

## CRANLEIGH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN VISION, OBJECTIVES & POLICIES CONSULTATION

1 = yes, 0 = no, ? = answer unclear

VISION	Questionnaire	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36
Cranleigh must maintain its village character, whilst adapting to the needs of a diverse and growing community with well-designed sympathetic development and protected green spaces.	Do you agree with this vision?	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

OBJECTIVES:	Questionnaire	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36
Housing and Design	Do you agree with this Objective	1	?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Working and Shopping	Do you agree with this Objective	1	?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Environment, sustainability and heritage	Do you agree with this Objective	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	?	1
Community leisure and well-being	Do you agree with this Objective	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Infrastructure	Do you agree with this Objective	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Please refer to the Objectives tab for details on the objectives

POLICIES	Questionnaire	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36
Policy CNP1: Housing Mix	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Policy CNP2: Location of Housing	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Policy CNP3: Design of Development	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Policy CNP4: Character of Development	Do you agree with this Policy	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Policy CNPE1: Protection of Employment Sites	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Policy CNPE2 Rural Enterprise and Agricultural Buildings for Business	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Policy CNP5: Natural Landscape and Rural Character	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Policy CNP6: Sustainable Development and Energy Efficiency	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1	?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Policy CNP7: Protection of Green Space	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Policy CNP8: Residential Gardens	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Policy CNP9: Flood Risk and Drainage	Do you agree with this Policy	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Policy CNP10: Heritage Assets	Do you agree with this Policy	1	?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Policy CNP11: Arts and Leisure Policy	Do you agree with this Policy	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Policy CNP12: Residential Parking	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Policy CNP13: Transport	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Policy CNP14: Telecommunications	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Policy CNP15: Water Supply and Wastewater Infrastructure	Do you agree with this Policy	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Policy CNP16: Gas and Electricity Infrastructure	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Please refer to the Objectives tab for details on the objectives

## CRANLEIGH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN VISION, OBJECTIVES & POLICIES CONSULTATION

1 = yes, 0 = no

VISION	Questionnaire	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	TOTALS	
Cranleigh must maintain its village character, whilst adapting to the needs of a diverse and growing community with well-designed sympathetic development and protected green spaces.	Do you agree with this vision?	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1		1	0	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	57	4

OBJECTIVES:	Questionnaire	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	TOTALS	
Housing and Design	Do you agree with this Objective	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	56	2
Working and Shopping	Do you agree with this Objective	1	1	1	1	1	1	?	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	58	2
Environment, sustainability and heritage	Do you agree with this Objective	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	56	2
Community leisure and well-being	Do you agree with this Objective	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	57	2
Infrastructure	Do you agree with this Objective	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	56	1

POLICIES	Questionnaire	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	TOTALS	
Policy CNP1: Housing Mix	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	57	1
Policy CNP2: Location of Housing	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1		0	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	60	1
Policy CNP3: Design of Development	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1			1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	58	1
Policy CNP4: Character of Development	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1			1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	55	1
Policy CNPE1: Protection of Employment Sites	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1		?	1	1	1	1			0	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	51	3
Policy CNPE2 Rural Enterprise and Agricultural Buildings for Business	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1		0	1	1	1		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	52	2
Policy CNP5: Natural Landscape and Rural Character	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	53	0
Policy CNP6: Sustainable Development and Energy Efficiency	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1			0	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	53	1
Policy CNP7: Protection of Green Space	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	55	1
Policy CNP8: Residential Gardens	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1		0	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	54	1
Policy CNP9: Flood Risk and Drainage	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	54	1
Policy CNP10: Heritage Assets	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	53	0
Policy CNP11: Arts and Leisure Policy	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1		0	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	52	4
Policy CNP12: Residential Parking	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	55	0
Policy CNP13: Transport	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1		1	1		1	1	1	1	1		0	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	52	1
Policy CNP14: Telecommunications	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1		0	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	54	1
Policy CNP15: Water Supply and Wastewater Infrastructure	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1			1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	51	1
Policy CNP16: Gas and Electricity Infrastructure	Do you agree with this Policy	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1			1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	52	0

## CRANLEIGH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN VISION, OBJECTIVES & POLICIES CONSULTATION

Tell us a little bit about yourself? Key 1 = Yes

Questionnaire	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36		
<b>DO YOU?</b>																																						
Live in Cranleigh	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1		1	1	1		1		1				1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Work in Cranleigh					1						1				1																	1						
Go to school in Cranleigh																																						
Visitor in Cranleigh																																						1

<b>ARE YOU?</b>																																							
Under 16																																							
17-24																																							
25-40																																						1	
41-64	1		1	1	1	1	1							1			1		1								1					1	1				1	1	
65+	1							1	1	1	1	1				1		1											1	1	1				1	1			1

## CRANLEIGH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN VISION, OBJECTIVES & POLICIES CONSULTATION

Tell us a little bit about yourself? Key 1 = Yes

Questionnaire	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	TOTALS	
<b>DO YOU:</b>																																
Live in Cranleigh	1	1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	53
Work in Cranleigh										1					1								1	1					1	1	10	
Go to school in Cranleigh																															0	
Visitor in Cranleigh																															1	

<b>ARE YOU:</b>																															
Under 16																															1
17-24																															0
25-40																												1		2	
41-64					1	1				1				1		1				1				1					1	23	
65+	1	1	1	1							1	1	1		1		1	1			1	1		1	1			1		31	

## VISION

Cranleigh must maintain its village character, whilst adapting to the needs of a diverse and growing community with well-designed sympathetic development and protected

## OBJECTIVE:

- **Housing and Design**
  - o Require high quality design standards in all future development.
  - o Development should reflect and reinforce the character and quality of Cranleigh.
  - o Provide a greater range of affordable housing and meeting local housing need.
  - o Provide a range of different housing types across all tenures.
  - o Ensure that the development sites are integrated into the village.
  
- **Working and Shopping**
  - o Maintain the viability and vitality of the Village Centre by resisting the loss of existing retail and office space and by planning for new commercial development.
  - o Engage and support leaders, entrepreneurs and business people in the rural economy.
  
- **Environment, sustainability and heritage**
  - o Conserve and improve the ecological, water quality and management of Cranleigh Waters.
  - o Protect and improve designated green spaces within the village.
  - o To review the Area of Strategic Visual Importance (ASVI)
  - o Conserve the special landscape and scenic beauty of the Surrey Hills AONB and its setting.
  - o Sustain and enhance the variety of heritage assets in the village.
  - o New development should address flooding and drainage issues.
  - o Encourage energy efficient and sustainable development.
  
- **Community leisure and well-being**
  - o Improve Leisure and Arts facilities within the village.
  
- **Infrastructure**
  - o Ensure that new development has good pedestrian, cycle and bus connections to Cranleigh and the wider area.
  - o Improve existing pedestrian and cycle routes within Cranleigh.
  - o Ensure car parking within the village supports the viability of the village centre.
  - o Ensure that new development has adequate utility infrastructure both on and off site.

**POLICIES:**

Objectives	Supporting Policies
Housing and design	CNP1, CNP2, CNP3, CNP4
Working and shopping	CNPE1, CNPE2
Environment, sustainability and heritage	CNP5, CNP6, CNP7, CNP8, CNP9, CNP10
Community leisure and well-being	CNP11
Infrastructure	CNP12, CNP13, CNP14

The policies to support these objectives are listed on the following pages, please indicate if you agree to each policy or not and add any comments that you might have in the box provided. If you need extra paper please ask.

Thank you for your contribution.

**Policy CNP1. Housing Mix**

Development within the settlement boundary will be supported that:

- a. increases the provision and range of affordable housing by including at the very minimum the level of affordable housing in accordance with the policies of Waverley Borough Council; and
- b. provides at least 10% of all dwellings on sites of more than 20 dwellings built to increased mobility standards suitable for people with disabilities and reduced mobility. Development of bungalows is encouraged as a local building type.
- c. provide individual self-build and custom housebuilding plots.

**Policy CNP2: Location of Housing**

- a. Proposals should make the best use of suitable brownfield land, where available, in preference to greenfield land or brownfield land of high environmental value; and
- b. Outside of the settlement boundary, priority will be given to protecting and enhancing the countryside from inappropriate development; and
- c. Development should not unacceptably erode the important, predominantly undeveloped gaps between Cranleigh and the settlements of Alfold, Dunsfold including the proposed new settlement at Dunsfold Aerodrome, Ewhurst and Rowly; and
- d. Development should not impede views into or out of open green spaces, AGLV, ASVI or AONB land, or key views and vistas identified in the Cranleigh Conservation Area Appraisal.

**Policy CNP3. Design of Development**

Development will be supported that is of high quality design standards, that responds and integrates well with its surroundings, meets the changing needs of residents and minimises the impact on the natural environment:

- a. developers are encouraged to adopt the principles of Building for Life to development in the Area; and
- b. developers should consider in full the guidance contained within the Cranleigh Design Statement and the Surrey Hills Management Plan; and
- c. developers are encouraged to avoid development over two storeys; and
- d. proposals are expected to create variety through the use of differing house types and variable plot boundaries; and
- e. affordable homes are expected to be designed to be tenure blind and integrated with market housing on all developments; and
- f. developers are encouraged to build adaptable dwellings that enable home working in respect of the number and size of habitable rooms; and
- g. developers are expected to meet the nationally described space standards set out in the Technical Housing Standards and are encouraged where possible to exceed these standards; and
- h. dwellings designed to be suitable for older residents (aged 60 and over) must demonstrate, as a minimum, that they meet the space and accessibility requirements of the Lifetime Homes standards. These dwellings may also be suitable for younger residents and are not intended to be restricted in use; and
- i. developers are encouraged to provide safe and secure dwellings that meet the requirements of 'Secure by Design' to minimise the likelihood and fear of crime; and
- j. developers should ensure that areas requiring service and maintenance including watercourses are accessible at all times.

**Policy CNP4: Character of Development**

Development is expected to reflect, reinforce and enhance the character of the site's unique surroundings, including the natural landscape, and that of the Area as a whole. Development is expected to take account of its context and not to provide standardised housing that is replicated nationwide and creates no sense of place. Developers are:

- a. expected to create developments that are locally inspired or are otherwise of distinctive character; and
- b. expected to submit proposals that complement and enhance character areas and key approaches into the village; and
- c. encouraged to meet recommended height to width ratios as outlined in the current Building for Life Standards; and
- d. to use good quality building materials that complement the palette of materials in the immediate surrounding area, thereby reinforcing local distinctiveness and the context of the site concerned; and
- e. not impede or detract from views into or out of local green spaces, AGLV, ASVI or AONB land, or key views and vistas identified in the Cranleigh Conservation Area Appraisal; and
- f. submit proposals that are not be of a scale or proximity that harms the setting and open views of the Common; and
- g. encouraged to balance and match the overall density of dwellings on new development sites with existing adjacent housing development, with particular attention given to achieving lower densities on site boundaries; and
- h. where development sites abut open countryside, development on the rural boundary edge are expected to be of a lower density than that of the overall site and to avoid development of three storeys and above in order to blend the development into the rural landscape and provide a gradual transition from the built form to open countryside.

**Policy CNPE1. Protection of Employment Sites**

- a. Proposals for change of use from employment use will be required to demonstrate that retention of employment cannot be delivered as part of a viable mixed-use scheme; and
- b. Proposals for the redevelopment or change of use of the ground floor of buildings or land in employment or service trade use to non-employment uses will be resisted if the site:
  - i. is located in the primary and secondary shopping areas;
  - ii. is economically viable;
  - iii. has not been marketed at a reasonable price for at least 6 continuous months for that and any other suitable employment or service trade.

**Policy CNPE2 Rural Enterprise and Agricultural Buildings for Business**

Outside the settlement boundary the following proposals will be supported:

- a. Where development remains within planning control, the change of use of an agricultural building to business use providing that it is:
  - i. for an appropriate rural business use that relates well to the location and does not adversely affect the amenity of residents and other countryside users; and
  - ii. a well-designed building that relates well to the location and landscape; and
  - iii. provides adequate parking adjacent to and within the boundary of the site for employees and visitors; and
  - iv. the proposed reuse would not cause harmful and/or negative impact with surrounding agriculture or other land-based activities.

**Policy CNP5: Natural Landscape and Rural Character**

Development proposals should maintain and enhance the natural environment, retain landscape features and enhance the rural character of Cranleigh. Development proposals are expected to:

- a. respect the natural contours of a site and preserve and sensitively incorporate existing natural features such as trees, hedges and ponds within the site; and
- b. be integrated into the landscape and include new landscape buffers between existing development and the countryside adjacent to development sites; and
- c. retain mature trees and/or trees of arboricultural and amenity value, groups of trees or woodland on site, and replacing any removed trees of recognised importance with trees of a similar potential size and native species on site, preferable of a local provenance from seed collected, raised and grown in the UK; and
- d. consider including street trees in their landscaping plans, preferable of a local provenance from seed collected, raised and grown in the UK; and
- e. avoid any building, including essential infrastructure, within root protection areas of mature trees; and
- f. to incorporate native species boundary hedging of a local provenance throughout the development site; and
- g. make provision for accessible open space through on or off-site provision or through contributions towards provision elsewhere, in line with Fields in Trust Beyond the Six Acre Standard (England) or updated guidance; and

- h. design open space that is in useable parcels of land and not fragmented, is safe and easily accessible and not severed by any physical barrier, is accessible to the general public and designed to feel public rather than private, creates a safe environment considering lighting and layout and provides some informal landscaping. An agreement will be required to ensure proper management over the lifetime of the development; and.
- i. Include confirmation of how habitats are to be created and maintained post development to help to restore and enhance the biodiversity value of the site; and
- j. include green corridors across the site connecting with adjacent green areas and corridors to enable and encourage the movement of wildlife; and
- k. not to have a negative impact on water quality or cause a deterioration in water quality elements as outlined in current legislation.



