate

3.2 Give some examples of what you have achieved in the past in the planning sphere

The Society worked hard to promote awareness of the ramifications of the last local Plan with leaflet drops and talks.

3.3 What policies do you think should be included in EHNP towards planning?

To promote a BALANCED future for our village with modest mixed development recognising Guildford Borough Green Belt & Countryside Study Volume V (published in April 2014) saying that ‘East Horsley would not be appropriate for a major expansion due to current population of 3,785 meaning that only a relatively small population growth requirement of 215 would be needed to reach the critical mass of 4000. The opportunities to bring forward new facilities through a small population increase would therefore be limited at East Horsley.’ (page 44 - 24.64)

To promote modest development for local people including small houses suitable for both downsizers and first time buyers.

4. Community Acquisitions

HCPS has played a leading role in funding and raising public donations for the community such as Great Ridings Wood & The Forest.

4.1 Would HCPS be prepared to play a similar role again if a suitable acquisition became available?

It is most likely that the HCPS would become involved if there were a justifiable need.

4.2 How many people made donations to each of these previous fund raisings?

A large number of local people made small donations. There were also donations from larger organisations.

4.3 What kind of acquisitions do you believe would most appeal to HCPS and its members?

It would most likely involve the protection of land; a suitable organisation would then be needed for long term care and ownership.

5. Other comments

5.1 Do you have any other comments you would like to make about the neighbourhood plan?

As a Society we are concerned with The Horsleys. It would be good to foster active collaboration between the villages in the production of Neighbourhood Plan. We are keen to preserve the individual character of the two villages while at the same time considering the bigger picture. It is inevitable that development in one village will have an effect on the other.

d) Meeting Notes: Surrey Wildlife Trust

20th October 2015

Present: John Wilshire (JW), Surrey Wildlife Trust ranger
Robert Taylor (RT), EHNP

Location: The Forest

1. Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) manage two areas of woodlands in EH, Sheepleas and The Forest. JW is the SWT's Ranger responsible for maintaining SWT's woodlands in the northern section of Surrey.
2. JW summarized SWT's approach towards woodlands management in general and The Forest in particular. A key theme of SWT's approach is to try to maintain their woodlands in a natural state, including where possible sustaining or reinstating the original habitat of the land (eg. as at Ockham Common). In woodlands this will typically involve trying to remove alien species such as rhododendron, which also poisons surrounding vegetation. Clearing away invasive species like rhododendron also means a woodlands like The Forest becomes more open, has more light, which makes it pleasanter for walking in. It also aids biodiversity. [NB: On the day of the meeting JW was out with his chain-saw cutting back another strand of rhododendron.]
3. JW explained that SWT would traditionally engage in coppicing of trees from time to time, (eg. hazel, sweet-chestnut, etc), removing (and selling off) timber to benefit surrounding trees. SWT's ability to engage in coppicing depends upon a range of factors including site access and budget funding. With very tight cost controls presently operating across SWT, little coppicing is currently being undertaken on sites such as The Forest. Most of their current activity in The Forest is focused on maintaining 'rides' (ie the main paths) and creating glades to allow pockets of light into The Forest.
4. JW explained that in woodlands like The Forest, the area is designated into the three zones for programmed maintenance. Zone 1 covers areas close to the main tracks and near to housing boundaries - trees are checked every year by a tree specialist and any dangerous, diseased or fallen trees promptly removed. Zone 2 covers the less well used permissive footpaths, which the Ranger checks each year and attends directly to periodic tree cutting as and when needed. Zone 3 covers all other areas. These are inspected less frequently and forestry work is occasional.
5. The Forest is maintained as a wildlife reserve. It is rich in biodiversity and is classified as both SNCI and Ancient Woodland. JW commented that the headline species on this site are toads, where the toad tunnel is particularly impressive, and Great Crested Newts, a European protected species. However, he added that there are a lot of other important species, particularly invertebrates, that a passing visitor wouldn't really see unless they know where to look! JW remarked that "*when SWT's specialists visit The Forest they are always very impressed with the wildlife here.*" He added further: "*From a biodiversity perspective this is probably one of our most important sites in Surrey.*"

