

LIMPSFIELD CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLAN**CONSULTATION STATEMENT MAY 2022****1. INTRODUCTION****The Purpose of the Statement**

1.1 This Consultation Statement has been prepared in accordance with Tandridge District Council's Statement of Community Involvement and with Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. Regulation 12 states that, before a local planning authority adopts a supplementary planning document, it must prepare a statement setting out

- (i) the persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the supplementary planning document;
- (ii) a summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
- (iii) how those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document.

1.2 When adopted by Tandridge District Council, the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan will constitute a Supplementary Planning Document, giving guidance to residents, local authorities and developers on what is special about the Area and how this can be conserved and enhanced. This statement is therefore a record of the consultation undertaken during its preparation and at the formal public consultation stage and explains how comments have been taken into account in preparing the final document. It includes a record of the public meeting held in accordance with Section 71 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The Preparation of the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan

1.3 Limpsfield Village was designated a Conservation Area in February 1973 but since that time there has been no formal appraisal of the Area and no management plan. In June 2019, Tandridge District Council adopted a Neighbourhood Plan for the Parish of Limpsfield. The Plan contained a commitment by Limpsfield Parish Council, working with Tandridge District Council, to prepare a conservation area appraisal and management plan (CAAMP). Surrey County Council was engaged as a consultant and a draft CAAMP was prepared. As a broad objective, the CAAMP seeks to identify what is special about the Limpsfield Village Conservation Area and how this can be conserved and enhanced.

1.4 As part of the process, the Appraisal included an Audit of Heritage Assets which was used to recommend changes to the boundary of the Conservation Area. Once approved by Tandridge District Council, these changes will be formally publicised in the London Gazette and at least one newspaper circulating in the local area, as required by Section 70 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and the Secretary of State will be notified.

2. INITIAL CONSULTATION: OCTOBER-NOVEMBER 2020

2.1 Early in the preparation of the CAAMP and before a draft document had been prepared, the Parish Council carried out a consultation exercise with residents living in, or close to, the Conservation Area. Over the weekend of the 17th and 18th October 2020, approximately 350 leaflets were distributed advising residents of the work being done and seeking their views. The consultation was advertised on the Parish Council’s website and a webinar was held on the 10th November. The consultation ran until Friday 27th November 2020.

2.2 Comments were received from 7 members of the public. A summary of the comments received and the response to them is attached as Appendix 1

3 FORMAL CONSULTATION FEBRUARY-MARCH 2022 AND PUBLIC MEETING 7 APRIL 2022

Who was consulted and how

3.1 Tandridge District Council, working with Limpsfield Parish Council, carried out a formal consultation under Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 between 21 February 2022 and 21 March 2022, inviting comments on the draft CAAMP. The consultation was carried out in accordance with the Council’s adopted [Statement of Community Involvement \(2020\)](#) and legislative requirements.

3.2 The Council utilised the Council’s Local Plan consultee database to carry out the formal consultation, to ensure that all those who have previously sought to get involved and have their say on emerging planning policies could do so. The database includes all prescribed and statutory bodies who needed to be notified of the consultation and invited to make comment. These are set out in Table 1.

Table 1 - List of local authorities and prescribed bodies that were consulted

The Environment Agency
Historic England
The Woodland Trust
Natural England
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
Adjoining Local Planning Authorities (including necessary County Councils and adjoining Parish Councils)
Relevant Telecommunications Companies
Clinical Commissioning Groups (formerly the Primary Care Trust)
Relevant utility companies (including gas, electricity and water)
The Homes and Communities Agency
National Highways (formerly the Highways England)

- 3.3 The Council is also required to consult with general bodies which include those listed below, along with any parties who have shown an interest in the preparation of the Local Plan and the general public (Table 2).

Table 2- List of other body consultee categories

Voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit any part of the local planning authority's area
Bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethical or national groups in the local planning authority's area
Bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the local planning authority's area
Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the local planning authority's area
Bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the local planning authority's area, such as voluntary organisations and those that live and do business in the area.