**Policy CNP6: Sustainable Development and Energy Efficiency**

The design and standard of any new development should aim to meet a high level of sustainable design. This includes:

- a. siting and orientation to optimise passive solar gain.; and
- b. the use of high quality, thermally efficient building materials; and
- c. installation of energy efficiency measures such as loft and wall insulation and double glazing; and
- d. incorporating on-site energy generation from renewable sources such as solar panels; and
- e. reducing water consumption through the use of grey water systems; and
  
- f. providing low carbon sustainable design and avoid or mitigate all regulated emissions using a combination of on-site energy efficiency measures (such as insulation and low energy heating systems), on-site zero carbon technologies (such as solar panels) and only where necessary off-site measures to deal with any remaining emissions; and
  
- g. providing the infrastructure for adequate electric vehicle charging points for each dwelling; and
- h. the retrofit of heritage properties/assets is encouraged to reduce energy demand and to generate renewable energy where appropriate, providing it safeguards historic characteristics and development is done with engagement and permissions of relevant organisations; and
- i. alterations to existing buildings should be designed with energy reduction in mind and comply with current sustainable design and construction standards; and
- j. the provision of safe, shared pedestrian and cycle routes into the centre of the village, linking up with existing routes where available.; and
- k. providing cycle parking frames on public play space on development sites.

**Policy CNP7: Protection of Green Space**

- a. the Neighbourhood Plan designates Local Green Spaces in the following locations, as shown on the Maps on pages x -x:

(list sites following July 2018 Public Consultation) ;

- a. development that results in the loss of open space or jeopardises its use by the public will not be permitted. The quality of existing open space should not be eroded by insensitive development on adjoining land.

**Policy CNP8: Residential Gardens**

- a. infill development of residential gardens that causes harm to the character and biodiversity of the local Area should be resisted.

Developers are encouraged to:

- b. to provide sufficient external amenity space, refuse and recycling storage and car and bicycle parking to ensure a high quality and well managed, uncluttered streetscape; and
- c. Provide proportionate garden space for each dwelling based on its size and to complement the adjacent character area; and
- d. Take opportunities to enhance the biodiversity of green corridors provided by private gardens; and
- e. Ensure that all dwellings including blocks of flats have an area of landscaping including native hedging or native plants to the front of the property to encourage wildlife and to screen the boundaries of car parking areas; and
- f. Provide native hedging at the rear boundary of dwellings in particular where the boundary is adjacent to open countryside.

**Policy CNP9: Flood Risk and Drainage**

This Neighbourhood Plan seeks to ensure that the remaining natural flood plain is retained, and appropriate conditions are applied to safeguard the Area from flooding.

- a. developers are encouraged to submit full details of the proposed surface water drainage scheme including gully maintenance and clearance (including details of its route, design and specification, how consideration has been given to the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), and details of its ongoing management and maintenance for the lifetime of the development) as part of their planning application; and
- b. developers are encouraged to use natural flood risk alleviation methods, including floodplain woodland, wetlands and other 'soft engineering' techniques; and
- c. a SuDS verification condition is required on all major applications; and
- d. development should not be permitted that impedes or alters the path of a river or watercourse; and
- e. developers should ensure that existing drainage ditches and culverts are retained.

f. developers are encouraged, where appropriate, to make occupants of dwellings aware of their responsibilities as riparian owners.

**Policy CNP10: Heritage Assets**

Development proposals will be expected to:

- a. conserve and enhance the distinctive built heritage assets of the Area and their settings; and
- b. not be of a scale or proximity that harms the historic balance of features within the Conservation Area; and
- c. not lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset; and
- d. assess the impact of increased traffic levels from development sites on designated heritage assets; and
- e. consider the effect of a proposal on Buildings of Local Merit and avoid or minimise the impact on the heritage asset's conservation; and
- f. include where possible new locally inspired landmark buildings of merit.

**Policy CNP11: Arts and Leisure Policy**

Developers will be encouraged to support leisure and arts activities through contributions towards:

- a. the provision and enhancement of public buildings and public grounds providing sports facilities for all, including community halls and state schools; and
- b. the provision and enhancement of arts projects and buildings.

**Policy CNP12: Residential Parking**

Developers should provide an adequate amount of parking which complies with Waverley Borough Council's Parking Guidelines, reflects car ownership levels in the Area, is well integrated and does not dominate the street scene; and developers are encouraged to:

- a. provide parking located within the curtilage of each plot to minimise the level of on street parking; and
- b. provide parking spaces close to and in sight of the dwellings they serve; and
- c. avoid parking courts, and if necessary they should be small in overall size (generally no more than five properties should use a single parking courtyard) and they should be well overlooked by neighbouring properties; and
- d. provide parking that reflects that of established adjacent development to maintain and enhance the character of the area; and
- e. use landscaping with native species to balance the visual impact of parked cars; and
- f. developers are encouraged to use a combination of car parking treatments and to avoid white lining to mark out and number spaces; and
- g. provide on-site cycle parking for residents and visitors.

**Policy CNP13: Transport**

Proposals for new housing should be well connected to the existing settlement. Development should be integrated within the existing settlement boundary and are encouraged to be built around the concept of a walkable neighbourhood which supports and encourages walking. Development should;

- a. minimise the need for car usage and include proposals which enhance and provide short, safe pedestrian routes and designated cycle routes from the development site to principal facilities including the village centre, schools and public open space, whilst also considering accessibility for people with impaired mobility; and
- b. provide access to public transport by locating development as close as possible to existing bus routes and provide safe pedestrian access to bus stops within a short walk; and
- c. incorporate permeable road designs that support the character of the area and are properly connected with adjacent street networks; and
- d. consider short and curved or irregular streets which contribute to variety and a sense of place; and
- e. provide bus shelters where necessary to encourage use of public transport; and
- f. proposals should include design and highways proposals that mitigate the impact of through traffic on the High Street.

**Policy CNP14: Telecommunications**

- a. development should demonstrate how it will reinforce existing telecommunications, including mobile signals, to serve the development; and
- b. development should provide each dwelling with access to new broadband services infrastructure, notably fibre to the home technology.
- c. the provision of essential infrastructure for telecommunications will be supported where it is of a scale and design appropriate to Cranleigh and would not cause undue visual intrusion or have an unacceptable and damaging impact on the setting of the AONB, AGLV, ASVI, the Cranleigh Conservation Area or the landscape setting and the character of Cranleigh.

**Policy CNP15: Water Supply and Wastewater Infrastructure**

All development proposals impacting on the sewage treatment works, sewerage infrastructure, water supply and water quality will require the following:

- a. applications should include proposals for the reinforcement of existing water supply and wastewater infrastructure to serve the development; and
- b. it is essential that developers demonstrate that adequate water supply and sewerage infrastructure capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances, this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water & sewerage infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the water company, then the developer needs to contact the water company to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development."
- c. drainage on the site must maintain separation of foul and surface flows; and
- d. where there is an infrastructure capacity constraint the Planning Authority will require the developer to set out what appropriate improvements are required and how they will be delivered prior to occupation; and
- e. on site pumping stations should be avoided. Where no reasonable alternative exists, they should be sited away from existing and new residential development and be surrounded by an appropriate exclusion zone to avoid odour and noise nuisance and include plans for its ongoing monitoring and maintenance.
- f. proposals are expected to consider the impact on water quality and biodiversity in line with current legislation and any adverse impacts accompanied by identified and adequately funded mitigation measures.

**Policy CNP16: Gas and Electricity Infrastructure**

Development should include proposals for the reinforcement of existing utility infrastructure for electricity and gas to serve the development.

<b>VISION - COMMENTS</b>	
<b><i>Cranleigh must maintain its village character, whilst adapting to the needs of a diverse and growing community with well-designed sympathetic development and protected green spaces.</i></b>	<b>Questionnaire No</b>
Agree totally	1,
What does diverse mean? Cranleigh no longer a village - its an overspill for London and suburbs. No work for local residents. The current housing development are using all EU workers. No hospital & overstretched health centre.	2,
Yes. But this was proposed recently prior to the developments happening and despite significant opposition to the extent of the house build everything went through. Why will this be any different?	3,
But no to anymore development. We have quite enough already. Cranleigh does not need anymore sites to be offered up for development.	5,
Unfortunately, so many new residents means the old style village feel was lost many years ago, since the High Street change to multi-nationals	6,
The village is quickly becoming over-populated, without the infrastructure to provide for its residents	7,
To a degree, but not on the scale of numbers of houses now built and to be built in the future	8,
But not to excluded needs of current residents	11,
If you take away any green space, this will have an adverse effect on the young in our community, of which we are getting more. On the green sites deemed as suitable for small housing developments, there have got to be made more available for social housing units, as we have enough expensive units already being developed.	12,
Cranleigh is already losing above due to greedy developers and politicians who seem to have lost why they the privilege of representing people. We need to say enough is enough and Cranleigh does not need to victimised by other places trying to prevent development in their villages or there will be backlash. The original SHAA plan determined 30 props per yrs. for 15 yrs. = 450 homes so why are there so many developments allowed.	20,
In more "diverse" areas crime grows at a rapid rate due to the lack of integration	22,
The vision should encompass social housing and affordable housing. The youth/future of Cranleigh cannot afford to live here. The infrastructure simply cannot support another 1700 house. We do not need anymore £1 million plus houses.	24,
Cranleigh is semi-rural and there are a number of families who've lived here for generation. I'm an incomer and am happy to welcome more but with the sudden large expansion in population coming, I'm worried Cranleigh will become a normal town but without any "town" advantages e.g. council budget, road structures/bypasses, railways stations town-sized bus services.	26,
We do not need anymore houses to be built as there is lots been built now.	30,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

## VISION - COMMENTS

<b><i>Cranleigh must maintain its village character, whilst adapting to the needs of a diverse and growing community with well-designed sympathetic development and protected green spaces.</i></b>	Questionnaire No
Cranleigh is getting like one big building site	31,
Cranleigh s already more a small town than a village, but I believe it should preserve all its historic buildings and character	34,
I agree development must be sustainable but all care must be taken to preserve our village character and development must be balanced, i.e. not all 7000,000+ "Affordable" homes.	35,
One of the charms of the village is the "open aspect" of many of the residential streets with trees and green verges. Not tarmac pavement to roadside. This aspect should be maintained	36,
We moved into Cranleigh to live in a village. Its already a town!	38,
This is a subjective view!! It is very important to protect green spaces. Over the last few years "affordable" house have been infilled in many areas e.g. land between Amlets Lane and Whiphurst Road, now an enclave of houses, Roberts Way etc. was built on donated land by a Mrs Roberts many years ago. Then sold on by her nephew after her death, to developers. This "green" belt was donated by Mrs Roberts for the enjoyment of the people of Cranleigh. How many other green spaces have been subjected to the same downfall!	39,
Not easy to say 'yes' or 'no' in an unqualified manner. Any development of our village must be fully supported by a proper designed, managed and implemented infrastructure before development commences	40,
Much of the special character of Cranleigh is currently being lost by the huge amount of inappropriate housing being built in Cranleigh. All this housing should instead be being built in Milford which has proper local infrastructure in place.	41,
Lets hope it is not just that, a vision or a dream. Accept we do need housing but Green Spaces are paramount to our well being.	42,
Difficult to disagree.	44,
Thank you to all those who have put so much good work into this plan and who care about Cranleigh	47,
Please protect our green spaces.	49,
Totally unacceptable. Affordable homes? Water? Roads?	50,
We are suffering from a borough council who are very insensitive to our requirements. They do not listen and choose to 'dump' an inordinate number of their housing stock on us without proper infrastructure in place or promised. Hopefully when the N.P is in place this may help to change development to the above statement.	51,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

**Page 2 of 3**

<b>VISION - COMMENTS</b>	
<b><i>Cranleigh must maintain its village character, whilst adapting to the needs of a diverse and growing community with well-designed sympathetic development and protected green spaces.</i></b>	<b>Questionnaire No</b>
The High Street is a particularly attractive feature of Cranleigh, but is being ruined by extremely heavy traffic. Pedestrians must be looked after - potential accident looming at the junction of Knowle Lane.	53,
I am wholeheartedly with his vision.	55,
Is it already beyond salvation? Who defines 'sympathetic'?	61,
I agree that the Cranleigh Village character is a key attraction of the place. The significant number of developments that are taking place must not be allowed to destroy this character.	62,
Strongly agree with maintaining the village character.	63,
Cranleigh is now saturated with new housing developments - therefore imperative to protect all green areas that have not already been earmarked. Developers must provide improvements for the benefit of the whole village i.e. new or refurbishment of facilities, schools, senior citizens, toddler groups.	65,
Depends what the definition of village character means! Greenspaces protected is a good criteria but needs flexibility in thinking to allow for sympathetic development where some of these areas might be put to alternative leisure uses. An earlier initiative in development of Cranleigh involved creating welcome packs for all new arrivals to Cranleigh. These contained information about all the local clubs and societies as well as business activities - perhaps the opportunity for a JV with Parish Council, Lions and local business. A simple analysis of purpose, values etc might structure a definition of what village character means for these 3 groups and therefore a basis for setting out Vision, Objectives and Policies.	66,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

## HOUSING AND DESIGN - COMMENTS

### Housing and Design - Do you agree with this Objective?

- o Require high quality design standards in all future development.
- o Development should reflect and reinforce the character and quality of Cranleigh.
- o Provide a greater range of affordable housing and meeting local housing need.
- o Provide a range of different housing types across all tenures.
- o Ensure that the development sites are integrated into the village.

