

Schedule of Examiner's Recommendations and MVDC Response, as agreed at Mole Valley District Council meeting 6 December 2016

Policy	Examiner's recommendation(s)	Reasons (summary)	Recommended MVDC response
Section 3.6	<p>Include additional supporting text:</p> <p><i>The neighbourhood plan will be reassessed at the time of the adoption of the emerging Mole Valley Local Plan. At that time an assessment will be made of the extent to which the policies in that Plan may make the policies in the Ashtead Neighbourhood Plan out of date. That process will then inform a decision on the need or otherwise to update the Plan or those parts of it most directly affected by the adoption of the Local Plan.</i></p>	<p>The plan needs to address how it will be reviewed and updated in changing circumstances. The adoption of the emerging Local Plan will represent an important change in development plan circumstances.</p>	<p>Accept recommendation.</p>
AS-H1: Land at Murreys Court	<p><b>Replace the policy with the following:</b></p> <p><b>Residential development of the Murreys Court site should include the provision of a new public footpath that will connect the site with the existing footpath between Agates Lane and Skinners Lane.</b></p>	<p>There is no need for the neighbourhood plan to repeat existing policy approaches in the body of the policy. Relocating these elements to the supporting text will bring the clarity required by the NPPF. The reader of the plan would be assisted if there was convenient access to Appendix 11 of</p>	<p>Accept recommendation, but reinstate reference to The Murreys as per original policy wording.</p> <p>Amend policy to read:  <b>Residential development of the Murreys Court site should include the provision of a new</b></p>

Policy	Examiner's recommendation(s)	Reasons (summary)	Recommended MVDC response
	<p><i>Include at the end of the third paragraph of the text in 4.1.3: These design criteria remain applicable and should be addressed as part of the development of future planning applications. The Local Plan appendix is reproduced as Appendix (insert number) of this Plan</i></p> <p><i>Include the following additional supporting text at the end of that currently set out at 4.1.3:</i></p> <p><i>Policy AS-H1 provides a policy context to secure this new footpath connection. Once established it will provide a convenient route between the new development on the site and The Street. The footpath and any associated lighting should take account of the MVDC Designing Out Crime Supplementary Planning Document (December 2011) and any specific design requirements requested by Surrey County Council with regards to a safe crossing point across Agates Lane.</i></p>	<p>the adopted Local Plan.</p>	<p><b>public footpath that will connect <u>The Murreys and</u> the site with the existing footpath between Agates Lane and Skinners Lane.</b></p> <p>Amend supporting text to read: <i>Policy AS-H1 provides a policy context to secure this new footpath connection. Once established it will provide a convenient route between <u>The Murreys</u>, the new development on the site and The Street.</i></p> <p>(additional text underlined)</p> <p>Reason: The examiner's recommendations do not raise any concerns about the element of the original policy which proposed connecting the existing housing at The Murreys with the proposed footpath. The amended wording clarifies this point.</p> <p>Insert MVLP Appendix 11 as Appendix 4 of the NDP.</p> <p>Update numbering of subsequent Appendices.</p>

Policy	Examiner's recommendation(s)	Reasons (summary)	Recommended MVDC response
<p>AS-H2: Balancing the Housing Mix</p>	<p><b>Delete 'or as near to them as possible' and replace with 'insofar as these proportions would be consistent with the size of the site and the development of a good layout and design in relation to the immediate locality'.</b></p> <p><b>Modify the second part of the policy by replacing 'will be encouraged' with 'over and above those set out in the first part of this policy will be supported'</b></p> <p><i>Include additional supporting text at the end of 4.1.4 to read:</i></p> <p><i>'Policy AS-H2 sets out a policy approach towards addressing this matter. It attempts to strike a balance between allowing the market to deliver high quality housing for five or more dwellings in an innovative style and providing housing to meet the needs for smaller dwellings. Plainly a wide range of sites may be affected by this policy. As such it sets out to ensure that the developments concerned are consistent with their locations within the Plan area.'</i></p>	<p>To provide greater clarity, particularly about the way flexibility should be exercised, taking into account the circumstances and location of the site concerned.</p> <p>To include consideration of viability issues in the supporting text.</p>	<p>Accept recommendation.</p>

Policy	Examiner's recommendation(s)	Reasons (summary)	Recommended MVDC response
	<p><i>There may be circumstances where the viability of developing a site may conflict with the successful implementation of this policy. In these circumstances developers will be expected to adopt an open book approach with the District Council as part of the determination of the application.</i></p> <p><i>The second part of the policy provides support for proposals that propose the provision of a greater number of 1/2/3 bedroom and a lesser number of 4 or more bedroom properties than those expected from the application of the first part of the policy.'</i></p>		
AS-H3: Infill and Smaller Sites	<p><b>Modify the first and second components of the policy as follows:</b></p> <p><b>1. Replace 'will be sought' with 'should be provided' and 'may' with 'should'.</b></p> <p><b>2. Replace 'will be sought' with 'should be provided', 'previously undeveloped' with 'all other' and 'may' with 'should'.</b></p>	For similar reasons as AS-H2: To provide greater clarity, including reference to the circumstances and location of the site. Also to include consideration of viability issues in the supporting text.	Accept recommendation.