- 3.4 As part of the formal consultation, those affected by the proposed conservation area boundary changes were also consulted. Occupants of 26 properties affected by the boundary changes were consulted and received a letter inviting them to comment on the draft.
- 3.5 In total 6978 people were directly invited to participate in the consultation.
- 3.6 All consultees were informed of the draft plan via an email or letter invitation to the consultation (Appendix 2). Included within the letter and posted in the email was key information including how to view the document, which could be done through the Council's website, at Oxted Library and at the Council offices. The invitation also provided instructions on how to submit comments, which could be done via the Council's online consultation portal, Objective, or by email or letter.
- 3.7 Notice of the consultation was also published as part of the Council's e-newsletter and through various social media channels throughout the four weeks of consultation to ensure people were aware of it.
- 3.8 In addition, Limpsfield Parish Council prepared a leaflet summarising the background to the CAAMP, indicating where and how the CAAMP could be viewed and inviting comments. This was circulated to all properties in Limpsfield Parish.
- 3.9 In accordance with Section 71 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, a public meeting was held at St Peters Church Hall Limpsfield on Thursday

April 7th. A presentation on the CAAMP was made and comments were requested. Approximately 50 people attended the meeting.

3.10 A list of the individuals and organisations who made representations is set out in Appendix 3.

Comments Received and Issues Raised

3.11 16 responses were received during the course of the formal consultation. A further 2 organisations and 1 individual responded after the deadline. 8 people commented or raised questions at the Public Meeting. A list of those responding is included as Appendix 3.

3.12 The written comments received during the consultation together with the joint response from Tandridge District Council and Limpsfield Parish Council are summarised in Appendix 4.

3.13 The comments and questions raised at the public meeting together with the response and proposed actions are summarised in Appendix 5.

4 CHANGES TO THE CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLAN FOLLOWING THE FORMAL CONSULTATION

4.1 Comments indicating support for the CAAMP, either in its entirety or with respect to particular components, were duly noted. Other comments and suggestions were also noted and were responded to as set out in Appendices 4 and 5. Some of these comments did not require or did not result in changes being made to the document and the reasons for this are set out in the Appendices. Others have resulted in minor changes. Again, Appendices 4 and 5 set out the comments, the response and the proposed actions. The changes proposed are summarised below.

The Appraisal

4.2 A number of small changes have been made to reflect historical and other information provided by respondents.

Boundary changes

4.3 Two minor adjustments have been made to reflect property boundaries.

Management Plan

4.4 Traffic and parking were the issues which raised the greatest volume of comment with a number of respondents suggesting further measures to reduce traffic in the High Street,

such as a one-way system. During the preparation of the CAAMP consideration was given to more radical and ambitious solutions to traffic issues in the High Street, including a one-way system. It was, however, the Highway Authority's opinion that this would not be possible owing to the difficulty of using the road junction at the end of Detillens Lane. Concerns were also raised about the impact on residents in Detillens Lane and also businesses in the High Street. Whilst it is not considered that the CAAMP should be amended to include these measures, a change has been made to section 9, 'Schemes of Preservation and Enhancement' to reflect the issue. Paragraph 3.1 has been amended to indicate that, as part of the traffic and parking scheme, Limpsfield Parish Council should seek a formal response from the Local Highway Authority to explain why traffic cannot be routed away from the High Street.

- 4.5 In addition, amendments have been made adding speed management surveys to the schemes of preservation and enhancement.
- 4.6 An amendment has also been made clarifying the timescales referred to in the Management Plan

APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS DURING CONSULTATION OCTOBER-NOVEMBER 2020

Limpsfield Village Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan Initial Consultation October-November 2020

During the preparation of the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, the Parish Council carried out a consultation exercise with residents living in, or close to, the Conservation Area. Over the weekend of the 17th and 18th October 2020, approximately 350 leaflets were distributed advising residents of the work being done and seeking their views.

The consultation was advertised on the Council's website and a webinar was held on the 10th November. The consultation ran until Friday 27th November 2020.

Comments were received from 7 members of the public. Tandridge District Council, with whom the Parish Council was liaising and who would ultimately take responsibility for the Appraisal and Management Plan, were also notified and indicated their support for the project. Three Parish Councillors also commented on the work, indicating areas that they considered might be included in the Management Plan.