COMMENTS	Questionnaire No
So vital to the community	1,
No bungalows for older residents. Existing bungalows replaced by 5 bed properties. Stop back garden development - promise from Cameron.	2,
Again much was said about more affordable housing this has not happened. The smallest properties are on sale for £300k= so affordable they are not. Promises made by developers are quickly reneged on. This is a land grab by developers who will only be interested on profit.	3,
Affordable housing for local people and family.	4,
But no to anymore development. We have quite enough already. Cranleigh does not need anymore sites to be offered up for development.	5,
Affordable housing should be for local people, Surrey born and bred. Too many incomers who don't understand the beautiful countryside and local culture are ruining the village character.	7,
In small quantities.	8,
We have enough over-priced large housing units already being built. Need more social housing for families unable to afford to buy and not to have to subsidise high rents with housing benefits.	12,
Need to ensure housing for local residents first if there are going to be developments they need to be as close to village centre as possible to ensure sustainability in terms of being able to walk to village etc.	20,
A student out of university cannot afford the current designs.	22,
Young families are no longer given the opportunity to live in our village the cost is well beyond most peoples purse.	23,
It must include social and council housing.	24,
Cranleigh needs a larger variety of low cost housing and shared ownership to retain young adults who have grown up in the village. We need to restrict the large increase in executive style homes in preference to more "starter" homes.	26,
It's a bit motherhood and apple pie and is not reflected in current developments e.g. Crest Nicholson.	29,
Quality needs to be clearly defined in terms of energy efficiency in particular - if a demanding standards is not met developers should be required - retro fitting is not a satisfactory option. Affordable housing commitments should be sacrosanct with no relief based on economic viability.	33,
It's important to have different architectural designs sympathetic to local character. New houses tend to be all the same and often boring.	34,
Again housing increase must be more affordable not just for fake 25% shared ownership schemes.	35,
But all new build should have integrated solar energy generation systems built in, these should be compulsory and insisted on at the planning stage.	36,
Very important to build houses for rent by younger people on low salaries when want to live and work locally.	37,
I agree that any housing should be integrated into the present structure of the village. But how many more houses can Cranleigh support? We need houses for young people but the term affordable is broadly used. The affordable houses on offer are very highly priced. Those developments are overcrowded built close together, as many as the developers can get away with.	39,
But with a bias towards lower cost housing. [Provide a range of different housing types across all tenures.	
It is imperative that developments are spread across the income spectrum. The village cannot and must not become a "rich man's enclave" such as St Georges Hill etc.	40,
This is a good objective but it simply is not happening. For example:- 1) there is no truly "affordable" housing at Swallowfields or Berkeley Phase 1. 2) There is no "character and quality" at the squalid crest development.	41,
Already no happening thought. Swallowhurst is an example of a developers dream - lots of big unaffordable houses for affluent people. An example of somewhere with no heart or soul. No body about during the day. Need smaller, characterful housing with vision and green spaces and trees being planted and older ones left to be.	42,
At present too many top end house included in current development. Where are starter/affordable homes (other than minimum no.) Where are bungalow for downsizing older residents.	47,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*



### Housing and Design - Do you agree with this Objective?

- o Require high quality design standards in all future development.
- o Development should reflect and reinforce the character and quality of Cranleigh.
- o Provide a greater range of affordable housing and meeting local housing need.
- o Provide a range of different housing types across all tenures.
- o Ensure that the development sites are integrated into the village.

### COMMENTS - Continued

	Questionnaire No
Affordable housing??? What's happened to that?	49,
Avoid at all cost the unimaginative and bland designs of corporate developers whose only concern is for their shareholders and their own pockets. Their community focussed energy is perfunctory and shows a local of morality.	51,
Parking to be a key feature.	53,
Really affordable housing is greatly needed in Cranleigh. Including council house type rental accommodation.	55,
I question what affordable housing means. I think the style of properties should be reflected i.e. 1 bedroom starter homes. 1/2 bed apartments. Affordable as term means a different thing to someone on a high income and someone on a low income.	57,
What about 'social housing' for people who will never be able to afford to buy a house.	58,
And keep the extent reasonable and a fair share of all Waverley development.	61,
All of the above objectives are essential to the village. The quality of the built environment must be maintained. The low density of development must be maintained. It is vital to provide housing to meet local need. There is a need for a range of different housing types to meet local need. The development sites must be integrated into the village if the new residents are to feel part of the community.	62,
Affordable housing is imperative.	63,
Strongly agree a need for greater range of affordable housing and meeting local housing needs.	64,
Design statement was developed in Cranleigh round about 2010 - not sure if it was ever applied part of the Cranleigh Initiative look.	
Needs definition of what enough quality design means as this maybe in conflict with the goal of affordable housing.	
Define that affordable housing means opportunities currently available but not currently being made known to all	
Quite a lot of emotional language in the above statements clearer definitions needed. It would be great to define exactly what shortages there are for the local people and some future forecasting based on current population and increased population.	
I assume Waverley do this now but sometimes we hear sad stories and those who live locally and don't get housing. Particularly the Lib Dem MP for Guildford Sue Doughty was very good at this.	66,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

**Informal Consultation held on 12th-14th July 2018 Cranleigh Village Hall- no more questionnaires accepted after 5pm Friday 20th July 2018**

## WORKING AND SHOPPING - COMMENTS

### Working and Shopping - Do you agree with this Objective?

- o *Working and Shopping*
- o *Maintain the viability and vitality of the Village Centre by resisting the loss of existing retail and office space and by planning for new commercial development.*
- o *Engage and support leaders, entrepreneurs and business people in the rural economy.*

COMMENTS	Questionnaire No
Not enough parking. No work for local people. Roads blocked with mass of cars travelling to Horsham and Guildford. No infrastructure developed by Planners. Water shortage. Sewage works too small.	2,
Great in principle but so far absolutely nothing to replace lost business units. All those buying house now will commute to work, the village has almost no industrial/light industrial space left and none as far as I know tech based units.	3,
Need local businesses for people to get jobs.	4,
Priority should be given to small independent retailers and traders. No global chains - such as the ghastly subway and costa.	7,
Good idea, don't need anymore shops like Manns or 140, as most people don't shop there because of the price.	8,
This can only be done if business rates are reduced.	12,
I don't agree that we need to increase retail and office space although there maybe a need to maintain some commercial space within overall plan at N32 593 5 11 & 959. I would like to see development of small scale starter and retirement homes as close to village centre as possible so utilising some of the above site in areas for this type of development is a better use of current site.	20,
Most commercial companies only pay minimum wage which it too low to live on.	22,
A reduction of commercial rates and less expensive parking would go a long way in meeting this objective.	24,
Cranleigh needs to build up its commercial viability, help new small industry organisations and entrepreneur start-ups to bring more sustainable economic growth. Cranleigh is becoming a commuter town to Guildford and Horsham. We need to encourage innovative ways of helping economic growth within the constraints of Borough and County Council budgets.	26,
Do not need more supermarkets.	27,
No large supermarkets.	28,
Not just commercial but also small scale industrial. Places for people (young) to work.	29,
To reduce the rent.	30,
If the rents do not come down you will only have big names on the High Street.	31,
But where are quality jobs going to be provided to minimise our commuting?	33,
We love Cranleigh's cafes, shops and local businesses, its what attracted us to the town.	35,
But with due regard to changing technologies and modes of shopping.	36,
This will give employment opportunities in the village.	37,
Avoid Cranleigh High Street looking like every other High Street in the land.	38,
The only reason we are losing existing retail space and shops mainly independent shops is he extremely high rates being charged. The shops can not maintain the high costs. We don't need to engage support leaders, entrepreneurs etc we need to maintain local professional people already working to the good of Cranleigh.	39,
Perhaps a reduction in business rates for new enterprises. Lower cost parking (even free) for first hour - with higher charges afterwards.	40,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

**Informal Consultation held on 12th-14th July 2018 Cranleigh Village Hall- no more questionnaires accepted after 5pm Friday 20th July 2018**

**Page 1 of 2**

**Informal Consultation held on 12th-14th July 2018 Cranleigh Village Hall- no more questionnaires accepted after 5pm Friday 20th July 2018**

**Working and Shopping - Do you agree with this Objective?e:**

- o *Working and Shopping*
- o *Maintain the viability and vitality of the Village Centre by resisting the loss of existing retail and office space and by planning for new commercial development.*
- o *Engage and support leaders, entrepreneurs and business people in the rural economy.*

<b>COMMENTS - continued</b>	<b>Questionnaire No</b>
This is a good objective.	41,
Cranleigh centre seems to buzz.... I accept the changes in the village . Encourage people to walk to Cranleigh.	42,
Desperately need more work opportunities locally - where are new residents going to work - potential travel nightmare.	47,
Agree completely. Must have adequate affordable parking.	53,
Maintaining the High Street character must be a priority.	55,
I also think free parking would assist smaller business who often benefit from people having time to browse the High Street.	57,
There is a need to support local retail shops so that people, especially the elderly, do not have to travel far for food and clothing. It would be good if local people did not have to travel for work.	62,
Resistance to "chain" retail outlets should be greatly encouraged.	63,
This may be harder to achieve. The high street has lost much of its character and many of its independently owned shops. To encourage this, rents and business rates should be looked at along with who owns the buildings. If people who have no connection to the village have no interest in maintaining its character. Engaging local businesses etc essential.	64,
Work space needed but requirements changing fast as our tastes change. Unlikely that retail will survive given cost of parking, unfair rates system vastly favouring garden centre and out of town in general. Development of internet shore of market to continue to grow. Given only 25% of Cranleigh people shop here (probably declined since last Waverley survey) almost impossible for independents to survive - rents too high and rates relative to internet start up - subsidies for independents would be a good idea!	66,
Parish Council has always been supportive to business within the confines of their limited budgets. Hopefully there will be an opportunity to develop some local business nits in Cranleigh - The loss of Hewitts had also led to a loss of retail trade as their employees shopped/ate etc. in Cranleigh during the lunch break.	

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

**ENVIRONMENT, SUSTAINABILITY AND HERITAGE - COMMENTS**

**Environment, Sustainability and Heritage - Do you agree with this Objective?**

- o Conserve and improve the ecological, water quality and management of Cranleigh Waters.
- o Protect and improve designated green spaces within the village.
- o To review the Area of Strategic Visual Importance (ASVI)
- o Conserve the special landscape and scenic beauty of the Surrey Hills AONB and its setting.
- o Sustain and enhance the variety of heritage assets in the village.
- o New development should address flooding and drainage issues.
- o Encourage energy efficient and sustainable development.

COMMENTS	Questionnaire No
This should have been completed prior to current developments. Its now too late.	2,
Too late on some of these. The impact on road infrastructure of several thousand new houses will be enormous. The A281 will not function, much points at Bramley and Shalford will gridlock. More and more people will rat run through Shere, Godalming etc. to try and get around these issues. It is a beautiful area which being spoilt.	3,
Ensure flood protection is kept up!	4,
Important. [New development should address flooding and drainage issues ]	5,
Agree to all points.	7,
Very import to re-new all existing asbestos lined water pipes. Especially for health reasons. Flooding is a big problem. Why build houses in a flood plain? Need to retain a "village atmosphere"	8,
Laudable ideas but probably too late!	11,
The objectives here been largely ignored by Waverley when approving all the developments in Cranleigh, so of course we agree with them and hope they will be taken into account.	12,
Sustainable developments' should include materials used, not just financial considerations.	15,
All the above are noble ideas - concepts but they mean nothing if they are not part of a realistic plan to build properties fit for purpose in areas close to village centre that are affordable i.e. some social housing with long term right to purchase equity over time more 4 bed lux housing is not the way to sustain village.	20,
All sound objectives	24,
But its already been blown away.	29,
Don't just encourage energy and water efficiency - mandate it in new developments e.g. insulation standards and water harvesting.	33,
Cranleigh's flooding is legendary - why are new developers still allowed on flood areas.	35,
NB. Need to add in the Wey and Arun Canal as a future focal point for environment and recreational usage.	36,
All of the above objectives ae very laudable and should be adhered to especially the flooding and drainage issues and designation of the green spaces.	37,
All of the above objectives ae very laudable and should be adhered to especially the flooding and drainage issues and designation of the green spaces.	37,
Conservation, flooding, drainage. Require action before development not just addressing.	38
The first statement is particularly relevant. The housing developments are being built on previously flooded lands. How this is allowed or overlooked is a matter of disbelief. It seemed that buildings will be developed on any 'spare' green land. Are insurance companies made aware of this, or is it another area simply overlooked! The special landscape and scenic beauty of the surroundings of Cranleigh are slowly and irretrievably being eroded away!	39,

Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number

**ENVIRONMENT, SUSTAINABILITY AND HERITAGE - COMMENTS**

**Environment, Sustainability and Heritage - Do you agree with this Objective?**

- o Conserve and improve the ecological, water quality and management of Cranleigh Waters.
- o Protect and improve designated green spaces within the village.
- o To review the Area of Strategic Visual Importance (ASVI)
- o Conserve the special landscape and scenic beauty of the Surrey Hills AONB and its setting.
- o Sustain and enhance the variety of heritage assets in the village.
- o New development should address flooding and drainage issues.
- o Encourage energy efficient and sustainable development.

