

Vision and Key Planning Principles

All the proposed sites are outside the settlement. aii) "The proposed development must be appropriate to the site's context" is extremely vague

Policy PO2 should make clear that development proposals will be permitted within housing allocations. Policy PO3 - the last para of the Policy appears to conflict with para 4.4 point 4.

Policy PO1 ought to be updated / significantly more flexible to accommodate the potential changes to AGLV/AONB status (including the possible removal of AGLV status). There should be more than simple "regard" to proposal to expand AONB (I see expansion of the AONB as absolutely critical to this village), and clarification of what "regard" actually means in practice - how is this demonstrated? There is no analysis as to why or how the limited number of identified "key views" have been selected, and why this category is not more expansive. Policy PO2 settlement area is a key contentious point in the plan. This makes no sense to include preference for development within the settlement area/exceptional circumstances to allow development outside of the settlement whilst solely identifying sites outside of the settlement area in housing allocations. 3 of the 5 housing allocations do not on paper appear to meet Policy PO2. Policy PO3 - I generally agree with the concept of including a gap between Dunsfold village and Dunsfold park. However, the extent of Dunsfold Green Gap seems arbitrary in that it has excluded both the Springfield (Miller Lane) site and Coombebury. It also needs to acknowledge that some good can come of the development at Dunsfold Park - good transport links (footpath/bridleway access) to Dunsfold Park should be sought to enable residents of both areas to access facilities. Re the vision statement. I know this is high level, but this is far too vague. What does "embrace the changing nature of modern life" mean for a planning document? The vision statement ought to be a vision for the future, but a whole sentence simply tells us the status quo: "Dunsfold comprises the quintessential English country village and its network of surrounding hamlets, with the expectation that it will be set within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty." We need aspiration!

I fully appreciate the Parish Council have a difficult and unenviable task of trying to please everyone but in order for the plan to be defensible, I would expect to see: 1. Clear vision and aims 2. Clear policies that ensure the vision and aims are upheld 3. Required infrastructure requirements 4. The designated neighbourhood area For the policies I would expect to see: 1. Natural environment - enhance and protect the rural character including wildlife, green spaces, trees, green buffers 2. Historic environment - preserve and protect heritage assets and their setting 3. Community Facilities - require these or contributions to existing ones based on housing numbers - creche, school, shop, pub, play areas etc 4. Housing - need and numbers and possible site allocations 5. Employment - need and numbers. Protect existing employment 6. Design - protect and enhance the village and historic character of the village 7. Local green space designations 8. Transport - cycleways, footpaths, cycle parking, bus routes and stops, public transport need and capacity For each of these I would expect to see demonstration of compliance with the basic conditions: 1. Regard to national planning policy 2. Contribution to sustainable development 3. Conformity with the local plan and development plan 4. Compatible with EU obligations where still appropriate 5. Not infringing with human rights

PO3 - More could be done around Dunsfold Aerodrome increasing development surrounding that site to take development away from Dunsfold itself.

I agree with the Policy PO2b that in the case of a replacement dwelling the size of the new dwelling should be appropriate to the plot. There may be cases where a new dwelling can deliver significant design, environmental, social and health benefits and that might involve using more of the plot productively, without necessarily significantly extending the area of development. It's important that the Neighbourhood Plan's policies attach significant weight to outcomes rather than making a simple statistical comparison between the footprint of previous and proposed developments, as has been the case in the past, in policies at all levels.

Policy PO1 – The review of the AONB boundary is to decide whether additional areas should or should not be included within the designation. Those additional areas should not be subject to AONB policy until the review concludes they meet the criteria for designation, and are formally designated. Policy PO2 – The proposed restriction to development outside of the settlement area is inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which does provide for additional forms of development in rural areas. The settlement boundary should also be extended to include all proposed allocations. Policy PO3 - This Policy seeks to create a new designation called "Green Gap." There is no adopted Green Gap Policy in the Waverley Local Plan relating to Dunsfold and no Green Gap policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. The Policy only allows development that would preserve the open or undeveloped character of the gap and restricts such development to agricultural and equestrian. As such, it would be significantly more onerous than Green Belt policy and would fail to have regard to the national policy presumption in favour of sustainable development

Policy PO1 – The review of the AONB boundary is to decide whether additional areas should or should not be included within the designation. Those additional areas should not be subject to AONB policy until the review concludes they meet the criteria for designation, and are formally designated. Policy PO2 – The proposed restriction to development outside of the settlement area is inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which does provide for additional forms of development in rural areas. The settlement boundary should also be extended to include all proposed allocations. Policy PO3 - This Policy seeks to create a new designation called "Green Gap." There is no adopted Green Gap Policy in the Waverley Local Plan relating to Dunsfold and no Green Gap policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. The Policy only allows development that would preserve the open or undeveloped character of the gap and restricts such development to agricultural and equestrian. As such, it would be significantly more onerous than Green Belt policy and would fail to have regard to the national policy presumption in favour of sustainable development

Housing: HO1 to HO4

The document presents the number of dwellings as a statement of fact, but the real numbers will be whatever the developer decides to apply for. I feel it should be made more clear that these are not some kind of permitted number. HO2: Why favour self-build over custom build? Surely the nature of the proposal is what matters, rather than the method of project management.