Summary of Comments from Members of the Public	Action Taken
Traffic in the High Street including HGVs and Speeding	
<p>Try to solve the problem of traffic congestion in the High Street. The number of large vehicles using the road is inappropriate Apply a weight limit to trucks passing through the village.</p> <p>Restrict cars and create a one-way system with the other direction going via Detillens Lane.</p> <p>Introduce measures to strengthen the 20mph speed limit zone, including clearer marking on the road near the traffic lights and the miniroundabout.</p> <p>Take the through traffic out of the High Street by by-passing the village on its eastern side.</p>	<p>Traffic was the most commonly raised issue in the initial consultation and as a result the impact of vehicles, in particular on the High Street, has been recognised within the Management Plan. As part of the initial consultation discussion was held with Surrey County Council who advised that any substantial changes would have to be supported by a Traffic Management Plan. They advised that this was high risk as it would likely conclude there were no suitable alternatives to the current situation. This is because of the adverse impact diverting traffic would have on residents in other parts of Limpsfield or because of financial and environmental limitations of alternatives.</p> <p>Schemes 3.1-3.5 of the Management Plan provide options for alleviating issues with traffic, speeding and HGVs. These have been designed so they are realistic and achievable and allow the Parish Council to take any opportunities should they become available.</p>
Conservation Area Boundary	
<p>Extend the geographical coverage of the Conservation Area to help stop the creation of properties that look out of place in the area around the current conservation area boundary.</p> <p>Resolve anomalies in the existing boundaries, including the possibility of including Padbrook in a similar way to the current inclusion of Stanhopes.</p> <p>Undertake a full review of the Conservation Area boundary, not just 'tidying up', in order to prevent inappropriately designed developments, close to the Conservation Area</p>	<p>As part of the Appraisal a thorough review has been undertaken of the Conservation Area boundary taking into account all issues and sites raised during the consultation. It is vital that any alterations to the boundary reflect what makes Limpsfield Village an area of special architectural or historic interest. Including areas which do not reflect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area weakens the whole designation and provides allowances for unsympathetic development. It would also be contrary to paragraph 191 of the NPPF.</p>

	<p>Any proposed additions or removals from the designation are in line with Historic England Advice Note (Second Edition) 1: Conservation Area Appraisal, Designation and Management which is the relevant professional guidance on the issue. The boundary changes to the Conservation Area are set out in Section 7 of the Appraisal. The fact these changes are only minor reflects the high degree of preservation in Limpsfield Village Conservation Area and the very clear boundaries which the area has. Consideration has been given as to how to reinforce these boundaries and prevent any inappropriate development in the future.</p>
<p>Use of Article 4 Directions</p>	
<p>Consider Article 4 directions. Greater clarity on materials used and alterations permitted would help retain the character. Article 4 Directions are potentially important and should be considered. Objection to residents living in the Conservation area being denied their permitted development rights through an Article 4 Direction.</p>	<p>Different opinions were submitted on this issue with two consultees, in principle, being in favour and one opposed. Taking into account these comments and the current local and national planning context, no Article 4 measures have been proposed but the option for them in the future has been kept under review. Items which may be considered for Article 4 Direction in the future are set out under section 12.</p>
<p>Dorothy's Cottage</p>	
<p>Consider enforcement measures to address the eyesore which is Dorothy's Cottage. Address the future of Dorothy's Cottage, one of the longest running conservation sores in Limpsfield.</p>	<p>The Dorothy's Cottage site has been addressed in items 6.1-6.3 of the Management Plan. The best solution to this issue would be for the owner or a future owner to implement the live permission granted under 2012/229.</p>

APPENDIX 2: Draft Limpsfield Village Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan Consultation Letter

Date: 18 February 2022

Dear

Consultation on the draft Limpsfield Village Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan

We are conducting a four-week public consultation on the draft Limpsfield Village Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, which has been produced by the Historic Environment Team at Surrey County Council, on behalf of the Limpsfield Parish Council.

To view the draft plan, please visit www.tandridge.gov.uk/limpsfield. Paper copies are available at, Oxted Library and the Council Offices in Oxted. Please book an appointment to come to the Council Offices in Oxted by e-mailing customerservices@tandridge.gov.uk, or calling 01883 722000.

The draft plan is an important policy commitment within the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan (2019). It has been prepared by Limpsfield Parish Council who, in conjunction with us, appointed Surrey County Council's Historic Environment Planning Team to manage the project. Once approved and adopted it will form a Supplementary Planning Document which guides Council decisions in the conservation area.

The consultation runs from 9am on Monday 21 February until 5pm on Monday 21 March 2022 and you can comment by:

- Using the consultation portal at <https://tandridge-consult.objective.co.uk/kse>.
- E-mailing neighbourhoodplans@tandridge.gov.uk.
- Writing to The Strategy Team, Tandridge District Council, 8 Station Road East, Oxted, RH8 0BT.

If you have any questions, please e-mail lpc.conservationarea@gmail.com or write to the Parish Council, The Pound, Wolf's Row, Limpsfield, Oxted, Surrey RH8 0EB.

