

Tandridge District Local Plan 2024-2044



Tandridge District Council

Regulation 18: Spatial Development Strategy Consultation

July 2026



Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Evidence base and context	7
3	Vision and objectives	20
4	Identifying the preferred spatial strategy.....	23
5	Strategic policies	33
6	Next steps	42
7	Consultation questions	44

1 Introduction

This document is the next stage of consultation under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. It builds on the earlier Regulation 18 Early Engagement Consultation. It moves the process from identifying issues and testing options to setting out a clear, evidence-led preferred development strategy alongside a refined vision and objectives.

Purpose of this consultation

We are asking for views on the preferred option for the Local Plan spatial development strategy, the updated vision and objectives and the proposed policy framework. Responses will be used to refine the preferred strategy, identify any further evidence needed and ensure that the emerging Local Plan takes stakeholder views properly into account.

Status of this document

This document is not the final Local Plan and does not include fully drafted policies. It establishes our proposed direction rather than a fixed or final position and provides an opportunity to test the soundness, deliverability and appropriateness of the preferred strategy before it is finalised. The locations and approaches identified are subject to refinement through this consultation and further evidence work.

Following this stage, the Regulation 19 Submission Local Plan will be prepared, setting out the final strategy, policies and allocations for independent examination.

How this consultation builds on previous engagement

The earlier Regulation 18 Early Engagement consultation sought views on a wide range of matters relating to the preparation of the Local Plan, including:

- The vision and priorities for the district.
- Broad spatial development options.
- Issues about housing provision, infrastructure, the environment and community needs.

The consultation, which took place from 19 January 2026 to 1 March 2026 generated a substantial level of engagement. A total of 2,493 responses were received using the online consultation platform and a further 66 submissions into the Local Plan inbox, including representations from residents, community groups, landowners, developers and statutory consultees. Together, these responses provide a robust and proportionate evidence base, comprising both quantitative data and qualitative feedback, to help inform the next stage of plan-making.

Since the Local Plan process began in 2024, this document has also been informed by ongoing engagement with neighbouring authorities infrastructure providers and other statutory bodies.



Key outcomes of the previous consultation

The consultation identified several recurring themes, which have directly informed the preferred strategy:

1. Infrastructure-first development - there was strong support for development being supported by infrastructure. In particular:

- Over 97% of respondents agreed that new development must be supported by sufficient infrastructure.
- There was strong support on the delivery of:
 - Healthcare provision.
 - Education facilities.
 - Transport infrastructure, particularly road capacity.
 - Utilities, including drainage and water supply.

Responses clearly indicate that support for development depends on infrastructure being delivered alongside, or ahead of, growth, rather than following it.

2. Protection of the Green Belt and countryside - respondents consistently identified the Green Belt, countryside and settlement separation as central to the district's character and identity. In particular:

- The rural character of the district and the openness of the Green Belt were identified as key defining features.
- There was strong concern about:
 - Loss of openness.
 - Coalescence between settlements.
 - Erosion of local character.

This shows that any strategy must minimise harm to the Green Belt and countryside and carefully manage any release of land.

3. Strong preference for brownfield development - there was a clear preference for brownfield or previously developed land as the primary location for development. However:

- Responses also showed that brownfield land supply within the district is limited.
- There was implicit understanding that brownfield development alone will not be sufficient to meet development needs.

This establishes brownfield development as a priority, but not a complete solution.



4. Support for housing delivery - there was general acceptance of the need to deliver new homes, but this support was conditional. In particular, respondents emphasised that development must:
- Be located in appropriate and sustainable locations.
 - Be supported by infrastructure.
 - Deliver the right type of housing, including genuinely affordable homes.
 - Be designed to respect local character and environmental constraints.

This shows that development is not opposed in principle but must be carefully planned and justified.

5. No single preferred spatial strategy - the consultation did not identify a preferred option:
- Responses were distributed across the options presented, with no option receiving majority support.
 - However, there was much stronger agreement on the principles that should guide development, including:
 - Alignment with infrastructure capacity.
 - Protection of environmental assets.
 - Accessibility and sustainability of locations.

This indicates that the Local Plan must move between options and instead develop a balanced and evidence-led strategy.

6. Significant concern regarding deliverability - a recurring theme across responses was concern about the deliverability of development:
- Concerns were raised about:
 - Existing infrastructure capacity, particularly transport and healthcare provision.
 - The ability of the district to accommodate the scale of development implied by national policy.
 - The need for greater transparency and evidence based decision making.

These responses emphasise the importance of ensuring that the Local Plan is realistic, deliverable and justified.

Implications for the Local Plan strategy

Overall, the outcomes of the previous consultation and engagement establish a clear framework of principles and priorities the Local Plan must address. We have developed a preferred strategy to meet development needs while balancing those needs against the district's environmental and infrastructure constraints.

It moves away from a single-option approach toward a hybrid, infrastructure-led strategy prioritising deliverability, realism and evidence-based decision-making and recognising the ability to meet development needs in full may be affected by the district's constraints.

How to respond

We invite comments on all aspects of this consultation, including the proposed vision and objectives, the preferred spatial development strategy, the distribution of growth, the identified development locations and the evidence base.

Responses can be submitted using the following methods:

- Online using the Council's consultation page www.tandridge.gov.uk/localplan or by scanning this QR code.
- By e-mail: localplan@tandridge.gov.uk.
- By post: Planning Policy Team, Tandridge District Council, 8 Station Road East, Oxted RH8 0BT.



The consultation period is from Monday 6 July 2026 to 11.59pm on Monday 17 August 2026. All responses must be received by the closing date to be considered.

Please provide clear comments, supported by evidence where appropriate, to help us refine the Local Plan. All responses received will be reviewed and considered when preparing the Regulation 19 Submission Local Plan.

A summary of the main issues raised and our response to them will be included in a Consultation Statement, which will accompany the Submission Plan.

The preparation of this Local Plan is taking place alongside the reorganisation of local government in Surrey. The government has confirmed from 1 April 2027, the current county, district and borough councils in Surrey will be replaced by two new unitary authorities. East Surrey Council will cover the Tandridge district. In this context, the Local Plan is being prepared on the basis it will continue through the later stages of preparation under the new authority arrangements and be finalised by East Surrey Council following Vesting Day.

Progressing this Plan has an important transitional purpose. It will provide a Tandridge district-specific policy framework for deciding planning applications during the period between the creation of East Surrey Council and the adoption of a new Local Plan for the wider East Surrey area. In doing so, it will provide continuity, reduce the risk of a policy gap and ensure locally specific planning policies remain in place during this period of change to local government arrangements.

Our approach is to continue preparing this Local Plan now, so the new authority inherits a plan which is already well advanced, evidence-led and capable of being taken forward without unnecessary delay. This is the most effective way of protecting the district's interests during transition, supporting robust development management and ensuring the district benefits from an up-to-date local planning framework until it can later be replaced by the future strategic and local planning framework for East Surrey.



2 Evidence base and context

This chapter sets out the context for the Local Plan to be prepared and summarises the key evidence that has informed the vision, objectives and preferred spatial strategy. It covers the principal environmental and policy constraints affecting the district, the settlement hierarchy, housing and employment land requirements, the findings of the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) and the infrastructure baseline.

Planning context and challenges

The preparation of the Local Plan is taking place in a highly constrained context. Approximately 94% of the district is designated as Green Belt, which helps to prevent urban sprawl, maintaining settlement separation and preserving the openness and character of the countryside.

In addition, the district includes a wide range of national and local environmental designations, including two National Landscapes, areas of flood risk and ancient woodland. The district also contains extensive heritage assets, including conservation areas and listed buildings.

These constraints do not operate in isolation and they combine to limit the range of reasonable spatial options available to us. The Local Plan cannot rely on a broad expansion-based approach to growth.

Instead, the strategy must prioritise the least harmful and most sustainable locations and carefully manage any release of Green Belt land without undermining its overall function and purpose. Environmental impacts must also be avoided, minimised or managed in accordance with national policy.

The housing requirement

National policy requires local planning authorities to determine their housing need using the government's standard method and to plan positively to meet that need, subject to relevant constraints.

The application of the government's standard method results in a housing requirement of 819 homes a year for the Tandridge District, equating to a total requirement of 12,285 homes over a 15-year plan period.

Due to past under delivery, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) also requires us to add a 20% buffer to the annual requirement when calculating five year land supply. Currently this equates to 983 a year. There is also a need for affordable homes to address existing deficits as well as future needs over the plan period.

The district already benefits from a substantial number of existing planning permissions and commitments, currently amounting to around 2,000 dwellings. It is expected this figure may increase further by the time the Local Plan is prepared and adopted.

These committed developments make an important contribution to meeting the district's housing requirement and reduce the amount of additional development we will need to plan for through the emerging Local Plan.

Despite the contribution that existing commitments will make to supply, the level of local housing need represents a substantial increase compared to historic delivery rates within the district and introduces a significant challenge in terms of:

- Identifying sufficient land to accommodate development.
- Ensuring development can be supported by infrastructure.
- Managing impacts on the environment and Green Belt.

The Local Plan must consider not only the amount of development required, but also the extent to which that requirement can be realistically and sustainably accommodated, taking account of the district's constraints.

Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople accommodation and delivery

In addition to meeting the need for market and affordable housing, the Local Plan must assess and plan for the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. This is a distinct part of the housing evidence base and is addressed through the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2025, together with a supporting Pitch Deliverability Assessment (PDA). These documents provide the evidence needed to set pitch and plot targets, identify how needs can be met and inform both site-specific allocations and criteria-based policies in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

At the GTAA baseline date of January 2025, the district contained 114 Gypsy and Traveller pitches across public, private, temporary, tolerated and unauthorised sites and 54 Travelling Showpeople plots across authorised and unauthorised yards. The GTAA identified 109 Gypsy and Traveller households that met the 2024 Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) planning definition, with a further 4 households recorded as undetermined. For Travelling Showpeople, all 72 households identified through the assessment were recorded as meeting the 2024 PPTS planning definition.

The headline needs identified by the GTAA are that by the end of the plan period we need to be plan for 143 pitches for Gypsy and Traveller needs and 69 plots for Travelling Showpeople needs.

We have also considered whether a formal transit site is required. The GTAA does not recommend a formal public transit site in the district due to historically low numbers of unauthorised encampments. However, the position should continue to be monitored, including through welfare assessment information where appropriate and the wider evidence on unauthorised encampments should continue to be reviewed on a Surrey-wide basis.

In terms of meeting the identified needs, a Pitch Delivery Assessment (PDA) was prepared to test whether existing sites and yards could meet all or part of the identified need through intensification, reconfiguration, expansion or regularisation. This is an important part of the delivery strategy because a significant element of need arises from existing households and existing sites rather than from completely unrelated new demand.

The PDA indicates that 92 pitches or plots could potentially be met on existing sites or yards over the plan period, meeting Gypsy and Travellers needs equivalent to 64% of the total requirement. However, the PDA identifies no capacity on existing Travelling Showpeople yards to meet the identified Travelling Showpeople need, which means this remains a key residual issue for the Local Plan to address.

Since the January 2025 GTAA baseline, we have made steady progress in converting identified pitch opportunities into permitted supply. The May 2026 monitoring position records permissions or appeal decisions for 52 Gypsy and Traveller pitches. These permissions include a combination of new provision, extensions to existing sites, intensification and regularisation of existing occupied sites. 10 plots have also been granted planning permission for Travelling Showpeople needs. They make a material contribution to addressing the immediate pitch need identified in the GTAA and reducing the number of pitches that must be addressed through the remaining plan-making process.

Our emerging approach is to meet the identified need through a combination of:

- Granting permission for suitable and acceptable existing-site solutions.
- Regularising temporary or unauthorised sites where this is justified and consistent with planning policy.
- Supporting intensification, reconfiguration or expansion of existing sites where suitable, available and achievable.
- Identifying site allocations or broad locations where residual need cannot be met on existing sites or yards.
- Including a robust criteria-based policy to address windfall proposals, undetermined households, potential in-migration, households seeking to move from bricks and mortar accommodation and other needs that cannot be fully anticipated at plan-making stage.

It is anticipated that this approach will result in all the need for Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople being met within the district by the end of the plan period.