**COMMENTS - continued**

	Questionnaire No
Once again, all the above will depend on infrastructure being properly designed manage and implemented.	40,
This is a good objective but it is simply not happening at present and it is an impossible objective because environmental damage will already have been done to Cranleigh by Waverley by the time the Neighbourhood Plan come into effect.	41,
How on earth will all these objectives be achieved?	42,
Very important to sustain and improve open area & access to local countryside.	
Flooding/drainage/water issues of major concern and importance.	47,
Not sure this is happening [new development should address flooding and drainage issues]	49,
[leisure] this includes walking don't destroy our beautiful walking areas.	49,
The Environment Agency lacks teeth, or has been instructed to handle developers with kid gloves. They are not helping the electorate at all. It is shameful.	51,
Water problems need to be addressed now, before all the new housing is completed. People are very concerned about these issues. Pressure should be applied to Thames Water to replace old piping asap.	53,
How can you improve nature? I am totally against the Disneyfication of our countryside. One can only fear what will happen to our countryside if the Knowle Park area is anything to go by. Only someone who doesn't enjoy the countryside can possibly think that anyone would want to improve an area which is a beautiful area as it is.	54,
I agree with all the objectives - but the ones ticked would be my priority [1) Conserve and improve the ecological, water quality and management of Cranleigh Water. 2) Protect and improve designated green spaces within the village. 3) To review the ASVI. 4) New development should address flooding and drainage issues.]	55,
Flooding, drainage is a huge issue and I do not believe it is being fully addressed by planners and developers are paying lip services to do it.	59,
This is the crux - without its current albeit already much threatened ecology and environment, Cranleigh will be destroyed and we might as well decamp to Croydon!	61,
All of the above are supported. The environment of the village is a major asset. The new developments taking place must not be allowed to harm the historic features within the village. The developers must address any flooding and drainage issues.	62,
Both developers and Thames Water do not address the general water issue, not flooding and drainage.	63,
The green spaces are what make Cranleigh so beautiful and such a desirable destination. New developments must be sustainable in terms of infrastructure with regards to roads and sewage.	64,
Green spaces - as above - preserve flexibility of use e.g. green field might need to be a 3g pitch, walking area, park, boating lake etc.,	
ASVI - don't know what this is?	
Surrey Hills - don't really know who controls this?	
Heritage assets - need some definition as to what sustain and enhance means?	
Existing development suffers from flooding too.	
Set some targets for energy efficiency on sustainability - good words but need targets and accountability.	66,

Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number

## COMMUNITY LEISURE AND WELL-BEING - COMMENTS

### Community Leisure and Well-being - Do you agree with this Objective?

*o Improve Leisure and Arts facilities within the village.*

COMMENTS	Questionnaire No
Where?	2,
Where will these be situated? It is a great idea but it takes long term funding and commitment something on short supply now. There are not enough buildings and not enough leader/adults to take increased demand.	3,
Use existing facilities and extend not use green field sites as Snoxhall or Bruce McKenzie.	4,
Can we have the cinema back! We may need new community halls for the increased population.	5,
Definitely	7,
To a degree. Do not need to spend all those thousands of pounds of a new leisure centre, just extend present one a fraction. Only 20 mins away from the Spectrum, Guildford anyway. Cranleigh needs a cinema again, not much entertainment available for any age group really.	8,
Yes, improve all leisure and arts facilities.	12,
We are lucky to have a thriving arts and leisure arrangement in the village. These could be subsidised by some of the developer contributors going forward.	20,
Emphasis on "within" the village.	24,
We definitely need to introduce more relevant activities for the teenage population.	26,
It's too woolly	29,
If prices were to be dropped a bit more people would use them.	30,
Already pretty good - low priority except improvements to play areas.	33,
The Arts Centre is amazing. It does a fantastic job and should be encouraged. Cranleigh's outdoor space is a key issue for families and young people living in the area.	35,
see objective above ( on questionnaire 36)	36,
These facilities are very good at present and should be maintained.	37,
Improve or expand? (to meet increase demand?)	38,
I do think we have good facilities in Cranleigh but there is always room for improvement. I'm not sure of the leisure centre facilities as I don't personally use it.	39,
This is a much lower priority objective. If developers wish to fund any improvements in this area - great. It is much more important that we have road, health facilities, sewage, schools, flood management. Without these, the village will come to a grinding halt.	40,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

**Page 1 of 2**

**Informal Consultation held on 12th-14th July 2018 Cranleigh Village Hall- no more questionnaires accepted after 5pm Friday 20th July 2018**

<b>Community Leisure and Well-being - Do you agree with this Objective?</b>	
<i>o Improve Leisure and Arts facilities within the village.</i>	
<b>COMMENTS - continued</b>	<b>Questionnaire No</b>
Tennis courts. Lucky to have the Arts Centre.	42,
Including tennis. Pay someone to run the 2 tennis courts and maintain them. E.g. Parish Council employs person such as tennis coach. E.g. leisure centre.	45,
Arts & Leisure for teenagers needed.	46,
We need to have a good range of Arts and Leisure adequate to meet the needs of increasing and variety of residents.	47,
Hugely important to the mental health and well-being of the community. Always the first to be cut - especially arts provision - as it is ephemeral. But none the less equally important as is a good diet to our physical health.	51,
The Arts seems to be well represented. You cannot have too many leisure facilities. Very little for teenagers though.	53,
Update as required.	55,
Especially for people with disabilities.	55,
These however need to be supported by residents to ensure their confirmed viability.	59,
With the existing level of development, both leisure/art facilities and retail and green space preservation are critical otherwise why continue living in Cranleigh.	61,
With the population of the village increasing significantly over the next few years it is essential that the leisure and arts facilities are improved.	62,
Arts Centre should have funding and/or grants not be self-supporting. Leisure facilities for young people should be developed.	63,
Facilities are excellent but leisure centre is in need of modernising as existing building old, tired, and dirty! Cost of leisure centre membership should be looked at - today expensive for council owned facility - cost prohibitive.	64,
Art Centre very good facility. Village hall terrible - needs to be replaced by a community centre - look at others in the area who have done a great job achieving this. If leisure and sports always room for improvement in all area e.g. football club pavilion, cricket club pavilion. 3G pitch good idea - new swimming centre etc. Parkland, boats, fishing, riding, walking etc. Can the Cranleigh character be created through a well run community centre located near sports area.	66,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

**Page 2 of 2**

## INFRASTRUCTURE - COMMENTS

### Infrastructure - Do you agree with this Objective?

- o Ensure that new development has good pedestrian, cycle and bus connections to Cranleigh and the wider area.
- o Improve existing pedestrian and cycle routes within Cranleigh.
- o Ensure car parking within the village supports the viability of the village centre.
- o Ensure that new development has adequate utility infrastructure both on and off site.

COMMENTS	Questionnaire No
Too late - should have been done.	2,
Too late - all of the new development have ignored these issues in practice. This objective is largely window dressing now as the damage has been done.	3,
Make sure new housing has adequate parking.	4,
It will be very important to have good road links with Guildford, considering you can queue for 40 minutes to get through Shalford at the present time. How will all the new houses affect this! Queueing time will probably become unreasonable. New ways to get out of Cranleigh may well have to be considered.	5,
Most definitely.	8,
All the above are not objectives they are absolute necessity to ensure the village can function. Again public transport needs improving and subsidy by developers contributions. Housing needs to be near bus routes (unlike Amletts Lane) I believe Cranleigh Parish Council should take direct control of our paths and green spaces and an element of our council tax could be assigned locally to employ local people to maintain these.	20,
Parking should be banned from the High Street.	23,
Do not combine pedestrians and cyclists. Access to existing Bridleways already very unsafe.	27,
Need to keep cycles away from pedestrians. Important existing Bridleways be maintained for horse traffic.	28,
And this should be enforced as a pre-requisite of development. You can't start building houses until the infrastructure needs are met.	29,
Developers should be required, through S.106, to contribute to the upkeep of the road infrastructure which is in an appalling state and further damaged by construction traffic.	33,
We need better public transport connections with bigger towns in the area, especially Guildford and Horsham. Roads are in really bad state already and they are going to be only worse with more cars and even buses. We should consider specially bus line, tramway or trains otherwise buses will be struck in traffic with everybody else. Walking or cycling won't solve commuting issues for local residents.	34,
New infrastructure should be done first as a pre-requisite to any planning approval.	35,
Parking should be non chargeable for first hour. More path side seating for the residents walking in and out of village centre not just in the centre.	36,
Cranleigh residents should be encourage to walk into the village centre if at all feasible. To encourage this seats should be provided along the major pedestrian routes. If residents do have to use their cars for larger shopping loads parking should be free for the first hour.	37,

Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number

Page 1 of 2



<b>Infrastructure - Do you agree with this Objective?</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>o Ensure that new development has good pedestrian, cycle and bus connections to Cranleigh and the wider area.</i></li> <li><i>o Improve existing pedestrian and cycle routes within Cranleigh.</i></li> <li><i>o Ensure car parking within the village supports the viability of the village centre.</i></li> <li><i>o Ensure that new development has adequate utility infrastructure both on and off site.</i></li> </ul>	
<b>COMMENTS -continued</b>	<b>Questionnaire No</b>
Good communications etc: Requires the right infrastructure for the demands. If the amount of employment in the Cranleigh area is insufficient to meet the requirements of the influx of new residents - there is one alternative - (other than by internet) and that is to commute!	38,
I don't think we should be subjected to all this new development. I don't think many people will take transport-buses etc. into Cranleigh in this driving society of today! Improving the state of the roads should be a priority.	39,
This area is the most vital part of any development of the village, if we are to survive. It is not just the utilities that need to be adequate". They Need to be future proof and should include health, schools, roads, etc.	40,
A good objective would be to convert the Downslink form Horsham through Cranleigh to Guildford into a tarmac cycle path to encourage better health and promote cycling to work etc.	41,
Well of course we want all this infrastructure - emphasis exercise and walking. Encourage less use of the car.	42,
Very, very concerned about capacity of Cranleigh and local surrey roads to cope with increase development. In 6 years I have lived in Cranleigh, traffic has increased considerably partic. of road such as A281 accessing Guildford (A3) and A31.	47,
Self evident.	51
Improve bus shelters. Why does Cranleigh not have any signs advertising when the next bus is due (Shamble Green has these signs)? Encourage bus travel with faster bus going to and from Guildford station at peak times. Need more car parking.	53,
Improvement to all infrastructure are imperative the roads, water supply, sewerage are all at breaking point - something had to be done.	55,
Keep car parking charges low and people will use them.	58,
Car parking in the village needs to be addressed. There is far too much illegal parking and the service road outside the Onslow pub should be closed.	59,
The infrastructure is vitally import. There is a good network of footpaths and frequent bus services to Guildford and Horsham. These must be maintained. Provision for cyclists is poor and must be improved. The car parking facilities are adequate but pricing is too high. Some short stay (30 minutes) free parking should be provided. All new developments must have adequate infrastructure.	62,
Existing pavements in the village need urgent improvement before anything else. E.g. Horsham Road. Also people allowing their boundary hedges to grow onto the pavement. e.g. Knowle Lane.	63,
Agree with car parking - unlikely to be viable for village centre when there are so many free alternative. A good time to sort out the market which takes away much of the parking on Thursday so that regular customers avoid Cranleigh. A weekly farmers market in the High Street would be more appropriate.	66,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

**Page 2 of 2**

***Informal Consultation held on 12th-14th July 2018 Cranleigh Village Hall- no more questionnaires accepted after 5pm Friday 20th July 2018***

**CNP1 - COMMENTS**

***Do you agree with this Policy?***

***Policy CNP1. Housing Mix***

***Development within the settlement boundary will be supported that:***

- a. increases the provision and range of affordable housing by including at the very minimum the level of affordable housing in accordance with the policies of Waverley Borough Council; and***
- b. provides at least 10% of all dwellings on sites of more than 20 dwellings built to increased mobility standards suitable for people with disabilities and reduced mobility. Development of bungalows is encouraged as a local building type.***
- c. provide individual self-build and custom housebuilding plots.***

**COMMENTS**

**Questionnaire  
No**

So why were these criteria not applied and insisted on for all of development now happening. All the developers had to do was appeal the restriction and all of the above be ignore. Great idea but never going to happen.

3,

Local affordable housing for local people as a priority.

4,

I have skimmed through all the following pages and agree with objectives. Unfortunately this is all too late. Much of the damage had already been done. Cranleigh is now one large building site. I hope these objectives can stop even more damage to this village.

5,

I agree - but housing must be for local people and not incomers if we are to retain our culture and heritage.

7,

Desperately need more bungalows as Cranleigh has an ageing population, with nowhere to move to, to downsize.

8,

Building bungalows is highly inefficient in terms of land so should not be actively encourage, as it will result in increase demand for green field sites.