Yours sincerely,



Cliff Thurlow
Interim Chief Planning Officer

APPENDIX 3: LIST OF RESPONDENTS TO THE FORMAL CONSULTATION

FEBRUARY-MARCH 2022 AND AT THE PUBLIC MEETING

First Name	Surname	Statutory / Resident	Organisation	Comment ID
Comments Received during the Formal Consultation				
Richard	Carr	Statutory	Transport for London	1
Amanda	Purdye	Statutory	Gatwick Airport Limited (Safeguarding)	2
Gareth	Niceday	Resident		3
Piers	White	Resident		4
Stephen and Katie	Tuddenham	Resident		5
Richard	Wright	Resident		6
Paul	Wade	Statutory	Elmbridge Borough Council	7
Clive	Smith	Statutory	Surrey Hills AONB	8
Claire	Blackwell	Resident		9
Johanna	Piper	Resident		10
Christian and Claire	Turner	Resident		11
Nicholas	Merritt	Resident		12
Megan	Edison	Resident		13
Helen	Dixon	Resident		14
John	Berbuto	Resident		15
Thomasin	Davis	Statutory	Historic England	16
Comments Received after the Consultation had closed				
Claire	Scott	Resident		17
Janice	Burgess	Statutory	National Highways	18
Paige	Eke-Goodwin	Statutory	Natural England	27
Comments Received at the Public Meeting				
Kevin	Ludbrook	Resident		19
	Anonymous	Resident		20
Helen	Ellson	Resident		21
Bob	Harvey	Resident		22
Nick	Skellett	Resident		23
David	Bell	Resident		24
Sheila	Mundell	Resident		25
Lucy	Stuart Lee	Resident		26

APPENDIX 4: FORMAL CONSULTATION FEBRUARY-MARCH 2022
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS, RESPONSES AND ACTIONS

Summary of Comments Received During the Consultation Period			
Comment ID	Summary of Content	Response	Action
General Comments			
7	No comment	Duly noted	No action required
1	No comment	Duly noted	No action required
16	Support for the production of the statement and management plan. Confirmation that the legislative background has been carefully studied in line with Historic England Guidance <i>Understanding Place: Designation and Management of Conservation Areas (2019)</i>	Duly Noted	No action required
8	Consider the document to be excellently prepared and should ensure that the Conservation Area is conserved, enhanced in such a way that it continues to be complementary to the adjoining AONB	Duly noted	No action required
9	Support for the draft – well thought out and informed. Particular support for the way the Plan sets out a vision for the Area	Duly noted	No action required
3	Does not support the draft; there is not enough money for schemes such as this and the use of money on the appraisal is queried	The CAAMP was funded by Limpsfield Parish Council on the guidance of the Neighbourhood Plan, part of the Statutory Development Plan as adopted by Tandridge District Council. This is set out clearly in the Introduction to the CAAMP. The document is valuable in assisting planning officers with ensuring they can carry out their statutory duty under the Planning (Listed	No action required.

		Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and also assists residents and developers in Limpsfield Village.	
11	Support for the Plan's efforts to maintain the character of the High Street through, for example, consistency of building works	Duly noted	No action required
14	Support for adoption in principle subject to revision to reflect comments made on the document	Duly noted. Specific issues raised by the consultees have been addressed below	Action as indicated in relation to specific issues
15	Adoption in current form not supported	Duly noted. Specific issues raised by the consultees have been addressed below	Action as indicated in relation to specific issues
4	Full support for the document	Duly noted	No action required
14	It is unclear what the timescale is for actions in the management plan. Make the plan more specific	It is intended that any short-term schemes are within 5 years. To reflect this better, it is proposed to amend the phrase to 'short to medium term.' No timescale is proposed for long term schemes. This is because long term schemes relate to when opportunities become available.	Amendment proposed to change short term to 'short to medium term' and to advise the timescales this may involve.
5	Congratulations on the quality of the document	Duly noted	No action required
15	There is a danger of Limpsfield becoming a replica English Village.	Consideration has been given as part of the appraisal and management plan to ensure that schemes reveal the character and appearance of Limpsfield as a distinct and unique Conservation Area, not as a twee or faux historic heritage attraction.	No amendment proposed
Appraisal (Clarification of Details)			
11	'Miles the Butchers' should be referred to as Miles House	The name used in the CAAMP document is the one in the List Entry for the building which is the reason for this error. The document should be corrected.	Name of Miles House to be amended in CAAMP and all other properties