The final Regulation 19 position will be informed by updated monitoring of permissions, delivery and site availability, together with further site assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, infrastructure evidence, Green Belt assessment, engagement with site and yard owners and consultation responses. We will need to ensure the final policy framework sets clear pitch and plot targets, identifies a deliverable five-year supply where possible, identifies developable sites or broad locations for later years and provides an effective criteria-based policy to manage any additional or residual need over the plan period.

Views are invited on the GTAA and PDA evidence, the current approach to meeting need through existing site solutions and recent permissions, the suitability of potential locations to meet residual pitch and plot need and whether any further land or sites should be considered to help meet the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople over the plan period. The schedule of current planning permissions for information is set out in Table 1.

Table 1: Additional Gypsy and Traveller pitch permissions schedule

Application / appeal ref	Site	Pitches	Decision / status
2022/299	Land North of Effingham Road, Keepers Corner, RH6 9RP	6	Permission granted on appeal 29/01/25. (Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/W/23/3331609).
2024/1121	Woodlands, Weatherhill Common, Smallfield, Horley RH6 9JF	2	Permission granted by the Council 11/02/25. PDA site
2024/1134	Land west of Dowlands Lane, Smallfield RH6 9SD.	6	Permission granted 10/03/25.
2022/537	Pony Paddocks, Beech Farm Road, Warlingham CR6 9QJ	3	Permission granted 20/03/25.
2024/1135	Land west of Dowlands Lane, Smallfield RH6 9SD.	6	Permission granted 25/03/25.
2024/1256	Land on West side of Lane, Dowlands Opposite Kerlyn Farm, Copthorne RH10 3HX	6	Permission granted 14/05/25
2024/66	Chardonnay Farm, Newchapel Road, Lingfield RH7 6BJ	2	Permission granted 15/05/25 PDA site
APP/M3645/C/24/3357967 (appeal against enforcement notice)	Plots E and F, Land South of Plough Road, Smallfield RH6 9SD	3	Permission granted on appeal 20/05/25
APP/M3645/C/24/3357971 (appeal against enforcement notice)	Plot H, Dowlands Lane, Smallfield RH6 9SD	1	Permission granted on appeal 20/05/25
APP/M3645/C/24/3357972 (appeal against enforcement notice)	Plot I (north), Land South of Plough Road, Smallfield RH6 9SD	1	Permission granted on appeal 20/05/25
APP/M3645/C/24/3357973 (appeal against enforcement notice)	Plot I (south), Land South of Plough Road, Horley RH6 9SD	1	Permission granted on appeal 20/05/25
2024/307	Burstow Stables, Church Lane, Burstow RH6 9TG	4	Permission granted 26/06/25 PDA site
2025/444	Beechfield, Moats Lane.	4	Permission granted 02/09/25
2025/525	Land At Beech Farm Road, Warlingham CR6 9QJ	5	Permission granted 16/02/26 following appeal against non-determination PDA site.
2025/1182	Greenacre, Crab Hill Lane, South Nutfield RH1 5PG	2	Permission granted 16/02/26
TOTAL		52	

Employment land requirements

There is a need for around 17 hectares of additional land for a range of employment uses including offices, storage and distribution, manufacturing and construction activities. This need can be met by intensifying development on existing employment land sites or by allocating new land opportunities.

The settlement hierarchy

The settlement hierarchy is an important part of the preferred spatial strategy, providing the framework for understanding the role, function and relative sustainability of different settlements across the district. Settlements with a wider range of services, facilities, employment opportunities and public transport connections will generally be more suitable locations for growth than smaller settlements with fewer services and greater reliance on the private car.

A Settlement Hierarchy Study is being prepared to assess the relative accessibility to and availability of services across the district's settlements. This informs the proposed draft hierarchy set out in Table 2 below.

The hierarchy provides the starting point for understanding where development can most sustainably be directed. However, the scale of growth at any individual settlement will depend on site availability, deliverability, infrastructure capacity, environmental constraints, Green Belt impact, settlement character and the ability to mitigate impacts. The hierarchy is therefore a framework to inform the location of development, not a fixed distribution formula.



Table 2: Draft settlement hierarchy

Tier	Settlements	Strategic role
Tier 1	■ Caterham on the Hill ■ Caterham Valley ■ Oxted (including Hurst Green and Limpsfield) ■ Warlingham ■ Whyteleafe	The largest and most sustainable settlements, generally with the strongest range of services, facilities, public transport accessibility and existing infrastructure. These settlements will remain important locations for growth. However, the scale of development they accommodate will depend on the availability of suitable and deliverable sites, infrastructure capacity, Green Belt impact, environmental constraints, settlement character and the ability to mitigate impacts.
Tier 2	■ Godstone ■ Lingfield ■ Smallfield	Larger rural service settlements which provide a range of local services and facilities and perform an important role for surrounding communities. These settlements may accommodate growth where suitable and deliverable opportunities exist and where the scale of development can be supported by infrastructure and achieved without unacceptable environmental, Green Belt, landscape, highway or settlement character impacts.
Tier 3	■ Bletchingley ■ Dormansland ■ South Godstone ■ South Nutfield	Smaller settlements with a more limited range of services and infrastructure, but may still be capable of accommodating growth where this is justified by the evidence. The level of development in these settlements will depend on site availability, local capacity, infrastructure requirements, accessibility, environmental constraints and the ability to deliver development in a way that reflects settlement character and supports local needs.
Tier 4	■ Blindley Heath ■ Burstow ■ Chaldon ■ Chelsham ■ Crowhurst ■ Crowhurst Lane End ■ Domewood ■ Dormans Park ■ Farleigh ■ Felbridge ■ Felcourt ■ Ficklehole ■ Horne ■ Limpsfield Chart ■ Nutfield ■ Old Oxted ■ Outwood ■ Tandridge ■ Tatsfield ■ Titsey ■ Woldingham	Smaller villages, rural settlements and other locations outside the higher-order settlements, where development will generally be limited and carefully controlled. Any growth in these locations is likely to only focus on small-scale allocations, rural exception schemes, appropriate infill, redevelopment opportunities or development that supports local community needs. However, where the evidence identifies suitable and deliverable opportunities, the scale of development will be considered having regard to local circumstances, infrastructure capacity, Green Belt impact, accessibility and environmental constraints.

The hierarchy should be read as a framework for assessing the relative sustainability of settlements, not as a fixed guide to the distribution of development. The final hierarchy will be confirmed once views are taken into account following this consultation.

Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment

The Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) has been published alongside this consultation as a separate evidence base document.

It identifies sites submitted to us from landowners and developers for consideration and provides a strategic assessment of their potential suitability, availability and deliverability for development. The full HELAA contains site-specific information including site boundaries, descriptions, proposed uses, indicative capacities, constraints and initial assessment outcomes.

The inclusion of a site in the HELAA does not mean the site is allocated for development. It does not grant planning permission, amend Green Belt boundaries, establish the principle of development, or indicate we support development on that site.

The HELAA does not determine the housing requirement, select the preferred spatial strategy, or remove the need for planning applications to be assessed on their individual merits.

It is an evidence gathering exercise that identifies the sites submitted for consideration through the Local Plan process. It provides a record of potentially available land that exists to help address the district's development need.

The working HELAA dataset includes 288 site records, which are assessed for their suitability. The HELAA shows a significant number of sites have been put forward across the district. However, it also shows many of those sites are affected by constraints or are in locations which are currently assessed as unsuitable or requiring further assessment.

A site assessed as **suitable** or **under assessment** in the HELAA is not automatically suitable for allocation. It remains subject to further assessment through the Local Plan process. Equally, a site assessed as **unsuitable** in the HELAA does not mean we can stop reviewing the evidence base where circumstances change or further information is submitted.

The submitted sites have also been considered in relation to the draft settlement hierarchy. The settlement hierarchy identifies the relative sustainability of settlements by considering access to services, facilities, public transport and other indicators.

This is important because the location of development will affect how sustainable the spatial strategy is. Sites in or adjoining higher-tier settlements may benefit from better access to services and public transport, although they may still be affected by Green Belt, landscape, flood risk, infrastructure or other constraints. Sites in lower-tier or rural locations may have more limited access to services and public transport and may therefore be less suitable for significant levels of growth.

Table 3 summarises the current working position by settlement hierarchy tier. The capacity figures are indicative only and are based on numerical residential or mixed residential capacities stated in the working HELAA capacity spreadsheet. They should not be read as a deliverable housing supply figure, a preferred strategy figure, or an indication that we consider the sites at the locations within the HELAA suitable for allocation.

For clarity, the sites in the HELAA are not proposed allocations, are not supported by default and in many cases are subject to significant constraints. The figures are presented only to show the broad scale of promoted capacity currently under consideration and should not be relied upon as an established or deliverable position. We welcome views on any of the sites identified.

Table 3: Distribution of HELAA sites by settlement hierarchy tier

Settlement hierarchy	Non-duplicate HELAA site records	Suitable / under assessment records	Indicative capacity on remaining sites promoted for consideration
Tier 1	81	57	around 2,885
Tier 2	15	25	around 2,671
Tier 3/4	113	44	around 4,478
Unclassified / rural / n/a locations	68	22	around 4,249
Total	277	148	around 14,283

The table shows that a significant amount of promoted land is located across all tiers of the settlement hierarchy. The highest indicative promoted capacity is not necessarily located in the highest-tier settlements. This reflects the fact that some lower-tier and rural locations include large strategic-scale sites or extensive land parcels.

The capacity figures in the tables must be treated with caution. They identify the broad scale of land put forward to us but do not represent suitable, deliverable or justified allocations.

These figures do not imply endorsement or priority. Final allocations will be determined through further infrastructure testing, Green Belt assessment and the wider evidence base.

Several issues arising from the HELAA will be important in preparing the spatial strategy:

- The majority of land put forward is constrained, particularly by Green Belt, flood risk, landscape sensitivity and infrastructure capacity.
- The largest submissions need the most detailed further assessment.
- Some smaller brownfield sites may have limited capacity despite being less constrained in principle.
- Sites in lower-tier settlements will need to demonstrate sustainability taking account of services, transport and infrastructure.
- A number of sites put forward are for non-residential or mixed uses, which will be assessed against the wider evidence base for employment, infrastructure and community needs.

Following this consultation, the HELAA will be updated to reflect factual corrections, new information from site promoters and comments from statutory consultees. It will then be used alongside the Sustainability Appraisal, Green Belt Assessment, transport evidence and other studies to help inform the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

Green Belt Assessment

A Green Belt Assessment Stage 1 is being produced, which assesses the role, function and purpose of the Tandridge District's Green Belt at a strategic level.

The Stage 1 work identifies that the majority of Green Belt strongly performs against at [least one of the five purposes of Green Belt](#), which confirms the constrained nature of the district.

The next stage will be a Stage 2 assessment focusing on site-specific impacts and the identification of grey belt land.

Grey belt is a term introduced in the National Planning Policy Framework to describe land within the Green Belt that is previously developed or that makes a limited contribution to three of the five Green Belt purposes. It is a specific new policy route that may allow development where relevant criteria are met.



Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Level 1 is being produced for the district. The Level 1 SFRA will provide a district-wide assessment of flood risk from all sources, including fluvial flooding from rivers and watercourses, surface water flooding, groundwater flooding and reservoir inundation.

The Environment Agency maps the extent and depth of flood risk across the district, identifies areas within Flood Zones 2 and 3. It also provides the strategic evidence base used to apply the sequential and exception tests required by national planning policy.

The Environment Agency mapping informs the spatial strategy by identifying areas where development should be avoided or where further site-specific flood risk assessment will be required. A Level 2 SFRA will be prepared later to provide a more detailed assessment of specific sites and locations where the exception test may need to be applied.

Local Nature Recovery Strategy

We also recognise the role of the Surrey Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS), being prepared by Surrey County Council as the Responsible Authority. The Strategy identifies priorities and opportunities for habitat enhancement, biodiversity net gain and nature recovery across the county.

As the Local Plan progresses, we will take account of the LNRS and consider how the spatial strategy and policy framework can support its delivery, including through the protection and enhancement of ecological networks, green infrastructure and other measures to support nature recovery.