13,

b) - How will the parish ensue that the 10% homes built to a higher mobility standard. If building regulations set out the required accessibility requirement, how can the parish insist upon a higher standard. Is the 'desire' to provide bungalows in accordance with the NPPF regarding not looking to dictate design?

18,

c) How will Parish ensure provide these plots and to whom. What is the mechanism to allow this?

We should be aiming for more affordable homes for local people in order of:

1. Existing residents or workers with min length of times working or living here
2. Other local people from out lying villages/areas
3. Key workers i.e. medical and education
4. Other Waverley residents
5. Other areas

20,

We should not be taking on other borough's problems i.e. Guildford or Woking without addressing our own needs. We should be not granting permission without at least 40% affordable housing.

What say does Cranleigh have in the policies of Waverley BC?

21,

Cranleigh has had enough new housing estates - the whole feel to the village is being erased.

23,

1. Waverley Borough Council should be pressed that the level of affordable housing is lowered after permission has been granted by the developer using various excuses.

2. Affordable - should mean for people on low wages, especially for the young first time buyers.

25,

**Do you agree with this Policy?**

<b>Policy CNP1. Housing Mix</b>	
<b>Development within the settlement boundary will be supported that:</b>	
a. <b>increases the provision and range of affordable housing by including at the very minimum the level of affordable housing in accordance with the policies of Waverley Borough Council; and</b>	
b. <b>provides at least 10% of all dwellings on sites of more than 20 dwellings built to increased mobility standards suitable for people with disabilities and reduced mobility. Development of bungalows is encouraged as a local building type.</b>	
c. <b>provide individual self-build and custom housebuilding plots.</b>	
<b>COMMENTS - continued</b>	<b>Questionnaire No</b>
Present requirement of 2.5 parking spaces is not sufficient.	28,
b) 10% not high enough.	29,
Affordable housing is a priority and should be above minimum.	32,
10% is totally inadequate - when will planners realise that affordable housing provision is the product of the original price paid for the land. If it is very clear from the onset that the policy is 25% minimum either the price will reflect the policy or there will be no excuse if the vendor and purchaser ignore the policy and subsequently find that they cannot make a profit - in which cast this land should be compulsorily acquired.	33,
Can we consider council funded self build long term lease schemes?	35,
A major priority. Without affordable rent or buy for those servicing the needs of the village residents the village will cease to attract these workers. They may well be forced to travel daily from cheaper areas thus increasing pressure on our overcrowded roads.	36
The housing needs of young people employed in he village must be met.	37,
Very important.	38,
What are the policies of Waverley B. Council? I'm not sure that building bungalows is an issue, but I'm not against it.	39,
The provision of affordable housing must be made a priority in the grant of any planning permission for more than 10 units. Development of bungalows must be tightly controlled as. Although they offer suitable accommodation for disabled people, they are not an efficient use of available land.	40,
Good objective but impossible to meet as Waverley BC simple does not care about affordable housing.	41,
Developers do not want to build bungalows as need more land and are not as profitable as house/flats.	
c) especially encourages vision, new ideas - need and time limit, otherwise building site for years (e.g. - 2 house being build on the Ridgway).	42,
Ensure that social housing does not have a negative impact, due to unacceptable behaviour, on existing properties (owner/occupied) in the area e.g. impact on Napper Place is severe.	44,
What about 'social housing' for people who can never afford to buy a house.	58,
There is a high need for affordable housing. Self-build plots should not be a high priority.	62,
Provision of affordable housing should be a prime objective.	63,
Option C is a great idea. Level of affordable housing should be beyond minimum level.	64,
Would need to know the numbers to make an informed decision.	66,

Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number

## CNP2 - COMMENTS

### Do you agree with this Policy?

#### **Policy CNP2: Location of Housing**

- a. Proposals should make the best use of suitable brownfield land, where available, in preference to greenfield land or brownfield land of high environmental value; and*
- b. Outside of the settlement boundary, priority will be given to protecting and enhancing the countryside from inappropriate development; and*
- c. Development should not unacceptably erode the important, predominantly undeveloped gaps between Cranleigh and the settlements of Alfold, Dunsfold including the proposed new settlement at Dunsfold Aerodrome, Ewhurst and Rowly; and*
- d. Development should not impede views into or out of open green spaces, AGLV, ASVI or AONB land, or key views and vistas identified in the Cranleigh Conservation Area Appraisal.*

### COMMENTS

Questionnaire  
No

Come and stand on the hill by Knowle Park House. Even before the developments are finished there is visual blight. The inability to control developers activity will mean that these housing areas will be joined up, it will become a continuation.	3,
Keep green borders around village.	4,
Agree	8,
Too late for Cranleigh. Damage already done.	11,
All very important points.	23,
So important.	29,
We must not lose any more open green spaces or green fields land surrounding the current settlement boundary,	32,
Please let us never turn into Cran-ford super towns.	35,
But not at the expense of employment i.e. housing on industrial sites.	36,
I agree totally with the item in C.	39,
Good objective but Waverley does not care about prioritising Greenfield development and they will continue to vote through developments to suit their individual pockets and friends desires.	41,
Of course but Waverley have their government remit and do not actually live in Cranleigh, mostly so why should they care?	42,
Ensure that social housing does not have a negative impact, due to unacceptable behaviour, on existing properties (owner/occupied) in the area e.g. impact on Napper Place is severe.	44,
But no development at Dunsfold - No train station!!!!	46,

Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number

**Page 1 of 2**

<b>Do you agree with this Policy?</b>	
<b>Policy CNP2: Location of Housing</b>	
<p>a. <i>Proposals should make the best use of suitable brownfield land, where available, in preference to greenfield land or brownfield land of high environmental value; and</i></p> <p>b. <i>Outside of the settlement boundary, priority will be given to protecting and enhancing the countryside from inappropriate development; and</i></p> <p>c. <i>Development should not unacceptably erode the important, predominantly undeveloped gaps between Cranleigh and the settlements of Alfold, Dunsfold including the proposed new settlement at Dunsfold Aerodrome, Ewhurst and Rowly; and</i></p> <p>d. <i>Development should not impede views into or out of open green spaces, AGLV, ASVI or AONB land, or key views and vistas identified in the Cranleigh Conservation Area Appraisal.</i></p>	
<b>COMMENTS - continued</b>	<b>Questionnaire No</b>
Very important. I hope there is no "ribbon" development joining villages.	47,
If there has to be more development in the area - then I believe that Dunsfold Aerodrome is the most appropriate area to be used.	55,
All greenfield must be protected.	57,
Especially c) and d)	61,
Definitely should encourage development on brownfield sites. Need justification to allow development outside of the settlement boundary for example for a farm worker.	62,
It is vital that brownfield sites are used first.	63,
Brownfield sites should already be the first option.	64,
Not enough into to make an informed decision . What is AGLV ASVI AONB land?. What is Cranleigh conservation tree appraisal.	66,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

**Page 2 of 2**

**CNP3 - COMMENTS**

**Do you agree with this Policy?**

**Policy CNP3. Design of Development**

*Development will be supported that is of high quality design standards, that responds and integrates well with its surroundings, meets the changing needs of residents and minimises the impact on the natural environment:*

- a. *developers are encouraged to adopt the principles of Building for Life to development in the Area; and*
- b. *developers should consider in full the guidance contained within the Cranleigh Design Statement and the Surrey Hills Management Plan; and*
- c. *developers are encouraged to avoid development over two storeys; and*
- d. *proposals are expected to create variety through the use of differing house types and variable plot boundaries; and*
- e. *affordable homes are expected to be designed to be tenure blind and integrated with market housing on all developments; and*
- f. *developers are encouraged to build adaptable dwellings that enable home working in respect of the number and size of habitable rooms; and*
- g. *developers are expected to meet the nationally described space standards set out in the Technical Housing Standards and are encouraged where possible to exceed these standards; and*
- h. *dwellings designed to be suitable for older residents (aged 60 and over) must demonstrate, as a minimum, that they meet the space and accessibility requirements of the Lifetime Homes standards. These dwellings may also be suitable for younger residents and are not intended to be restricted in use; and*
- i. *developers are encouraged to provide safe and secure dwellings that meet the requirements of 'Secure by Design' to minimise the likelihood and fear of crime; and*
- j. *developers should ensure that areas requiring service and maintenance including watercourses are accessible at all times.*

**COMMENTS**

Questionnaire  
No

Enforce it?	2,
Great words. There is a thought developers will agrees to everything on the list, then build as many houses as possible, sell them for the highest possible price and then..... Move on.	3,
Developers should make mixed developments for all age groups not just over 60 type developments.	4,
Section H, should be only for residents over 60, not younger. Need to provide small gardens, parking spaces and garage.	8,
Too late again.	11,
c) limiting development to two storeys is unnecessary - there are a number of 2.5/3 storey buildings already in the centre of Cranleigh.	13,
When I last read it the Cranleigh Designs Statement had undue emphasis on tile hanging and brick finishes. Cranleigh has a rich and varied visual environment and that needs emphasising.	15,
c) is the requirement to avoid 2 storey dwellings in accordance with the NPPF regarding not restricting or dictating design?	
d) does c & d not conflict - i.e. encouraging a mix of design, but discourage 2 storey homes?	18,
b) developers should be required to build to this not consider and be encouraged.	20,
In respect of developer delete "encourage" and insert "insist".	24,
Density of housing also reflects the current impractical requirements for car and parking as if is increasingly difficult financially for 'children' in their 20's to get their own housing away from parental home. So more cars.	28,
Ideal objectives in an ideal world. If only pressures could be borough to bear on developers.	32,

Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number

**Page 1 of 2**

## Do you agree with this Policy?

### Policy CNP3. Design of Development

Development will be supported that is of high quality design standards, that responds and integrates well with its surroundings, meets the changing needs of residents and minimises the impact on the natural environment:

- a. developers are encouraged to adopt the principles of Building for Life to development in the Area; and
- b. developers should consider in full the guidance contained within the Cranleigh Design Statement and the Surrey Hills Management Plan; and
- c. developers are encouraged to avoid development over two storeys; and
- d. proposals are expected to create variety through the use of differing house types and variable plot boundaries; and
- e. affordable homes are expected to be designed to be tenure blind and integrated with market housing on all developments; and
- f. developers are encouraged to build adaptable dwellings that enable home working in respect of the number and size of habitable rooms; and
- g. developers are expected to meet the nationally described space standards set out in the Technical Housing Standards and are encouraged where possible to exceed these standards; and
- h. dwellings designed to be suitable for older residents (aged 60 and over) must demonstrate, as a minimum, that they meet the space and accessibility requirements of the Lifetime Homes standards. These dwellings may also be suitable for younger residents and are not intended to be restricted in use; and
- i. developers are encouraged to provide safe and secure dwellings that meet the requirements of 'Secure by Design' to minimise the likelihood and fear of crime; and
- j. developers should ensure that areas requiring service and maintenance including watercourses are accessible at all times.

### COMMENTS - continued

Can we get a police station back in Cranleigh now we have all these new houses?

c) only in exceptional circumstances should there be any buildings over 3 stories and these should be limited to a very small % of the whole village.

j) Developers should be responsible in fall for these. No historical ditches or drain should be sealed off in any circumstances. They were put there for a reason! Maintenance plans must be put in place to enable clearance etc as well as suitable fencing. Cranleigh is vulnerable to flash surface water flooding.

h) Cranleigh expanded enormously in the 1960's and 70's bringing in young families who could afford a starter home (1/2 beds) or growing families (3 beds). Now in our older age we ae bed-blocking - remaining in our 3-4 beds homes, as there are so few bungalows or small houses with small gardens suitable for the active retired. We don't all want to live in a retirement complex with he huge overheads that they require. More Park Mead Estate type development please.

Basically Cranleigh Cannot support all these building developments. I would like to see some development for older members of the community. Elmbridge Village is not the answer for everyone, People like to be with in walking distance of the village.

Developers must build suitable drainage scheme, especially where the proposed development in on an area known to be subject to flooding - i.e. most of the development route of the Horsham Road, High Street. At present the design simply shifts the increased water flow from the development into inadequate drainage on balancing ponds.

Good in principle but Waverley planners are not interested in this stuff so it won't happen.

Well, all of this is great, but in reality will it happen?

Developers should contribute to infrastructure and development of wildlife areas.

Good design is essential in all new development.

Again too detailed to comment.

