

Examination into the soundness of the Waverley Local Plan part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites. REP-7654305-1

Representations from Dockenfield Parish Council to Mr Jonathan Bore, Inspector.

We wish to make representations 7, 7.4 and 8.2 concerning your questions of the WBC Plan

Number 7. Green Belt New GB areas.

Proposal for alteration to the western boundary of the Green Belt to include Dockenfield Parish.

DPC objects to the currently drawn western boundary ... "west of Frensham" proposing a minor alteration and have a strategic role and follow clearly defined features.

Justifications are point 1 and point 3 of the Green Belt Policy.

7.4 Waverley Borough Council supported Dockenfield's proposal to include Dockenfield and other land west of Frensham 1983/4. They also proposed our inclusion in 1991. It is very disappointed WBC have not supported our claim this time.

In 1984 a barrister for Frensham Heights School won the day and Dockenfield lost as part of this. In 1991 at the SCC final meeting it was formally decided boundary changes included a proposal for Dockenfield Parish to be included. Unfortunately the proposal was lost due straight political lines.

DPC does not propose the northern boundary of this extension is too close to Farnham enabling development coming southwards without heavy restriction but to "Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas". We note the AMEK draft proposals for Waverley much too closely followed the perceived current extent of Farnham, including incidentally, the proposed Hamlet-in-the-Woods development site.

By not drawing the boundary so tightly, notable hectarages of land would be available for appropriate and gradual development to south Farnham over time of several successive Plans. DPC believes it is particularly important to consider this particularly when the current Inspector has already queried whether more houses should be allocated to Farnham, together with the huge currently unresolved question of whether the huge Dunsfold Aerodrome development occurs or not.

The most recent Material consideration for our area is that now the new South Downs National Park [also with severe restrictions on Development] is on the whole western boundary of Dockenfield Parish. The southern boundary of DP is the county boundary and the GB already forms the eastern boundary of the Parish.

The original 1983 case argued by WBC was to use the Long Road, Rowledge as the boundary of the GB.

GB boundaries should follow either highways or major feature boundaries, as particularly noted by the Inspector responding to our submission in 1983 (Harris July 1983 para. A4.9) suggested Wood Hill Lane as a northern boundary to a new G.B.

Our preferred northerly boundary option is West End Lane, Frensham, running from the County/National park boundary to the existing GB in Frensham, whilst contributing c150 acres for future Farnham expansion and in fact c230 ha more than the Consultant's report to WBC.

Wood Hill Lane which again runs west / east contributes more than c250 ha for future expansion.

Part of Dockenfield is already in the Green Belt and Dockenfield Parish itself is only 400 ha.

The third point of the GB is to ... "Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;"

Dockenfield has been we consider unique in Waverley in having a c1% per annum growth of new housing over the past 30 years or so and is by no means a NIMBY parish. Even recently there have been substantial windfall sites. No other village in Waverley has endured this level of expansion in fact we believe only Farnham and Cranleigh exceed our figure. These developments have included removing 3 of our few business sites thus making the village less sustainable and reducing "vitality". A sustainability index produced by WBC some years ago placed Dockenfield in the lower half of the lowest quartile of sustainability. Our open loose-knit structure Village will be quite rapidly destroyed if this level of growth is allowed to continue. It is thus important to assisting in safeguarding the countryside in and around this small unique village, whilst recognising the need for Farnham to expand in this direction. Developers concentrating on every possible site in Dockenfield will further reduce the number of business premises, and thus local employment and urbanise this area. We only have three remaining business sites whereas we have lost three within the last 10 years. We believe that collectively, Dockenfield's situation to be exceptional.

DPC thinks there is now less of a long term problem of GB principal 3. "Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another" because the new National Park has recently interceded between the rapidly expanding Town of Bordon, Hampshire and Farnham, Surrey. Nevertheless it would be poor long term planning for the two towns to be separated solely by that designation without any countryside buffer.

Inspector para 8.2 AONB

DPC would also wish to contribute to WBC's Response to this item, since we understand that Dockenfield Parish is current top of the List for the Surrey Hills AONB extension and has been for some years. We believe this review should start if NE has the resources, quite soon, well within the Plan timetable. AGLV acts as an important visual buffer to the AONB. Much of Dockenfield is the back drop for views from AONB.

Dockenfield Parish would be happy to discuss these points in front of the Inspector.

Jill Trout, Chairman, Dockenfield Parish Council