

Dormansland NP Reg 14 Consultation Responses (Non-Statutory) – Assessment

Comments including from Land owners/agents			
Source	Comment	Response	ONH/PC/WG Action
Station Fields Landowner (Comment 1 – Ref 3)	<p>We previously put forward our sites for development consideration as part of the Nieghbourhood Plan in 2015.</p> <p>Given the huge requirement in place we have also recently put forward our land in Tandridge Council's call for sites.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>We feel that the site has strong development potential given the proximity to transsport links via the train station. In order to do this we'd look to obtain planning for a sympathetic development to include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>The consideration of sites for development is not being undertaken by the DNP</p> <p>Respond by email</p>	PC

	<p>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.</p> <p>With that in mind, I attach the title plans for reference, and would respectfully request that the land is considered in the upcoming meeting on Saturday.</p>		
<p>Station Fields Landowner (Comment 2 – Ref 16)</p>	<p>Request removal of Station Fields as a LGS</p> <p>“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.”</p> <p>“Further to the emails you will have received yesterday, please also formally include the response below on behalf of my parents, XXXXXXXX and XXXXXX XXXXXXXX, landowners of Station Fields, who are in copy to this email.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) requires: 	<p>Refer to Planning Practice Guidance on LGS –</p> <p>Public access/ownership is not a requirement for designation.</p> <p>This site is bisected by a well-used PROW (as an adopted highway is maintained by the County Council) and bounded on 2 sides by another PROW/Bridleway (Mill Lane) and Highway (Station Road).</p> <p>Located close to the village and is on the route to the nearest station used daily by school children/commuters/etc</p> <p>Has not to date been allocated in TDC Local Plan – constraints to development include close to National Landscape, ecological importance including to protected species, separated from edge of village.</p> <p>The site is valued by the local community because of its tranquillity and wildlife</p> <p>The Parish Council informed the landowner through their agent (daughter) 7 December 2023 by email that the site was to be included for consideration as a</p>	<p>PC/WG</p>

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Please confirm by return email that this email has been received, and will be formally noted.”</p>	<p>candidate LGS and any formal response is through the consultation process of Reg 14.</p> <p>Background: The landowner/agent was made aware in the public engagement of 27 February 2016 that the DNP was unlikely to support development on this site because of planning constraints, including high ecological importance and a potential candidate for LGS</p> <p>WG consideration that allocation as LGS is desired by community to protect this site from development mainly because of its ecological value and wellbeing benefits for people passing through on the PROW. Continue to support inclusion and submit to examination for determination</p>	
<p>Station Fields Landowner (Comment 3 – Ref 17)</p>	<p>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. As andowner 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 dorsmansland 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.</p>	<p>The consideration of sites for development is not being undertaken by the DNP - response as above.</p> <p>The agent was made aware of the inclusion as a LGS in email 7 December 2023</p> <p>Reg 14 consultation is the appropriate place to raise objection to nomination as LGS</p> <p>The WG have a different view as to the tranquillity of the site collected through public engagement, it forms an “oasis” for people walking to the station to experience birdsong, see rare insects and in the dark watch bats foraging. The</p>	<p>PC/WG</p>

		<p>road to the south of the site is a rural lane and the train line is a distance from the site, with screening vegetation. The station is a smaller rural station with average day time trains 2 each direction per hour (Dormans total number of passengers for 2024/25 122,678; East Grinstead next station on the line, same year 1,000,494 passengers)</p> <p>The submission to Tandridge as development site for Local Plan 2033 was rejected by Tandridge as “unsuitable” (Site DOR 015, 2018 HELAA). The Parish Council cannot submit sites for development on behalf of owners</p>	
<p>Owner of 54-58 High Street (Ref 15)</p>	<p>Rejection of property being designated an Asset of Community Value</p> <p>“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.”</p>	<p>The owner was consulted through the Reg 14 Consultation process by mail (July 2025). The premises serves a particular purpose, and the PC wishes to reflect that within the policy but also through designating it as an asset of community value. Long history of consultation, including PC asking Historic England to consider Listing the building in 2014, when there was a planning application for its demolition. Although that failed, the building is still locally listed as a non-designated heritage asset. Local community has consistently identified the shop as important, recent decisions continue to recognise the shop as</p>	<p>PC</p>