Questionnaire  
No

35,

36,

38

39,

40,

41,

42,

47,

62,

66,

Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number

Page 2 of 2

**CNP4 - COMMENTS**

***Do you agree with this Policy?***

**Policy CNP4: Character of Development**

*Development is expected to reflect, reinforce and enhance the character of the site's unique surroundings, including the natural landscape, and that of the Area as a whole. Development is expected to take account of its context and not to provide standardised housing that is replicated nationwide and creates no sense of place. Developers are:*

- a. expected to create developments that are locally inspired or are otherwise of distinctive character; and*
- b. expected to submit proposals that complement and enhance character areas and key approaches into the village; and*
- c. encouraged to meet recommended height to width ratios as outlined in the current Building for Life Standards; and*
- d. to use good quality building materials that complement the palette of materials in the immediate surrounding area, thereby reinforcing local distinctiveness and the context of the site concerned; and*
- e. not impede or detract from views into or out of local green spaces, AGLV, ASVI or AONB land, or key views and vistas identified in the Cranleigh Conservation Area Appraisal; and*
- f. submit proposals that are not be of a scale or proximity that harms the setting and open views of the Common; and*
- g. encouraged to balance and match the overall density of dwellings on new development sites with existing adjacent housing development, with particular attention given to achieving lower densities on site boundaries; and*
- h. where development sites abut open countryside, development on the rural boundary edge are expected to be of a lower density than that of the overall site and to avoid development of three storeys and above in order to blend the development into the rural landscape and provide a gradual transition from the built form to open countryside.*

**COMMENTS**

	Questionnaire No
Why do we need more housing in Cranleigh - most of the existing developments are not sold.	2,
Great ideas.	3,
Definitely.	8,
Too late again.	11,
i.e. (a) no more nonsense about ?????? us! Building 3 stories in the centre of development can reduce the spread.	15,
See CNP3 c) - Design of Development states that "developers are encouraged to avoid development over two storeys. CNP4 h) - states the intention to 'avoid' development of three storeys and above. Perhaps, as we are asking them to avoid more than 2, we should not accept 3 near the open countryside.	19,
New developments to include shops and easy access to health centre	21,
Developments should provide local green spaces where children can play and folk can meander.	29,
Again this is life in an ideal world.	32,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*



**Do you agree with this Policy?**

**Policy CNP4: Character of Development**

*Development is expected to reflect, reinforce and enhance the character of the site's unique surroundings, including the natural landscape, and that of the Area as a whole. Development is expected to take account of its context and not to provide standardised housing that is replicated nationwide and creates no sense of place. Developers are:*

- a. expected to create developments that are locally inspired or are otherwise of distinctive character; and*
- b. expected to submit proposals that complement and enhance character areas and key approaches into the village; and*
- c. encouraged to meet recommended height to width ratios as outlined in the current Building for Life Standards; and*
- d. to use good quality building materials that complement the palette of materials in the immediate surrounding area, thereby reinforcing local distinctiveness and the context of the site concerned; and*
- e. not impede or detract from views into or out of local green spaces, AGLV, ASVI or AONB land, or key views and vistas identified in the Cranleigh Conservation Area Appraisal; and*
- f. submit proposals that are not be of a scale or proximity that harms the setting and open views of the Common; and*
- g. encouraged to balance and match the overall density of dwellings on new development sites with existing adjacent housing development, with particular attention given to achieving lower densities on site boundaries; and*
- h. where development sites abut open countryside, development on the rural boundary edge are expected to be of a lower density than that of the overall site and to avoid development of three storeys and above in order to blend the development into the rural landscape and provide a gradual transition from the built form to open countryside.*

<b>COMMENTS - continued</b>	<b>Questionnaire No</b>
We need to avoid 3+ storey buildings in the area to retain the rural feel of the area.	35,
Not all pastiche tree developments though. Modern and exciting visually - fit for the 21st century please.	38,
I agree with all the points in this policy. I don't think 3 storey houses are in keeping with the ethos of Cranleigh.	39,
Good in principle but Waverley planners are not interested in this stuff so it won't happen.	41,
Character/innovative design. Imagination, vision, idealism - lovely if all this were happening, but we are stuck in a rut design. Kevin McCloud would be very distressed.	42,
I agree with all this particularly limiting the height of the buildings to two storeys.	55,
Should there be reference to local need. Why are we accepting need relating to the Working area? Why are the Parsonage Road houses farmed onto to a different authority?	61,
Cranleigh does have its special characteristics. New development must take this into account.	62,
Building should be "in keeping" with the locality.	63,
Again too complex.	66,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

## CNPE1 - COMMENTS

### ***Do you agree with this Policy?***

#### **Policy CNPE1. Protection of Employment Sites**

- a. Proposals for change of use from employment use will be required to demonstrate that retention of employment cannot be delivered as part of a viable mixed-use scheme; and**
- b. Proposals for the redevelopment or change of use of the ground floor of buildings or land in employment or service trade use to non-employment uses will be resisted if the site:**
- i. is located in the primary and secondary shopping areas;**
  - ii. is economically viable;**
  - iii. has not been marketed at a reasonable price for at least 6 continuous months for that and any other suitable employment or service trade.**

#### **COMMENTS**

COMMENTS	Questionnaire No
What is this about?	2,
We need more employment sites	3,
Don't understand the question!	8,
We may need to adopt commercial property for domestic use.	20,
I agree, last thing Surrey needs is yet another town centre with only hairdressers and estate agents in it.	35,
Need to ensure that residential properties are not used for trading where this would disturb other local residents.	36,
Retention of employment use is important if Cranleigh is not to become a dormitory town. Employment opportunities must be provided in the village. The use of private buildings/houses as business premises, if the business creates noise should not be allowed.	37,
I don't see any sign of resisting development with regard to the Park Mead group of shops which caters for everyday items for its residents. This must cut down on residents travelling into Cranleigh by car to get a pint of milk etc.	39,
It is, of course, critical that the village retain employment. The objective is obvious and should be strengthened if not becoming mandatory.	40,
Good in principle but Waverley planners are not interested in this stuff so it won't happen.	41,
b(iii) should be 1 year at least and somehow to introduce a longer period if the site is left to deteriorate to lessen the marketability.	51,
Trade and employment to be kept and encouraged.	57,
Local employment sites are very important and should be protected.	62,
The conversion of redundant farm buildings to business use is preferable to conversion to residential use.	62,
Would rather see existing buildings converted than more green spaces built on. Would rather see shops/buildings developed as dwellings rather than move big high street drains moving in and creating another 'generic' high street.	64,
So dependent on what national government would do with regard to unfair competition in retail. Which area will Amazon not take over? Moves into baking and food will change the landscape.	66,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

**Page 1 of 1**

## CNPE2 - COMMENTS

***Do you agree with this Policy?***

### ***Policy CNPE2 Rural Enterprise and Agricultural Buildings for Business***

***Outside the settlement boundary the following proposals will be supported:***

- a. Where development remains within planning control, the change of use of an agricultural building to business use providing that it is;***
- i. for an appropriate rural business use that relates well to the location and does not adversely affect the amenity of residents and other countryside users; and***
- ii. a well-designed building that relates well to the location and landscape; and***
- iii. provides adequate parking adjacent to and within the boundary of the site for employees and visitors; and***
- iv. the proposed reuse would not cause harmful and/or negative impact with surrounding agriculture or other land-based activities.***

### **COMMENTS**

**Questionnaire No**

Good idea	3,
Proper agricultural buildings are to be promoted - not just stables for horses for richer residents.	35,
Most small businesses dotted around Cranleigh - the old Hewitts companies and those on Little Mead - would love to be rehoused in a delightful converted barn. How many could afford the rent?	38,
Especially a)iii) is particularly relevant and often not adhered to.	39,
Protection of important trees and natural features is definitely required.	62,
This seems to give advantages to agricultural building owners against other sites and therefore more unfair competition!	66,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

**Page 1 of 1**

**CNP5 - COMMENTS**

**Do you agree with this Policy?**

**Policy CNP5: Natural Landscape and Rural Character**

*Development proposals should maintain and enhance the natural environment, retain landscape features and enhance the rural character of Cranleigh. Development proposals are expected to:*

- a. respect the natural contours of a site and preserve and sensitively incorporate existing natural features such as trees, hedges and ponds within the site; and*
- b. be integrated into the landscape and include new landscape buffers between existing development and the countryside adjacent to development sites; and*
- c. retain mature trees and/or trees of arboricultural and amenity value, groups of trees or woodland on site, and replacing any removed trees of recognised importance with trees of a similar potential size and native species on site, preferable of a local provenance from seed collected, raised and grown in the UK; and*
- d. consider including street trees in their landscaping plans, preferable of a local provenance from seed collected, raised and grown in the UK; and*
- e. avoid any building, including essential infrastructure, within root protection areas of mature trees; and*
- f. to incorporate native species boundary hedging of a local provenance throughout the development site; and*
- g. make provision for accessible open space through on or off-site provision or through contributions towards provision elsewhere, in line with Fields in Trust Beyond the Six Acre Standard (England) or updated guidance; and*
- h. design open space that is in useable parcels of land and not fragmented, is safe and easily accessible and not severed by any physical barrier, is accessible to the general public and designed to feel public rather than private, creates a safe environment considering lighting and layout and provides some informal landscaping. An agreement will be required to ensure proper management over the lifetime of the development; and.*
- i. Include confirmation of how habitats are to be created and maintained post development to help to restore and enhance the biodiversity value of the site; and*
- j. include green corridors across the site connecting with adjacent green areas and corridors to enable and encourage the movement of wildlife; and*
- k. not to have a negative impact on water quality or cause a deterioration in water quality elements as outlined in current legislation.*

**COMMENTS**

**Questionnaire  
No**

We are a rural community and we need to retain our identity. Inappropriate development will destroy this.	3,
Agree.	8,
Too late again, damage already done.	11,
a) Yes to street trees but specifying in such a detailed way is not practical and adds un-necessary costs to developers. f) Similar. No leylandii g) ? Contribution elsewhere doesn't give Green Space in this development. h) "Open to general public" Inappropriate for small developments open to abuse. Who pays for upkeep - if public not residents i) as above	27,
Especially section (j) isolated areas are pointless if trees are to be part of any planning the provision must be made for their maintenance i.e. they must be watered. See for example the disaster of the tree planting at the entrance to Amlets Place and no the weather is not to blame not one of the trees has a pipe insert to allow root watering.	36,
If mature trees are planted, maybe as replacement, they should be watered in order to ensure that they become established - unlike those planted at the entrance to Amlets Park!	37,
see h	38,
Trees are almost never protected, replaced as promised by developers. So loss of life enhancing greenery despite promises from developers. It takes years for trees to reach maturity - if they are included in plans by developing the trees are often left to fend for themselves with detrimental results.	39,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

**Do you agree with this Policy?**

**Policy CNP5: Natural Landscape and Rural Character**

Development proposals should maintain and enhance the natural environment, retain landscape features and enhance the rural character of Cranleigh. Development proposals are expected to:

- a. respect the natural contours of a site and preserve and sensitively incorporate existing natural features such as trees, hedges and ponds within the site; and
  - b. be integrated into the landscape and include new landscape buffers between existing development and the countryside adjacent to development sites; and
  - c. retain mature trees and/or trees of arboricultural and amenity value, groups of trees or woodlands on site, and replacing any removed trees of recognised importance with trees of a similar potential size and native species on site, preferable of a local provenance from seed collected, raised and grown in the UK; and
  - d. consider including street trees in their landscaping plans, preferable of a local provenance from seed collected, raised and grown in the UK; and
  - e. avoid any building, including essential infrastructure, within root protection areas of mature trees; and
  - f. to incorporate native species boundary hedging of a local provenance throughout the development site; and
  - g. make provision for accessible open space through on or off-site provision or through contributions towards provision elsewhere, in line with Fields in Trust Beyond the Six Acre Standard (England) or updated standards.
- Design open space that is in useable parcels of land and not fragmented, is safe and easily accessible and not severed by any physical barrier, is accessible to the general public and designed to feel public rather than private, creates a safe environment considering lighting and layout and provides some informal landscaping. An agreement will be required to ensure proper management over the lifetime of the development.
- i. Include confirmation of how habitats are to be created and maintained post development to help to restore and enhance the biodiversity value of the site; and
  - j. include green corridors across the site connecting with adjacent green areas and corridors to enable and encourage the movement of wildlife; and
  - k. not to have a negative impact on water quality or cause a deterioration in water quality elements as outlined in current legislation.

