

| Ref | Date received | Vision and Objectives | Spatial Plan | Education Provision | Promoting the natural environment | The green corridor | Local Green spaces | Community facilities | Local heritage assets | Ashdown Forest SPA | The village Hall | The design code | General / Other | Overview Positive, negative or neutral | DNP Response |
|-----|---------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|--------------------|--|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | 21-Jul | Positive | Helpful to understand the character and zones | room to increase the size of the school if ever required | Particularly vital due to the biodiversity potential in this unique Green Belt and AONB Parish | See general comments | See general comments | | Dormansland is so incredibly rich in these - a strong Parish Plan is vital to maintain for future generations | | I am glad the existing community hall is renovated, rather than the awful new building planned | Looks good though I have not read it in any detail | A Green Corridor between the village and the railway line is a perfect position to not only maintain local amenity and views but also as part of a wider wildlife corridor. It would enable wildlife to move from the forthcoming Eden Valley Rewilding landscape (to the North), South to the proposed Station Road Green Space (which already has recorded biodiversity), and into the open countryside towards East Grinstead. The 6 proposed Local Green Spaces could provide great natural environmental and wildlife benefits alongside the Green Corridor. These could be enhanced by 're-wilding' with a strip of wildflowers and native under-storey trees around the edges. | positive | Noted |
| 2 | 21-Jul | | | | | | | | | | | | Please can you provide a key to the colours on this map, as there doesn't seem to be one. I would like to know what the orange and pale green/turquoise colours indicate in the built-on areas. | neutral | Done |
| 3 | 17-Jul | | | | | | | | | | | | We previously put forward our sites for development consideration as part of the Neighbourhood Plan in 2015. Given the huge requirement in place we have also recently put forward our land in Tandridge Council's call for sites. As a brief summary, the land we own is adjacent to Dormans Train Station (two fields with a public footpath running through it from Mill Lane through to Dormans Station Road - title numbers for reference are SY590841 and SY223820). There is a hedge boundary surrounding the land. It is currently classed as Green Belt, however we would like to apply for a change of use to residential development. Due to the position of the footpath it is not practical for grazing animals and therefore is currently disused land. We feel it would benefit the wider community as we are looking to provide a combination of parking (for the station) in addition to a number of starter and private family homes. We feel that the site has strong development potential given the proximity to transport links via the train station. In order to do this we'd look to obtain planning for a sympathetic development to include: 1. formation of a new access off Dormans Station Road to a number of parking spaces (TBC) which will overcome the great need for improved parking within the area 2. there is currently a footpath going through the and which we'd ensure a developer must maintain/improve (it is currently poorly lit and not a particularly comfortable walk in the dark, especially during winter months) 3. in order to respect the surrounding greenbelt we would look to retain a green landscape "buffer" around the whole site with dedicated areas of open space so as to ensure that the rural feel of the land is retained 4. provision of a number of standard private dwellings together with a number of 2 and 3 bed starter homes for the area, which will allow both younger first time buyers/small families/those looking to downsize to acquire. Obviously any housing produced on site will assist Tandridge in hitting their targets and will allow Dormansland to be seen as doing their "bit" for the District. We have seen other successful Greenbelt type development sites within Smallfield and Warlingham, and believe the same could be achieved on our land. It would be great to work with the Parish to meet the requirements of Tandridge, and we hope you consider supporting us in doing so. With that in mind, I attach the title plans for reference, and would respectfully request that the land is | | See Non Statutory Comments Assessment |
| 5 | 22-Jul | | | | | | | | | | | | Frith Manor is a grade 2 listed building | neutral | Noted |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | Objection to Redevelopment of Dormansland Village Hall – Policy DNP7 I wish to register my strong objection to the proposed redevelopment or relocation of the Dormansland Village Hall under Policy DNP7 of the Dormansland Neighbourhood Plan. My concerns are as follows: 1. Insufficient Parking Provision The village already suffers from limited and inadequate parking. Any redevelopment of the hall, particularly if designed to accommodate larger events, will place even greater pressure on local streets. Residents already contend with a lack of off-street parking, and no clear provision has been proposed to address this. Without substantial additional dedicated parking, this scheme risks creating daily disruption for nearby households. 