		<p>instrumental in terms of Dormansland village sustainability. Asset of Community Value a separate process but DNP WG signalling PC's future intent.</p> <p>Regarding the use of part of the building as residential, consideration of using the income from the residential portion could be an integral part of the business case for subsidising a community venture. The current owner's 2 residential properties to the rear of the Village Stores is not part of the proposal of ACV as they are in a separate building.</p>	
<p>Agent for Hill House Baldwins Hill East Grinstead (Ref 22)</p>	<p>"We are the agent for the owners and they request that Hill House should be removed from the list of Buildings of Character as the property is it is no longer merits it's inclusion. The large 1960's contemporary steel and glass house is regrettably due to the lack of technology available at the time it was built in 1960, failed to include the essential thermal break, insulation and other suitable construction materials to achieve sustainability. The house is in disrepair and it is either to be completely re-modelled and or replaced with new housing and we await to hear from you in reply."</p>	<p>Despite the description of the state of the building, it is still on the register for assessment by English Heritage for potential listing because of the architectural importance of it being the last remaining UK dwelling designed by Bronek Katz and that there are extensive records of the original design. It is ultimately the decision of TDC whether to include it on the Local List by DNP will continue to support its inclusion. PC to respond in email as per advice from TDC</p>	<p>WG/PC</p>
<p>Individual responses (Refs 6, 10 & 21)</p>	<p>Objections raised about DP7 relating to the site of the Dormansland War Memorial Community Hall citing new trustees, refurbishment and increased use of the Hall for community events and for regular bookings, generating an income, confirming the continued use of the facility on its current site is viable and preferred by the community.</p>	<p>The whole of DP7 removed and protections as a designated ACV should allow for the continued use by the community. DNP recommends PC submit as ACV.</p>	<p>WG/PC</p>

Individual Response Ref 14	<p>"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."</p>	Noted to pass onto the PC	PC
Individual Response Ref 19	<p>"Lacks particular vision and objectives. Generally vague, which is fine but needs to go further."</p> <p>Re Spatial plan "Have specific areas/sites been identified for possible future housing, recreational, commercial use etc?"</p> <p>Re Green corridors "More and better pathways should be proposed. eg across Hollow Lane through St John's Wood. Etc. Also to the Station."</p> <p>Re LGS "A conceptual plan for the various green spaces should to be undertaken. Eg. the Rec? - parking, playground, toilet facilities etc"</p> <p>Re Buildings of Character "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."</p> <p>Re DP7 "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</p>	<p>Scope allows conformity with current TDC policies</p> <p>Sites for housing are not being allocated</p> <p>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"</p> <p>Not within the remit of Neighbourhood Planning</p> <p>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 nominations for TDC Local List</p> <p>DP7 removed</p>	WG

	<p>uses and is well used – although for some indoor sports (as per Sports England) other facilities would be needed.”</p> <p>Re the Design Code “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”</p> <p>General/other “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”.”</p>	<p>1 Noted. The aim was to protect the character of the existing village 2 New design is not proscribed 3 PD rights would need to be removed with an Article 4 direction to prevent parking being created in front gardens. 4. Dormans Park is not currently designated as a settlement in TDC policies and is washed over by green belt so density is already controlled</p> <p>General comments most are outside of the remit of a neighbourhood plan and rely on development proposals bringing forward the infrastructure improvements suggested. Other suggestions will rely on Network Rail and Surrey Highways to approve and deliver The path from the station is deliberately kept “underlit” because of the dark skies planning policies and to protect night wildlife. The village centre suggestions are dependent on funding and Highways approvals.</p>	
Individual Response Ref 20	Re Educational Facilities “I agree with the provision for Dormansland Primary school. Why is Lingfield College not included in Education provision as part of the	Registered address of Lingfield College is in Lingfield Parish. Both are privately run	WG

	<p>site is within the parish boundary. Also, St Piers college & school are fully within the parish. “</p> <p>Re Community Facilities “The Community facilities form an intrinsic part of the village and make it a special place to live.</p> <p>The potential proposals for the Memorial Hall require careful consideration, after all the hard work carried out by volunteers. Does the village need the green hut, the Centenary room and the War Memorial Hall? Is there a need for all 3? Has a survey been carried out about current use and future use of all 3 halls?</p> <p>Re the Design Code “The title Design Code is very confusing. It would better if referred to: A guide to development proposals or Development Proposals Guide</p> <p>Dormansland Village features four distinct Character Areas – these should be listed in the introduction to ANALYSIS Character Areas.</p> <p>It is very hard to navigate the design code on the website. It needs a list of distinct areas with hyperlinks to the relevant information.</p> <p>Overall, it is a good approach looking at different vision and design principles for each distinct area.</p> <p>Newhache is misspelt as 2 words (New Hache) in the estates section.</p>	<p>educational establishments and beyond the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>DNP7 has been removed. All three facilities are recommended to be considered as ACVs. They have different client groups and different provisions and can all be in use at the same time, so are seen to be needed</p> <p>Design Code aligns with Government directions</p> <p>Noted</p>	
Steering Group Request		Supporting text of DNP4 to recognise emerging Surrey Local Nature Recovery Strategy.	ONH