



Waverley Borough Council Local Planning Authority Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2032

DECISION STATEMENT

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), the Council has a statutory duty to assist communities in the preparation of neighbourhood development plans and orders and to take plans through a process of examination and referendum. The Localism Act 2011 (Part 6 chapter 3) sets out the Local Planning Authority's responsibilities under Neighbourhood Planning.
- 1.2 This report confirms that all of the modifications proposed by the Examiner's report have been accepted, the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2032 has been altered as a result of it, and that this Plan may now proceed to referendum.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2032 relates to the area that was designated by Waverley Borough Council as a neighbourhood area on 19th February 2013. This area is coterminous with the Haslemere Town Council boundary that lies within the Waverley Borough Council Local Planning Authority area.
- 2.2 Following the submission of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2032 to the Council, the Plan was publicised, and representations were invited under Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations from the 5th February until the 19th March 2021.
- 2.3 Mr Andrew Ashcroft was appointed by Waverley Borough Council with the consent of Haslemere Town Council, to undertake the examination of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2032 and to prepare a report of the independent examination.

- 2.4 The Examiner's report was received by Waverley Borough Council on 6th July 2021. An erratum to this report was received on 13th July 2021. He concluded that, subject to making the modifications recommended in his report, the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2032 meets the basic conditions set out in the legislation and should proceed to a Neighbourhood Plan referendum.
- 2.5 Paragraph 12(4) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") states that a referendum must be held on a proposal for a neighbourhood development plan or order if the LPA is satisfied that it meets the basic conditions and other legal requirements or would do so if modifications were made to the draft plan or order (whether or not recommended by the Examiner).
- 2.6 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was updated on 20th July 2021 after the Examiner's report was published. The LPA is satisfied that the update to the NPPF does not affect the Examiner's conclusion that the neighbourhood plan meets the basic conditions and other legal requirements. It is also satisfied that the update to the NPPF does not affect his recommendations. However, it is considered that it is appropriate for the neighbourhood plan to make minor changes in order that it correctly reflects the new date of NPPF and its revised paragraph numbers.

3. Decision

- 3.1 The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) require the local planning authority to outline what action to take in response to the recommendations of an Examiner made in a report under paragraph 10 of Schedule 4A to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of the 2004 Act) in relation to a neighbourhood development plan.
- 3.2 Accordingly, having considered each of the recommendations made by the Examiner's report, and the reasons for them, Waverley Borough Council, with the support of Haslemere Town Council, has decided to accept all of the Examiner's recommendations to the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2032. Table 1 below outlines the alterations made to the Plan under paragraph 12(6) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of 2004 Act) in response to each of the Examiner's recommendations and the justification for them.

Table 1: Recommendations by the Examiner agreed by Waverley Borough Council with the consent of Haslemere Town Council

Recommended modification number (RM)	Policy/ paragraph reference	Modification	Reason	WBC decision
RM1	Policy H1	<p>Reverse the order of Policies H1.2 and H1.3</p> <p>Replace Policy H1.3 (as submitted) with: ‘Development proposals within the settlement boundaries that comply with development plan policies will be supported’</p> <p>Replace Policy H1.2 (as submitted) with: ‘Development outside the settlement boundaries will be strictly controlled. Development proposals in such locations will only be supported which otherwise conform with national and local planning policies’</p>	<p>To bring a sharper focus to the intent of the policy to focus new development within the settlement boundaries.</p> <p>To incorporate a connection between the part of this policy relating to development within settlement boundaries and the wider development plan rather than simply to the submitted Plan as included in the submitted policy.</p> <p>To ensure the clarity required by the NPPF as the approach relating to development outside settlement policy boundaries only to support development on previous-developed land is more onerous than that in national policy.</p>	Accepted
RM2	Paragraph 3.4	<p><i>Delete the final sentence of paragraph 3.4</i></p> <p><i>At the end of paragraph 3.4 add: Policy H1.2 offers support to development proposals within settlement boundaries where they otherwise comply with development plan policies. At this stage this</i></p>	Consequential changes to the recommended modifications to Policy H1 (RM1).	Accepted