2. Existing Traffic Congestion and Highway Safety There are serious and long-standing concerns about traffic in the area, particularly around blind bends and narrow roads near the existing hall site. There have been multiple near-misses due to poor visibility and speeding vehicles. The nearby closure of Public Footpath 381 between Dormansland and Lingfield (extended until June 2026 due to safety concerns) further demonstrates that local infrastructure cannot safely accommodate increased vehicle or pedestrian traffic. 3. Disturbance to Nearby Residential Properties Any increase in activity at the site will unavoidably lead to noise, light, and general disturbance to the many homes situated in close proximity. Evening events, private hire functions, deliveries, and vehicle movements will create significant nuisance for residents, undermining the quiet, village atmosphere that the Neighbourhood Plan explicitly seeks to protect. 4. Risk of Increased Anti-Social Behaviour The current site already experiences issues with noise and occasional anti-social behaviour. Increasing the size or frequency of events held at the hall will exacerbate this, particularly if the building is hired out for private functions or late-night activities. Without robust security or on-site management plans, the risks to community cohesion and resident wellbeing are significant. 5. Incompatible with Current Infrastructure and Village Character This proposal risks overdevelopment and is inconsistent with the scale and character of Dormansland. As seen with recent planning refusals in nearby Lingfield, including a GP/retirement scheme rejected in 2025 due to scale and intrusion into the green belt, developments which threaten village identity or overwhelm local infrastructure are not in keeping with the wishes of local residents. Furthermore, recent council investment in biodiversity at Dormansland Recreation Ground (e.g., BioCubes) highlights the importance of protecting peaceful and ecologically sensitive areas from overuse. Conclusion While I understand the desire to | negative | DNP7 removed |
| 7 | 23-Jul | | | | | | | | | | | | I saw your stall at the carnival and talking about the neighbourhood plan. I agree that any property development in the area should be with in keeping of local properties. | positive | |
| 8 | 28-Jul | | | | | | | | | | | | I have reviewed the Dormansland Neighbourhood Plan on line, and visit both the parish council's desk at the carnival and display at the Memorial Hall. I am pleased to unreservedly offer my support of the plan. Thanks and congratulations to all involved with the production of the plan. | positive | |
| 9 | 28-Jul | | | | | | | | | | | | Well done to all involved in the DNP. I've read the plan and confirm my full support. | positive | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|--|--|------------|---|---|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 10 | 28-Jul | | | | | | | | | | | | | Just a quick email regarding the Dormansland Neighbourhood plan. We have read through the document and have no strong comments or opinions positively or negatively. It all seems pretty sensible and agreeable. My only comment, as a trustee of The Dormansland War Memorial Hall, was that any plans or discussions regarding the future of the hall would need to be discussed and approved by the trustees of the hall. As you are aware the Hall is owned by the people of the village and held in trust by the trustees. We would welcome any positive suggestions or improvements to the hall that would benefit the community in the medium and long term. | positive (sensible and agreeable) | DNP7 removed |
| 12 | 01-Aug | | | | | | | | | | | | | Good Afternoon Having attended the consultation meeting on the 19th July and viewed the documentation available. Both myself and my husband XXXXXXXXXXXX fully support all aspects and categories of the Dormansland Plan. Our property is included in the Local Green Spaces, XXXXXXXXXX. Our neighbour at number X owns the field directly behind our property. For us to have both our property and the Cricket Pitch registered as a protected sites would mean that the possibility of the field behind our property being used for housing is reduced. Having moved from South London to the village in 2020 it is important to us that it remains as such and so feel that it is imperative that the plan is implemented so again and to confirm both myself and my husband are fully supportive of the plan. With best regards | positive | |
| 13 | 05-Sep | Agree with the vision and objectives, particularly relating to preserving the rural nature of the parish whilst improving access to the countryside | Spatial plan and supporting good design: | | Agree with protecting the character of the village by preventing inappropriate development and keeping building low rise and in character with the different areas that are identified in the plan. | Promoting the natural Environment and the Green Corridor – strongly support action to protect and enhance the natural environment | Would like to see all the green spaces that are mentioned protected and the largest area of the open fields and woods on the walk to the station declared as green space as this is part of the green corridor and gives a real feeling of having arrived in the countryside after a train journey from London. Would like to see more hedges planted within the village as we seem to be losing these as people put up fences and create parking in front gardens. | | | | | | The memorial hall and other community assets should of course be protected. No need to consider moving the memorial hall given all the work that volunteers have done over the years, it appears to be well managed and is not causing any of the occasional disturbances that we experienced when it operated as a club. We had a quick look at the Design Guide which is too detailed to go into in depth but seems well put together and will hopefully prevent a repeat of the out of character developments that have taken place in the village. | I support the tree planting that has taken place over the last few years. | positive | |