			checked to make sure they refer to the current property name, not the List Entry name.
14	Possible discrepancy with respect to tithe map references (P11 para 4.4 3). Information held at the National Archives suggests that tithes could not have been commuted.	There are a number of properties clearly missing from the tithe map and it was initially considered that these were tithes that had been sold or commuted. Further research provided by a respondent has shown that in fact the rector of the Parish had not collected tithes for the period 1828-1835 for certain cottages in the village and had recommended that no rent charge should be collected from these properties. When the tithe map was drawn up this recommendation was followed and as a result the properties were not shown. Larger properties such as Detillens and The Bower are, by contrast, on the map. This will need to be made clear as part of the document.	Amendment required to rephrase 4.4.3 as: The 1841 tithe map shows that by the middle of the century the roads of Limpsfield Village had largely taken on their current layout. As the rector of the Parish had not exercised his right to collect tithes from certain cottages in Limpsfield prior to the map being produced, these properties are absent from the map but their plots are still shown.
5	Clarify what being mentioned as a positive building means	The criteria for positive buildings are set out in paragraph 7.1.6 of the document. In essence, this means that a positive building should be retained because it reveals the historic or architectural character of the conservation area.	No action required.
5	Garage not marked on map and could be identified in terms of its effect on the Conservation Area	A number of smaller buildings, such as garages, were not marked up on the Audit of Heritage Assets because they were too small to be of any consequence. Having said that,	Garage at Priest Hill Cottage to be marked as detracting on the Audit of

		the garage in question does have a harmful impact on the Conservation Area and it is proposed to mark this as 'detracting'. Maps will also be revised for the Boundary Review and Character Areas to ensure they are in sufficient detail to show smaller buildings.	Heritage Assets. Boundary Review and Character Area map to be produced in more detail to show all small buildings.
Renaming the Conservation Area			
3	Change to name of the Conservation Area not agreed; requests reasons for the change	The name change was proposed as there are other historic areas in the Parish which could in future be considered for Conservation Area designation. It was proposed to help differentiate them from each other	No amendment proposed
14	Support for name change	Duly noted	No action required
15	Support for name change	Duly noted	No action required
Boundary Changes			
3	Proposed boundary changes not supported. Why should they be changed?	The boundary change has been proposed in line with Historic England Advice Note 1 <i>Conservation Area Appraisal, Designation and Management</i> and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. This was deemed necessary as the boundary has not been revised since the Conservation Area was first designated in 1973.	No amendment proposed
14	Support for boundary changes	Duly noted	No action required
6	The boundary for one of the properties on the map is incorrect as it shows the location of a wooden fence, rather than exactly what is shown on a field plan registry document.	The revised boundary was drawn based on information available as part of the assessment. Owing to the new information available, a slight change is proposed to retain this area of road within the Conservation Area	A small area of road in Priest Hill will need to be retained.
4	Stanhopes was retained within the Conservation Area despite being built on	Consideration was given to removing Stanhopes in its entirety from the Conservation	No amendment proposed

	previously open land, but Detillens Lane has not been added. If there is not a good explanation for this, then Detillens Lane should be added.	Area as much of the housing is new. However, it was agreed that the design of all of the houses in Stanhopes had paid close attention to many of the features which reveal the character and appearance of Limpsfield Conservation Area. This includes the features identified in 6.5.1 of the appraisal. As outlined in 7.2.7 Detillens has a more suburban character. That is the difference between the two areas and the reason why one has been retained and the other not added.	
4	How and when could houses on Detillens Lane be included on the local list?	Scheme 8.2 of the Management Plan advises that Limpsfield Parish Council should nominate any buildings of historic or architectural interest for the Buildings of Character list. This review has now been undertaken and the results are being assessed by Surrey County Council. Should any buildings have not been nominated they should be submitted when the list is next reviewed in line with Historic England guidance.	No action required
5	Support inclusion of garden of Priest Hill Cottage in Conservation Area.	Duly noted	No action required
5	The boundary for the Priest Hill Cottage site is incorrect as it does not include the road which is in the same ownership	The boundary was drawn based on information available as part of the assessment. Owing to the new information available, a slight change is proposed to include this area of road.	Small area of road in Priest Hill will need to be included.
Management Plan (Paving/Hard Surfaces)			
14	Poor repairs to the paving are not just unsightly and inconsistent in style but are uneven and create a hazard for pedestrians. Full support for a fund to secure improvements although this may need to	Duly noted and comments passed on to stakeholders. For clarity, it is not the intention at the current time to re-pave the entire High Street. The proposed scheme recommends replacing any poor-quality repairs as soon as possible. Any trip hazards	No amendment proposed