We will also consider whether there are opportunities, where justified by the evidence base and consistent with the wider Plan strategy. This could include safeguarding land or supporting land use patterns that would support the long-term delivery of LNRS priorities and strategic nature recovery measures.

Infrastructure baseline and key constraints

Our emerging evidence identifies a range of existing infrastructure pressures and future delivery requirements. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan baseline is being prepared as a working evidence document. It will be updated as the Local Plan progresses, including through further engagement with infrastructure providers and as the preferred spatial strategy becomes clearer.

The current evidence shows infrastructure will be important in comparing and refining the spatial options. In particular, the evidence indicates that the Local Plan will need to consider how different patterns of growth affect transport networks, water supply, wastewater treatment, flood risk, healthcare, education, green infrastructure, sport and recreation, utilities and wider community infrastructure.



Table 4: Infrastructure considerations

Infrastructure type	Baseline provision / asset position	Assessment output / key constraint	Constraint rating	Local Plan implication
Rail	There are 11 stations in the Tandridge District.	Important sustainable transport asset, but subject to overcrowding, service limitations and reliance on unfunded strategic upgrades.	Medium / High	There is currently no committed programme or funding to support any major additional rail capacity upgrades in the District.
Bus	Network of commercial, supported, Transport for London (TFL) and demand-responsive services.	Provision is strongest on core corridors but variable in rural areas, at weekends and outside peak periods.	Medium	Higher growth will need coordinated bus investment, Digital Demand Responsive Transport (DDRT) expansion, bus priority and developer contributions.
Active travel	Extensive Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network, National Cycle Network (NCN) routes and long-distance trails.	Quality, safety, surface, signage and severance issues limit use. Walking/cycling commute share is 7.8%, below 13.7% national average.	Medium	Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and site-level active travel infrastructure will be needed. Active travel cannot alone offset strategic transport impacts.
Local highways	A22, A25 and A264 provide principal district connectivity.	Recurring congestion, weak east-west connectivity, rat-running and sensitive junctions/corridors.	High	Spatial strategy should avoid compounding known hotspots unless mitigation is deliverable and funded.
Strategic Road Network	M25 and M23 influence local traffic conditions.	M25 Junction 6 identified as operating at capacity in previous evidence. No current National Highways forward-programme scheme including Road Investment Strategy 3 (RIS3).	High	Major growth affecting M25/A22 corridor requires specific testing and cannot rely on committed Strategic Road Network (SRN) intervention.
Air transport	Close to Gatwick, Heathrow, Biggin Hill, Redhill Aerodrome and London City.	Gatwick Northern Runway Project may increase cross-boundary airport-related demand. Mitigation focused mainly outside the district.	Medium	Requires cross-boundary coordination and assessment of airport-related transport impacts.
Clean water	SES Water supplies district. Godstone and Kenley water treatment works (WTW) are relevant assets.	Demand increase estimated at 1.44-1.92 Ml/d. SES Water cannot meet demand for six current proposals without reinforcement: ■ 2 in Oxted ■ 3 in South Godstone ■ 1 in Smallfield	High	Growth locations require early SES engagement, reinforcement planning and updated Water Cycle Study evidence.

Infrastructure type	Baseline provision / asset position	Assessment output / key constraint	Constraint rating	Local Plan implication
Wastewater	Seven Wastewater treatment works (WWTW) operated by Thames Water and Southern Water.	Oxted operating beyond consented flow. Felbridge close to consented flow. Additional load estimated at 1.81-2.4 Ml/d.	High	New development in constrained catchments will need phasing or upgrades to ensure the infrastructure is capable of supporting growth.
Flood risk / drainage	Environment Agency (EA), Surrey County Council Lead Local Flood Authority (SCC LLFA) and Upper Medway Internal Drainage Board (IDB) roles. Risks include fluvial, surface water, sewer, reservoir, groundwater and source protection zone (SPZ).	Risk areas include River Eden/Eden Brook, Smallfield, Horne and north Lingfield. Five high-risk reservoirs identified.	High	Site allocation should be sequentially tested and avoid locations with costly or complex mitigation where alternatives exist.
Electricity	UK Power Networks (UKPN) distribution network with multiple substations and overhead/ underground assets.	No immediate constraint identified based on the existing situation. This may change when growth is factored in along with increased electrification and absence of Local Area Energy Plan (LAEP), which creates future uncertainty.	Medium	Early UKPN engagement, phasing information and on-site land for substations may be required.
Gas / heat networks	SGN gas network has robust current capacity. No heat networks currently identified.	Gas is not currently constrained but future role is uncertain due to decarbonisation, hydrogen and heat network zoning.	Low / Medium	New development should anticipate low-carbon heat policy rather than rely on long-term gas infrastructure.
Health	Three Primary Care Networks (PCN), GP practices, Caterham Dene, East Surrey Hospital and wider NHS facilities.	Capacity data incomplete due to Integrated Care Board (ICB) merger. ICB indicated major growth creates healthcare capacity challenges.	Medium / High	Healthcare modelling and provider engagement needed once site locations and quantities are known. Large sites may require new provision.
Waste	Tandridge District Council (TDC) collection, SCC disposal/planning role, Community Recycling Centres (CRC) and Waste Transfer Station (WTS) infrastructure across Surrey.	Strong recycling performance but county-wide capacity shortfalls and Local government reorganisation (LGR) uncertainty. East Surrey capacity imbalance risk.	Medium / High	Growth will increase waste demand and may require new/expanded infrastructure. Updated Waste Local Plan due 2029.
Green infrastructure	Extensive rural green infrastructure (GI), 94% Green Belt, Surrey Hills and High Weald National Landscapes.	Provision is uneven. 2017 evidence identifies parish-level access deficits and perceived shortfalls in several typologies.	Medium / High	Growth should secure accessible GI, Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) / Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) type mitigation and address existing deficits.

Infrastructure type	Baseline provision / asset position	Assessment output / key constraint	Constraint rating	Local Plan implication
Digital infrastructure	Openreach, major providers and local/specialist providers. Gigabit coverage 86.4% in Surrey by July 2025.	No discrete evidence gaps identified. New homes must include gigabit-ready infrastructure.	Low	Not a major constraint, but rural speed and digital inclusion should remain considerations.
Sports and recreation	Leisure centres, pitches, courts, pools, skateparks and multi use game areas (MUGA).	Current shortfall of five full-size 3G football pitches. Future demand may require at least two further pitches by 2030.	Medium / High	Growth must contribute to pitch quality, 3G provision and facility upgrades through Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)/Section 106 (S106) agreements and strategy updates.
Education / Special educational needs and disabilities (SEND)	Nurseries, infant, junior, primary, secondary, specialist schools, units and sixth forms.	Primary rolls falling, but secondary/post-16 and SEND pressures rising. Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) up 25%.	Medium / High	Growth strategy must model secondary, post-16 and SEND needs. Primary surplus should not obscure specialist need.
Community facilities / care / emergency services	Community centres, youth provision, libraries, elderly accommodation, police, fire and ambulance services.	Voluntary-sector reliance, funding uncertainty, ageing population needs, cemetery capacity and emergency service evidence gaps.	Medium	Growth should support accessible community infrastructure, older persons provision and emergency service engagement.

Table 4 summarises the principal infrastructure considerations needed to prepare the Local Plan. It demonstrates that infrastructure constraints are not limited to one issue or one location. Instead, they arise across a range of infrastructure types and affect how growth can be planned, phased and delivered. The key strategic infrastructure issues include:

- Capacity constraints on the strategic and local road network, particularly the A22 corridor and M25 Junction 6.
- The need to maximise opportunities for rail, bus, walking and cycling, while recognising that sustainable transport improvements may require funding, coordination and long lead-in times.
- Water supply and wastewater capacity constraints, including the need for early engagement with relevant providers.
- Flood risk and drainage constraints, including the need to apply a sequential approach and avoid locations where mitigation may be complex or difficult to deliver.
- Healthcare capacity and the need for further engagement with NHS bodies once the location and scale of growth is clearer.
- Education capacity, including secondary, post-16 and SEND provision.
- Green infrastructure, open space, sport and recreation requirements.
- Utilities, energy, waste and digital infrastructure requirements.
- Wider community infrastructure, including community facilities, care provision and emergency service requirements.

These issues were consistently raised through the first consultation as well as identified in the baseline work. The Local Plan will need to ensure infrastructure is treated as a central part of the spatial strategy, rather than as a matter to be addressed only after sites have been selected. Infrastructure capacity is a critical factor in determining the level and distribution of development and represents one of the most significant constraints within the district.

The delivery of new infrastructure is also often complex and time-dependent, involving coordination with multiple providers and subject to funding and delivery constraints. As a result, infrastructure capacity acts not only as a constraint, but also as a key factor of where development can be sustainably located, reinforcing the need for an infrastructure-led spatial strategy.

Generally, infrastructure is most likely to be delivered when it is plan led, as opposed to speculative development. Most government infrastructure funds and grants are limited to those that support schemes and developments that are in an adopted plan. This is why it is critical to put in place a forward looking development plan for the district.



Approach to meeting development needs

In preparing the Local Plan, we must balance the requirement to plan positively for development with the need to ensure growth is sustainable, deliverable and consistent with the district's constraints.

This requires a proportionate and evidence-led approach which recognises that not all development needs may be capable of being met in full. The distribution of development must reflect environmental capacity and infrastructure availability and that a strategy based solely on theoretical land capacity would not be deliverable in practice.

The approach set out in this consultation seeks to maximise the delivery of development within the district's capacity, identify a realistic and deliverable level of growth based on evidence rather than aspiration. It also focuses development in locations where it can be supported by infrastructure and services and provide flexibility to respond to changes in circumstances through future review of the Plan.

Our approach is not to restrict development unnecessarily. Rather, it is to ensure development is planned and delivered in a way that is coordinated and aligned with the district's environmental and infrastructure capacity to avoid unsustainable or unplanned growth.

Meeting development needs and Green Belt considerations

Based on the current evidence, we consider the district's identified housing need is unlikely to be met within existing urban areas and defined village settlement boundaries alone. While urban areas and previously developed land will continue to play an important role in the district's planning strategy, evidence from the HELAA and past delivery rates indicates that land availability within these areas is limited when compared with the scale of development needs.

In response and in addition to the sites identified through the HELAA, we are preparing an Urban Capacity Study. This will assess whether there are further opportunities for the sensitive intensification and optimisation of development within urban areas and villages, including on previously developed land. This work represents the next step in ensuring that all reasonable opportunities to accommodate development needs outside the Green Belt are fully explored. Notwithstanding this further work, currently it is considered likely that the full housing requirement will not be capable of being accommodated within urban areas and other non-Green Belt locations alone.

We consider it may be necessary to identify land for development beyond existing settlement boundaries, including through the release of land from the Green Belt. This may include strategic releases as well as more localised Green Belt boundary changes, such as the review of settlement boundaries and the potential inseting of land from the Green Belt. This will ensure that a full range of reasonable options is considered in responding positively to identified needs.

In addition, we will consider whether it is appropriate to review existing settlement boundaries, including those villages currently washed over by the Green Belt. This may involve the identification of revised settlement boundaries or the inseting of villages from the Green Belt where justified, to enable the delivery of sustainable development at an appropriate scale. Any such changes would be informed by detailed evidence, including assessment of Green Belt purposes, the role and function of settlements and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development.

The Local Plan is being prepared on a 'no stone unturned' basis, seeking to maximise opportunities to meet development needs within urban areas and on previously developed land wherever possible. The findings of the Urban Capacity Study and other evidence will inform the final spatial strategy and the selection of site allocations at Regulation 19 stage.

However, given the constrained nature of the Tandridge District, there remains a realistic prospect that some level of unmet need could arise, where the combined effects of land availability, infrastructure capacity, environmental constraints and deliverability limit the amount of development that can be sustainably accommodated.

In this context, we will continue to engage constructively on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities to explore options for addressing any unmet need, in accordance with national policy and guidance on cross-boundary cooperation. Views are invited through this consultation on these matters, including the potential role of Green Belt release in delivering sustainable development and how any residual unmet need should be addressed, including through collaboration with neighbouring authorities.