Policy HO1 - The Neighbourhood Plan has strongly condemned the independent site assessment prepared by AECOM in favour of the Dunsfold Parish Site Assessment. The Site Assessment and Selection carried out by the Steering Group, however, is flawed, and should be subject to independent, professional scrutiny. It also does not reflect the final Policies in the draft Neighbourhood Plan, such as: 1. The scale and density criteria (DPSAP1) for site DNP20 is scored Red owing to the site capacity being for 32, however the site owner has submitted a planning application for the site including 21 homes. Notwithstanding this, the community feedback for 32 dwellings within site DNP20 is plainly positive, as highlighted in the table following paragraph 4.2 of the Dunsfold Parish Site Assessment. For the proposed 21 home development proposed, the DPSAP 1 (i) RAG should be yellow, and the DPSAP 1(ii) RAG should be green according to the assessment criteria quoted. Overall scale/density should therefore be green or yellow. 2. The location / coalescence criteria (DPSAP3) for Site DNP20 is scored as red, even though the site is excluded from the Green Gap Policy in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. DPSAP3(i) should be yellow, as the site is near the settlement boundary, and DPSAP 3(2) RAG should be green as the site is not identified as being within the Dunsfold and Dunsfold Park Green Gap. Overall Location and Coalescence should therefore be green or yellow. 3. The Natural Environment criteria (DPSAP4) for site DNP20 is scored red, even though the site has no wildlife or habitat designations within or associated with it and the site is contained on at least three sides with strong landscape boundaries. DPSAP 4(i) RAG should be green, and DPSAP 4(ii) should be green. The criteria for assessing DPSAP 4 are generally confused - it should be noted that Green Belts, AONB, and National Parks are not wildlife or habitat designations. 4. The Access and Highways criteria (DPSAP8) for site DNP20 is scored red, even though the submitted application for the site includes for at least one pedestrian link to the centre of the village, and the scale of the proposal will not significantly increase vehicular movements within and through the parish. The proposed development uses on the site are not reliant on HGVs. DPSAP 8(10 and (ii) should therefore be scored as yellow. Overall Access and Highways should therefore be yellow. 5. Housing Allocation HAS: Springfield is for 10 dwellings, and the proposed boundary for this allocation includes the 8 affordable homes already constructed. Even if the boundary or allocated number of dwellings does not include the affordable homes, 10 homes spread over the remaining 2 hectares of land is a chronic waste of land identified as being suitable for development. It is therefore suggested that the Dunsfold Parish Site Assessment is not fit for determining the Site Selection for Policy HO1.

The village is a pretty historic one and every effort should be made to retain its rural character and to control residential development to appropriate level to provide for strictly local need

HO1 - there appears to be a typo "Completion and deliverable commitments (2013-2022)" - i believe this should be 2032, consistent with the preamble. I wish to put on record that I fundamentally disagree with the selection of sites in HO1, and the analysis apparently used to arrive at these sites. If this plan were to come to referendum as is, my expectation is that it would fail on the basis of the site selections and widespread mistrust of the procedure to date. There is still an opportunity to put this right, but it needs to be done urgently and crucially with independent expert oversight. HO2 - what is meant by "individual" self-build, do you mean single units, what about multiple developments, such as that currently proposed at Dunsfold Common Road North (Chennels Field)? Can the policy be specific about what "self-build" actually means for these purposes? By referring to Site Selection Principles (which I consider to be fundamentally flawed for a number of reasons, but mostly because of their subjectivity), I am concerned that this potentially opens the

policy door to numerous self-build developments. HO3 same concerns arise to the deferral to NPPF. The Dunsfold Neighbourhood plan ought to be a chance to add to policy. Likely windfall sites/units should be included in the overall housing allocation to alleviate pressure elsewhere. HO4 space for homeworking is a sensible goal, but in practice is this simply likely to be achieved by an extra bedroom? The housing mix only refers to bedroom numbers, which seems to encourage more apartments for smaller 1/2 bedroom units. Can this be an opportunity to broaden housing style and layout? The Dunsfold HNA recommends 21 units for the elderly, and a need for terraced homes - can HO3 be more explicit about a preference for smaller mid range /elderly friendly units?

Policy HO1 - I fail to see how the provision of housing meets the criteria set out in the vision and policies. The NP policies state that housing should be inside the settlement boundary except on previously developed land or where it is a replacement dwelling or a dwelling for an existing commercially viable agricultural business. (which I agree with). The only site that I can see falls within this criteria is Wetwood Farm?! I also fail to see how this stops the coalescence with Dunsfold Park as 2 of the proposed sites are in the existing green gap and sit between the settlement boundary and Dunsfold Park. Policy HO2 should be tightened up to prevent developers using this as a route to secure planning consent. Applications should be for single dwellings only and for the named title owners of the land and it should be conditioned that they will also be the occupiers of the building post development for at least 3 years. The owners must have direct control over the design. This is not suitable in a characterful village of rural nature or in proximity to heritage assets where design and setting must be carefully controlled. Policy HO4 cannot require a dwelling to have a place for home working! I also think certain locations are better suited to smaller unit sizes than others. Same for retirement housing or family housing. Sites should be allocated for certain size of dwellings.