**COMMENTS - continue**

	Questionnaire No
Care must be taken with 'street' trees to ensure the safety of pedestrians with mobility problems, when moving past such trees - roots can be a big trip hazard.	40,
Great aspiration, but in reality Waverley planners have no interest in environmental considerations so it wont happen.	41,
I guess we have to be idealistic - oh that all this could happen.....	42,
Totally support.	47,
Again, this is a major area of concern one can only ask, again, who in mindful of the views and needs of the people of Cranleigh, and how patently questionable planning decisions are made.	61,
Sustainable development must be a high priority .	62,
Too complex for me!	66,

Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number

## CNP6 - COMMENTS

**Do you agree with this Policy?**

### **Policy CNP6: Sustainable Development and Energy Efficiency**

*The design and standard of any new development should aim to meet a high level of sustainable design. This includes:*

- a. siting and orientation to optimise passive solar gain.; and*
- b. the use of high quality, thermally efficient building materials; and*
- c. installation of energy efficiency measures such as loft and wall insulation and double glazing; and*
- d. incorporating on-site energy generation from renewable sources such as solar panels; and*
- e. reducing water consumption through the use of grey water systems; and*
- f. providing low carbon sustainable design and avoid or mitigate all regulated emissions using a combination of on-site energy efficiency measures (such as insulation and low energy heating systems), on-site zero carbon technologies (such as solar panels) and only where necessary off-site measures to deal with any remaining emissions; and*
- g. providing the infrastructure for adequate electric vehicle charging points for each dwelling; and*
- h. the retrofit of heritage properties/assets is encouraged to reduce energy demand and to generate renewable energy where appropriate, providing it safeguards historic characteristics and development is done with engagement and permissions of relevant organisations; and*
- i. alterations to existing buildings should be designed with energy reduction in mind and comply with current sustainable design and construction standards; and*
- j. the provision of safe, shared pedestrian and cycle routes into the centre of the village, linking up with existing routes where available.; and*
- k. providing cycle parking frames on public play space on development sites.*

<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>Questionnaire No</b>
All good ideas	3,
More cycle lane improvements to Downslink towards Guildford	4,
Am not happy with section J. Pedestrians and cyclists do not make a safe and happy match. Personal experience of almost being knocked down by cyclists on pavement. A separate cycle lane is required away from pedestrians.	8,
(j) no to mixed cyclist and pedestrian path to dangerous for children, Keep cycles to cycle lanes.	9,
Very big tick to all that!	15,
Very good ideas.	24,
A cycle super highway from Cranleigh to Guildford is an excellent idea.	35,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

## Do you agree with this Policy?

### **Policy CNP6: Sustainable Development and Energy Efficiency**

*The design and standard of any new development should aim to meet a high level of sustainable design. This includes:*

- a. siting and orientation to optimise passive solar gain.; and*
- b. the use of high quality, thermally efficient building materials; and*
- c. installation of energy efficiency measures such as loft and wall insulation and double glazing; and*
- d. incorporating on-site energy generation from renewable sources such as solar panels; and*
- e. reducing water consumption through the use of grey water systems; and*
- f. providing low carbon sustainable design and avoid or mitigate all regulated emissions using a combination of on-site energy efficiency measures (such as insulation and low energy heating systems), on-site zero carbon technologies (such as solar panels) and only where necessary off-site measures to deal with any remaining emissions; and*
- g. providing the infrastructure for adequate electric vehicle charging points for each dwelling; and*
- h. the retrofit of heritage properties/assets is encouraged to reduce energy demand and to generate renewable energy where appropriate, providing it safeguards historic characteristics and development is done with engagement and permissions of relevant organisations; and*
- i. alterations to existing buildings should be designed with energy reduction in mind and comply with current sustainable design and construction standards; and*
- j. the provision of safe, shared pedestrian and cycle routes into the centre of the village, linking up with existing routes where available.; and*
- k. providing cycle parking frames on public play space on development sites.*

### **COMMENTS**

a) now charge points for electric cars

d) is essential and as stated earlier no building without this should be allowed.

The compulsory integration of solar panels into the design of new houses should be included in the plans and enforced.

In an ideal world. Builders want quick, easy builds with maximum profit.

Developer of larger scale developments should consider the installation of a centralised heating system for the whole development.

Great aspiration, but in reality Waverley planners have no interest in environmental considerations so it won't happen.

Well of course, but how many trees have been used for this survey? Energy efficiency - hope this paper was recycled paper. Was it even a consideration.....

Should add in (d) possible ground and air source heat pumps.

The green spaces within Cranleigh must be protected.

Looks like this does address sustainability but unqualified to know what it really means.

**Questionnaire  
No**

36,

37,

38,

40,

41,

42,

51,

62,

66,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

**Page 2 of 2**



**CNP7 - COMMENTS**

**Do you agree with this Policy?**

**Policy CNP7: Protection of Green Space**

a. the Neighbourhood Plan designates Local Green Spaces in the following locations, as shown on the Maps on pages x-x :  
( list sites following July 2018 Public Consultation ) ;

a. development that results in the loss of open space or jeopardises its use by the public will not be permitted. The quality of existing open space should not be eroded by insensitive development on adjoining land.

**COMMENTS**

**Questionnaire No**

Stop back garden development. Keep existing green spaces. School playing fields? Cycle lanes. Fix pot holes - too dangerous for cyclist	2,
We must protect all Green Space areas.	3,
No building on any green public spaces!	4,
This is key for a successful Neighbourhood Plan I will not vote for it if this is not in plan.	20,
Keep Green Space.	24,
This policy is absolutely essential - it is not negotiable.	37,
Its very important to safeguard Green Spaces.	39,
This will require rigid policing and developers must not be allowed to 'bend' the rules,	40,
Great aspiration, but in reality Waverley planners have no interest in environmental considerations so it wont happen.	41,
Again, how could you argue with the protection of Green Space?	42,
Strongly support.	47,
Keeping open green space is a priority.	55,
It is not necessary or desirable for residential gardens to be built on. They must be protected.	62,
Vital!	63,
Flexibility in thinking required as above.	66,

Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number

Page 1 of 1

## CNP8 - COMMENTS

### Do you agree with this Policy?

#### **Policy CNP8: Residential Gardens**

- a. *infill development of residential gardens that causes harm to the character and biodiversity of the local Area should be resisted.*

Developers are encouraged to:

- b. *to provide sufficient external amenity space, refuse and recycling storage and car and bicycle parking to ensure a high quality and well managed, uncluttered streetscape; and*
- c. *Provide proportionate garden space for each dwelling based on its size and to complement the adjacent character area; and*
- d. *Take opportunities to enhance the biodiversity of green corridors provided by private gardens; and*
- e. *Ensure that all dwellings including blocks of flats have an area of landscaping including native hedging or native plants to the front of the property to encourage wildlife and to screen the boundaries of car parking areas; and*
- f. *Provide native hedging at the rear boundary of dwellings in particular where the boundary is adjacent to open countryside.*

### COMMENTS

Questionnaire  
No

Stop back garden development by greedy owners - plenty of housing of all types without using back gardens

2,

Good idea but big gardens = less houses, developers will ignore.

3,

Explore adequate parking off road.

4,

Requires rather than ensure.

20,

How do you screen carparking areas attached to houses? You have to drive in and out to road.

27,

New builds have ridiculously small gardens - insist on bigger gardens and less houses.

35,

Most important.

36,

In a previous 'new' building development, single trees were placed very near house. I complained that those trees were planted in an inaccessible position for them to grow or indeed to be maintained/watered. The Waverley B. Council said it was the developer's responsibility equally the developer refused responsibility and all the trees died. So these 'developer' promises were not upheld!

39,

Infilling should become a "non-event". The village is being slowly strangled by such developments with access/egress being dangerous.

40,

This is something that a Cranleigh NP may be able to help with.

41,

Green, Green, Green spaces.

42,

No infilling of residential greens.

46,

Bearing in mind that if we did not have perversely excessive developments, these would not be issues.

61,

Flooding must be prevented.

62,

a) absolutely. AS above there is no necessity to use "in fills" to achieve the targeted development plot numbers.

63,

I think infill development in Cranleigh was stated by a local Councillor. Again unqualified to comment.

66,

Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number

Page 1 of 1

**CNP9 - COMMENTS**

**Do you agree with this Policy?!**

**Policy CNP9: Flood Risk and Drainage**

*This Neighbourhood Plan seeks to ensure that the remaining natural flood plain is retained, and appropriate conditions are applied to safeguard the Area from flooding.*

- a. developers are encouraged to submit full details of the proposed surface water drainage scheme including gully maintenance and clearance (including details of its route, design and specification, how consideration has been given to the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), and details of its ongoing management and maintenance for the lifetime of the development) as part of their planning application; and*
- b. developers are encouraged to use natural flood risk alleviation methods, including floodplain woodland, wetlands and other 'soft engineering' techniques; and*
- c. a SuDS verification condition is required on all major applications; and*
- d. development should not be permitted that impedes or alters the path of a river or watercourse; and*
- e. developers should ensure that existing drainage ditches and culverts are retained.*
- f. developers are encouraged, where appropriate, to make occupants of dwellings aware of their responsibilities as riparian owners.*

**COMMENTS**

Questionnaire No

Developers should be forced to meet these needs otherwise nothing will be done - why should they	2,
Cranleigh is prone to flooding always has been. So far this issue seems to have been ignored. Developers build houses, they really don't care.	3,
Developers should not build so that flooding risk is made worse - enough green spaces around developments required to soak up excess water.	4,
The site on the Elmbridge Road floods frequently and deeply. I had to have my car pulled from Elmbridge Road during floods several years ago. I would not buy a house there! This is called closing the door after the horse has bolted.	5,
Is the policy related to all developments regardless of how many units/floor area?	18,
Required to rather than encouraged etc.	20,
Very important! Developers need to really adhere to this proposals.	24,
If only - current development flouts this.	32,
Fully agree as commented earlier.	36,
It is essential that developers do dig out ditches properly unlike on the Amlets Lane site where a drainage ditch, on a downward slope, has a stretch on it higher than the summit thus resulting in the retention of a large pool of water. Developers should be penalised if they do not carry out their statutory duties.	37,
Existing natural flood plains - can they cope with increased 'run-off' from residential and hard surfaces.	38,
The village has suffered from major floods in the past and the current spate of over development will inevitably lead to a recurrence. Developers must deal with flood risk before starting work and must tell buyers, in details, of the risks involved.	40,
Good aim, but Waverley planners don't care about flood risk so it wont happen.	41,
Do developers really care about flood risks - after all they will not be living in the flooded houses they helped create.	42,
Of great importance in this area.	47,
Important to have restriction as Waverley is not checking as they are supposed to do. They are not doing their job.	51,
We cannot allow any further development on known flood plains.	55,
Essential the policy is followed exactly.	58,
Yes, of course one agrees - but does it actually make any difference. Building is already started on the Elmbridge flood plain site., How did planning permission come be given?	61,
The historic environment must be protected. It provides the village's identity.	62,
Again unqualified.	66,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

**Page 1 of 1**

## CNP10 - COMMENTS

**Do you agree with this Policy?**

**Policy CNP10: Heritage Assets**

*Development proposals will be expected to:*

- a. conserve and enhance the distinctive built heritage assets of the Area and their settings; and*
- b. not be of a scale or proximity that harms the historic balance of features within the Conservation Area; and*
- c. not lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset; and*
- d. assess the impact of increased traffic levels from development sites on designated heritage assets; and*
- e. consider the effect of a proposal on Buildings of Local Merit and avoid or minimise the impact on the heritage asset's conservation; and*
- f. include where possible new locally inspired landmark buildings of merit.*

**CNP10 - COMMENTS**

**Questionnaire  
No**

What on earth does this mean?	2,
Increased traffic will impact.	3,
Required not expected	20,
Developers should be expected to make good any damage to the roads , verges and paths.	25,
While Cranleigh has its large share of housing style estates, its unique architectural treasures and feels should be maintained. In Cranleigh buildings from all modern eras can be seen in an easy way and is testament to their times.	35,
Overlap of other policies.	42,
Has any study been made as to whether the increase traffic in the High Street is harming the buildings.	53,
Is it already too late?	61,
Developers should be required to contribute to improvements of arts and leisure facilities which are already under pressure.	62,
Again not qualified.	66,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

**Page 1 of 1**

## CNP11 - COMMENTS

**Do you agree with this Policy?**

### **Policy CNP11: Arts and Leisure Policy**

*Developers will be encouraged to support leisure and arts activities through contributions towards:*

- a. the provision and enhancement of public buildings and public grounds providing sports facilities for all, including community halls and state schools; and*
- b. the provision and enhancement of arts projects and buildings.*

### **COMMENTS**

**Questionnaire No**

You need to force it. 'Whishy washy' force it.	2,
Guilt money? Small provision, short term and no longer term provision.	3,
Could this be done in partnership with Cranleigh School.	4,
As long as they are accessible to existing residential areas therefore minimising transportation issues. Not just for new developments i.e. Dunsfold park. Otherwise local transportation will need to be improved. Costs need to be affordable unlike some of the housing!	5,
The developers should be made to pay "up front" for all a) and b) before they are allowed to lay the first brick. They "back track" now, on roads, green spaces, DRS, libraries etc, all essential for a development by saying, "they have now run out of money to build these things."	8,
State schools	10,
Support state schools, not private.	11,
Cranleigh should remain a hub for outdoor pursuits in the area. Cranleigh arts centre is a jewel in he town and needs protection.	35,
Ref b - where is Cranleigh Museum? High time we had one!	38,
Lovely, lovely lovely.... Words all words, lets hope some of them are based in the real world	42,
Although ephemeral in measuring the effects of local arts in the community it is nevertheless really important for its social and general well-being.	51,
Residential parking can be an eyesore if it is not adequately provided for.	62,
Definitely.	63,
Almost feels like 'dirty money' - you can build what you want as long as you give money to xyz....	64,
?	66,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

**Page 1 of 1**

**Informal Consultation held on 12th-14th July 2018 Cranleigh Village Hall- no more questionnaires accepted after 5pm Friday 20th July 2018**

**CNP12 - COMMENTS**

**Do you agree with this Policy?[]**

**Policy CNP12: Residential Parking**

Developers should provide an adequate amount of parking which complies with Waverley Borough Council's Parking Guidelines, reflects car ownership levels in the Area, is well integrated and does not dominate the street scene; and developers are encouraged to:

- a. provide parking located within the curtilage of each plot to minimise the level of on street parking; and
- b. provide parking spaces close to and in sight of the dwellings they serve; and
- c. avoid parking courts, and if necessary they should be small in overall size (generally no more than five properties should use a single parking courtyard) and they should be well overlooked by neighbouring properties; and
- d. provide parking that reflects that of established adjacent development to maintain and enhance the character of the area; and
- e. use landscaping with native species to balance the visual impact of parked cars; and
- f. developers are encouraged to use a combination of car parking treatments and to avoid white lining to mark out and number spaces; and
- g. provide on-site cycle parking for residents and visitors.