3 Vision and objectives

This chapter sets out the amended vision for the Tandridge District to 2044 and the strategic objectives that will help deliver it. The earlier Regulation 18 Early Engagement Consultation tested an initial vision and asked whether it reflected local priorities, balanced growth with environmental protection and omitted any important issues. This chapter builds on that work, refining the vision to reflect consultation outcomes. It also reflects the emerging evidence base and our view of an appropriate and deliverable strategy for the district.

What the early engagement consultation said about the vision and priorities

The earlier consultation received a mixed but generally positive response, around 44% of respondents agreed it reflected what they wanted for the district. Around 45% agreed it balanced growth with protection of countryside and local character. However, many considered the vision too broad and in need of further refinement.

The clearest messages were:

- Place greater emphasis on infrastructure.
- Be more explicit about protecting the Green Belt, countryside and settlement character.
- Say more about delivering the right homes, particularly genuinely affordable housing.
- Be more realistic and transparent about how growth would be planned and delivered in practice. These messages were consistent across both the vision-specific responses and the wider consultation.

Amended vision for the Tandridge District to 2044

The revised vision has been prepared to balance local priorities and delivering realistic and managed growth. It retains the core direction of the original vision, but places more emphasis on infrastructure, realistic delivery, environmental protection and the provision of homes and services in the most sustainable locations. It is then supported by a clearer and more focused set of objectives which explain how the vision will be achieved. Our amended vision for the Local Plan is as follows:

By 2044, the Tandridge District will remain defined by its countryside, Green Belt and distinctive towns and villages, while accommodating growth in a planned, coordinated and sustainable way. Development will have been directed to the most appropriate and sustainable locations, supported by infrastructure delivered in step with growth. And will be designed to respect the character, identity and environmental qualities that make the district distinctive.

The district will provide a wider choice of homes, including homes that are more affordable and better suited to local needs, alongside thriving local centres, accessible services, improved opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport and a resilient local economy. Growth will have been managed in a way that protects and enhances the natural, historic and landscape environment, supports nature recovery and responds positively to the challenges of climate change.

The Local Plan will provide a realistic and deliverable framework for the district, balancing national policy requirements with the district's environmental and infrastructure constraints. It will ensure growth takes place in a way that strengthens communities, safeguards the countryside and supports long-term wellbeing.



Strategic objectives

The amended vision sets out the broad direction of the Local Plan. The strategic objectives provide the framework for delivering the vision. They translate the vision into a smaller number of clear strategic priorities which will inform the spatial development strategy, site allocations and the detailed policies prepared later in the plan process. The objectives are not intended to replicate detailed policy wording. Instead, they identify the main outcomes the Local Plan will seek to achieve over the plan period.

1. Objective 1: Plan positively for a realistic and deliverable level of growth.

To provide a clear and positively prepared planning framework which seeks to meet development needs as far as reasonably possible, while ensuring that the overall scale of growth proposed is realistic, justified and capable of being delivered having regard to the district's constraints.

2. Objective 2: Direct development to the most appropriate locations and align it with infrastructure provision.

To focus development in locations most appropriate for growth, taking account of accessibility, the availability of services and facilities, infrastructure capacity, environmental constraints and the need to secure infrastructure delivery in step with development.

3. Objective 3: Deliver homes that better meet local needs and support strong communities.

To provide a mix of homes that better reflects local needs, including smaller homes and affordable housing and to ensure development supports healthy, inclusive and well-connected communities with access to services, green space and community facilities.

4. Objective 4: Protect the Green Belt, countryside and the character of places.

To safeguard the purpose and openness of the Green Belt, protect the countryside and maintain the distinct identity and setting of the district's towns and villages, while ensuring that any change is carefully managed and respects character.

5. Objective 5: Support a resilient local economy and accessible centres.

To protect and support local employment, town and village centres, rural enterprise and digital connectivity, to help maintain a balanced local economy and support access to jobs and services.

6. Objective 6: Conserve and enhance the district's natural and historic environment.

To protect and enhance biodiversity, landscapes, heritage assets and the wider environmental quality of the district and to ensure development contributes positively to nature recovery, green infrastructure and high quality placemaking.

7. Objective 7: Respond to climate change and maintain a deliverable and adaptable Local Plan.

To support development that helps address climate change, improves resilience to future environmental pressures and can be monitored, managed and reviewed to ensure the Plan remains effective over time.

How the objectives will help deliver the vision

The amended vision and the strategic objectives should be read together. The vision describes the overall outcome the Local Plan is seeking to achieve, while the objectives explain the main way the outcome will be delivered through the spatial strategy, allocations and policy framework.

The first two objectives establish the core strategic basis of the Plan. They make clear the Local Plan must both plan positively for growth and ensure that growth is realistic, deliverable and aligned with infrastructure and capacity.

This reflects the strongest messages arising from the earlier consultation, particularly the need for development to be carefully managed, located in the most appropriate places and supported by infrastructure delivered in step with growth.

The third, fourth and fifth objectives focus on what the strategy will deliver for the district's communities and economy. They respond directly to consultation feedback which emphasised the need for the right homes, stronger local communities, protection of the Green Belt and countryside and support for local centres, services and employment.

Together, these objectives seek to ensure that the Plan does not simply provide for growth in numerical terms but supports a pattern of development that is locally appropriate and beneficial in practice.

The final two objectives address the environmental quality, resilience and long-term effectiveness of the Plan. They reflect the importance given in the consultation to protecting the district's natural and historic environment, improving environmental quality, responding to climate change and ensuring the Plan remains deliverable and responsive over time. In this way, the objectives provide a clear and focused framework for the preferred strategy and the more detailed policy approach that follows.

Altogether, the objectives provide a more concise and focused statement of the Plan's strategic priorities. They establish the basis for the preferred spatial strategy has been prepared and will be used to develop and test future policies, allocations and delivery mechanisms.



4 Identifying the preferred spatial strategy

This section sets out the spatial strategy options considered for the Local Plan, informed by the previous Regulation 18 consultation responses and the supporting evidence base.

It also identifies our preferred strategy, which will provide the basis for site allocations, infrastructure requirements and the broad pattern of development to be taken forward at the next stage.

Identifying reasonable spatial strategy options

We have considered several options for distributing growth across the district. Those options range from larger settlement approaches to more proportionate dispersal with and without a new strategic development site. These options are being assessed alongside the Sustainability Appraisal, HELAA, infrastructure evidence and environmental constraints. The final housing requirement and development strategy will be determined through this process rather than assumed at this stage.

Consideration of a strategic development site at Redhill Aerodrome

Two of the options include a new strategic development site at Redhill Aerodrome, potentially capable of delivering approximately 2,250 dwellings in a planned way, supported by new infrastructure, services, green infrastructure and community facilities.

This large site presents a unique development opportunity on predominantly brownfield land. Information provided by the site promoter indicates that the proposal could include a substantial package of supporting infrastructure, including:

- Education provision.
- Community facilities.
- Neighbourhood centre uses.
- Healthcare provision or land for a health facility.
- Active travel connections, bus service enhancements.
- Green infrastructure.
- Employment floorspace.

The promoter has also identified that the proposal could include around 300 dwellings as key worker affordable and intermediate housing, intended in part to support East Surrey Hospital with staff recruitment and retention, as well as the needs of other organisations and businesses in the wider Gatwick sub-region.

The site remains subject to further technical assessment, Green Belt assessment, transport evidence, flood risk assessment, master planning and Sustainability Appraisal findings.

The principal benefit of a strategic site is that development can be planned comprehensively from the outset as a new community, rather than being delivered through piecemeal growth.

In this case, the promoter's current concept includes a planned structure of neighbourhoods, local and community facilities, schools, open space, active travel routes and public transport improvements. The education concept currently identifies a 2-form entry primary school with early years provision and a 4-form entry secondary school. An all-through school has also been identified as a possible alternative for further consideration.

The wider concept also includes neighbourhood centre and community uses, including retail and service provision, a community hub, day nursery, sports facilities and health uses.

Strategically, this illustrates the potential for Redhill Aerodrome to function not simply as a housing site, but as a planned and more self-contained community with supporting infrastructure embedded within the overall scheme.

Table 5: Redhill Aerodrome Strategic Development Site - summary of key considerations

Topic	Indicative strategic site components / considerations
Scale and role	Approx. 2,250 dwellings delivered as a planned strategic development site / new community rather than piecemeal growth.
Housing	Mixed housing offer, including affordable housing subject to viability, potential self/custom build provision, provision for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation and around 300 key worker affordable and intermediate homes identified by the promoter.
Education	Indicative provision for a 2-form entry primary school with early years and a 4-form entry secondary school, with an all-through school identified as a possible alternative subject to further work with the education authority.
Healthcare and community use	Potential for a health facility or land for health provision, community hub, day nursery, sports provision and other supporting community infrastructure.
Retail and local services	Neighbourhood centre uses identified by the promoter, including convenience retail, cafe, pharmacy, gym and other local service provision to support day-to-day needs.
Employment	Potential employment provision including refurbishment of existing business space and new light industrial floorspace, alongside support for key worker housing linked in part to East Surrey Hospital and the wider Gatwick sub-region.
Transport and accessibility	Proposed bus service enhancements, active travel routes, improvements to rights of way and cycling links, local highway works and land safeguarding associated with longer-term highway considerations.
Flood risk and drainage	Significant flood risk and drainage interventions identified, including culvert removal, channel improvements, bridge replacement, bunding, earthworks and a surface water management strategy.
Foul drainage	Upgrading of Crab Hill Lane sewage works, to ensure sufficient capacity for the proposed development, subject to further evidence and programming with the Environment Agency and Thames Water
Green infrastructure and ecology	Comprehensive green infrastructure, on-site biodiversity net gain, naturalised watercourse, tree planting, grassland creation, wetland habitat and sustainable drainage features.
Delivery and phasing	Strategic site would require significant lead-in time, infrastructure planning, utilities assessment, viability work, transport modelling, master planning and phased delivery.
Long-term stewardship	Promoter has indicated that long-term management should not rely on a standard developer management company model and could instead involve a parish council, local authority, community land trust or residents' association type arrangement.
Key qualification	Any allocation would remain subject to further technical evidence, Green Belt assessment, transport evidence, flood risk assessment, master planning and Sustainability Appraisal findings.

A further advantage of a strategic site is it can provide greater scope for integrated infrastructure and environmental mitigation than would typically be achievable through a more fragmented pattern of growth.

The material provided by the promoter includes, for example, potential flood risk and drainage works associated with Redhill Brook and the Salford Stream, including culvert removal, channel improvements, bridge replacement, surface water management and the use of bunding and other earthworks to manage extreme events.

It also includes a package of transport and accessibility measures, including enhanced bus provision, active travel routes, improvements to rights of way and cycling links and local highway works. Ecological enhancements and primarily onsite biodiversity net gain are also envisaged, including a naturalised watercourse, tree planting, grassland creation, wetland habitat and sustainable drainage features.

In principle, the ability to plan these elements comprehensively is a significant strength of a strategic site approach and could reduce pressure on existing settlements. Incremental growth might otherwise give rise to greater cumulative harm to Green Belt purposes, settlement character and local infrastructure.

However, we recognise a strategic site carries a long lead in time and requires substantial evidence, infrastructure planning, transport modelling, utilities assessment, viability work and phasing. Any allocation at Redhill Aerodrome would need to demonstrate it can contribute realistically to housing delivery within the plan period and that the necessary infrastructure can be secured and delivered in a timely way.

In addition to housing numbers, any future allocation would need to address master planning, phased infrastructure delivery, education, healthcare, public transport, active travel, flood risk, drainage, green infrastructure, biodiversity net gain, affordable housing, employment provision, design quality and long-term stewardship. The promoter has indicated that long-term management should not rely on a standard developer management company model, but could instead be provided through a parish council, local authority, community land trust or residents' association or similar arrangement. This matter would require further consideration through any future policy and master planning work.

The promoter has suggested an infrastructure led, phased development following a comprehensive masterplan and agreed parameters and phasing for Redhill Aerodrome which seeks to align housing delivery with the provision of key supporting infrastructure and facilities. The phasing information is indicative only at this stage and requires further testing through master planning, infrastructure planning, transport evidence, viability work and the wider evidence base if the site were to be taken forward. However, the developer confirms the site could start delivery in the early part of the plan period with peak delivery of around 300 homes a year.