Policy	Examiner's recommendation(s)	Reasons (summary)	Recommended MVDC response
	<p><b>Include a separate section to the policy to read:</b></p> <p><b>In all housing developments of this size the mix of housing types should also be consistent with achieving a good layout and design in relation to the immediate locality.</b></p> <p><i>Insert additional supporting text at the end of 4.1.4 (and to come immediately after that recommended above in relation to Policy H2):</i></p> <p><i>Policy AS-H3 provides a similar approach for smaller housing sites to that adopted for policy AS-H2. The viability issues will also apply to these potential smaller sites.</i></p>		
AS-H4: Central Area Developments	<p><b>Replace 'new dwellings.... wishing to downsize' with '1, 2 or 3 bedroom properties', and 'are particularly encouraged' with 'will be particularly supported'.</b></p>	<p>To clarify the definition of "smaller dwellings" and refine the policy language.</p>	<p>Accept recommendation.</p>

Policy	Examiner's recommendation(s)	Reasons (summary)	Recommended MVDC response
AS-H5: Maintaining Built Character	<p><i>Insert an additional sentence of supporting text at the end of 4.1.5 to read:</i></p> <p><i>The policy applies throughout the Plan area.</i></p>	To clarify the geographical extent of the policy.	Accept recommendation.
AS-H6: Off Street Parking	No modifications recommended.	The policy meets the basic conditions as it stands.	N/A
AS-EC1: Barnett Wood Lane Shops	<p><b>Delete 'in addition to.... Proposals Map'.</b></p> <p><b>Insert 'and as reproduced in Appendix (insert number) of this Plan' at the end of the policy.</b></p>	<p>It is not necessary to include the reference to existing Local Shopping Areas which are already designated in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The existing Local Plan policy should be included as an Appendix to assist the reader.</p>	<p>Accept recommendation.</p> <p>Insert MVLP policy S5 and Core Strategy policy CS8 as Appendix 5 of the NDP.</p> <p>Update numbering of subsequent Appendices.</p>
AS-EC2: Existing Public Houses	<p><b>Replace 'be resisted' with 'not be supported'</b></p> <p><b>Delete 'in accordance....CS17'</b></p> <p><i>Insert after the first sentence of 4.2.3: 'Policy AS-EC2 indicates that these facilities will be safeguarded in</i></p>	To provide clarity on the wording of the policy and transpose the reference to the relevant core strategy policy to the supporting text.	Accept recommendation.

Policy	Examiner's recommendation(s)	Reasons (summary)	Recommended MVDC response
	<i>accordance with policy CS17 of the adopted Core Strategy'.</i>		
AS EC3: 53-57 The Street	<p><b>Replace the policy with the following:</b></p> <p><b>Proposals for the redevelopment of 53-57 The Street for retail purposes will be supported subject to the following criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>the proposal is of a scale appropriate both to the retail function of The Street and its design and townscape. Proposals should not have a net sales area greater than 700 square metres and a gross floor area of 1350 square metres; and</b></li> <li>• <b>no more than 10% of the net sales area should be used for the sale of comparison goods; and</b></li> <li>• <b>the customer access to the store should be from The Street only.</b></li> </ul>	<p>The policy is overly-prescriptive as submitted, although its general approach is clear and appropriate. The modifications would made its approach more criteria-based and address generic planning matters rather than repeating the conditions applied to earlier planning permissions.</p>	<p>Accept recommendation.</p> <p>Also amend footnote below policy to read:</p> <p><i>In the above policy “comparison goods” refers to goods such as clothes and electrical equipment, for which the consumer generally expects to invest time and effort into visiting a range of shops before making a choice. In contrast, convenience goods are goods such as food, newspapers and drinks, which tend to be purchased regularly and for which convenience of purchase is therefore important.</i></p> <p>Reason: to update the definition following deletion of the term “convenience goods” from the policy wording.</p>
AS-EN1: School	<p><b>In the first sentence replace ‘allow for’ with ‘include’.</b></p>	<p>For clarity and to more clearly relate to the community's expectation that decisions on school expansion</p>	<p>Accept recommendation.</p>

Policy	Examiner's recommendation(s)	Reasons (summary)	Recommended MVDC response
Playing Fields	<p><b>Replace the second sentence of the policy with the following:</b></p> <p><b>'Planning applications for the expansion of schools and associated facilities should also demonstrate that the retained playing field space has taken account of its potential for wider community use outside school hours'.</b></p>	proposals demonstrate that they have addressed the value of the playing fields to the wider community.	
AS-EN2: Amenity Spaces	<b>Replace 'must be.... that' with 'should' and 'retains' with 'retain'</b>	For clarity	Accept recommendation.
AS-EN3: Retaining Character	No modifications recommended.	The policy meets the basic conditions as it stands.	N/A
AS-INF1: Improving Health Facilities	<b>Replace 'expand' with 'extend'.</b>	The modified wording is land use based.	Accept recommendation.
AS-INF2: Pedestrian Access	No modifications recommended.	The policy meets the basic conditions as it stands.	N/A
AS-INF3: Valued	<b>In the first part of the policy replace 'named above' with 'listed in section</b>	To bring the clarity required by the	Accept recommendation.

Policy	Examiner's recommendation(s)	Reasons (summary)	Recommended MVDC response
Community Facilities	<p><b>4.6 of this Plan' and 'set out' with 'required by'.</b></p> <p><b>In the second part of the policy replace 'that result in' with 'for', 'existing valued community' with 'these' and 'the' with 'their'. Delete 'of the proposals'</b></p>	NPPF.	
AS-INF4: Infrastructure Priorities	No modifications recommended.	The policy meets the basic conditions as it stands.	Accept recommendation.