Recommended modification number (RM)	Policy/ paragraph reference	Modification	Reason	WBC decision
		<i>consists of policies in Local Plan Part 1 and in this neighbourhood plan. This situation will evolve as Local Plan Part 2 is adopted'</i>		
RM3	Section 4	<p><i>Insert a new paragraph at the end of Section 4 to read:</i></p> <p><i>'Waverley Borough Council is currently producing the Local Plan Part 2. It will include a series of detailed development management policies, identify settlement boundaries and a package of housing allocations. The adoption of this Plan will alter the composition of the wider development plan. In this context section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that any conflict between different elements of the development plan must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to become part of the development plan. In this context the Town Council will assess the need for a full or a partial review of the made neighbourhood plan within six months of the adoption of Local Plan Part 2. In the event that a review is required the Town Council will ensure that it is undertaken as quickly as its resources and capacity permit'</i></p>	<p>To ensure that there is a closer functional relationship between any potential review of a made neighbourhood plan and the eventual adoption of Local Plan Part 2.</p> <p>In particular to ensure that, where necessary, any made neighbourhood plan can be reviewed so that it would be consistent with the wider development plan.</p>	Accepted
RM4	Policy H2	<p>Replace the policy with:</p> <p>'The density of development proposals should be consistent with the character, appearance and the topography of their immediate locality and the delivery of high-quality designs.</p> <p>Development proposals which meet these requirements and provide 45 dwellings per hectare in general, or 75 dwellings per hectare within 1000 metres of the Haslemere railway station will be particularly supported'</p>	<p>To recast the policy so that its primary focus is on densities which respect the character of the immediate locality and produce good design.</p>	Accepted
RM5	Paragraphs 3.8 to 3.12	<p><i>Replace 3.8 with:</i></p> <p><i>'Policy H2 provides a context to this matter. It seeks to ensure that the density of new development takes account of the circumstances of the site concerned and the need to produce high quality design. In this context it offers particular support for developments which achieve these objectives and make the best use of the site concerned. This is</i></p>	<p>Consequential changes to the recommended modifications to Policy H2 (RM4).</p>	Accepted

Recommended modification number (RM)	Policy/ paragraph reference	Modification	Reason	WBC decision
		<p><i>generally expected to be 45 dwellings per hectare. However, within 1000 metres of the railway station this is anticipated to be 75 dwellings per hectare'</i></p> <p><i>Delete the final sentence of paragraph 3.12.</i></p>		
RM6	Policy H3	Delete the policy	<p>The policy's focus on previously developed land is more onerous than that in national policy. In addition, its details about biodiversity and landscape have the ability to cut across policies which apply to some of the affected environmental designations.</p> <p>The detail of how development proposals outside identified settlement boundaries will be assessed is already captured in Policy H1.</p>	Accepted
RM7	Paragraphs 3.14 to 3.20	<p><i>Delete paragraphs 3.14 to 3.20.</i></p> <p><i>Insert the contents of paragraph 3.15 (without 'but should any.... for this development') at the beginning of paragraph 3.4.</i></p>	To accord with the nature of the recommended modification to the policy (RM7) and its wider implications on the structure of the Plan To provide a broader context to the recommended modifications to Policy H1	Accepted