	be supplemented. Given existing hazard seek urgent funding from local highways	should be reported to Surrey County Council at https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/do-it-online/report-it-online .	
14	Proposals to encourage or discourage the use of appropriate materials are too weak. Consider stronger mechanisms, including financial or other incentives	The provision of hard surfaces falls under permitted development rights in Conservation Areas and as such ironstone usage can often only be encouraged rather than insisted on. The Management Plan makes provision for small grants and this can be considered as part of the Preservation and Enhancement Fund	No amendment proposed
5	Paving. Many areas in poor condition. What timescales are proposed for addressing this?	The Management Plan proposes that repairs are carried out in the short term. Reinstatement will be for the long term. Amendments clarifying timescales are proposed. As per the comment in response to ID14 above, any loose paving should be reported to SCC.	Amendment proposed to change short term to 'short to medium term' and to advise the timescales this may involve.
15	Ironstone is expensive and difficult to find	In the short term there is a clear opportunity to insist that ironstone be retained when it is in situ. Long term schemes have been included to find a less expensive and easier to access source of ironstone.	No amendment proposed.
Management Plan (Traffic and Parking - general)			
11	Plan should be more ambitious in terms of traffic management addressing direct and indirect impact of goods vehicles and cars on buildings and historic character, pollution, pedestrian safety. Consider rerouting HGVs to Detillens Lane	Consideration was given to more radical and ambitious solutions to traffic issues in the High Street as part of the preparation of the CAAMP. This was raised as part of the initial consultation and by members on the working group. A meeting was held with the Highway Authority to consider if there were any other suitable alternatives to sending traffic down the High Street but, as also identified in the Neighbourhood Plan, there are no easy fix solutions as traffic has to be displaced elsewhere	Proposed amendment to 3.1 saying "As part of this scheme Limpsfield Parish Council should seek a formal response from the Local Highway Authority to explain why traffic cannot be routed away

		<p>(see below comments on Detillens Lane). A number of measures are proposed within the Management Plan to try and alleviate traffic issues. This includes developing a better protocol for working with the Highway Authority, reviewing on street parking, reviewing HGV signage and supporting a community speed watch scheme. Should alternatives become available, the Management Plan provides scope to allow stakeholders to explore this.</p> <p>Discussion was also held with Surrey County Council on re-routing traffic via Detillens Lane. It was the Highway Authority's opinion that this would not be possible owing to the difficulty of using the road junction at the end of Detillens Lane. Concerns were also raised on the impact on residents on Detillens Lane and also businesses on the High Street. As such it was agreed this would not be possible at the current time and could not be included as a scheme in the management plan. Should the situation change, the Management Plan provides the opportunity to reconsider this. Following comments received during the consultation it is now proposed the Parish Council get formal response from the Local Highway Authority explaining why this is not feasible.</p>	<p>from the High Street.”</p>
14	Traffic and Parking. P46 Section 3. Concern that past efforts to address issue have been to no avail and that is reflected in a lack of determination and ambition in this section	See above	See above

Management Plan (Traffic and Parking - reducing traffic)			
14	Traffic. High risk of accident due to the way traffic passes through the High Street. Need for radical solution limiting High Street to essential vehicles only. Review (para 3.2) should be given more urgency	See above	See above
14	Traffic. Consider one-way system and creation of no through road in the High Street	See above.	See above
10	Traffic and Parking. Negative impact of excessive traffic which has grown in recent years. High Street too narrow for current volumes making pavements dangerous Consider one-way system; diversion of buses.	See above	See above
12	High Street not built for modern traffic, especially with cars parked and people walking. Make the High Street one-way.	See above	See above
13	Traffic has a negative impact. A one-way system would be beneficial	See above	See above
5	Traffic. Consider one-way system to slow traffic, reduce traffic, and make better parking provision. Provide wider pavements and improve the character. Detillens Lane could handle the extra traffic	See above	See above
Management Plan (Traffic and Parking - Parking)			
14	Parking (3.4) Better indication of parking options available including signage and encouraging people to park by St Peter's Church.	As part of the management plan a parking review is proposed to encourage people to park elsewhere. Additional signage would cause visual clutter and would cause harm to the Conservation Area.	No amendment proposed.