| 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | I would like to add my voice to the Neighbourhood Plan and suggest that if the future Unitary Authority suggests reducing the speed limit throughout the village to 20 mph that this is something that would be favourably received. A 20 mph speed limit would reduce accidents and make the village safer for car users, pedestrians and cyclists. | neutral | Noted to pass onto the PC |
| 15 | 07-Sep | | | | | | | | | | | | | I am writing to formally object to the proposed designation of my property as an 'asset of communityvalue' within the draft Dormansland Neighbourhood Plan (DNP). My home at 54-58 High Street is primarily a residential property and my only residence, which also includes a commercial part— the Village Shop and Post Office. | negative | See Non Statutory Comments Assessment |
| 16 | 17-Sep | Strongly disagree with the inclusion of station fields in the local designated green space report. The land is privately owned and the parish council have not followed the required protocol in consulting with the landowners. This breaches landowners property rights. | No Comment | No Comment | No Comment | No Comment | No Comment | No Comment | No Comment | No Comment | No Comment | No Comment | No Comment | Further to the emails you will have received yesterday, please also formally include the response below on behalf of my parents, XXXXXXX and XXXXX XXXXXXX, landowners of Station Fields, who are in copy to this email. 1.XXXX andXXXXXXXXX formally object to Station Fields being included as local designated green space in the neighbourhood plan, and request it's removal 2.The land is privately owned with no public access, permissive access, or rights of way; It is not used by the public for recreation or amenity purposes; The owner has repeatedly requested that the land be excluded from any LGS designation with these requests have not been adequately acknowledged or acted upon. 3.Contravenes national policy (NPPF paras 106 and 107) and the PPG A Local Green Space does not need to be in public ownership. However, the local planning authority (in the case of local plan making) or the qualifying body (in the case of neighbourhood plan making) should contact landowners at an early stage about proposals to designate any part of their land as Local Green Space. Landowners will have opportunities to make representations in respect of proposals in a draft plan. Paragraph: 019 Reference ID: 37-019-20140306 Open space, sports and recreation facilities, public rights of way and local green space - GOV.UK. This step was not undertaken by the Parish Council. 4.Regulatory and Legal Requirements: a.Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) requires: i. under Regulation 14: the plan-making body must consult those "whose interests the authority considers may be affected by the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan." Failing to approach the landowner and address their concerns breaches this. ii. under Regulation 16: the final submission must include a Consultation Statement showing how those representations have been considered. If previous requests by the landowner have been ignored, that Statement cannot lawfully claim to have properly considered them. a.Human Rights Act 1998, Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property): imposing planning restrictions on land (such as LGS designation) without fair procedure / without justification is potentially an interference with property rights. We believe that Dormansland Parish Council have not followed fair procedure and accordingly have breached Article 1 of the Human Rights Act 1998. We are seeking legal advice accordingly. | negative | See Non Statutory Comments Assessment |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|--|--|---|--|------------------------------|--|--|---|------------|---|--|--|----------|---|
| 17 | 17-Sep | The parish council have not considered land for development, which could provide new starter homes, close to transport links, improvements to Highways in the provision of station parking, and better lit footpath (connecting mill lane to dormans station) - all of which was offered when the Landowners of the fields adjacent to dormans station put forward their land for development consideration. This seems to contradict the vision and objectives. | No Comment | No Comment | No Comment | No Comment | As a landowner of the station fields adjacent to dormans station I was not notified by the parish council that the council were proposing the land for Lgs designation. This is the only opportunity I have had to comment. Please note that I do not want the land to be a local designated space. In addition, Per the criteria in the green spaces report, it doesn't meet criteria 2.b as we have proposed the land for development to both the dormansland parish council and tandridge district council. I would also argue that it does not meet the criteria of 2.d (tranquility) given it's adjacent to the station and bordered by a main road and an access road, with a footpath running through it. | No Comment | No Comment | No Comment | No Comment | No Comment | | negative | See Non Statutory Comments Assessment |