Recommended modification number (RM)	Policy/ paragraph reference	Modification	Reason	WBC decision
RM8	Policy H4	<p>Replace the policy with:</p> <p>‘Proposals for the residential development of windfall sites within the settlement boundaries (as defined by Figure 1a-c) will be supported where they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide an appropriate mix, type and design of housing to the site concerned; and • respond positively to the character and appearance of the immediate locality’ <p>Development proposals which meet these requirements and which contribute towards delivering the housing needs of the local community, downsizers, those who work in the town and affordable housing will be particularly supported’</p>	<p>The nine dwellings threshold in the policy is over-prescriptive and is a matter which can be controlled by criteria in both this policy and other relevant policies in the Plan.</p> <p>To ensure that the highlighted need for affordable housing for local residents, downsizers and those who work in the town is incorporated into the policy in a way which offers particular support to such forms of houses which otherwise meet the wider approach taken in the Plan.</p>	Accepted
RM9	Paragraph 3.21	<p><i>Replace paragraph 3.21 with ‘The Town Council and the Borough Council have agreed that the emerging local plan will identify allocated housing sites. In this context Policy H4 of this Plan sets out an approach to windfall development within the identified settlement boundaries.’</i></p>	<p>The level of detail in the supporting text is unnecessary in general terms. It seeks to anticipate the eventual outcome of a process which has not yet reached its own examination stage.</p>	Accepted

Recommended modification number (RM)	Policy/ paragraph reference	Modification	Reason	WBC decision
RM10	Policy H6	<p>Replace the policy with:</p> <p>‘New residential developments should provide a range of dwelling types and sizes to meet the needs of the neighbourhood area taking into account the most up-to-date evidence and reflect the character of existing development in the surrounding area.</p> <p>In the town centre and in the immediate vicinity of the railway station area, the development of one and two bedroomed homes will be particularly supported’</p>	<p>The distinction in the policy between larger and smaller sites is unclear. In addition, the focus on the larger sites is the delivery of smaller homes rather than the broader mix as anticipated in the Housing Market Assessment (HMA).</p> <p>To maintain the intentions of the policy whilst taking account of the very distinctive and sensitive nature of the neighbourhood area.</p>	Accepted
RM11	Paragraphs 3.35 and 3.36	<p><i>Replace paragraph 3.35 with ‘Policy H6 sets out to ensure that new developments reflect the strategic requirements as described in Tables 1 and 2. In particular smaller properties are suitable for young singles, couples, people starting families and residents wishing to downsize. It is evident that increasing numbers of elderly residents will wish to downsize from large houses to more modest homes and apartments (2-3 bedroomed) in Haslemere during the Plan period. The policy also offers particular support for smaller houses in the town centre and close to the railway station. This approach reflects the character of existing housing development in the town’.</i></p> <p><i>Replace paragraph 3.36 with: ‘Policy H6 aims to ensure that the mix of dwelling types and sizes required to meet the needs of current and future households in the Plan area will be achieved in relation to new development. The most up-to-date evidence of housing need for the Plan area is currently in the West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (December 2015).</i></p>	Consequential changes to the recommended modifications to Policy H6 (RM11).	Accepted

Recommended modification number (RM)	Policy/ paragraph reference	Modification	Reason	WBC decision
RM12	Policy H7	<p>In Policy H7.1 delete the initial commentary about the Haslemere Design Statement.</p> <p>Replace the following paragraph with ‘As appropriate to their scale, nature and the location development proposals should respond positively to the relevant sections of the Haslemere Design Statement. In particular proposals should be of a high-quality design and respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area by:’</p> <p>In vii replace ‘it’ with ‘the existing settlement and the proposed development concerned’</p> <p>Replace Policy H7.2 with: ‘New developments of 10 or more dwellings should meet the Accessible Natural Green Space Standard. This may be achieved by providing additional public green space which contributes towards meeting this Standard. Where practicable the green space provided should connect to other open spaces within the town via safe pedestrian/cycle access’</p> <p>Replace H7.3 with: ‘Applications for major developments which meet Building for a Healthy Life standards will be particularly supported’</p>	<p>To ensure that the policy provides the clarity required by the NPPF in two important areas. The first is the way in which development proposals should respond to the Design Statement. The second is the way in which the policy should be applied on a proportionate basis to reflect the scale, nature and the location of the development concerned.</p> <p>To take account of Haslemere Town Council’s response to the clarification note.</p>	Accepted
RM13	Policy H8	Delete the policy	The approach is process-based rather than an expression of policy. In addition, it is prescriptive and offers no guidance about the outcome of development proposals which do not engage with the local community in this way.	Accepted