**COMMENTS**

	Questionnaire No
Current High Street and side roads are full of parked cars which makes driving dangerous - volume of traffic is at breaking point already	2,
From all the plans seen the parking provision has never been adequate - cars will overspill onto adjoining road which are not big enough to cope.	3,
Use water permeable surface, as show at Wisley.	15,
Problem is planning requirement for number of car spaces is too low (see any development)	28,
It needs to acknowledge that cars are the only available transport for lots of people. No trains and limited bus service. The only way out of Cranleigh is through the High Street.	29,
Can the parking wardens be increased to allow street parking by non-residents to be curtailed and checked.	35,
New developments never seem to cope with the required need for car parking. The "development" opposite Glebelands School caters for 1 car per house leaving the remaining cars parked in the school parking bays opposite OR on the corner of a bend, therefore endangering the sightline of oncoming cars.	39,
Parking:- Encourage all to have smaller cars, fewer cars per family. Electric power charging points on all. New housing from now: Big tax for SUV's - bigger engines, 4 x 4 etc. Making parking places smaller so bigger cars cannot park and have to pay for 2 parking spaces.	42,
Ensure enough parking is provided to meet the existing building development in the village. Real risking of shortage	44,
So often inadequate residential provided and street parking becomes the norm.	47,
Any developments should take into account the cumulative effect on the roads and parking of previously allowed developments.	55,
How many parking spaces per property? I know of one family in Cranleigh, with two grown up children, who have 4 cars. They have no garage and are dependent on street parking.	58,
If continued planning permission for yet more development is given	61,
Any new development should have good pedestrian access to schools, and open spaces. New residents should live close to bus routes to get to work. There are few bus shelters so would welcome provision of more.	62,
We understand that the parking facilities at the Swallow Tiles development is terrible. This should not happen again.	63,
Don't know.	66,

Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number

## CNP13 - COMMENTS

### Do you agree with this Policy?

#### **Policy CNP13: Transport**

*Proposals for new housing should be well connected to the existing settlement. Development should be integrated within the existing settlement boundary and are encouraged to be built around the concept of a walkable neighbourhood which supports and encourages walking. Development should;*

- a. minimise the need for car usage and include proposals which enhance and provide short, safe pedestrian routes and designated cycle routes from the development site to principal facilities including the village centre, schools and public open space, whilst also considering accessibility for people with impaired mobility; and*
- b. provide access to public transport by locating development as close as possible to existing bus routes and provide safe pedestrian access to bus stops within a short walk; and*
- c. incorporate permeable road designs that support the character of the area and are properly connected with adjacent street networks; and*
- d. consider short and curved or irregular streets which contribute to variety and a sense of place; and*
- e. provide bus shelters where necessary to encourage use of public transport; and*
- f. proposals should include design and highways proposals that mitigate the impact of through traffic on the High Street.*

### COMMENTS

**Questionnaire  
No**

Put the train back or free bus travel for all. Improve the horrible buses. We are third world. Most countries have clean, cheap and reliable trains and buses. Our roads in Surrey are a disgrace.

2,

Public transport? Will never happen. People need to commute.

3,

But I cant see how you will enforce this as buses only go to main bus station - railway is 40 min drive at rush hour and private school transport is parents in cars! Most workers commute up and down to Guildford/Horsham.

4,

Car usage is essential in an area with little public transport. We can't all ride a bike or walk to a bus stop. My disabled dependent certainly cannot.

7,

Definitely, especially (a), and impaired mobility persons.

8,

Should be well connected but not within existing estates using green space.

20,

CNP13 is very important - a priority.

24,

KPI original plans provided bus turning and shelter the others not

28,

If only - we already have development going ahead which is not within easy walking distance of village amenities. Developers must contribute towards transport infrastructure improvements.

32,

Some excellent ideas here!

35,

But should integrate suitable bench seating at frequent intervals. None of us are getting younger and suitable rest points would encourage more to walk. Also the more seat the less likely it will that anyone will become a focal point for anti-social behaviour.

36,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

**Page 1 of 2**

## Do you agree with this Policy?

### Policy CNP13: Transport

*Proposals for new housing should be well connected to the existing settlement. Development should be integrated within the existing settlement boundary and are encouraged to be built around the concept of a walkable neighbourhood which supports and encourages walking. Development should;*

- a. minimise the need for car usage and include proposals which enhance and provide short, safe pedestrian routes and designated cycle routes from the development site to principal facilities including the village centre, schools and public open space, whilst also considering accessibility for people with impaired mobility; and*
- b. provide access to public transport by locating development as close as possible to existing bus routes and provide safe pedestrian access to bus stops within a short walk; and*
- c. incorporate permeable road designs that support the character of the area and are properly connected with adjacent street networks; and*
- d. consider short and curved or irregular streets which contribute to variety and a sense of place; and*
- e. provide bus shelters where necessary to encourage use of public transport; and*
- f. proposals should include design and highways proposals that mitigate the impact of through traffic on the High Street.*

### COMMENTS - continued

	Questionnaire No
If walking is to be encouraged seats should be provided along pedestrian routes to allow walkers, especially older walkers to rest during their walk.	37,
The roads in and around Cranleigh are already overcrowded by traffic, mainly cars. If you are living in Cranleigh, the majority of the working population will travel in their cars, on overcrowded roads either to their place of work, or their nearest railway station. Majority of people will work outside of Cranleigh. There is only a limited opportunity of working with the Cranleigh area!	39,
The through passage of traffic in the village will very shortly become a major issue. Already, when a large delivery vehicle in unloading, the High Street becomes impassable. Would it not be sensible to have a road through the developments behind Stocklund Square going one way (SW to NE) and keep the High Street one way in the opposite direction.	40,
Let's try and get the downlink tarmacked into a cycle path as a start.	41,
More buses/trains/public transport more frequent services on smaller vehicles....	42,
Work with private sector for local minibus 2 per hour - include Knowle Lane up to Wildwood round 281 then Alfold Road, include Alfold and Ewhurst but restrict it to a 7 mile area.	45,
Bus service not sufficient - extra buses will just get caught up in all the extra traffic.	47,
Downslink should not be built on or interrupted as is an important link for the village.	57,
But what about surrounding infrastructure notably the disaster that will befall the A281 such that nobody will actually be able to leave Cranleigh!	61,
Again pavement quality needs to be vastly improved.	63,
Large delivery vans should not be allowed to 'off-load' in the High Street between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm to enable a fair flow of traffic.	65,
Don't know.	66,

Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number

**Page 2 of 2**



CNP14 - COMMENTS	Questionnaire No
<b>Do you agree with this Policy?</b>	
<b>Policy CNP14: Telecommunications</b> <i>a. development should demonstrate how it will reinforce existing telecommunications, including mobile signals, to serve the development; and</i> <i>b. development should provide each dwelling with access to new broadband services infrastructure, notably fibre to the home technology.</i> <i>c. the provision of essential infrastructure for telecommunications will be supported where it is of a scale and design appropriate to Cranleigh and would not cause undue visual intrusion or have an unacceptable and damaging impact on the setting of the AONB, AGLV, ASVI, the Cranleigh Conservation Area or the landscape setting and the character of Cranleigh.</i>	
COMMENTS	Questionnaire No
How - private companies! What about electric points for battery cars - no mention	2,
Come and live in Alfold Road, mobile phone signal poor, broadband ok but often drops away.	3,
Broadband speeds - better access - less traffic!	4,
Essential.	24,
Cranleigh's access to high speed broadband is awful.	35,
Should be policy to retrofit to all existing properties as well.	36,
Well lets not get into internet etc. Should of course be user friendly for all - Not user error.	42,
We are unable to use our phones in all rooms of our house. Signal is still very weak.	53,
Good broadband facilities is a must.	62,
Don't know.	66,

Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number

**CNP15 - COMMENTS**

**Do you agree with this Policy?**

**Policy CNP15: Water Supply and Wastewater Infrastructure**

*All development proposals impacting on the sewage treatment works, sewerage infrastructure, water supply and water quality will require the following:*

- a. applications should include proposals for the reinforcement of existing water supply and wastewater infrastructure to serve the development; and*
- b. it is essential that developers demonstrate that adequate water supply and sewerage infrastructure capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances, this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water & sewerage infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the water company, then the developer needs to contact the water company to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development.”*
- c. drainage on the site must maintain separation of foul and surface flows; and*
- d. where there is an infrastructure capacity constraint the Planning Authority will require the developer to set out what appropriate improvements are required and how they will be delivered prior to occupation; and*
- e. on site pumping stations should be avoided. Where no reasonable alternative exists, they should be sited away from existing and new residential development and be surrounded by an appropriate exclusion zone to avoid odour and noise nuisance and include plans for its ongoing monitoring and maintenance.*
- f. proposals are expected to consider the impact on water quality and biodiversity in line with current legislation and any adverse impacts accompanied by identified and adequately funded mitigation measures.*

<b>CNP15 - COMMENTS</b>	<b>Questionnaire No</b>
Bellway site has onsite pump!	4,
Water companies need to be aware of aging pipe concerns/leaks etc. on going modernisation of all services, sewage treatment.	5,
This another key policy that must be adhered to given Cranleigh's position and history.	20,
Don't understand how Cranleigh sewage works can provide the capacity unless further water treatment to remove residual chemicals e.g. Nitrates	28,
Existing new developments in progress contravene some of these policies.	32,
With the high frequency of leaks all existing water pipework should be upgraded to suitable blue plastic piping.	36,
This policy is essential and the sewerage facilities in Cranleigh should be expanded and improved before permission is given for any more houses to be built in the village. The tardiness of Thames Water to replace old disintegrating pipes in the village, including those made of blue asbestos is disgraceful and is resulting in frequent water pipe bursts which cause lack of water to residents sometimes for more than 24 hours.	37,
I feel that the building development already approved on the Elmbridge Road site, appears to have disregard to which is basically/originally a flood plain. I cannot see any evidence to this being addressed so far.	39,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

## CNP15 - COMMENTS

**Do you agree with this Policy?**

### **Policy CNP15: Water Supply and Wastewater Infrastructure**

*All development proposals impacting on the sewage treatment works, sewerage infrastructure, water supply and water quality will require the following:*

- a. applications should include proposals for the reinforcement of existing water supply and wastewater infrastructure to serve the development; and*
- b. it is essential that developers demonstrate that adequate water supply and sewerage infrastructure capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances, this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water & sewerage infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the water company, then the developer needs to contact the water company to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development.”*
- c. drainage on the site must maintain separation of foul and surface flows; and*
- d. where there is an infrastructure capacity constraint the Planning Authority will require the developer to set out what appropriate improvements are required and how they will be delivered prior to occupation; and*
- e. on site pumping stations should be avoided. Where no reasonable alternative exists, they should be sited away from existing and new residential development and be surrounded by an appropriate exclusion zone to avoid odour and noise nuisance and include plans for its ongoing monitoring and maintenance.*
- f. proposals are expected to consider the impact on water quality and biodiversity in line with current legislation and any adverse impacts accompanied by identified and adequately funded mitigation measures.*

This is a critical area. The current sewage works cannot cope with the existing load. Thames water have indicated it will take them 7 years to build sufficient capacity for the proposed development. What happens in the meantime? Cranleigh Waters is already heavily polluted. No development should be allowed to start (let alone be occupied) unless and until the developer has secured proper sewage treatment.	40,
Great policy, but Waverley wont support it so it wont happen.	41,
Yes we need clean/clear, asbestos free water for all.	42,
Issue of considerable concern.	47,
Very important to act now!	53,
Any future application for development must not just be assessed as part of the cumulative effect on the infrastructure - not just as an individual application.	55,
This must be enforced as Cranleigh has a terrible history of localised flooding.	57,
Has anything been done about the existing issues? Will there be major new works and refurbishments with the completion of these huge numbers of new houses?	61,
It is essential that new developments have adequate water supply and sewerage infrastructure.	62,
All water pipes filled between 1960-1980 should be automatically replaced - to avoid burst pipes and contamination by asbestos.	65,
Don't know.	66,

Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number

Page 2 of 2

## CNP16 - COMMENTS

**Do you agree with this Policy?**

### Policy CNP16: Gas and Electricity Infrastructure

Development should include proposals for the reinforcement of existing utility infrastructure for electricity and gas to serve the development.

### COMMENTS

Should have been implemented before current developments. No other country in the world allow this scale of development without the following: Schools, Doctors, Transport, Cycle Way, Waterways, Flooding, Local places for work. 3 years too late. Its all an expensive document and means nothing, just a dream - Tick box exercise.

**Questionnaire  
No**

2,

Will have problems if water and power are inadequate, surface water really does need to be worked through because of our history of flooding.

3,

How about upgrade whole village!

4,

But don't want pylons for the electricity.

8,

Excellent idea!

35,

Electrical supply in particular as Cranleigh is prone to outages.,

36,

Again Cranleigh often experience electricity outages inconveniencing residents especially those who either work from home or in the village. Maintenance of a reliable electricity supply is essential.

37,

Not enough thought is given to improving existing infrastructure in my opinion. The same applies to the Health Centre, for obtaining appointments, roads are already impassable when large lorries are delivering supplies. The High Street can at times be impassable.

39,

Water pipes already being replaced, lets hope gas doesn't start leaking like the water pipes.

42,

Very important.

55,

Underground electricity infrastructure should be a requirement. All new development should be connected to mains gas.

62,

Don't know.

66,

*Every questionnaire that was completed and received before 5pm Friday 20th July 2018 has been given its own individual reference number*

**Page 1 of 1**