| 18 | 23-Sep | I am very pleased that the policy wants to protect the village character and stop any development that will not fit the village. The school and doctors surgery are full to capacity so there is no scope for much development. Parking is already an issue and the High Street is difficult to navigate with so much on road parking. | | As I have mentioned the school is full to capacity. | Yes we need to do this. | Very much in favour of this. | Need more | More use could be made of the Community Hall | Need to be preserved. | | This has been great – committee have done a good job in restoring the hall for use but more people should use and support it. | | Wonderful that people care about our village and want to preserve its character. | positive | |
| 19 | 24-Sep | Lacks particular vision and objectives. Generally vague, which is fine but needs to go further. | Have specific areas/sites been identified for possible future housing, recreational, commercial use etc? | No Comment | More and better pathways should be proposed. eg across Hollow Lane through St John's Wood. Etc. Also to the Station. | No Comment | A conceptual plan for the various green spaces should be undertaken. Eg. the Rec? - parking, playground, toilet facilities etc | OK | List seems limited? There are many other buildings that perhaps should be on the list? Eg, The Plough, The Royal Oak, St Barnabus, Baldwyn's Hill House. I'm sure there are others? Better and stronger protection for these is required. | No Comment | This section seems rather out of date? – especially given the more recent history of the Hall, the work of the new Trustees are doing, and the refurbishment work that is underway and ongoing. This includes making the building more accessible. ie a new / replacement facility is unlikely and possibly unnecessary. The existing building is now fit for purpose, has scope for many uses and is well used – although for some indoor sports (as per Sports England) other facilities would be needed. | 1. Too prescriptive and conservative. Any project, small or large should be reviewed and assessed on its own merits. Dormansland has a wide range of building types, styles and materials – so there is scope for more creative design. 2. The Code should discourage "pastiche" design and encourage more high quality architecture and innovative housing types – as long as they are appropriate for their location. 3. The Code should discourage / ban replacement of front gardens with private parking – which reduces green space and gardens, reduces on-road parking (for everyone) and creates drainage issues. 4. Density controls required for Dormans Park | Firstly, it is great that we now have, after such a long period of time, an actual Plan in place. However, given that this plan is to "shape the future" until 2044, ie 19 years, it does appear to be rather "vanilla", and lacks particular vision and objectives. It also ignores some important issues and concerns. These include – 1. Parking for the Station – the current street parking is not ideal (an understatement), and the new car park behind the station (currently under construction?) will be inadequate in terms of numbers even if/when completed. By 2044, I would hope a car park fit for purpose is achievable, and should be an objective of the DNP. Clarity for on-street parking on Station Road (which I hope remains free and open) would also be helpful. 2. Full accessibility, for both railway platforms needs addressing (in conjunction with Southern Rail). 3. A satisfactory and properly lit pedestrian pathway from the station to the village centre should be provided. 4. A plan / vision for the Village Centre is required – with better landscaping, traffic calming, lighting, perhaps more retail/commercial. And a revitalised "Royal Oak". | positive | Scope allows conformity with current TDC policies Sites for housing are not being allocated Noted. Large portion of southeast of parish protected as National Landscape and Biodiversity Opportunity Areas are potentially to be protected by Local Nature Recovery Strategy covering flood plain of River Eden. . South of Hollow Lane and St John's Wood fall inside the High Weald National Landscape, the latter is also protected as "Historic Parkland" Not within the remit of Neighbourhood Planning The Plough is Listed; the Royal Oak to be ACV; St Barnabus (already listed) out of parish area: Baldwyn's Hill House included in the |

| As listed in the Regulations (2012) | Legal entity | Date Sent | Response | Date Received | Comments Received /Notes |
|---|--|------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---|
| Specific Comment re breach of regulation | | | | | |
| (b)a local planning authority, county council or parish council any part of whose area is in or adjoins the area of the local planning authority; | Surrey County Council Kent; East & West Sussex; Mid Sussex & Wealden These are listed below and adjacent authorities only were contacted | | | | |
| | Tandridge District Council Officers | 30/07/2025 sent to all | Detailed Response | 26/09/2025 | Provided a detailed response. This is substantially included within the ONH Assessment |
| | Tandridge District Council | 30/07/2025 | | | All councillors on website |
| | Parish Councils in Tandridge Lingfield & Dormansland listed separately | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | Dormansland Parish Councillors | | See comments | | One councillor responded and it has been included in the public responses page |
| Adjoining Town and Parish Councils | | | | | |
| | Lingfield Parish Councillors | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | Crowhurst Parish Council | | | | |