6. RT asked whether SWT had any policies in respect of Neighbourhood Plans. JW said he was not aware of anything particular but suggested we telephone SWT's planning adviser, Ken Ackorn, if there were any specific questions. He fully supported any decision to seek Local Green Space designation for The Forest.
7. RT commented on reports of funding issues at SWT. JW admitted that his expenditure budget had been cut in half in recent years. He also added that woodlands such as The Forest can be maintained at relatively low cost – tighter funding constraints impact more on SWT's ability to make improvements to what is there already. Indeed the low cost of maintaining The Forest was one reason SWT had originally taken a very quick decision to take on The Forest when it first became available.
8. RT asked, given the funding situation, whether SWT would be interested in looking at other woodland sites to manage, should these become available for public purchase in the coming years. JW said that SWT is still looking for new woodlands to manage but any decision would depend upon the specific features of the woodlands concerned, how they might fit into their overall strategy and indeed how costly they might be to maintain. Generally, he believed SWT would, in principle, be ready to consider managing further Ancient Woodlands should they become available.

RT/21.10.15

e) Forestry Commission: Note of Meeting

Meeting with: John Stride (JS), Planning Manager, SE England District, based in Lyndhurst

NP Team: David Foot (DF), Robert Taylor (RT)

Location: Forestry Commission (FC), Alice Holt Centre, near Farnham

Meeting Date: 6th October 2015

Notes:

1. JS explained that the FC's woodlands in East Horsley (EH), sometimes called collectively Effingham Forest, are grouped with two other areas, Ranmore and Highridge Wood (near Dorking), and designated by FC as 'Surrey Hills'.
2. JS gave us a copy of the FC's long term management plan, the "Surrey Hills Forest Design Plan 2011 – 2041" and referred to this document throughout the meeting.
3. FC's holdings in East Horsley are a complex of three woodlands – Dick Focks, Oldlands and Mountain Wood. Other names for specific woods are still found on maps for historical reasons. All of Effingham Forest is freehold, owned 100% by FC, and managed as a single unit for management purposes. The total size is 145 hectares, equivalent to 20% of the land area of EH. Some of the FC's land also crosses into Effingham.
4. The FC's Design Plan describes this woodland as: "*... a mixture of conifer (principally Douglas Fir) and broadleaved (principally Beech) species. The key features of these woodlands are the Lovelace Bridges, the woods' designation as Planted Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS), invasive non-native regeneration (Sycamore), one small geological SSSI and some small areas of Yew.*"
5. Much of Effingham Forest is classified as Ancient Woodland. The FC's main woodland strategy in this area is to restore planted ancient woodland Sites (PAWS) back to native species. The process of transformation is gradual and long term. In the past the FC used to adopt a policy of 'clearfell', ie clearing large areas of forest and re-planting them with new saplings. Now the strategy is predominantly a group Selection System, whereby small areas are cleared (0.25 hectares or less) and "restocked" by natural regeneration or, if needed, by re-planting. The impact of woodland clearances is less visible and the approach is beneficial for bio-diversity. Mixed woodlands are now preferred and considered more resilient than mono-cultures.
6. Most woodland operations (such as tree-felling and thinning) are organised on a 5 year cycle, both for efficiency and to minimise disturbance. Most trees felled are sold commercially.
7. The FC has not sold any significant areas of woodland nationally since 2010 and has no foreseeable plans to do so. For Effingham Forest there are no plans to sell any land, and there are no commercial or political pressures to do so. Nor are there any plans to acquire additional woodlands in this area in the future.

8. JS confirmed that after government proposals in 2010 to privatize the FC, later abandoned, the FC's policy is now focused upon internal re-structuring to ensure the FC works efficiently within a state-owned structure.
9. There are no plans to consider any housing development in the area of Effingham Forest. JS remarked that *'this just doesn't happen'*. He could recollect only one small development of rural exception housing in the SE region during this time with FC. Cabin sites have been developed in other areas for holiday accommodation but there are no plans to do this in EH.
10. JS explained that providing recreation facilities for the community is considered as an important part of the FC's function. All of Effingham Forest is accessible to the public on a freedom to roam basis for walkers, dog-walkers, cyclists, etc. Horse-riding is licensed through TROT (toll-riders off-road trust). There are no specific plans to develop any additional recreational facilities in Effingham Forest beyond the present network of tracks and footpaths. No changes to car parks in this area are planned.
11. JS commented that the Surrey Hills AONB were encouraging the use of wood fuel as an energy source with a number of local authorities and wondered if EH might consider this. His colleague Mathew Woodcock is responsible for this area and JS proposed to send us contact details if we wished to follow up in this area.
12. RT asked about the FC's policies towards 'Local Green Spaces'. JS replied that if we wanted to designate a location as a Local Green Space it would be a matter for the FC's Estates team to decide - they would need to check the legal status of the freehold title before giving a decision. He was not aware of any general policy on this matter.
13. RT asked if there was anything the FC would like to see within an NP for EH that would be of help to FC. JS replied that in preparing long term Design Plans he always finds it useful to consult with existing Neighbourhood Plans to ensure their Design Plans are consistent with those of the local community.