As detailed in the AECOM assessment, all proposed housing developments should provide for a high number of 2 or 3 bedroomed homes exceeding the Waverley SHMA recommendation. There should also be provision for houses suitable for the elderly residents of the village. Support for current and imminent applications developers should be kept to a minimum until the decision on the hoped for AONB designation has been made.

I strongly object to the inclusion of the Springfield site (HA5) on the list of Allocated Sites. Please see separate written submissions dated 2 October 2022.

Policy HO 1 relates to the allocation of houses to specific sites. The site allocations have been made in complete disregard of independent third party assessment by AECOM and WBC. Thus the inclusion of sites at Coombebury and Alehouse cannot be justified. The allocation of housing to Coombebury has been vigorously resisted by a large number of residents and indeed by the Parish Council and Waverley Borough Council. Given the conclusion regarding HO1 it is impossible to agree with the subsequent statements. The vision speaks of preservation of the historic rural character of Dunsfold. However, the development of the Coombebury site would result in increased urbanisation and build density on the north eastern flank of the village which is disproportionate to the scale of build across the village as a whole. Furthermore, the Parish Council has previously resisted development on the site and in 2016 stated that development at Gratton Chase was a 'once in a generation extension to the village'.

The proposed allocation of housing is seriously flawed in the process, inaccuracy and specifically the inclusion of just 10 houses for site HA5, Springfield, which is of little or no interest to the owners of the site when such a small number would leave the rest of the site useless. The inclusion of the site HA5, Coombebury is wrong in principle, as it disregards the submission of a petition in 2018 by 97 residents of the northern end of Dunsfold rejecting and further suburbanisation at this end of the village. Furthermore, this site is owned by a friend of one of the Parish Councillors on which the Councillor had influence over its inclusion in the plan, which will lead to 'strip development' at this end of the village when the Springfield site could easily accommodate and exceed the need for houses to meet the village housing plan for the foreseeable future.

Policy HO1 – The proposed site allocations are of too small a scale to deliver the required quantum of affordable housing. Only one site would cross the affordable housing threshold, delivering just 4 affordable units. Further, it is questionable as to whether the size of the proposed allocations could deliver a range of house types and sizes to meet the needs identified within the AECOM Housing Needs Assessment and as required by Policy HO4. Specifically, the AECOM report identified a need for smaller homes and in particular entry level homes given the 'extremely unaffordable' house prices in Dunsfold. These can best be provided as part of a larger development which is not currently provided for within the Neighbourhood Plan. Given the ongoing delays with the Dunsfold Aerodrome development this cannot be relied upon to address these immediate needs of the parish. Policy HO2 – Support the principle of self-build homes but question where

these are to be provided given the tightly drawn settlement boundary, the restrictive wording of Policy PO2 and the small size of the proposed housing allocations.

Policy HO1 – The proposed site allocations are of too small a scale to deliver the required quantum of affordable housing. Only one site would cross the affordable housing threshold, delivering just 4 affordable units. Further, it is questionable as to whether the size of the proposed allocations could deliver a range of house types and sizes to meet the needs identified within the AECOM Housing Needs Assessment and as required by Policy HO4. Specifically, the AECOM report identified a need for smaller homes and in particular entry level homes given the ‘extremely unaffordable’ house prices in Dunsfold. These can best be provided as part of a larger development which is not currently provided for within the Neighbourhood Plan. Given the ongoing delays with the Dunsfold Aerodrome development this cannot be relied upon to address these immediate needs of the parish. Policy HO2 – Support the principle of self-build homes but question where these are to be provided given the tightly drawn settlement boundary, the restrictive wording of Policy PO2 and the small size of the proposed housing allocations.

HO1 - The proposals made by the Steering Group are a nonsense. They have not listened to the village and acted in a contradictory manner in particular towards Coombebury. Unfortunately, I feel the whole process has been compromised from the beginning by self interest rather than doing the right thing for the village. How can Coombebury have 12 dwellings suggested when this site was rejected by Waverley Borough Council Eastern Planning Committee? Our Parish Council Chairman even spoke at the meeting to reject the site! Changing the number of dwellings proposed from 21 (which the developer wants) to 12 makes no sense. The arguments went far beyond the density of dwellings (though this is one issue). The Springfield site has only 10 dwellings on the Neighbourhood Plan, but the developer apparently wants 21 which would make far more sense. It is in a far more suitable location to extend the village and the plans provided so far look excellent and very much in keeping with the rural nature of the village.

Housing Allocations

I don't support the development of Coombebury for several reasons ('infill' of housing / loss of natural habitat and green space)

