

LIMPSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL – LNP REVIEW WORKING GROUP

Notes of the meeting held on 23rd April 2025

Attending: Mark Wilson, Tony Taylor, John Thompson, Jenny Williams and Ted Beresford Knox, Clerk: Sophie Martin

Absent: Ann Osborn, Robin Masefield (excused due to planning).

To discuss LNP2,3 and 5

1. Review of any action points from the last meeting (notes attached)

- TDC Building – AT says that it is likely that the health centre will be moving into the TDC building.
- Some paragraphs may be out of date.
- TBK suggests putting a paragraph into P14 Strategic Planning Context - Although changes to the NPPF are not considered to fundamentally change the principles of the LNP.

2. Review of LNP2: Housing Type and Mix

MW believes this still works well. Downsizers in this area are also very relevant

TBK has reviewed TDC Housing Strategy 2019-23 – most recent. IT confirms need for smaller dwelling. LNP therefore remains in line. And it also refers to 3-bedroom dwellings (but only in the context of larger developments) The LNP develops this further to single or smaller developments.

In terms of 50% 3 bedrooms or less is based on available Housing Market Assessments.

JW asks what the definition of a residential development is. TBK says any single dwelling.

If Red Lane Stables goes ahead, these smaller dwellings could subsequently develop.

3. Review of LNP3: Design, Heritage & Landscape

This policy does seem to have been successful with several applications in Park Road for example, having been amended in accordance with the LNP.

LNP is more difficult to enforce as it is quite subjective. Its success is more about planning officers / committees considering the policy and thinking it through in relation to applications, which they seem to be doing.

Design – Para 139 NPPF – Development that is not well designed should be refused especially where it fails to reflect local design policies...

It is still there in the reformed NPPF. In our policy “good design” refers to keeping “in character”. These need to refer to the appendices in terms of character areas.

JW notes that the approach to design aesthetics has fundamentally changed. TBK agrees but the criteria is still relevant.

With regards to Point 5. There have been a couple of incidents where it has not been completely successful (e.g. Granville Road wall), but has largely been effective.

The principles are still relevant and do not require change. TBK notes that if we had more time, we could have gone further.

4. Review of LNP5: Landscape Character

The change in this policy is the references to AONB, now being proposed for extension and re-named Surrey Hills National Landscape.

TBK suggests here we could put * and footnote referencing the above. This will also note that there has been a review of the AGLV/AONB.

JT asks about the definition of “adverse impact on the landscape”... what is this.

AT notes the high expectation of the initial statement that says “proposals...will be expected to enhance the quality of that landscape....”. TBK says this is a good statement of intent and gives a chance to respond. We have endorsed the National Landscape and the ability to argue what is right about National Landscape.

TBK asks if we have any knowledge of what might happen to remaining AGLV. **Action: to find out what is remaining.**

JW suggests that this policy could be part of the planning aspect of AGM. - in how LPC / LNP is protecting the parish

Rather than change all references to AONB, councillors would prefer to have a footnote. TBK suggests an overview paragraph that considers these changes.

5. Next meeting – to review LNP13, 14 and infrastructure projects.

Review of transport projects and projects designed to improve connectivity across the Parish.

Meeting ends 17.20