RT/06.10.15

f) The Woodland Trust: Conference call note

Conference with: Victoria Bankes Price (VB), Planning Adviser

NP Team: Robert Taylor (RT)

Date: 7th October 2015

Notes

1. Woodland Trust (WT) manage two areas of woodland in EH, Great Ridings Wood and Clamp Rough & Gallows Grove in Effingham Junction. The latter is owned by WT, the former owned by EHPC with a long-term lease to WT.
2. Detailed 5 year Management Plans for both sites are available on the WT website covering 2012-17 for Great Ridings Wood and 2015-20 for Clamp Rough. The essence of the WT's woodland strategy for both sites is to protect native woods, hedges & wildlife, whilst seeking to remove invasive species, such as rhododendrons, where possible.
3. Ancient woodlands are a priority for WT. VB explained the difference between the two classes of ancient woodlands, ie Planted Ancient Woodlands (PAWS) and Ancient Semi-natural Ancient Woodland, (ASNW). VB suggested we look at the Guidance Notes to the NPPF which discuss both categories. She also commented that they have found planners sometimes do not give the same weight to the first category even though NPPF rules explicitly do not make this distinction.
4. VB said WT has proposed guidance to other NP's and suggested policies would require a buffer zone of at least 50 metres around Ancient Woodland (both classes) in which housing development would not be permitted. This guidance has been followed in a number of NP's.
5. RT explained that we might seek to designate both woodland sites managed by WT as Local Green Spaces in the NP. VB said they have no problem with this at all and indeed would welcome it. There is no prospect of WT developing these locations (or any others!) so this is fully consistent with their own policies.
6. She also recommended we may consider two other features to include in our Environmental policies, namely:
 - a) Street trees: In a large housing development requiring that one new tree is planted in the street for every new house built.
 - b) Tree replacement policy: For every existing tree removed in a new development, one new tree should be planted as a replacement.
7. RT asked whether, if further woodlands areas are acquired by the community in EH, whether WT would have an interest in taking on the management of such woodlands. VB said they would certainly be happy to consider this but much would depend upon the type and size of the woodlands concerned. They have now established strategic priorities favouring larger sites and areas of special interest. As a result they are taking on less woodlands management sites in general. Their preference currently is to own the woodlands themselves and to lease

them back to local communities who would take on the management, albeit with some guidance and hand-holding by WT. VB will send details of the 6 pilot programmes running across the country which takes this approach.

8. RT asked about the WT's recreational policies. VB explained that WT generally has an open access policy to all of their woodlands. The emphasis is on ensuring that recreational developments are sympathetic to each woodland area in question. The extent of eg. creating new parking areas, maintaining footpaths, etc is designed accordingly for each site. All WT woodlands allow horse-riding.
9. RT asked about the funding position of WT. VB explained that the WT receives little government support. Most of its funding comes from public donations, including legacies/wills, and important corporate sponsors such as Waitrose, Sainsburys, IKEA, etc. With this diverse funding base they have not been impacted by the kind of cost-cutting measures now effecting eg. Surrey Wildlife Trust.
10. RT agreed to send VB a draft of the EHNP Environment policy when it is prepared for her suggestions.

RT/07.10.15

Present: GBC: Marianna Beadsworth (MB), GBC Conservation Officer
Dan Knowles (DK), Senior Planning Officer, Neighbourhood Plan Liaison
EHNP: David Foot (DF), Robert Taylor (RT), Brian Wolfe (BW)

Location: GBC Offices, Millmead

Meeting Notes

a) Tree & hedgerow policies

1. RT began by explaining that the consultation work carried out in EH to date showed ‘leafiness’ represented an important part of EH’s village character. He gave out a copy of the October Open Day Mini-Survey showing that 96% of respondents said “tree-lined roads and generally leafy appearance” helped “a lot” in defining the character of East Horsley. Therefore, developing a policy which conserved trees was seen as being important to the NP.

2. MB said that, in general, where there is no TPO and the location is outside of the Conservation Area and is not an area of Ancient Woodland, SSSI or SNCI, then there is no current planning policy which gives general protection for trees. Nor is there any planning policy which prevents a developer from cutting down such classes of trees prior to starting a development. RT cited the case of Bramfield in East Horsley where the developer had cleared this large site of well-developed trees before making a planning application that had ultimately been rejected – MB said there was nothing GBC could have done in that particular case.