Recommended modification number (RM)	Policy/ paragraph reference	Modification	Reason	WBC decision
RM14	Paragraph 3.45	<p><i>Delete Policy H8 in the policy title</i></p> <p><i>In paragraph 3.45 replace</i></p> <p><i>‘Requiring a development brief and evidence of consultation with the community for major developments is not considered an onerous requirement since the content will be a necessary part of the planning application’ with ‘Opportunity [insert number] sets out an approach whereby developers can engage with the local community. In many circumstances the approach will not be onerous and will underpin any subsequent planning application’</i></p> <p><i>Reposition the policy to the Opportunities Section. In doing so replace the opening sentence with: ‘In order to secure early engagement of the development process the Town Council suggests that major planning applications should be accompanied by:’</i></p>	<p>Consequential changes to the recommended modifications to Policy H8 (RM14).</p> <p>To retain Haslemere Town Council’s intentions, the matter should be repositioned as a further ‘Opportunity’.</p>	Accepted
RM15	Policy H9	<p>In Policy 9.1 replace ‘must’ with ‘should’</p> <p>In Policy 9.1 replace the first criterion with ‘off street parking to comply with approved standards’</p> <p>In Policy 9.2 replace ‘Is to’ with ‘should’ and fourth criterion with ‘be designed to be accommodated satisfactorily in the local highway network’</p> <p>In Policy 9.3 delete the final paragraph.</p> <p>In Policy 9.4 delete the third criterion of ii).</p> <p>Replace Policy 9.6 with: ‘Development proposals should respect the proposed new footpath/cycleway routes shown in Figure 3 Haslemere High Street to Wey Hill and Figure 4 Station to Devil’s Punchbowl. Where practicable, development proposals within the immediate vicinity of the two routes should provide safe and attractive connections to the route concerned and be designed to contribute towards its attractiveness’</p>	<p>In order to bring the clarity required by the NPPF. In general to simplify the approach used.</p> <p>Specifically;</p> <p>Policy 9.3 - to delete the final paragraph which makes general comments rather than setting out a policy.</p> <p>Policy 9.4 - to delete the very prescriptive design guidelines on future connectivity arrangements and spacings; and</p> <p>Policy 9.6 - to replace the policy with one which makes a more appropriate</p>	Accepted

Recommended modification number (RM)	Policy/ paragraph reference	Modification	Reason	WBC decision
			relationship between new development proposals and planned transportation projects.	
RM16	Policy H10	<p>Replace Policy H10.1 with: ‘As appropriate to their scale, nature and location development proposals should incorporate appropriate water and sewage capacity facilities’</p> <p>Delete Policy H10.2</p>	<p>To ensure a simpler policy which draws attention to the need for this matter to be managed in a practical fashion and which directly relates to the scale, nature and location of development proposals. The other elements of the submitted policy are supporting text and should be repositioned accordingly.</p> <p>The second part of the policy sits uncomfortably within this policy and should be repositioned into Policy H16 of the Plan.</p>	Accepted
RM17	Paragraphs 3.57 and 3.58	<p><i>At the end of paragraph 3.57 add: ‘Planning applications for major development should include evidence that developers should ensure they have formulated arrangements with the relevant water/waste water company to ensure that any potential water and waste water network infrastructure reinforcement requirements are met. Where capacity constraints are identified phasing conditions will be used to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered before the occupation of the relevant phase of development’</i></p> <p><i>Delete paragraph 3.58.</i></p>	Consequential changes to the recommended modifications to Policy H10 (RM17).	Accepted