Housing Allocation HA5: Springfield 1. The scale and density criteria (DPSAP1) for site DNP20 is scored Red owing to the site capacity being for 32, however the site owner has submitted a planning application for the site including 21 homes. Notwithstanding this, the community feedback for 32 dwellings within site DNP20 is plainly positive, as highlighted in the table following paragraph 4.2 of the Dunsfold Parish Site Assessment. For the proposed 21 home development proposed, the DPSAP 1 (i) RAG should be yellow, and the DPSAP 1(ii) RAG should be green according to the assessment criteria quoted. Overall scale/density should therefore be green or yellow. 2. The location / coalescence criteria (DPSAP3) for Site DNP20 is scored as red, even though the site is excluded from the Green Gap Policy in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. DPSAP3(i) should be yellow, as the site is near the settlement boundary, and DPSAP 3(2) RAG should be green as the site is not identified as being within the Dunsfold and Dunsfold Park Green Gap. Overall Location and Coalescence should therefore be green or yellow. 3. The Natural Environment criteria (DPSAP4) for site DNP20 is scored red, even though the site has no wildlife or habitat designations within or associated with it and the site is contained on at least three sides with strong landscape boundaries. DPSAP 4(i) RAG should be green, and DPSAP 4(ii) should be green. The criteria for assessing DPSAP 4 are generally confused - it should be noted that Green Belts, AONB, and National Parks are not wildlife or habitat designations. 4. The Access and Highways criteria (DPSAP8) for site DNP20 is scored red, even though the submitted application for the site includes for at least one pedestrian link to the centre of the village, and the scale of the proposal will not significantly increase vehicular movements within and through the parish. The proposed development uses on the site are not reliant on HGVs. DPSAP 8(10 and (ii) should therefore be scored as yellow. Overall Access and Highways should therefore be yellow. 5. Housing Allocation HA5: Springfield is for 10 dwellings, and the proposed boundary for this allocation includes the 8 affordable homes already constructed. Even if the boundary or allocated number of dwellings does not include the affordable homes, 10 homes spread over the remaining 2 hectares of land is a chronic waste of land identified as being suitable for development.

HA5 is prominent on the approach to the village. A large development here is more akin to what we see in Cranleigh. It is not appropriate for Dunsfold. It also appears to be at odds with Policies ES02 and ES03. By comparison! HA1 and HA2 are appropriate and discrete locations which could comfortably take more houses.

Springfield is a concern. Encouraging further traffic along the Alfold Road should be avoided. Very poor road surface. Dangerous for pedestrians. Dangerous road junction at cricket green when verges uncut. Can waste water be managed adequately? The current dwellings are fine but additional would lead to creating an estate that is really outside of the ribbon development of the village.

HA1 & HA2 are in accordance with Objective ES4 and Policies ES02 & RS03 whereas HA5 is plainly not in accordance with these Objectives and Policy. HA1 has long been seen as an ideal central and convenient location for retirement housing for local people and could comfortably take six or seven units. HA2 is discretely located in the centre of the village and could comfortably take twenty units without making any detrimental visual impact on the rural nature of the village. HA5 was only ever promised by the Parish Council to take the existing eight units. The site is open to view when entering the village from Common House Road. A larger development here would severely harm the rural nature of this location - the sight of a large estate of houses obscuring the distant view of the Hascombe Hills would be entirely out of keeping with the rural nature of the village. It would be at odds with much of what is being sought by the Neighbourhood Plan and the Village Design Statement.

See separate letter submitted by Pearce Planning on behalf of Cognatum Estates

As a general point, the site allocation assessments are deeply flawed in a number of respects, and the apparent changes from the last site assessments presented to the village in March 2021 unexplained. None of the site specific policies, with the exception of over 55s accommodation (which is not elderly!), address the identified likely need for generally smaller homes. In fact, reducing the numbers of houses per site may encourage the converse to happen as developers seek a profit. HA1 - is inconsistent with the village's aspiration to be included in the AONB, owing to significant heritage assets. There are also significant question marks over the site's overall deliverability at the numbers proposed. There is no reason why the over 55s housing (which is not elderly) cannot be provided by e.g. Springfield if appropriate footpaths are also provided alongside the Alfold Road to the junction with Dunsfold Common Road. HA2 - is inconsistent with Waverley Borough Council's rejection of development on the site IN PRINCIPLE. The manner in which the site appears to have ascended in popularity and the management of process/transparency at the Parish Council level surrounding this is extremely poor. The developer is currently appealing refusal for 21 units. Therefore the allocation of 12 units appears fanciful. This is an important site for the village's ecology, and development at this location presents a material risk of attempts for additional linear development up the Dunsfold Common Road (which, unlike the areas surrounding Springfield, is NOT protected by the proposed Green Gap policy). HA3 - the site ought to take into account the increased housing numbers proposed by the developer. HA4 - the site ought to take into account the decreased housing numbers proposed by the owner/developer. HA5 - I fully support this site's inclusion, particularly as it was the only site identified by AECOM and Waverley as being suitable for development. In my opinion, its use should be maximised and full development potential reflected in the Neighbourhood plan to help alleviate pressure away from sites like Alehouse and Coombebury. The presence of a Green Gap ought to contain/mitigate any attempts of additional development in this area. The amendments to the site allocation assessments, and indeed the Green Gap policy itself (piggy backing off the "coalescence" criteria) seem blatantly targeted towards scuppering sensible development on this site - which frankly, appears to be supported by large numbers of the voting village. Upsetting some people on the site allocations is inevitable, what matters is that the assessments are objective, properly reasoned/concluded and - if I don't agree with a site's inclusion - I can understand and accept why that conclusion has been made. At present the site assessments DO NOT DO THIS. The anger people from all areas of the village and risk the whole plan failing at referendum. The site assessments need to be revisited urgently. Independent assessment (re)done. A single measure of proposed density applied across the board (Waverley, Steering Group or developer assessment??) Any matters relying on subjective judgment must be FULLY DOCUMENTED AND REASONED and proper independent evidence acquired for any apparent statements of fact.