Table 6: Redhill Aerodrome indicative infrastructure phasing summary

Phase	Indicative content
Phase 1	Initial delivery of homes for a mix of tenures: ■ Employment space additions and regeneration. ■ Main local centre. ■ New schools as required. ■ Formal sports facilities. ■ Temporary shuttle bus in service. ■ Open space in delivery. ■ Gypsy and Traveller site. ■ De-culverting complete with sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) work complete in development areas.
Phase 2	■ Additional dwellings and employment space delivery continuing. ■ Additional community facilities and commercial development. ■ Public open space delivery largely complete. ■ Additional school provision as required. ■ Hospital keyworker housing delivered.
Phase 3	■ Final phase delivering remaining dwellings (all tenures). ■ Internal bus services complete. ■ Completed delivery of recreation and open space, etc...

Redhill Aerodrome should not be treated simply as a housing allocation. Its role, if taken forward, would be to deliver a planned new community as part of the long-term spatial strategy of the district. It would combine housing, infrastructure, services, employment, environmental mitigation and stewardship within one strategic framework.

Whether its role can be fulfilled in a way which is sustainable, deliverable and justified will depend on the continuing evidence base, the Sustainability Appraisal and our wider consideration of the spatial strategy options. It should be emphasised that, at this stage, Redhill Aerodrome is included only as a potential strategic option for consultation. Its progression through the Local Plan process is not decided and will depend on consultation responses, ongoing evidence gathering, Sustainability Appraisal conclusions and whether it is ultimately considered a sustainable, deliverable and justified component of the preferred spatial strategy.

The spatial strategy options

We have considered four options for distributing growth across the district. These are spatial distribution options for housing and employment growth, rather than final site allocation decisions. They provide a framework for considering how development could be accommodated. They also allow us to assess the sustainability, infrastructure, environmental and deliverability implications of each approach. The four options are:

- **Option 1:** Hierarchical Approach, with development distributed proportionately down the settlement hierarchy.
- **Option 2:** As Option 1, but with an additional strategic component of around 2,250 dwellings at Redhill Aerodrome.
- **Option 3:** Capacity-led dispersed growth across settlements throughout the district.
- **Option 4:** As Option 3, but with an additional strategic component of around 2,250 dwellings at Redhill Aerodrome.

These options have been identified as the reasonable alternatives available to us. The district is heavily constrained and any strategy for growth will require difficult choices about Green Belt release, infrastructure delivery, settlement character, accessibility, landscape impact and the ability to meet housing and employment needs. The advantages and disadvantages of each option are discussed in the following sections.

Option 1: Hierarchical Approach, with development distributed proportionately down the settlement hierarchy

What this option involves

Option 1 applies the settlement hierarchy as the primary framework for the distribution of development. This means, the greatest proportion of growth would be directed towards the district's largest and most sustainable settlements (Tier 1 and then Tier 2), with more limited development directed to lower-tier settlements on a proportionate basis.

Main advantages

The principal advantage of this approach is it reflects the established spatial hierarchy and aligns with the objective of directing development to the most sustainable locations within the district.

By also drawing from a range of sites across the settlement hierarchy, while maintaining a clear emphasis on the most sustainable locations, the strategy could broaden the supply of deliverable sites and reduce reliance on a small number of large allocations. This may help improve resilience in the housing trajectory and allow development to respond to a variety of local opportunities, including brownfield land, smaller edge-of-settlement sites and infill development, where they are consistent with the role and character of the settlement.

Main disadvantages or risks

The effectiveness of this option is strongly affected by the constraints affecting the district's largest and most sustainable settlements, which would be expected to accommodate most of the development if this option were taken forward.

Infrastructure and environmental implications

These settlements are subject to a range of environmental and policy constraints, including Green Belt, infrastructure and highway capacity limitations, landscape sensitivity, flood risk, heritage considerations and established settlement character.

As a result, there is a risk that directing the greatest proportion of growth to these locations could prove challenging in practice and may place considerable pressure on constrained areas. This could require substantial mitigation, infrastructure investment or, in some cases, extensive Green Belt release that could undermine its purpose across the wider plan area.

This gives rise to a fundamental tension within the option. While the hierarchy directs growth towards the most sustainable locations in principle, these locations are also subject to significant constraints and competing pressures.

There may be limits to how far development needs can be accommodated within the upper tiers without resulting in unacceptable impacts or significant changes to settlement form and character. Although the inclusion of limited development in lower-tier settlements introduces a degree of flexibility, there remains a risk that the overall strategy continues to concentrate growth pressures in locations where capacity is most restricted.

There is also a need to ensure that an appropriate balance is achieved across the settlement hierarchy. If too much development is directed towards the upper tiers, the strategy may exacerbate existing infrastructure and environmental pressures.

Conversely, if a greater proportion of development is directed towards lower-tier settlements to respond to these constraints, the strategy risks becoming more dispersed and less aligned with the principles of accessibility and sustainability that underpin the hierarchy. The success of this option would therefore depend on demonstrating, through evidence, that the proposed distribution strikes an appropriate and deliverable balance.

Conclusion

Option 1 represents a conventional hierarchy-led approach to growth, providing a clear and logical spatial framework and a useful baseline for assessing alternative strategies.

However, its effectiveness is constrained by the significant limitations affecting the district's most sustainable settlements, creating a clear tension between the spatial strategy and the ability to deliver sufficient development to meet identified needs. It is therefore necessary to consider whether alternative spatial strategies could provide a more balanced and deliverable pattern of growth.

Option 2: As Option 1, but with an additional strategic component of around 2,250 dwellings at Redhill Aerodrome

What the option involves

Option 2 combines the hierarchical approach set out in Option 1 with a new strategic development site at Redhill Aerodrome, expected to provide approximately 2,250 dwellings, subject to further technical assessment, master planning, infrastructure planning and Sustainability Appraisal.

Main advantages

The principal advantage of this option is that it combines the relative sustainability benefits of a hierarchy-led pattern of growth with the opportunity to deliver a significant proportion of development in a single, comprehensively planned strategic location.

Infrastructure implications

Development at Redhill Aerodrome has the potential to be infrastructure-led, providing new services, community facilities, green infrastructure and active travel networks and opportunities to improve public transport provision.

This form of development may be more capable of integrating infrastructure and land use planning than a more fragmented pattern of smaller sites. The inclusion of a strategic site also increases the overall capacity of the strategy helping to meet development needs within a plan-led framework.

A further advantage is the strategic allocation at Redhill Aerodrome could help to offset existing constraints to growth. This could support a more balanced distribution of development between existing settlements and a new strategic location, while maintaining the settlement hierarchy as the primary framework for the district.

Main disadvantages or risks

This option does not remove the constraints affecting the district's existing settlements, particularly those in the upper tiers which would still be expected to accommodate a substantial proportion of development.

These settlements are subject to a range of environmental and infrastructure constraints, including Green Belt, highway capacity limitations, landscape sensitivity, flood risk, heritage considerations and established settlement character. As a result, there remains a risk that this option combines the complexity and lead-in requirements of a strategic site with the cumulative impacts associated with continued growth across constrained settlements.

Delivery and phasing

There are also important delivery and phasing considerations. Development at Redhill Aerodrome is likely to require significant lead-in time to address access, infrastructure provision, servicing, site assembly and master planning. Consequently, the strategy would need to rely on deliverable sites within the settlement hierarchy to maintain housing supply in the early and middle years of the plan period while the strategic site is brought forward. The effectiveness of this option would therefore depend on both the long-term deliverability of the strategic site and the ability of the hierarchy-led element to provide a resilient and flexible supply of sites in the shorter term.

Conclusion

Overall, this option provides a broader strategy than a hierarchy-led approach alone, increasing the amount of housing that could be delivered by combining a distributed pattern of growth with a significant, infrastructure-led strategic allocation. It may improve the capacity to meet development needs and provides opportunities for comprehensive planning at scale. However, its continued reliance on distributing a substantial proportion of development through the settlement hierarchy means it does not fully overcome the constraints affecting the district's most sustainable settlements.

When considered alongside the delivery and phasing challenges associated with a major strategic site, there is a risk that this option would not provide a sufficiently balanced or deliverable solution. As a result, it is necessary to consider whether alternative approaches could more effectively address both the spatial constraints and delivery challenges identified.

Option 3: Capacity-led dispersed growth across settlements throughout the district

What the option involves

Option 3 would distribute growth across settlements throughout the district based primarily on land availability and infrastructure capacity and environmental limits, rather than a fixed hierarchy-led distribution.

How this differs from the hierarchy-led options

While the settlement hierarchy would remain a relevant consideration, it would not be applied rigidly as in Options 1 and 2. Instead, the scale and location of development would be determined through the site assessment process. This would take account of existing community and commercial services within settlements, site availability, deliverability, infrastructure capacity, accessibility, Green Belt impact, landscape sensitivity, flood risk, settlement character and the ability to mitigate impacts. This option is also distinct from equal dispersal.

It would not mean that every settlement receives the same amount of growth, nor would it mean that higher-tier settlements automatically receive the greatest level of development. While the role, size, services and accessibility of settlements would remain important considerations, the final distribution of growth would be guided by the evidence.

This means that some higher-tier settlements may accommodate a lower level of growth where they are more constrained, while some lower-tier settlements may accommodate a higher level of growth where suitable and deliverable opportunities exist and impacts can be appropriately managed.

Main advantages

The principal advantage of this option is that it provides a flexible and locally responsive settlement-based strategy. It avoids placing excessive reliance on a small number of locations and allows a wider range of settlements to contribute to meeting housing needs where the evidence supports this.

This could support the vitality of existing communities, help sustain local services and provide housing opportunities across different parts of the district.

This option could also improve the resilience of the housing delivery by providing a broader portfolio of small and medium-sized sites across a range of locations. This would help avoid placing undue reliance on a limited number of larger sites and provide greater flexibility if individual sites come forward more slowly than anticipated. It also allows the strategy to respond flexibly to site availability, local capacity and the varying constraints affecting different settlements.

Main disadvantages or risks

Option 3 also has limitations. Without a new strategic development site, the ability to plan positively for development needs is less certain. It could also mean that a greater amount of growth would need to be accommodated across the existing settlement network.

This could increase cumulative pressure on existing communities, infrastructure and Green Belt land around settlements. It may also reduce the opportunity to deliver larger-scale, comprehensively planned infrastructure that is more likely to be associated with a strategic development site or new settlement.

Infrastructure implications

A settlement-based dispersed strategy may result in development being spread across a larger number of locations. This may not deliver the same level of strategic, large-scale infrastructure as a new settlement or single major allocation.

However, it may support a more incremental and locally responsive pattern of infrastructure provision, helping to sustain existing services and deliver improvements across a wider range of settlements. While this may provide broader localised benefits, it may be less effective in delivering new schools, local centres, major transport improvements or comprehensive green infrastructure networks at scale.

The distribution of growth would therefore need to be carefully managed to ensure that development is directed to locations where infrastructure can support development and impacts appropriately mitigated.

Conclusion

Option 3 provides a flexible, evidence-led and locally responsive approach to growth, recognising that the capacity of individual settlements is not determined by their position in the hierarchy alone. It allows development to be directed to the most suitable and deliverable opportunities across the district and may improve resilience by diversifying the supply of sites.

This approach may also enable a broader distribution of growth to support existing communities and services, creating opportunities for incremental infrastructure improvements across a wider range of settlements.

However, in comparison to Options 1 and 2, which provide a clearer spatial structure and/or include a strategic-scale development, this approach may be less certain in delivering coordinated infrastructure at scale and could rely more heavily on cumulative provision across multiple sites. As a result, it may present challenges in ensuring infrastructure delivery is aligned and comprehensive across the plan period.



Option 4: As Option 3, but with an additional strategic component of around 2,250 dwellings at Redhill Aerodrome

What the option involves

Option 4 combines evidence-led dispersed growth across settlements throughout the district with a new strategic development site at Redhill Aerodrome, expected to provide approximately 2,250 dwellings, subject to further assessment, master planning, infrastructure planning and Sustainability Appraisal.