Recommended modification number (RM)	Policy/ paragraph reference	Modification	Reason	WBC decision
		<i>Delete the second element of the Intent of the Policy. Delete 'and connectivity' from the policy title.</i>		
RM18	Policy H11	In Policy H11.1 add 'of value' after 'woodlands' In Policy H11.2 add 'of value' after 'trees' In Policy H11.3 add 'of value' after 'hedgerows' In Policy H11.4 add 'of value' after 'woodland'	To ensure that they take account of the importance the value of the vegetation concerned. To acknowledge that an otherwise a matter-of-fact application of the policy as submitted could have unintentional consequences and prevent acceptable development from coming forward.	Accepted
RM19	Paragraph 3.60	<i>At the end of paragraph 3.60 add: 'Policy H11 provides an important level of protection for these aspects of the neighbourhood area. It acknowledges that different elements of the existing vegetation will have different levels of importance. As such its focus is on features of value'</i>	Consequential changes to the recommended modifications to Policy H11 (RM19).	Accepted
RM20	Policy H12	Replace the opening component of the policy with: 'Development proposals should be designed to minimise the effect of external lighting. In particular development proposals should meet this objective by:' Delete the final paragraph of the policy	To clarify the remit and effect of the main part of the policy. With regards to the final part of the policy the issues raised are process related.	Accepted
RM21	Policy H13	Replace Policy H13.1 with: 'The areas identified in Table 4 (below) and Figures 6a-d are designated as Local Green Space. Development proposals within the designated local green spaces will only be supported in very special circumstances' Replace Policy H13.2 with: 'The areas identified in Table 5 and the map in Figure 7 are designated as "Green Fingers". Development proposals within a Green Finger will only be supported where	To take the matter-of-fact approach in the NPPF. In particular it removes any reference to 'inappropriate' development which is not otherwise defined in the Plan and to take account of the recent case in the High Court and the Court of Appeal on	Accepted

Recommended modification number (RM)	Policy/ paragraph reference	Modification	Reason	WBC decision
		<p>they otherwise comply with the policy implications of the relevant environment designations as set out in Table 5. In particular development proposals should respect the undeveloped, open character of the Green Finger concerned and its ecological, landscape or recreational contribution both to its immediate locality and to the wider neighbourhood area'</p>	<p>the designation of LGS and the policy relationship with areas designated as Green Belts (2020 ECWA Civ 1259)</p> <p>To ensure that the policy directly reflect the existing environment designations which affect the various Green Fingers and takes account of their different policy regimes.</p>	
RM22	Paragraphs 3.80 & 3.81	<p><i>Replace paragraph 3.80 with: 'The sites identified in Table 4 and Figures 6a-d satisfy the criteria for LGS designation and are afforded special protection in Policy H13.1. The policy follows the matter-of-fact approach in the NPPF. In the event that development proposals come forward on the local green spaces within the Plan period, they can be assessed on a case-by-case basis by the Borough Council. In particular it will be able to make an informed judgement on the extent to which the proposal concerned demonstrates the 'very special circumstances' required by the policy'</i></p> <p><i>At the end of paragraph 3.81 add: 'Policy H13.2 addresses this important aspect of the environment of the neighbourhood area in a policy context which makes a direct connection with their existing environmental designations'</i></p> <p><i>Replace Table 5 with the update table provided by HTC in its response to the supplementary clarification note</i></p>	<p>To clarify that development proposals affecting LGSs can be assessed on a case-by-case basis and an informed judgement can be made on the extent to which the proposal demonstrates the 'very special circumstances' required by the policy.</p> <p>Consequential changes to the recommended modifications to Policy H13 (RM21).</p>	Accepted
RM23	Policy H14	<p>At the end of the first sentence of Policy H14.1 add 'as appropriate to their existing designations and biodiversity status'</p>	<p>To bring the clarity required by the NPPF.</p> <p>The policy fails to acknowledge that different</p>	Accepted