10	Parking. Consider extended double lines outside Burstow	A parking review is proposed as part of the management plan.	No amendment proposed
15	Consider scrubland between Pebble Hill House and A25 as a car park	Section 3.4 of the Management Plan allows stakeholders to identify new locations for parking.	No amendment proposed
Management Plan (Traffic and Parking - Traffic Calming)			
14	Traffic (Signage (3.5)) Support for improvements with examples of obscured signs and worn-out markings	This has been discussed with Surrey Highways (as above) who are going to look at what could be done to improve road markings and existing signage. Should this prove ineffective, a speed management survey could be considered to justify new signage.	No amendment proposed but see below - response re speed management survey.
15	Traffic. Para 2.5 Speed limits should only be used if they are observed and enforced. Carry out a full-scale survey over weeks to understand the issues	The issue of speeding has been raised with Surrey Highways who have suggested the Parish Council could pay to monitor speeding on the High Street to investigate this issue further. The Management Plan already identifies the need to ensure speed signage is visible and that speed limits are respected.	Proposed amendment to add speed management surveys to the schemes of preservation and enhancement
14	Traffic. More effective traffic calming needed. Speed humps not effective	The design and location of the speed bumps has been raised with Surrey Highways who have indicated that the speed bump design is the most effective for slowing traffic. These may need to be altered to resolve drainage issues. Additional speed bumps would need to be paid for by Limpsfield Parish Council and would need to have a good evidence base to justify their construction. For this reason, a speed management survey is suggested above.	Amendment as above
Management Plan (Drainage)			
11	Support for efforts to persuade SCC to resolve issues with historic drainage problems and rectify wet spot areas.	Duly noted	No action required

Management Plan (Public Realm)			
15	Para 9.1 Special streetlights and bins expensive, unnecessary and a bit twee. Ironstone expensive and difficult to find. There is a danger of Limpsfield becoming a replica English Village.	The streetlights and street furniture were specific points raised as part of the consultation. The intention is to ensure there is a greater degree of consistency in terms of design throughout the Conservation Area. There is already a great deal of consistency and the scheme relates to identifying those areas where this is not the case. Replacing bins is not expensive and the Parish Council will need to consider whether the expense of replacing any streetlights is justified. Scheme 5.1 only commits stakeholders to investigating schemes.	No amendment proposed
Management Plan (Engagement)			
14	Other options for underlining the historic value of the village including plaques, guides, information in windows or QR codes should be considered. A new guide to the village should also be considered and a walking trail.	These are a number of good suggestions which have been fed back to the Parish Council. With the exceptions of plaques, which could cause visual clutter, there is scope for all of these elements within section 9.1 of the Management Plan.	No amendment proposed
Management Plan (Viewpoints)			
14	Pebble Hill Viewpoint. Strongly support recommendation.	Duly noted	No action required
14	Add reinstatement of view of 'Limpsfield Rocks'.	This view was not identified either through research or site visits as contributing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area either historically or today. While it is a good suggestion based on a historic photograph, it would involve the removal of trees which contribute to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area so it would not be encouraged. The rocks may become slightly more visible	No amendment proposed

		when the viewpoint at Pebble Hill is improved	
Management Plan (Funding)			
14	Funding. Support for Preservation and Enhancement Fund. Consider opportunity for local community initiatives.	Limpsfield Parish Council are content that they can set up the enhancement fund and work with Surrey County Council on the works set out, but this will ultimately be dependent on the resources available. Where possible, suggestions have been made to seek other sources of funding and this could be done with engagement from the local community.	No amendment proposed
New Development			
3	Insufficient provision made for new housing. The area is close to a range of local facilities, making it ideal for denser housing	The purpose of the appraisal is to identify what makes the Conservation Area of special architectural or historic interest, not to allocate housing to the area. By identifying what is of interest, the document helps developers and planners understand what is feasible in terms of development not just in the Conservation Area but also within its setting.	No amendment proposed
2	Request consultation on any proposals for wind turbines	Tandridge District Council already consult on wind turbines within 30km of Gatwick Airport. No wind turbines are being proposed.	No action required
Additional Comments Received After the Consultation Period			
18	No material effect on traffic levels on the Strategic Road Network and no concerns raised	Duly noted	No action required
27	No comments. Reference made to general guidance on woodland and protected species	Duly noted	No action required
17	Request to extend the brick paving along Detillens Cottages, replacing an area of patched up tarmac with a surface in keeping with the pretty historical village	The document allows as part of the management plan (scheme 1.1) for changes to paving within the Conservation Area which should take into account precedent, functionality and coherency. An argument could be made for extending the	No amendment proposed