Main advantages

This option combines the strengths of Option 3, a flexible, evidence-led pattern of settlement-based growth, with the benefits of a strategic site. Dispersed growth across the district allows suitable and deliverable sites to come forward in the early stages of the plan period, supporting existing communities while maintaining a broad supply of homes across a range of locations.

Infrastructure implications

The strategic development site at Redhill Aerodrome provides a comprehensive, infrastructure-led component capable of delivering new community facilities, green infrastructure, active travel connections and public transport improvements in a coordinated way.

Why this option differs from the others

This combination helps to address the key limitations of the other options. Unlike Options 1 and 2, it does not concentrate a significant proportion of development pressure on the largest settlements, which face constraints relating to Green Belt, infrastructure capacity and settlement character.

Unlike Option 3, it does not rely solely on dispersed settlement-based growth and allows the delivery of strategic-scale infrastructure alongside new development. It is considered that this approach, which takes proper account of relative environmental and infrastructure capacity alongside the delivery of a strategic development. For this reason, it is considered the option that would respond most positively to meeting the district's development needs.

Main disadvantages and risks

Development at Redhill Aerodrome will require significant lead-in time for infrastructure provision, access and phasing. Dispersed growth will require careful site selection, particularly where Green Belt release is necessary.

Cumulative impacts on infrastructure, highways, landscape and settlement character will need to be properly assessed and mitigated, with contributions coordinated where multiple smaller allocations are proposed at or near existing settlements. This will be addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and site-specific policy requirements in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

Conclusion

Option 4 is our preferred spatial strategy. It provides a balanced approach, combining a flexible, evidence-led distribution of growth with a strategic, infrastructure-led development capable of delivering at scale.

We are seeking views on whether this represents the most appropriate approach, whether the balance between the strategic development site at Redhill Aerodrome and dispersed growth is correct. Also, whether there are alternative approaches that would better address the district's needs and constraints.

Sustainability Appraisal and selection of the preferred strategy

The emerging Local Plan is being prepared alongside a Sustainability Appraisal, which assesses the likely social, economic and environmental effects of each reasonable alternative against a range of sustainability objectives. These include housing delivery, accessibility, infrastructure, climate change, biodiversity, landscape, heritage, flood risk, health and economic growth.

The Sustainability Appraisal is an ongoing process and will be finalised before the Regulation 19 stage. It shows Options 2 and 4 provide a better balance by combining a strategic development with development in other locations. Option 4 performs best overall against environmental objectives and is likely to deliver the strongest overall sustainability outcomes when social and economic constraints are taken into account.

Role of unidentified Grey Belt development

The preferred strategy recognises the potential role of unidentified Grey Belt development. National policy provides a specific route under which development on Grey Belt land may come forward through the development management process, alongside planned allocations, where relevant criteria are met. This may include sites located outside defined development boundaries, if they are identified as Grey Belt and are assessed against the relevant national and local policy tests.

Our preference is for Green Belt release to be plan-led wherever possible, through identified allocations rather than speculative development.

Unidentified Grey Belt sites are not included in the housing trajectory and the strategy does not rely on them to meet the housing requirement, as their scale, timing and location cannot be known with sufficient certainty at the plan-making stage.

Work on urban capacity and updates to the Brownfield Land Register will help provide robust evidence of the scale of potential development in existing built-up areas and large Grey Belt sites.

It is realistic to expect some additional homes may be delivered through this route over the plan period, providing a degree of additional flexibility above the planned trajectory. Any such development will still need to satisfy national policy and local plan policies, including consideration of Green Belt purposes, sustainability, infrastructure, landscape, flood risk, biodiversity, heritage and affordable housing requirements.

Our priority remains to identify sufficient suitable and deliverable allocations through the Local Plan. The recognition of a potential role for unidentified Grey Belt development outside development boundaries does not alter that position. It simply acknowledges that a limited amount of additional development may come forward through the development management process where it can be demonstrated to comply with the relevant policy framework.

Summary of the preferred spatial strategy

Our preferred spatial strategy is Option 4: Capacity-led dispersed growth across settlements throughout the district, plus a new strategic development site of around 2,250 dwellings at Redhill Aerodrome, subject to further technical assessment, master planning and infrastructure planning. The scale of development at individual settlements will be determined by the evidence, including site availability, deliverability, infrastructure capacity, accessibility, Green Belt impact, environmental constraints and settlement character.

This approach has been selected because it provides a balanced strategy combining strategic infrastructure-led growth at Redhill Aerodrome with a flexible, evidence-led dispersed pattern across the district.

It avoids over-reliance on any single settlement or site typology, allows growth to respond to actual capacity rather than hierarchy position alone. It also provides resilience across the plan period by combining strategic and settlement-based sources of supply. It also recognises the potential for additional Grey Belt development without relying on it as part of the planned trajectory.

The preferred strategy remains subject to further testing in the Sustainability Appraisal, Green Belt assessment, infrastructure evidence and site assessment work, which will all inform the final strategy in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

We are seeking views on whether Option 4 provides the most appropriate basis for the emerging Local Plan. In particular, whether the proposed balance between the strategic development site at Redhill Aerodrome, evidence-led dispersed growth and the potential additional role of Grey Belt development is appropriate and whether alternative approaches would better address the district's needs and constraints.

The consultation does not pre-determine any future decision. We are consulting on the potential role of Redhill Aerodrome. If responses support this approach, the following policies and requirements could be developed through the Local Plan process for this site. If responses do not support this approach, we may decide not to progress the site as part of the Council's preferred strategy and will consider alternative approaches through subsequent stages of the Local Plan.



5 Strategic policies

This section sets out the proposed strategic policy direction for the emerging Local Plan. It does not contain draft policy wording and should not be read as the final form of the policies in the Plan. Instead, it establishes the strategic framework for growth, infrastructure, environmental protection, place-making and delivery, which we expect to develop in full at the next stage. This will follow further evidence, Sustainability Appraisal, viability testing, engagement with statutory bodies and consideration of consultation responses.

The policy areas set out below are derived from the themes identified through the previous Regulation 18 Early Engagement Consultation:

- Housing provision.
- Affordable housing.
- The economy.
- Employment and retail.
- Infrastructure.
- Transport and delivery.
- The historic environment.
- The natural environment and nature recovery.
- Health and wellbeing.
- Community infrastructure.
- Climate change and sustainable design.

Strategic policy framework 1 - Spatial Strategy and Housing Provision

The Plan will include a strategic policy establishing the spatial framework for growth across the district. This will set out the settlement hierarchy, confirm Option 4 (capacity-led dispersed growth plus a new strategic development site at Redhill Aerodrome) as the basis for the Local Plan strategy. It will also provide the framework for distributing development in a way which is informed by the hierarchy but not rigidly determined by settlement tier alone.

The policy will confirm the broad role of each settlement tier while making clear the scale of growth directed to individual settlements may be determined by the evidence, including site availability, deliverability, infrastructure capacity, accessibility, Green Belt impact, environmental constraints and settlement character.

It will also set out the principles guiding site selection, including how development outside existing settlement boundaries will be considered where necessary to meet identified needs and where impacts can be justified and mitigated.

The policy will also establish the housing requirement for the plan period and explain how this will be delivered through a combination of existing commitments, site allocations, the strategic development site at Redhill Aerodrome, windfall development and other identified sources of supply.

The final housing requirement will be informed by national policy, the standard method, the Sustainability Appraisal, infrastructure evidence, environmental constraints and deliverability. The housing trajectory will need to be realistic, deliverable and supported by necessary infrastructure.

The policy will also address housing mix, setting out the size, type and tenure of homes required to meet the needs of different households, including families, smaller households, older people, people with disabilities and those requiring specialist accommodation. This will be informed by the latest housing evidence and viability testing.

It will also address the need for self-build and custom-build housing, which is expected to be delivered through a policy requirement for sites above a specified threshold. Those sites would be expected to make provision for a proportion of dwellings to be delivered for that purpose.

At this stage, we expect this will apply to sites of over 50 dwellings, with the proportion and detailed requirements to be informed by the evidence base and viability considerations.

The policy will also ensure the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople are assessed and addressed in accordance with national policy and local evidence.

The strategic policy direction for the spatial strategy and housing provision should:

- Establish the settlement hierarchy as the framework for understanding the relative sustainability of settlements, without applying it as a fixed distribution formula.
- Confirm capacity-led dispersed growth as the basis for directing development across the district, with the scale of growth at each settlement responding to site availability, infrastructure capacity, accessibility and environmental constraints.
- Identify Redhill Aerodrome as a strategic development site capable of delivering around 2,250 dwellings as a comprehensive, infrastructure-led new community.
- Set a clear housing requirement for the plan period and identify a deliverable supply of housing land to meet it.
- Support a mix of sites - strategic, medium-sized and smaller - to provide a resilient housing trajectory across the plan period.
- Ensure housing growth is aligned with the spatial strategy and supported by necessary infrastructure.
- Address the needs of all groups in the community, including specialist and affordable housing needs.
- Protect the character and identity of settlements and avoid unacceptable harm to the Green Belt, landscape, heritage, biodiversity and flood risk areas.

Strategic policy framework 2 - Strategic Development Site

The Plan will include a detailed strategic policy for the potential strategic development site at Redhill Aerodrome, providing the framework for its comprehensive planning, delivery and long-term stewardship. The policy would establish the site's role within the overall development strategy, the scale and broad mix of development, its relationship with existing settlements and the infrastructure required to support delivery. It would ensure the site is planned as a coherent place rather than a series of disconnected parcels.

Development would need to be planned comprehensively from the outset through a site-wide masterplan or equivalent framework. The policy would set out strategic requirements covering:

- The amount and mix of development, including the contribution to housing and affordable housing needs.
- Employment, local services and community facilities.
- Relationships with nearby settlements and the surrounding landscape.
- Green and blue infrastructure, biodiversity and environmental protection.
- Walking, cycling and public transport connectivity.
- Infrastructure requirements, phasing and delivery triggers.
- Design quality, local character and place-making.
- Long-term stewardship and management of shared spaces and infrastructure.

Development should only proceed where necessary infrastructure, including transport, education, healthcare, utilities, green infrastructure and community facilities, is delivered in step with growth. Detailed requirements will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

The policy would also require the site to be designed around sustainable movement, reducing reliance on car journeys, prioritising active travel and integrating with existing transport networks. Environmental protection and enhancement will be central, with development expected to avoid, minimise and mitigate harm to landscape, biodiversity, flood risk, heritage and climate resilience and to deliver measurable environmental improvements where possible.

Redhill Aerodrome is a strategic-scale site and its delivery will require a coordinated approach to governance, phasing and infrastructure that goes beyond standard site requirements. The strategic policy will therefore require the site to be supported by:

- A site-wide infrastructure delivery strategy setting out what infrastructure is needed, when it will be delivered, who by and through what funding mechanisms.
- A phasing and implementation plan that sequences development alongside infrastructure, ensuring early phases do not place unacceptable pressure on existing services or networks.
- A transport and movement strategy, including highway mitigation, public transport improvements, active travel networks and connections to existing settlements.
- A utilities and drainage strategy, including early engagement with water, wastewater, electricity and other providers to confirm capacity and any required reinforcement.
- Education, healthcare and community infrastructure planning, including on-site provision where the scale of development justifies it.
- Governance arrangements for the long-term management and stewardship of shared spaces, community infrastructure and environmental assets.

Where the site has cross-boundary implications, particularly for transport, utilities or housing markets, we will work with neighbouring authorities and infrastructure providers to ensure impacts are assessed comprehensively and mitigation is coordinated.

Strategic policy framework 3 - Site Allocations

The Plan will include a strategic policy on site allocations, setting out the sites proposed for allocation to support delivery of the Local Plan strategy over the plan period. The purpose of the policy will be to identify the specific locations we consider suitable, available, achievable and justified for development, taking account of the preferred spatial strategy, the evidence base, the Sustainability Appraisal and the results of consultation.

The policy will establish how allocations contribute to the overall development strategy, including the distribution of development across the district, the role of the strategic development site at Redhill Aerodrome and the role to be played by sites within or adjoining existing settlements. It will also explain the relationship between allocations, existing commitments, windfall development and any other identified sources of supply used to support delivery of the Plan.