Please refer to my previous page replies. I cannot see how these allocations meet the NP vision and policies. They are not inside the settlement boundary (although Alehouse is close), not on brown field land (except Wetwood and Orchard) and not a single dwelling for an existing viable agricultural business.

Sites HA3, HA4 and HA5 are supported in principle but the number of dwellings to be constructed on HA3 and HA5 should be increased and HA4 should be reduced to one. HA1 and HA2 should be removed from the DNP housing allocation proposals. Please see accompanying letter for reasoning to support the above.

I strongly object to the inclusion of the Springfield site (HA5). Please see separate written submissions dated 2 October 2022.

All development could take place around Dunsfold Aerodrome where new facilities are going to be constructed taking away the need of any development happening around the village

As per the previous question, whilst we have no specific comments on the sites proposed for allocation we do question how their small size will deliver the required affordable housing, smaller homes and housing mix.

As per the previous question, whilst we have no specific comments on the sites proposed for allocation we do question how their small size will deliver the required affordable housing, smaller homes and housing mix.

Alehouse - no strong opinion though I understand there are some listed buildings around it. Coombebury - a ridiculous inclusion when it has already been rejected by the local residents and Waverley Borough Council Eastern Planning Committee. There should be no more building at the North end of the village as has been strongly urged by local residents via petition. The Neighbourhood Plan also mentions any site included will have evidence wastewater can be disposed of. I would like to know who advised the Steering Group on this point. Wetwood Farm - seems a sensible location to build and potentially I see no reason there could not be more dwellings if necessary. The Orchard - same comments as Wetwood Farm. Springfield - a very good location to build alongside the recently completed Miller Homes small development. What makes no sense to me is the Neighbourhood Plan suggests only 10 dwellings there. Why is this? The developer apparently wishes to build 21 and the plans look good with some lovely rural touches in keeping with a country village location.

Springfield has no connection to the village drainage system. Access to the village is dangerous with no footpath on a narrow road. Development would lose good agricultural land. The development is too close to the airfield and within the proposed 'green gap'

Springfield should have had more housing and Alehouse field no houses

HA1-this is a Conservation area site, surrounded by Listed properties. Access has to be bought from the Sun Inn and without a Developer this is a non commercial proposition. HA2- this site was rejected by WBC and DPC for 21 units. The developer Kitewood is appealing this decision and will not reduce their plans from 21 to 12 units. HA3- is very remote from the village, and the planning application was rejected by the PC. HA4 - the owner only wants to build 1 unit. HA5 - this is the only site approved by WBC. The owners want to develop another 21 units but the Steering Group has suggested a non commercial limit of 10 units.

Natural Environment

NE01: Why concentrate on bats? We have owls, badgers, amphibians, deer, etc but the policy seems to regard only bats.

Dunsfold lies in an area of very low light pollution - this should be recognised as a valuable characteristic and, indeed, that of a rural village and be preserved. There should be no street lighting.

Drainage a major problem in the village especially at Gratton Chase where I live which floods. This should be addressed before any development. Street lighting is not wanted or appropriate in this village

NE01 is not strong enough. This is extremely broad, all the way up to allowing "compensation" for significant harm to designated environmental assets. The whole point is that significant impact should be prevented altogether. More often than not, development (particularly housing) does not meet the threshold for "significant", so this element of NE01 seems likely to be redundant in most cases. I also query what specialist input has been acquired for these policies? (a) Development ought to protect AND ENHANCE habitats. What are the existing habitat networks and wildlife corridors in the parish? (b) seems to be a bit duplicative of (a). How likely is an ecology report to state an area is a "key feature" for bats? Is that a realistic threshold? (c) I think this ought to state a significant preference for natural boundaries and not fences/high kerbstones. (d) I agree with achieving a net gain - but this conflicts with the rest of the policy see above. Where has the reference to "stepping stones" come from? Can this say something of encouraging natural features and wildlife ponds (e.g. at Gratton), retaining existing landscaping for its ecological benefits (NE02 refers to more visual factors). Overall this policy mentions bats but otherwise speaks in very vague terms of any other environmental assets. I don't think this is strong or specific enough to help potential developers make better decisions. NE02 - similar concern about allowing compensation for significant harm, yet in the next part saying "detrimental impact on landscape character will not be permitted". This is inconsistent. Significant harm ought to be a red flag to not allow development. This needs to be specific about what is "irreplaceable habitat" - ancient woodland is arguably one. NE03 - what is a "more vulnerable use class". This policy seems about human water management as opposed to wildlife habitats, so there is some conflict/confusion with the ecological policies above. NE04 - completely agree, but i think this also needs IN THE POLICY WORDING (not just the explanation/guidance) to address light spill from windows, particularly along houses lining the Common - this has a visual effect as well as impacting night time habitat. NE05 - how can development "reduce noise" and the text in 6.19 - what does this mean?? Clearly something is in mind here but this seems cryptic.

Because of the rural nature of the village, noise and light pollution should be kept to an absolute minimum.