| | Limpsfield Parish Council | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | Forest Row Parish Council | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | Edenbridge Town Council (below) | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | Cowden Parish Council | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | Felbridge Parish Council | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | East Grinstead | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| (c)the Coal Authority | planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| (d)the Homes and Communities Agency | | | | | |
| | enquiries@homesengland.gov.uk | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| (e)Natural England | consultations@naturalengland.org.uk | 30/07/2025 | Response | 25/09/2025 | Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. |
| (f)the Environment Agency | enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| (g)the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as English Heritage) | londonseast@HistoricEngland.org.uk | 30/07/2025 | Response | 11/08/2025 | Although your neighbourhood area does contain a number of designated heritage assets, at this point we don't consider there is a need for Historic England to be involved in the detailed development of the strategy for your area |
| (h)Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (company number 2904587); | AssetProtectionSouthern@networkrail.co.uk TownPlanningSE@networkrail.co.uk | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| (i)the Highways Agency; | planningSE@highwaysengland.co.uk | 30/07/2025 | Response | 03/09/2025 | Thank you for your email of 30 July 2025 consulting National Highways regarding the above referenced document. We are concerned about the safety, reliability, and operational efficiency of the Strategic Road Network (SRN). In the case of Dormansland, the nearest stretches of the SRN are the M25 and the M23. We have reviewed the consultation document. We are satisfied that this Plan, if adopted and implemented, would not have an unacceptable impact on the safety, reliability, and/or operational efficiency of the SRN. Our formal response is no objection |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|------------|----------|------------|---|
| (j)the Marine Management Organisation | info@marinemanagement.org.uk | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| (k)any person— | | | | | |
| (i)to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106(3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003; and | | | | | |
| (ii)who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority; | BT EE Plusnet Openreach | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | Cornerstone Telecommunications Infrastructure Ltd (For All Mobile networks) | 31/07/2025 | | | Hive 2, 1530 Arlington Business Park, Theale, Berkshire. RG7 4SA |
| | Three | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | Mobile Broadband Network Ltd (EE & 3) | 31/07/2025 | | | Sixth Floor, Thames Tower, Station Road, Reading, RG1 1LX |
| | Virgin (owns O2) | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | EE (BT owned) | | | | |
| | Vodafone | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | Vodafone (Telefonica) | | | | This is now Cornerstone - covered above |
| (l)where it exercises functions in any part of the neighbourhood area— | | | | | |
| (i)a Primary Care Trust established under section 18 of the National Health Service Act 2006(7) or continued in existence by virtue of that section; | Surrey Heartlands | | | | |
| | Surrey Integrated Care Board | 31/07/2025 | | | Surrey Heartlands Block C, 1st Floor, Dukes Court, Duke Street, Woking, Surrey, GU21 5BH |
| | Dorking Health Care | 31/07/2025 | | | Dorking Healthcare Ltd, Holmhurst Medical Centre, 12 Thornton Side, Redhill, Surrey, RH1 2NP |
| | Lingfield Surgery - practice manager | 31/07/2025 | | | sent to both |
| | Queen Victoria Hospital Trust | 31/07/2025 | | | Queen Victoria Hospital NHS Foundation Trust Holtye Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 3DZ |
| | First Community Health Care Includes Caterham Dene Hospital | | | | First Community Health and Care, Orchard House, Unit 8A Orchard Business Centre, Bonehurst Road, Salfords, Redhill, RH1 5EL |
| | Surrey and Sussex Health Care Trust | | | | Trust Headquarters, East Surrey Hospital, Canada Avenue, Redhill, RH1 5RH |
| (ii)a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 6(1)(b) and (c) of the Electricity Act 1989(8); | UK Power Networks | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| (iii)a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986(9); | National Gas | 31/07/2025 | | | Asset Protection, National Grid House, Gallows Hill, Warwick, CV34 6DA |
| | British Gas | | | | |
| | Southern Gas Networks | | | | covered in email to National Grid |
| (iv)a sewerage undertaker; and | Southern Water | 31/07/2025 | Response | 11/09/2025 | We have reviewed the draft Plan with interest and attach below links to the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage issued by the Government in June of 2025 should this help you to finalise policy directed at sustainable development. We look forward to being kept informed of progress. |
| (v)a water undertaker; | | | | | |
| | Sutton & East Surrey Water (SES) | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | Thames Water | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | South East Water | 31/07/2025 | | | South East Water, Rocfort Road, Snodland, Kent, ME6 5AH |
| (m)voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit all or any part of the neighbourhood area; | | | | | |
