

Cranleigh Neighbourhood Development Plan

Examiner's Clarification Note

This Note sets out my initial comments on the submitted Plan. It also sets out areas where it would be helpful to have some further clarification. For the avoidance of any doubt, matters of clarification are entirely normal at this early stage of the examination process.

Initial Comments

The Plan provides a clear vision for the neighbourhood area. It is also very comprehensive. The presentation of the Plan is good. The difference between the policies and the supporting text is clear. It makes good use of various high-quality maps and photographs.

A key success of the Plan is the way in which its policies are underpinned by a series of detailed appendices.

Points for Clarification

I have read the submitted documents and the representations made to the Plan. I have also visited the neighbourhood area. I am now able to raise issues for clarification with the Parish Council and with the Borough Council

The comments made on the points in this Note will be used to assist in the preparation of the examination report and in recommending any modifications that may be necessary to the Plan to ensure that it meets the basic conditions.

Matters for the Parish Council

I set out specific policy clarification points below in the order in which they appear in the submitted Plan:

The delivery of new housing

The Plan takes a positive approach to this matter in the allocation of three sites for housing purposes (Policies CRAN 1A-1C).

Please can the Parish Council advise about the nature of any existing planning permissions for housing developments on the three proposed allocated sites?

Various representations from the development industry have commented about:

- the dated nature of Local Plan Part 1;
- the revised strategic housing requirement for the neighbourhood area in Local Plan Part 2; and
- the potential need for an early review of any made neighbourhood plan once Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted.

To what extent has the Parish Council grappled with these matters?

What is the Parish Council's views on a potential early review of the Plan in the event that it is made?

Policy CRAN6

On the one hand, the policy is commendably comprehensive.

On the other hand, it addresses both the natural landscape/rural character and biodiversity. Plainly there are overlaps between the various issues. Nevertheless, was this approach deliberate?

Both parts A and B of the policy set out a requirement for 'enhancement'. I am minded to recommend that this approach is modified so that development proposals are required to preserve the issue concerned and enhance it where practicable. This acknowledges that in some cases enhancement will not be feasible. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

I understand the approach taken in Part C of the policy. However, how would Waverley Borough Council be able to identify which proposals would affect the setting of the Surrey Hills AONB? In addition, should the details required be proportionate to the scale and nature of the proposed development?

Policy CRAN7

The ambition of the policy is clear. However, given that there is no Air Quality Management Area in the parish and that no other strategies are referenced in the supporting text, how would the policy be administered?

Could the policy be modified so that it takes on a more positive format (developments should be designed to safeguard existing air quality) rather than the submitted negative approach (the need for detailed assessment to show that current levels are not exceeded)?

Policy CRAN8

As with Policy CRAN7 the ambition of the policy is clear. However, is the first part of the policy already addressed by the Water Framework Directive and the second part in legislation applying to the storage of hazardous substances (by HSE and/or the Environment Agency)?

Policy CRAN10

The policy takes a positive approach to this important matter.

However, is criterion h now required given the recent introduction of Part S of the Building Regulations (on EV charging facilities)?

Policy CRAN11

I note the comments in paragraph 6.50 of the Plan. However, is the definition of an Area of Strategic Visual Importance a strategic matter and therefore not one for a neighbourhood plan to address?

The relationship between Figure 29 and Figure 30 is unclear. Could the details shown on Figure 30 also be shown on Figure 29?

Does the Parish Council wish to respond to the representation from Gleeson Land Limited and the details included in the work which it has commissioned on this matter?

Policy CRAN 12

The assessment of proposed Local Green Spaces (LGSs) is very thorough. In addition, Appendix 4.3 is very comprehensive and helpfully underpins the policy.

Within this wider context:

- is LGSA genuinely local in character?

- LGS O is clearly iconic. However, is it genuinely local in character? In addition, is it already adequately protected by its designation as common land and its management by Waverley Borough Council?

Policy CRAN13

The purpose of the policy is clear.

However, is Part A reasonable within the broader national context of making the best use of urban land?

Policy CRAN15

Part A takes a positive approach to the sustainability of new housing. However, should it acknowledge that its ambitions may not always be practicable?

Part D is a process matter rather than a land use policy. As such, I am minded to recommend that it is repositioned into the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

Policy CRAN 16

Has the purpose of Part B of the policy now been overtaken by the introduction of Part S of the Building Regulations?

Policy CRAN17

Part B is a process matter rather than a land use policy. As such I am minded to recommend that it is repositioned into the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

Matters for Waverley Borough Council

I would find it helpful if Waverley Borough Council would provide me with:

- an update on the judicial review of Local Plan Part 2 and its potential impact on the submitted neighbourhood plan; and
- an update on the planning appeal referenced in the Gleeson representation.

Representations

Does the Parish Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan?

I would find it helpful if the Parish Council commented on the representations from:

- Gleeson Land Limited;
- Royalton Group;
- Bewley Homes Limited;
- Land and Partners Limited; and
- Cranleigh and South Eastern Agricultural Society

The Borough Council proposes a series of revisions to certain policies and the supporting text in the Plan. Does the Parish Council have any comments on the suggested revisions?

Protocol for responses

I would be grateful for responses to the questions raised by 24 November 2023. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It is intended to maintain the momentum of the examination.

If certain responses are available before others, I would be happy to receive the information on a piecemeal basis. Irrespective of how the information is assembled, please could it come to me directly from the Borough Council. In addition, please can all responses make direct reference to the policy or the matter concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

Cranleigh Neighbourhood Development Plan

26 October 2023