I support the intentions of Policy NEO1 and in fact suggest that this might be re-expressed to signal support for development proposals that achieve all of points a) b) c) and d). Similarly, I agree with Policy NEO2 and suggest that proposals that enhance the Parish's landscape character and in particular enhance woodland management practices to increase biodiversity should be supported. I detect there is a slight assumption in the wording of the Policy that landscape and development are considered separate entities. The Plan should also support proposals where its objectives can be achieved through the careful integration of buildings and landscape in a manner that promotes innovative design. Again, for NEO3, development proposals should be afforded additional support where sustainable drainage features are incorporated into the scheme and integrated with building and landscaping to promote innovative design.

Policy NEO2 – we support the aim of Policy NEO2 in terms of the need to protect important trees, woodland and hedgerows. The final paragraph however should reflect the wording of Policy RE3 of the Waverley Local Plan which requires new development to 'respect and where appropriate enhance the distinctive character of the landscape in which it is located'. Policy NEO4 – The second paragraph should be amended to refer to 'significant' light polluting impacts as all new development could otherwise be prevented by this policy.

Policy NEO2 – we support the aim of Policy NEO2 in terms of the need to protect important trees, woodland and hedgerows. The final paragraph however should reflect the wording of Policy RE3 of the Waverley Local Plan which requires new development to 'respect and where appropriate enhance the distinctive character of the landscape in which it is located'. Policy NEO4 – The second paragraph should be amended to refer to 'significant' light polluting impacts as all new development could otherwise be prevented by this policy.

NEO1 - this policy has been ignored as regards the Coombebury site. How including this site on the Neighbourhood Plan could possibly comply with this policy is beyond me. It is all well and good ticking the environmental box but you have to back it up with action, this has not been done despite repeated issues raised by residents. NEO2 - recently planted trees from an EU Grant, beautiful wild hedgerows with many birds nesting, Ancient Woodland on the border, Deers, Frogs, Great Crested Newt, Owls and numerous other species will be adversely impacted by the Coombebury development. Carbon Emissions are far greater from young trees cut down in the open where there are no other trees around them to absorb the Carbon (such as a forest). Coombebury has over 50 young trees which will presumably all get cut down. NEO3 - the Coombebury site does not comply with any of these points and is unlikely to unless something significant changes. It has the potential to cause problems for both Gratton Chase and Nugent Close. The infrastructure is not in place and no guarantees can be given that this will change. Thames Water are in the village seemingly weekly in the winter time and when there is heavy rainfall this development will increase the stress on an already buckling system.

There is already a creeping increase in urbanisation of the "dark countryside" by the lighting up of gardens eg Wintershall, gate lights at Barbins, garden light in The Sun garden.

Environment, Sustainability and Design

ES09: I would strongly suggest that there are many more views of strategic visual importance than Footpath 288 and bridleway 545. The view all along Dunsfold Common Road is an obvious example, including potential visual impact of the potential Coombebury development.

Very obviously the proposed further development of the Springfield site, which lies at the edge of Dunsfold Village, is at odds with policy ES02 which states that 'housing densities will reduce towards the edge of the village settlement'. Plainly this site cannot be included as one of the proposed sites for development.

The visual character of the village should override such things as solar panels on roofs and edgy 'sustainable' design.

The traditional beauty of the village should be more important than eyesore developments such as solar panels buildings of jarring design etc

I am assuming that the scoring above is "On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree")". ES01 - i agree with the sentiment, but this seems duplicative/vague as to design (referring twice to the design statement). There is also duplication with ES02 and protecting and enhancing character, and emphasis on development "on the edge of the village" - what does on the edge mean? also the reference to the design statement ES02 - see above on duplication. Housing densities are not already reduced towards the "edge" of the village, that seems an arbitrary inclusion and increases the number of developments needed to deliver the required housing supply figures. ES03 - additional duplication on the design statement reference. Also a reference to the design statement being reviewed - when is that happening, why is that not mentioned elsewhere? ES04 - agree, no material comments ES05 - agree with the sentiment. I note this includes common land, which is a significant character feature of the village. This policy should explicitly refer to policies and guidance for common land. The policy text in 7.11 mentions "larger scale" development - what does this mean relative to the proposed housing allocation sites)? ES06 - I agree but this is all rather vague and confusing - what does "natural surveillance" and "defensible space" actually mean in practice? ES07 this is not strong enough, and is inconsistent with paragraph 7.13 below it. It is unclear how a requirement for preserving and enhancing listed building assets can possibly be compatible with weighing (potentially substantial) harm against public benefit, and how such harms or "public benefit" is to be properly identified and measured. This is particularly important for sites such as Alehouse - there is nothing to prevent provision of "over 55s" housing in another of the proposed housing allocation sites. ES08 I completely agree with the principles but I understand from other parish experiences that achieving any kind of sustainability criteria in a neighbourhood plan is extremely difficult. I would like to understand how likely it is that this criteria will survive Inspector examination. ES09 - It is really not clear how these two locations have been selected above and beyond other views in the parish. In particular, the route from the Dunsfold Common Road to High Loxley (behind Coombebury farm) ought to be a strong candidate on any of the measures identified in 7.16. Dunsfold Common/Green should be included as a Local Green Space to highlight its importance as a matter of planning policy (not just the law/policy for the protection of common land. It is inconsistent with other local plans to not do this and it is not clear what any "loss" could be from not designating it). References to AGLV/AONB ought to be updated.

