

WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL: LAND NORTH OF LYDIA PARK, STOVOLDS HILL, CRANLEIGH**PINS REF: APP/R3650/W/25/3367393, 3366387****SUPPLEMENTARY LANDSCAPE NOTE****Introduction**

1. This note provides an update to the Inspector following the release of the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in August 2026. It relates to the written landscape evidence that I have presented to the above appeals, and the oral evidence that I will give when the Inquiry opens.

Response to Policy Changes

2. The key general landscape policy within the new NPPF is N2: Improving the Natural Environment. N2(1)(a) states that development proposals should consider the environmental qualities of land proposed for development, including a number of factors such as landscape character and the natural beauty of the countryside, and identify opportunities for those qualities to be conserved or enhanced. N2(1)(d) states that development proposals should conserve and enhance existing natural features of visual, historic or nature conservation value (such as established trees and hedgerows) where possible; and use appropriate landscaping to help create a well-designed place and integrate the development into its surroundings.
3. In the context of Policy N2(1)(d), I consider the wooded stream corridor within Pitch 1 that visually separated Lydia Park from the edge of the Surrey Hills National Landscape to be a natural feature of visual value, because of the strategic contribution it made to this Protected Landscape.
4. Given that the Appeal Sites are located within the setting of the Surrey Hills National Landscape, NPPF Policy N4: Protected Landscapes is also engaged. The approach to development proposals within the setting of National Landscapes is consistent with that of the previous NPPF, in that it requires them to be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the Protected Landscape.
5. It is therefore the case that my previous evidence in relation to the application of the former paragraph 189 of the previous NPPF remains relevant.
6. One of the key policy changes is the loss of the term 'valued landscapes' within the NPPF, and the obligation to protect and enhance them.
7. Whilst this is likely to have implications for a number of developments currently being considered, I do not consider it to be the case with these appeals. As previously noted,

the Appeal Sites are located within the setting of a Protected Landscape and make a strategic contribution to the preservation of the character of that landscape.

8. Furthermore, the Appeal Sites are located within an Area of Great Landscape Value designated within the Local Plan, and therefore they remain subject to protection under local planning policy as set out within my original Proofs of Evidence.

Conclusion

9. Whilst the new NPPF has brought about policy changes in relation to landscape character and important visual features, the tone of the policy is similar to the previous document and in the case of the setting of Protected Landscapes, the wording is the same. The Appeal Sites are also located within a locally designated landscape and are therefore subject to the relevant Local Plan policies.
10. I therefore conclude that the new NPPF does not materially alter the findings of my original written submissions.

Ian Dudley BSc(Hons) MICFor CEnv CMLI

8th September 2026