The allocations policy will be informed by the HELAA, Green Belt Assessment, Settlement Hierarchy Study, infrastructure evidence, flood risk evidence, transport evidence, environmental assessment and any other relevant technical work. Inclusion of a site in the HELAA will not in itself justify allocation. The final allocations will be selected through a broader planning judgement, taking account not only of site availability and capacity but also of sustainability, infrastructure requirements, environmental effects, Green Belt impact, deliverability, viability and the contribution each site makes to the overall strategy.

The policy will set out the site allocations in a clear and structured way. This is expected to comprise of:

- An allocation schedule identifying each site by name, reference and location.
- The proposed use or mix of uses for each site.
- The indicative capacity or scale of development expected.
- The settlement or broad location for the site.
- A reasoned explanation of the site's role within the strategy.
- A site-specific set of main requirements or criteria to guide future development.

Each allocation will also be shown on the Policies Map so the extent of the allocated land is clearly identified. Where necessary, inset maps, illustrative diagrams or other supporting figures may be used to show the relationship of the site to the existing settlement, surrounding land uses, key constraints and infrastructure connections.

The policy will make clear that allocation does not remove the need for subsequent planning applications to demonstrate compliance with the wider development plan and any site-specific requirements. Allocated sites will still be expected to address, where relevant, matters such as access, movement, infrastructure delivery, affordable housing, housing mix, self-build and custom-build provision where applicable. They will also need to address landscape, Green Belt, heritage, flood risk, drainage, biodiversity net gain, green infrastructure, design quality, climate resilience and long-term stewardship.

For larger or more sensitive allocations, the policy may be supported by site-specific criteria or development principles setting out the key matters that proposals will need to address. This may include, for example, requirements relating to site-wide master planning, infrastructure triggers and phasing, education and healthcare provision, transport mitigation, green and blue infrastructure, flood mitigation, community facilities and design expectations. The allocations policy will not simply identify land for development but will provide a strategic framework to ensure that development is brought forward in a coordinated way.

The strategic policy direction for allocations should:

- Identify the sites required to deliver the spatial strategy over the plan period.
- Explain the contribution of each allocated site to housing, employment and wider plan objectives.
- Ensure allocations are justified by the evidence base and consistent with the Sustainability Appraisal.
- Provide a clear schedule and map-based framework for the location and extent of each allocation.
- Distinguish between strategic allocations and other allocations where relevant.
- Set out the main site-specific requirements necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms.
- Ensure allocated sites can be delivered in a coordinated, infrastructure-led and environmentally responsible manner.

Strategic policy framework 4 - Affordable Housing

The Plan will include a strategic policy on affordable housing, establishing our approach to securing affordable homes as part of new development and responding to the district's identified need for affordable homes.

Our intention is that the policy will seek as high a level as possible of affordable housing subject to whole plan viability testing, on greenfield sites. A lower threshold is expected on brownfield and urban sites reflecting the typically higher development costs involved.

These figures are provisional and will be tested through viability evidence and the Sustainability Appraisal before being finalised in the Plan. The policy will allow flexibility in delivery mechanisms to reflect local circumstances, site-specific viability constraints and the need to ensure that development remains deliverable and able to support necessary infrastructure.

The policy will address tenure mix, setting out the priority for social rent, affordable rent and affordable home ownership products in proportions that reflect local need. It will also address the approach to strategic and non-strategic sites, off-site contributions or commuted sums where justified and the mechanisms required to secure long-term affordability.

Affordable homes should be designed and delivered as an integral part of new communities. They should be well-designed, tenure-blind where possible, accessible to services and facilities and meeting a range of household needs. They should not be isolated or treated as a separate component of development.

The final policy will be informed by the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, affordable housing evidence and viability testing and will reflect the delivery role of the Council, Registered Providers, public sector land and a strategic site.

Strategic policy framework 5 - Economy, Employment and Retail

The Plan will include a strategic policy on the economy, employment and retail, to support a strong, diverse and resilient local economy while ensuring that housing growth is matched by access to jobs, services and local facilities.

Our evidence identifies a need for 16 hectares of additional employment land over the plan period. The policy will set out how this need will be met, through a combination of intensification of existing employment sites and new allocations where justified.

It will protect existing employment areas that continue to play an economic role while allowing appropriate flexibility to respond to changing demand, including for logistics, light industrial uses, flexible and start-up workspace and service-based employment.

The policy will establish a strategic framework for town centres and local centres, supporting their vitality and viability, encouraging appropriate investment. It will also recognise their role not just as retail locations but as places for services, community activity, employment and social interaction.

It will set out the approach to retail, leisure, offices and other main town centre uses and address the needs of smaller settlements and rural economic activity including farm diversification where appropriate.

Strategic development, including Redhill Aerodrome, should consider opportunities for employment use, workspace and mixed-use development. The policy will also address the relationship between economic development and sustainable transport and the role of digital infrastructure in supporting modern working patterns.

Strategic policy framework 6 - Infrastructure, Transport and Delivery

The Plan will include a strategic policy on infrastructure, transport and delivery, one of the key policies in the Plan, reflecting our infrastructure-first approach. Growth will be planned alongside the infrastructure required to support it, with development not permitted to proceed in isolation from the services and facilities needed to make it acceptable and sustainable.

The infrastructure baseline set out in Chapter two demonstrates that constraints in the Tandridge District are significant, varied and interact with one another. Transport, water supply, wastewater, flood risk, education, healthcare and green infrastructure all present challenges that will directly influence where development can go, how much can be delivered and when. These are not generic planning considerations, they are specific, evidenced constraints affecting this district and the spatial strategy has been shaped accordingly.

The policy will be informed by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Plan is a working evidence document and will be updated as the preferred strategy is refined and further engagement with infrastructure providers takes place. The policy will identify the infrastructure required to support the spatial strategy, the broad timing of delivery, the bodies responsible and the funding mechanisms required.

Infrastructure will be funded and delivered through a combination of direct developer provision, Section 106 planning obligations, Community Infrastructure Levy where applicable, planning conditions, infrastructure provider investment programmes, public sector funding bids and partnership working. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will set out infrastructure requirements, delivery responsibilities, indicative timing, funding sources and known gaps and will be kept under review throughout the plan period.

Transport will be a central component. The policy will provide a strategic framework for reducing the need to travel, improving accessibility and mitigating transport impacts. This includes impacts on the local highway network, the A22 corridor and M25 Junction 6 where development could compound known capacity issues.

Sites should be selected and planned to maximise opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport use, while recognising that some parts of the district have more limited accessibility and will require targeted mitigation.

Further transport assessment work will be required to test the preferred strategy and identify the package of measures needed to support planned growth.

Water supply and wastewater capacity are major constraints for this district. SES Water has indicated it cannot meet demand from a number of current proposals without reinforcement and Oxted wastewater treatment works is already operating beyond its consented flow.

The policy will require development to be supported by adequate water and wastewater capacity, or by a clear and funded programme of upgrades. The policy will also use phasing requirements or infrastructure triggers where necessary to ensure development does not proceed ahead of essential capacity.

The policy will also address education, healthcare and community infrastructure, green and blue infrastructure, biodiversity net gain, utilities, energy, waste and digital connectivity. For larger sites, infrastructure must be provided at the right stage of development through phasing requirements and delivery triggers, not deferred until after impacts have arisen. For dispersed smaller and medium-sized sites, cumulative infrastructure impacts will need to be assessed and contributions coordinated where multiple sites affect the same networks or services.

The policy will establish clear expectations for developer contributions, planning obligations, phasing triggers and monitoring and will require infrastructure to be realistic, justified and compatible with viability evidence.

Strategic policy framework 7 - Historic Environment

The Plan will include a strategic policy on the historic environment, setting out how the plan will conserve or enhance heritage assets, their settings and the wider historic character of the district.

The district contains a wide range of designated and non-designated heritage assets, including listed buildings, conservation areas, scheduled monuments, historic landscapes, archaeological assets and locally important buildings and features.

The policy will ensure that the location, scale, layout and design of development respond to heritage significance and setting from the earliest stages of planning. Where harm is identified it will need to be justified in accordance with national policy and weighed against public benefits.

The policy will address the conservation and enhancement of designated and non-designated assets, the protection of conservation areas and their settings, historic landscape character, archaeology, heritage-led regeneration and the reuse of historic buildings. It will also recognise the importance of high-quality design in sensitive historic locations.

Heritage assets should not be treated simply as constraints. The historic environment contributes to local identity, distinctiveness, sense of place and economic vitality. The policy will also support opportunities to enhance and better reveal heritage significance through development, investment and public realm improvements.



Strategic policy framework 8 - Design and Placemaking

The Plan will include a strategic policy on design and place-making, establishing the expectation that all new development across the district achieves high quality design that responds positively to local character, context and the natural and built environment.

Design quality will be a material consideration in the assessment of all development proposals. The policy will require development to demonstrate it has responded to the distinctive character of its location, including settlement form, landscape setting, street pattern, building typology, materials and scale. It should also contribute positively to the public realm and the experience of moving through and between places. Poor design that fails to respond to local context or prioritises quantity over quality will not be acceptable.

The policy will address the design of the strategic site and larger allocations, where a masterplan or design code will be required to establish the character framework before detailed proposals come forward. It will also address the design of smaller infill and edge-of-settlement development, where the relationship to existing built form and landscape setting will be particularly important. Across all scales of development, the policy will expect proposals to demonstrate compliance with national design guidance and, where prepared, local design guides and codes.

Design should also support the wider objectives of the spatial strategy, creating walkable, well-connected neighbourhoods, supporting active travel, providing accessible public open space and green infrastructure. It should also deliver homes and places that are adaptable, inclusive and climate resilient. The policy will expect development to integrate sustainable design principles from the outset rather than treating them as an afterthought.

The district's varied character from urban centres and suburban areas to historic villages and open countryside means that design expectations will need to be locally responsive. We intend to develop design guidance to support the policy, providing more detailed direction for different settlement types and character areas across the district.



Strategic policy framework 9 - Natural Environment and Nature Recovery

The Plan will include a strategic policy on the natural environment and nature recovery, setting out how the Plan will protect and enhance biodiversity, landscape, ecological networks, green and blue infrastructure and the wider natural environment.

The district contains a wide range of valued landscapes, ecological assets, ancient woodland, watercourses, designated sites and priority habitats. Environmental considerations will influence both the distribution of growth and the design of development. Sites that would result in unacceptable harm to sensitive environmental assets should be avoided unless harm can be appropriately justified and mitigated. Where development is acceptable, it should be designed to integrate green and blue infrastructure and contribute to wider ecological networks.

The policy will address protection and enhancement of biodiversity, mandatory biodiversity net gain, ecological networks and habitat connectivity, Local Nature Recovery Strategy priorities, designated sites and priority habitats, ancient woodland, veteran trees and important hedgerows. It will also address, landscape character and sensitivity, river corridors and wetlands, access to nature and multifunctional open space, nature-based solutions to flood risk and climate resilience and long-term stewardship of environmental assets.

The natural environment provides benefits beyond ecology, supporting climate resilience, health and wellbeing, landscape quality, recreation, flood risk management and local identity. The policy will therefore seek to secure multifunctional environmental benefits, treating open space, biodiversity, green infrastructure and landscape as interconnected rather than separate issues.

Strategic policy framework 10 - Health, Wellbeing and Communities

The Plan will include a strategic policy on health, wellbeing and communities, establishing the expectation that new development creates healthy, inclusive and well-served places.

The design and location of development have a significant influence on physical health, mental wellbeing, social inclusion and community cohesion. The policy will require development to support active travel, access to green space, safe and inclusive streets, social interaction and access to everyday services. For larger sites, including Redhill Aerodrome, the structure of development will be expected to build these principles from the outset rather than treat them as add-ons.

New development should contribute to the facilities and services required to support existing and future communities without placing unacceptable pressure on existing provision. Where new or expanded facilities are required they should be planned and delivered alongside development, aligned with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and relevant provider evidence. The policy will address healthcare and education infrastructure, community buildings, sports and recreation provision, open space, play space, allotments and cultural facilities.