No development should be permitted if it would cause any (not substantial) detrimental harm to the character, setting or historic nature and use of a heritage asset. NPPF states that consent should not be granted if the benefits do not outweigh the harm. It is not possible to change damage to historic assets and their setting once it is done so protection and prevention is essential.

The proposed housing allocation as detailed in the DNP is at variance with these policies: an example is housing on Alehouse Field does not, in my view, support Policy ES07. All new development sites should have adequate provision for cars (unlike Grattons Chase) and there should be more village car parks. Each year, the village increasingly suffers from the visual impact of cars either parked on tracks across and/or around the common land. Due to the lack of public transport, it is not unreasonable to expect each household to have at least two cars.

I support the intentions of these four policies. However, I am concerned about the frequent references to the Dunsfold Village Design Statement which is now over twenty years old. I would prefer for these references to anticipate the preparation of new design guidance for the Parish that better reflects the encouragement of innovative and unique approaches to design, as expressed in the National Planning Policy Framework, in section 12 – Achieving Well Designed Places. The Village Design Statement of course was published more than ten years before the very first version of the NPPF appeared, but nevertheless the current version of the NPPF para 127 recognises the important role that neighbourhood groups can have in identifying the special qualities of their area and ensuring that these are reflected in new developments. I suggest this can most appropriately be achieved through the policies of this Neighbourhood Plan and any subsequent design guidance, to which I will be pleased to contribute. Para 130c) in particular advises 'Policies and decisions should ensure developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change' And 130f) 'Developments create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users' The VDS belongs to a different plan making regime altogether, and while it can serve as useful historical element of the NP's Evidence Base, it should not be referred to in the policies of the new Neighbourhood Plan. However, I am pleased to see, and strongly support Policy ESO3 where it states that pending a review of the VDS, the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will take precedence. In my view they are much more reflective of attitudes towards contemporary design and what it should be achieving.

Solar panels should be required rather than a “nice to have” on newbuilds

Employment and Business Support

These policies need to address the recent interest in agricultural developments in the area, including "ancillary accommodation". In my view that is as important as equestrian facilities. Dunsfold needs to form a view on what is and is not acceptable. EB03 - generally agree, but can this be qualified to need to balance any visual/landscape impacts (e.g. Hascombe mobile phone mast)? Cables should be underground to future proof against disruption.

EB01 - new employment should be focussed on employment in Dunsfold Park. Policies should enhance and protect existing agricultural and community businesses and their facilities. EBo2 - this should be supported but there needs to be clear policies on temporary structures and not allow these to become permanent and therefore potential for future development/replacement.

I suggest that developments generating local employment should be supported by the Plan if they improve sustainability especially in the manner described by points a) b) and c).

Transport and Getting Around

The plan quotes statistics regarding support for reducing the speed limit within Dunsfold to 30mph. As I understand it, this would mean the installation of street lighting to which many have objected. These two factors seem to be at odds.

I am assuming that the scoring above is "On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being “strongly disagree” and 5 being “strongly agree”)”.

TG01 - many people drive like lunatics through the village and surrounding area. This needs to stop and firmly back this policy. TG02 - this policy is a good idea and would improve the village. TG03 - this is good in theory but most new developments are not built with sufficient parking for each house and the proposals for Coombebury are a prime example of this. A garage is not a parking space in modern Britain. Therefore, we get cars parked all over the roads and we will end up looking like any town or City. Electric charging is a good idea and I support this. TG04 - the bus service here is a joke, hardly anyone uses it except students and the odd senior citizen. The majority use cars and I don't see how an improved bus service is sustainable.

The extension of the speed limit of 40 mph along The Chiddingfold Road is long over due. It is almost impossible to walk here now. HGV's coming from Chiddingfold along this road need to be stopped, particularly when construction work for Dunsfold Park begins. Weight restrictions are to be introduced along Markwick Lane which will force more A3 bound traffic through Dunsfold to Chiddingfold/A283. Weight restrictions should be imposed to stop HGV's crossing Loxley Bridge at the bottom of Wrotham Hill and the other 2 small bridges in Pickhurst Lane or White Beech on this route.

Recreation, Leisure and Well-Being

Why is it not appropriate to list Winn Hall and the KGV & recreation ground / children's play area as assets of Community Value ? You mention that they're charities but don't explain why this excludes ACV status.

Community and leisure facilities must be for local use only.

I am assuming that the scoring above is "On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being “strongly disagree” and 5 being “strongly agree”)”. RL02 - should be removed. The Plan should not stipulate specific ACVs in the village - I am firmly in favour of retaining the Parish Council's overall discretion as to whether to seek / maintain ACV status in a given case. The bar for ACV status is extremely low. This policy is an unsupported fetter on the community's discretion. There is also no evidence provided to support its inclusion in the plan. ACV status (or not) is NOT A PLANNING MATTER, just a right for the community to bid for an asset - it is inappropriate to use a planning policy to cross pollinate decisions/discretion on non-planning matters. Paragraph 10.13 is inappropriate for similar reasons.

The village shop, post office and pub are extremely valuable assets and every effort should be made to pursue their designation as Assets of Community Value.