| Meals on Wheels | Sara Watson (Chair of Trustees) | 31/07/2025 | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|------------|--|--|--|
| | Tandridge Voluntary Action | | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | Dormansland War Memorial Community Hall | Delivered by post | | | | |
| | Claridge House | Delivered by post | | | | |
| | (n)bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the neighbourhood area; | | | | | |
| | | Guild of Travelling Showmen | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | | Friends, Families & Travellers Association | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | | London Gypsy Council | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | (o)bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the neighbourhood area; | | | | | |
| | St Peter & St Pauls Lingfield | | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | St Bernards Catholic Church | Part of East Grinstead parish | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | St John's Dormansland | | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | Baptist Chapel Dormansland | | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | The College of St Barnabas | | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | The Church of the Latter Day Saints | London Temple, Newchapel | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | (p)bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the neighbourhood area; and | Delivered by post to all | | | | |
| | Charters Village | | | | | |
| | Chartham Park | | | | | |
| | Ladycross Business Park | | | | | |
| | Carewell Farm | | | | | |
| | Starborough Farm Business Park | | | | | |
| | Skitts Farm | | | | | |
| | Moor Hall (Wilderwick Rd) | | | | | |
| | Village Stores & Post Office | | | | | |
| | (q)bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the neighbourhood area. | | | | | |
| | Tandridge Access Group | | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | Surrey County Council | Surrey County Council | | | | Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill, Woodhatch, Reigate, RH2 8EF. |
| | | Planning | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | | Lead Flood Authority | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | | Highways | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | | Education | | | | |
| | | Surrey County Council | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | | Lingfield Primary School | | | | |
| | | Lingfield College both campuses Head | 31/07/2025 | | | St Pier's Ln, Dormansland, Lingfield RH7 6PH |
| | | Dormansland Primary School | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | | Felbridge Primary School | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | | Godstone Primary School | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | | Holland Primary School | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | | Hurst Green Infant & Junior | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | | St Mary's Oxted | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | | St Stephen's South Godstone | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | | Oxted School | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | | De Stafford | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | | Imberhorne | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | | Sackville | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | | The Stables Nursery School | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------|------------|------------------------------------|------------|--|
| | | Little Chums Dormansland | | | | |
| | | Young Epilepsy | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | | | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | Adjoining County Councils | | | | | |
| | West Sussex | West Sussex | | | | |
| | | Minerals & Waste | | | | |
| | | Local Transport | | | | |
| | | Flood risk management | | | | |
| | Kent | Kent | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | East Sussex | East Sussex - Wealden | 30/07/2025 | Detailed response | 23/09/2025 | This is substantailly included within the ONH Assessment |
| | Adjoining Local Authorities | | | | | |
| | | Mid Sussex | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | | Sevenoaks | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | | Reigate & Banstead | | | | |
| | | Mole Valley | | | | |
| | | Elmbridge | | | | |
| | | Surrey Heath | | | | |
| | | Waverley | | | | |
| | | Spelthorne | | | | |
| | | Woking | | | | |
| | | Guildford | | | | |
| | Adjoining Town and Parish Councils | | | | | |
| | | Edenbridge | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | | East Grinstead | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | | Horley | | | | |
| | Gatwick | Gatwick Safeguarding | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | | | 30/07/2025 | No Aerodrome Safeguarding Concerns | 04/08/2025 | |
| | Services | | | | | |
| | Surrey Fire Service | Surrey Fire Service | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | Surrey Ambulance Service | Surrey Ambulance Service | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | Surrey Police | Surrey Police | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | | Tandridge Police | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | Drainage Board | Lower Medway Drainage Board | | | | |
| | | Upper Medway Drainage Board | 30/07/2025 | | | |
| | Wildlife | Surrey Wildlife Trust | 31/07/2025 | | | |
| | High Weald National Landscape | | 31/07/2025 | | | |