The policy will also address healthy place-making and inclusive design, access to nature and green infrastructure. It will also address the needs of different age groups and communities, protection of valued community facilities and the role of development in supporting community cohesion.



Strategic policy framework 11 - Climate Change and Sustainable Design

The Plan will include a strategic policy on climate change and sustainable design, setting out how the Plan will address climate mitigation and adaptation, flood risk, energy efficiency, sustainable construction and resilient design.

The policy will address both mitigation, reducing greenhouse gas emissions through energy-efficient buildings, renewable and low-carbon energy, sustainable transport and efficient use of resources. It will also address adaptation, ensuring development is resilient to the effects of climate change including heat, drought, flooding, water stress and extreme weather.

Development should be designed to perform well over its lifetime, with layout, orientation, density and form contributing to long-term adaptability rather than technical compliance alone.

Flood risk will be a central component. Development will be directed away from highest risk areas. Flood risk from all sources must be properly assessed. Development must not increase flood risk elsewhere. The policy will be informed by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and will support sustainable drainage systems and nature-based solutions as the preferred way to manage surface water.

The policy will address energy efficiency and low-carbon design, renewable energy opportunities, sustainable construction and resource efficiency, climate resilience and adaptation, flood risk and sustainable drainage, water efficiency, overheating and urban cooling, green and blue infrastructure as part of climate resilience and sustainable transport.

It will also reinforce the design quality expectations set out in Strategic Policy Framework 7, ensuring that climate performance and place-making are treated as complementary rather than competing objectives.

Development management policies

This Plan does not intend to introduce a separate suite of new development management policies. Instead, the Plan will identify those policies in the adopted development plan that remain relevant for development management and decision making, where as they continue to be consistent with national policy and have not been superseded by the new Local Plan.

This approach reflects the strategic scope of the emerging Plan and will help ensure continuity in decision-making while avoiding unnecessary duplication.

We also recognise national planning reforms are moving towards a greater role for nationally set decision-making policy through the revised National Planning Policy Framework and associated national decision-making policies. The final form and status of which are not yet settled. Once confirmed, those national policies will need to be considered alongside the development plan in the determination of planning applications.



6 Next steps

This section explains what will happen after the close of the consultation and how we intend to use the responses received to progress the Local Plan. It sets out the next formal stages in the plan-making process. These include the preparation of the Regulation 19 Submission Local Plan, consultation on the Plan and the process of submission, examination and adoption.

What happens after this consultation

Following the close of this consultation, we will review and analyse all representations received. Responses will be considered alongside the evidence base, including the HELAA and other supporting studies. This will help to determine whether any amendments are required to the amended vision and objectives, the preferred spatial development strategy, the broad development distribution, the strategic policy direction or the approach to infrastructure, delivery and implementation.

The purpose of this process is not simply to record comments, but to use the responses to refine the Local Plan and the evidence which supports it. This may include:

- Further assessment of strategic options and broad locations for growth.
- Refinement of the spatial strategy and supporting policy approach.
- Further work on infrastructure requirements, delivery and implementation.
- Updates to the evidence base where additional information is required.

We will assess and prepare a summary of the consultation responses. These will inform the next stage of plan-making and form part of the overall consultation record for the Local Plan.

Preparation of the Regulation 19 Local Plan

Once we have considered the responses to this consultation and completed any further evidence or drafting work that is required, we will prepare the Regulation 19 Submission Local Plan.

The Regulation 19 Plan will represent the version of the Local Plan we intend to submit for independent examination. It will set out:

- Spatial strategy.
- Strategic policies.
- Site allocations, where applicable.
- The supporting evidence base and implementation framework.

The Regulation 19 Plan will be published for formal consultation in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. Representations will be invited on whether the Plan is legally compliant and sound.



Submission and examination

Following Regulation 19 consultation, we will consider the representations received and, subject to the outcome of that process, will submit the Local Plan to the Secretary of State for independent examination.

An appointed Planning Inspector will then examine the Plan to determine whether it has been prepared in accordance with the relevant legal requirements and whether it is sound. This will include consideration of whether the Plan is:

- Positively prepared.
- Justified.
- Effective.
- Consistent with national policy.

The examination process may include hearing sessions and where necessary, proposals for main modifications. If main modifications are required, these would normally be subject to further consultation before the Inspector issues a final report.

Adoption and monitoring

If the Inspector concludes the Local Plan can be adopted, with or without modifications, we will move to adopt the Plan. For the avoidance of doubt, if this stage is reached on or after 1 April 2027, the relevant council for these purposes will be East Surrey Council.

Once adopted, the Local Plan will form part of the statutory development plan for the district and will be used in determining planning applications.

Following the creation of East Surrey Council on 1 April 2027, the Plan will continue to apply as the relevant local planning policy framework for the Tandridge area until it is replaced.

We will then monitor the performance and implementation of the Plan on an ongoing basis, including through annual monitoring and review of housing delivery, infrastructure provision and wider policy outcomes.

Where necessary, we will consider whether a review of the Plan, or part of it, is required in response to changes in circumstances, delivery performance or national policy. For the avoidance of doubt, where these functions fall to be exercised on or after 1 April 2027, they will be undertaken by East Surrey Council.



7 Consultation questions

This section sets out the questions we are asking as part of this consultation.

The questions reflect the main components of the document, including the:

- Vision and objective.
- Preferred spatial development strategy.
- The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA).
- Proposed strategic policy direction.

You can answer as many or as few questions as you like. You can also comment on any other part of this document or the supporting evidence base.

The questions are there to help you give clear feedback on the key issues at this stage. They do no limit what you can say. Where possible, please keep your comments clear and explain your reasoning.

The easiest way to have your say is to complete the survey at www.tandridge.gov.uk/localplan2026 or scan the QR code.



Prefer paper?

Below are the questions. You can tear them out or return the whole booklet to your local library or the Council Offices, 8 Station Road East, Oxted RH8 0BT by 11.59pm on Monday 17 August 2026.

Thank you for sharing your views.

Vision and objectives

1. To what extent do you agree with the amended vision and objectives? Please refer to pages 20-22 of the consultation document.

Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree or disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Which of the following issues are most important to you? (select up to 3)

- Delivering new homes ☐
- Affordable housing ☐
- Protecting the Green Belt and countryside ☐
- Infrastructure delivery alongside development ☐
- Supporting local communities ☐
- Economic growth / jobs ☐
- Climate change and sustainability ☐

3. Are there any changes you would suggest to the vision or objectives.

Spatial Development Strategy

4. Which spatial strategy option do you prefer? (See summary of each option on pages 26-30)
- Option 1 ☐
 - Option 2 ☐
 - Option 3 ☐
 - Option 4 (Council's preferred option) ☐
 - None of these ☐
5. What are your main reasons for preferring your chosen strategy? (select up to 3)
- Better protects the Green Belt ☐
 - Better supported by infrastructure ☐
 - More likely to be delivered (realistic and achievable)..... ☐
 - Spreads development fairly ☐
 - Focuses development in locations with good access to services and transport..... ☐
 - Provides sufficient homes ☐
 - Other..... ☐

Redhill Aerodrome

6. To what extent do you support a strategic development site at Redhill Aerodrome?

Strongly support ☐	Support ☐	Neutral ☐	Oppose ☐	Strongly oppose ☐
--	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---

7. Do you have any concerns about the site? (Select all that apply)
- Traffic and transport ☐
 - Impact on local services (schools, GPs and nearby communities) ☐
 - Impact on Green Belt / environment ☐
 - Scale of development ☐
 - Deliverability ☐
 - No concerns about the site ☐

Grey Belt

8. Do you support the Council's approach to Grey Belt development? (National Policy definition of Grey Belt refers to previously developed or lower-quality land within the Green Belt)

Yes ☐	No ☐	Unsure ☐
---------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------------

Please explain:

Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA)

9. Do you agree with the approach used to assess sites? (HELAA - Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment)

Agree ☐	Disagree ☐	Not sure ☐
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

10. Please rank the order the types of sites should be prioritised. (where 1 is top priority and 5 is lowest priority)

- Brownfield sites ☐
- Sites in larger settlements (Tier 1 / 2 - main towns and villages) ☐
- Sites dispersed across the district based on land availability, infrastructure capacity and environmental limits. ☐
- A large new development site which includes all supporting infrastructure. ☐
- Sites in rural locations..... ☐

11. Are there any sites you think the Council should prioritise allocating?

Yes ☐	No ☐
---------------------------------	--------------------------------

If yes, please state which sites and why. Please give the site name or number.

12. Are there any additional sites, factual corrections or other matters we should consider in relation to the HELAA evidence base?

Meeting development needs and Green Belt considerations

13. How can we make the best use of existing towns and villages to meet development needs? (select all that apply)

- Identifying new sites not currently identified by the Council (HELAA) ☐
- Making better use of existing sites, for example increasing density or redeveloping sites ☐
- Redevelopment of previously developed land ☐
- Changes to settlement boundaries ☐
- Other ☐

Please explain your choice, including any specific locations of additional capacity

14. As all development cannot be met within existing areas, some Green Belt land will be considered. What factors should guide this? (Select all that apply)

- How important the land is to the Green Belt, focussing on areas that make a weaker contribution ☐
- How easy it is to access services, facilities and infrastructure, for example shops, GPs, schools and public transport ☐
- Avoid land affected by environmental constraints, for example flood risk or protected habitats ☐
- Look for opportunities to adjust settlement boundaries or remove land from the Green Belt where appropriate ☐

15. Should development be phased if infrastructure is not yet in place? (for example roads, schools and GP services)

Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
☐	☐	☐	☐

16. In some cases, it may not be possible to meet all development needs within the district. When do you think it is acceptable that development needs cannot be met in full?

Please explain your views, including the role that constraints such as the Green Belt, environmental considerations and infrastructure capacity should play in determining whether all needs can be accommodated within the district and whether some needs may need to be met elsewhere.

17. If development cannot meet all needs, which should be prioritised? (rank 1-5 where 1 is the highest priority)

- Meeting housing needs in full ☐
- Affordable housing ☐
- Protecting the heritage, character and landscape ☐
- Limiting pressure on infrastructure ☐
- Supporting economic growth ☐

18. To what extent do you agree with the following policy approaches. See the policies from pages 33-41.

- Housing, including providing more affordable housing

Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree or disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

- Infrastructure, transport and delivery

Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree or disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

- Natural environment and nature recovery

Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree or disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

- Climate change and sustainable design

Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree or disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

- Health, wellbeing and communities

Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree or disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

- Economy, employment and retail

Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree or disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

- Historic environment

Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree or disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

- Design and placemaking

Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree or disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

19. Do you have any further comments?

About you

To help us understand the views of different groups and make sure everyone's voice is heard, please tell us a little about yourself. This information is optional and will only be used to analyse responses fairly and improve our Local Plan.

20. Are you (tick all that apply)

- a resident..... ☐
- a business owner ☐
- a councillor ☐
- a property developer ☐
- a representative of a community or voluntary organisation ☐
- a council officer ☐
- a landowner ☐
- a housing association representative ☐
- a member of a faith group ☐
- a member of an environmental or campaign group ☐
- Other (Please say)

21. What is your age?

- | | |
|---|--|
| ■ Under 18 ☐ | ■ 45-54 ☐ |
| ■ 18-24 ☐ | ■ 55-64 ☐ |
| ■ 25-34 ☐ | ■ 65+ ☐ |
| ■ 35-44 ☐ | ■ Prefer not to say. ☐ |

22. What is your gender?

- | | |
|---|--|
| ■ Female ☐ | ■ Non-binary ☐ |
| ■ Male ☐ | ■ Prefer not to say ☐ |

23. Post code:

24. First name:

25. Last name:

26. E-mail address:

27. Would you like to sign up for our Local Plan newsletter, so you never miss an update?

We'll only use your e-mail to send Local Plan updates. You can unsubscribe anytime.

- Yes, please add me to the mailing list ☐
- No, thank you ☐

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your feedback is invaluable and will help shape the future of our Local Plan.



Tandridge District Council
Council Offices, 8 Station Road East, Oxted, Surrey RH8 0BT.

customerservices@tandridge.gov.uk

www.tandridge.gov.uk