		<p>paving along the front of these cottages to better define the Conservation Area boundary as part of a much wider scheme for the area. The document does not preclude this. In such an instance the decision would have to be made as to whether it is more appropriate to follow the original paving scheme, or to alter this. This would be a long-term scheme.</p>	
--	--	---	--

APPENDIX 5: PUBLIC MEETING APRIL 7TH 2022
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS, RESPONSES AND ACTIONS

Limpsfield Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan Summary of Comments Received at Public Meeting 7th April 2022			
Comment ID	Summary of Content	Response	Action
19	Does the Document provide specific guidance on the style and materials to be used when buildings in the Conservation Area are altered or refurbished?	Guidelines are set out in the policy guidance section. This includes guidance on windows, doors and porches and, in the context of extensions, roofs. However, it is recognised that each property is different and the guidance cannot be prescriptive	No action required
20	Concerned that new traffic controls in the High Street could push traffic onto other roads	The draft Management Plan recognises that substantial changes would have an adverse impact on other roads and that there may be no suitable alternatives to the current situation. The Management Plan therefore focuses on better management of the traffic passing through the High Street. A minor amendment is being considered to secure a formal response from the Highways Authority on traffic issues.	Minor amendment to the text of the Management Plan
21	Are there any plans for the site adjacent to Wolf's Row which was previously allotments? Concerned that the hedge along the side of the old allotments site on Westerham Road has been heavily cut back.	No plans for the site were discussed as part of the CAAMP as it is not in the Conservation Area, but it is in the Green Belt and proposals would have to be in line with Green Belt policies. As part of the CAAMP emphasis was given to the fact that the properties on Wolf's Row are only on one side of the road which reflects edge of common land development, should anything be proposed in the future. The Management Plan seeks to secure better integration of Wolf's Row with the rest of the Conservation Area.	No amendment proposed

22	Is there an increasing conflict between the conservation of historic buildings and the needs of the 21 st Century? We have to recognise circumstances have changed. For example, can advice be obtained on what can be done to secure better insulation where properties are single glazed?	The problems of climate change are recognised both nationally and locally and this requires a balance between conservation and energy efficiency. For example, the Management Plan outlines ways in which windows and doors may be repaired or replaced. The Historic Buildings Officer is able to give advice on specific proposals for listed buildings.	No amendment proposed
23	The document has an appendix listing the listed buildings. Does it address listed buildings that are 'at risk'?	There is a National Register of buildings at risk; however, this only deals with listed buildings of Grade 2* and above. There is not an up-to-date list covering all listed buildings in Surrey. The only listed building in the Conservation Area at risk is Dorothy's Cottage which is addressed in the Management Plan.	No amendment proposed
24	There used to be a leaflet about living in the Conservation Area, setting out what could and could not be done to buildings. It would be useful to have an updated version	There have been a lot of changes to permitted development in the last 30 years and the Parish Council will consider producing an updated document	No amendment proposed. However, the Parish Council will consider updating the leaflet.
22	White Hart Lodge was owned in the past by the McDougall family. The garden was left to the village to be green space but subsequently built on. Can this be prevented in the future?	Ultimately any issue such as this would be based on a legally restrictive covenant which is a legal matter, not a planning consideration, and could not be included in the CAAMP.	No amendment proposed
25	Is there a record of works to listed buildings for which permission has been sought and what should be done if unauthorised works are taking place?	Applications are recorded by Tandridge District Council. If there is a concern about works taking place, then they should be reported to Tandridge District Council's enforcement officer who will follow the matter up. Historic England provide advice on what does and does not need listed building consent in their guidance, but it is not	No amendment proposed

		prescriptive. The Historic Buildings Officer is happy to provide advice on this.	
26	Does the Document address the effect of telecommunications equipment and electric charging points on the Conservation Area	<p>The Management Plan contains a number of actions designed to improve the public realm. However, permitted development rights for telecommunications limit the extent to which this can be controlled, and it is almost impossible to remove these rights. This is also the same for electric charging points for cars and the highway authority. There are some permitted development rights for homeowners, but these are removed for listed buildings.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan makes provision for joint working with the Highway Authority to help secure local vehicle charging points</p>	No amendment proposed. Provision of local charging points to be referred to Limpsfield Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Group