3. MB explained that one possible approach towards tree protection is to identify specific non-TPO trees which have special value and to apply for a TPO for them. DK added that such a designation would normally require the consent of the owner and therefore this may not always be a suitable approach towards ensuring conservation and would potentially require a huge amount of work from residents. DK suggested that the alternative of seeking a Local Green Space designation might be a better way of providing protection for a particular copse of trees. There was a discussion on the merits of applying for TPOs on potential development sites to which MB responded that such action might be perfectly reasonable if the "case" was good enough – however, there is also the risk is that a developer might cut down trees in advance if they know TPO’s are being proposed – and planning law cannot stop them.

4. RT distributed an outline of an EHNP policy aimed at ‘Conserving Trees & Hedgerows’ which MB and DK read. They agreed that, with one small change, the first paragraph appeared workable. However, the second paragraph, which proposed a 12 months retrospective enforcement against the removal of trees was certainly not workable. MB suggested that a useful way to develop this tree policy was for EHNP to consider policies aimed at ensuring adequate Site Screening, perhaps as part of a Housing Design policy. DK added that most developers do include detailed landscaping policies with new planning applications and therefore a requirement for adequate Site Screening would usually not give them any problems – and since developers usually want to ensure public support if possible for a new application this might be built into an effective Design policy.

5. MB explained that TPO’s were handled by generalist planning officers but GBC also had one Tree Officer, Stuart Bee, a tree specialist who gives advice to the planning officers on TPO’s.

6. DF asked about sources of information on tree types across the area and TPO's. RT showed a copy of the Forestry Commission's tree maps for Effingham Forest. DK said that GBC have nothing like that. MB said that the information on individual TPOs is publically available on the GBC website but even the Council's official paper records are in some respects patchy.

b) Heritage Assets

7. MB explained that the EH Conservation Area offered strong protection to all buildings within its boundaries as well as over the setting of those buildings. The position of the two open fields beside Horsley Towers was discussed given the proposed change in Settlement Boundaries. MB said that given their close proximity to Horsley Towers, and their historic connection to that site, it was quite likely such fields would be considered part of the setting for this Grade 2* listed building, although she would need to visit it again to be absolutely sure of the lines of sight. DK said that to his knowledge there was currently no consideration being given to the development on those two fields.

8. BW raised the question of how far the 'setting' of the listed asset would apply, citing the case of the development being proposed for the Thatcher's Hotel site. There was no clear answer given.

9. RT distributed a copy of the EH Housing Style exhibit, showing examples across EH. He referred to the Chown Houses, which in general were not listed. MB explained that a number of the Chown houses – the best ones – had been given "local listings". RT asked where we could find details. DK said they are available on the GIS website and offered to send the link to RT – now done.

10. RT distributed an outline policy draft on Heritage Assets, which MB and DK read. With some small changes they agreed that the first paragraph was broadly workable. RT suggested that this paragraph more or less repeated existing policy already in place and DK agreed. RT asked if it made sense to include this in the NP regardless – DK seemed relaxed, arguing that if it helped the wider policy discussions it was reasonable to include it.

11. MB suggested revisions to the second paragraph of the policy draft, suggesting we should address the four categories of buildings in turn: Statutorily listed buildings, Conservation Area buildings, Local Listings and other Non-Designated assets of 'Architectural Merit'. The fourth category is not currently given any protection but can still be addressed within the NP by defining the conditions under which it would apply – she cited the example of a prominently located building which might make a significant contribution to a specific Street-scene.

c) Other Matters

12. DK said that both the LAA and Local Plan are still expected to be issued in March 2016.

13. RT asked about recent comments DK had made to West Horsley NP about referencing in the NP document. DK explained this related only to cross-references between policies – the Burpham examiner had been very critical of an NP having too many policies continually cross citing other policies in the same NP document. It did not apply to the citing of information supplied within Appendices or Evidence Base documents.

14. DK mentioned his recent general e-mail on GBC's paper defining saved policies of the 2003 Local Plan and the emerging (ie 2014) Local Plan. BW commented that there were some issues in both the emerging Local Plan and the 2003 Local Plan that had been superseded by changes in legislation. DK acknowledged this. However, DK said he thought it reasonable that NP's could make reference to the potential changes required in these areas. Reference was also made to the example of 'protected area status' in relation to "right to buy" and the "enfranchisement of leases".

RT/18.12.15