I fully support the objectives of Policy RLO1 and in particular its efforts to improve the well-being of Dunsfold residents by supporting development proposals that comprise the provision of new or extended community and leisure facilities within the Parish. There may be opportunities for schemes to come forward through private sector initiatives and these will be more effective if local community engagement is undertaken at an early stage, in the manner anticipated by para 126 of the NPPF 'The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants,

communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.’ And in para 132 of the NPPF ‘Applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Applications that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot.’

Infrastructure and Delivery

While we probably need a mobile phone mast, I feel the condition "sensitive to the landscape" isn't strong enough

I am assuming that the scoring above is "On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree")". ID01 - this ought to reference community allotment provision/communal growing spaces please. Can this also include sewage upgrades? ID02 - agree in principle, but is this policy deliverable? Has the surgery indicated willingness to reinstate Dunsfold? ID03 - i think this needs to tie in with previous policies on communications. ID04/05/06 - ditto for ID03 ID07 - this plan ought to address the increased potential interest in oil & gas exploration in the village. This is a crucial issue for the community and the plan is eerily silent.

ID02 - I think it is a great idea but I suspect it will be unviable.

ID01 and ID06 - I don't see how the Coombebury proposal meets these policies.

More renewable energy should be required on new houses. The Dunsfold GP has informed me that the Dunsfold surgery will never re-open. Where will the new mobile phone masts be located. This needs to be shown in the plan

Infrastructure Projects

Make use of the old school and field for the community

No

Allotments/community grow space. Additional bus stop along Alfold Road opposite Miller Lane. Path/pavement between Miller lane and the pub. Sensitive expansion of car parking/electric charging facilities in the village. Winn Hall - increasing energy efficiency. Renovation of the red phone box and creation of a mini library. Wildflower patches in selected areas of the common. Sewage improvements. Water butts in every home to harness rainwater.

Sewage and waste water improvements Improvements to wildlife and heritage Improvements to footpaths and low level lighting Upkeep of playing areas and community facilities

Sort out the waste water, mobile signals, and high speed broadband for the village.

Further Solar farms, and grants for local households

Any Other Comments

I would like to point out again the ludicrous nature of demanding that a village increase its dwelling capacity by 25%. Aside from putting the village under huge,unrealistic and unpleasant pressure to potentially change its character, this paves the way for further preposterous increases after 2032.

There are conflicting published deadlines for feedback, ie September 19th and October 3rd. We were told at the meeting that October 3rd was the deadline and this is what we assume is correct.

Resist at all costs any further pressure from Waverley for more residential development. It should be recognised that Dunsfold has done its bit with the development of Dunsfold Park.

Please don't destroy our beautiful village

see separate letter submitted by Pearce Planning on behalf of Cognatum Estates

Overall the draft plan contains some good and sensible policy suggestions - but these do not go far enough, are in a number of cases vague/contradictory and sometimes lack any clear evidential basis. The site allocations are particularly problematic. I also support a number of other consultation responses that additionally highlight the lack of transparency, oversight and record keeping that have damaged wider confidence in the neighbourhood plan process to those who have taken a care to observe closer. The key priority must now be to revisit the site allocations with independent input from experts and Waverley. Compromise will not be achieved by scattering selected sites around the village, in densities that can't be guaranteed by the plan. The current trajectory of this draft plan risks failure at wider village referendum.

Please see my comments on page 1. I fail to see how the housing policy and site allocations meet the policies in the plan. I think generally the plan is strong with good policies but the site allocations open the Council up to challenge as the site selection criteria are unknown, inconsistent and contradictory to the vision and policies. I fully appreciate the Parish Council have a difficult and unenviable task of trying to please everyone but in order for the plan to be defensible, I would expect to see:

1. Clear vision and aims
2. Clear policies that ensure the vision and aims are upheld
3. Required infrastructure requirements
4. The designated neighbourhood area

For the policies I would expect to see:

1. Natural environment - enhance and protect the rural character including wildlife, green spaces, trees, green buffers
2. Historic environment - preserve and protect heritage assets and their setting
3. Community Facilities - require these or contributions to existing ones based on housing numbers - creche, school, shop, pub, play areas etc
4. Housing - need and numbers and possible site allocations
5. Employment - need and numbers. Protect existing employment
6. Design - protect and enhance the village and historic character of the village
7. Local green space designations
8. Transport - cycleways, footpaths, cycle parking, bus routes and stops, public transport need and capacity

For each of these I would expect to see demonstration of compliance with the basic conditions:

1. Regard to national planning policy
2. Contribution to sustainable development
3. Conformity with the local plan and development plan
4. Compatible with EU obligations where still appropriate
5. Not infringing with human rights

In the context of the selected housing allocations, it is seriously flawed, out of date and against the wishes of a significant number of residents. It is not fit for purpose.

I think it is a great initiative and gets my full support. Laurie – Willards Cottage

I am baffled and very disappointed by the plan. I do not think the sites have been proposed with the right considerations taken into account. Coombebury should not be on there and Springfield should allow for over twice the number of dwellings. Some of the other points in the plan are excellent, but the above proposals totally undermine this.

There should be more houses on Alehouse Field for older villagers - the Housing Needs Survey identified a need for such housing and the site is perfectly situated

More housing at Springfield and non at Alehouse Field