Recommended modification number (RM)	Policy/ paragraph reference	Modification	Reason	WBC decision
		<p>In Policy H14.1 second sentence replace ‘permitted’ with ‘supported unless appropriate mitigation is incorporated within the proposal’</p> <p>In Policy H14.1 delete the final sentence.</p> <p>In Policy H14.2 (first and third sentences) replace ‘will’ with ‘should’</p> <p>Replace the first sentence of Policy H14.3 with ‘Development proposals should result in a net gain for biodiversity’</p> <p>In the first of the two bullet points in Policy H14.3 insert ‘of value’ after ‘biodiversity interest’</p> <p>In Policy H14.4 replace ‘permitted’ with ‘supported’</p>	<p>types of development will have different effects on land based on its designations and status. It also fails to acknowledge that certain types of development could come forward where any harm can be mitigated or where its wider benefits outweigh the harm.</p> <p>The policy sets out a very specific approach to biodiversity net gain, although the evidence is not sufficiently compelling to support a higher level of biodiversity net gain than is anticipated to be included in forthcoming national legislation.</p>	
RM24	Paragraphs 3.87 to 3.93	<p><i>In paragraph 3.87 retain the first sentence. Replace the remainder with: This matter is incorporated within Policy H14.3.</i></p> <p><i>At the end of paragraph 3.88 add: ‘The Ecological Network consists of Internationally designated Wildlife Sites; Nationally designated Wildlife Sites; Local Wildlife Sites; Protected and Priority Species and their habitats; Priority habitats; Ancient Woodland; rivers, streams and ponds; Wildlife Corridors (particularly those shown on Figure 9) and Local Green Spaces and Green Fingers identified in Policy H13’</i></p> <p><i>In paragraph 3.93 replace the final sentence with ‘New developments should deliver a net gain for biodiversity’</i></p>	Consequential changes to the recommended modifications to Policy H14 (RM23).	Accepted

Recommended modification number (RM)	Policy/ paragraph reference	Modification	Reason	WBC decision
RM25	Policy H15	<p>Replace the first part of the policy with:</p> <p>‘Development proposals to provide new employment space, including through the conversion or division of existing employment space and the creation of new premises will be supported, subject to the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they do not generate unacceptable traffic generation, parking, noise and other forms of pollution; and • their scale and design respect the character of the immediate locality’ 	<p>To ensure that the first part of the policy is criteria-based and brings the clarity required by the NPPF.</p>	Accepted
RM26	Policy H16	<p>Replace Policy H16.1 with:</p> <p>‘Proposals for the change of use of existing employment sites to residential and other alternative uses will be supported where it can be clearly demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for employment use’</p> <p>Replace Policy H16.2 with:</p> <p>‘Insofar as planning permission is required proposals which retain employment provision through a change of use will be supported subject to the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they do not generate unacceptable traffic generation, parking, noise and other forms of pollution; and • their scale and design respect the character of the immediate locality’ <p>Delete Policy H16.3</p> <p>At the end of the policy add a new element (Policy H16.3) to read:</p> <p>‘As appropriate to their scale and nature new developments should provide up to date information technology and communications infrastructure’</p>	<p>To ensure that the first part of the policy adds value to the approach in Policy EE2 of the Waverley Local Plan Part 1 and in the absence of any specific information on the appropriateness of the 12-month marketing campaign this issue is captured in the supporting text rather than the policy itself</p> <p>. To ensure that the second part of the policy takes on a more general nature which acknowledges permitted development rights as this part of the policy could be affected by future changes in the composition of the Use Classes Order and does not address the complicated matrix of permitted</p>	Accepted

Recommended modification number (RM)	Policy/ paragraph reference	Modification	Reason	WBC decision
			<p>development rights between commercial use classes captured in the Order. To ensure that the second part of the policy takes on a criteria-based approach for the same reasons as Policy H15 (RM25).</p> <p>Third part of the policy largely repeats the contents of the first part of Policy H15.</p>	
RM27	Paragraphs 3.99 & 3.100	<p><i>At the end of paragraph 3.99: add: ‘These matters are addressed in Policy H16 of the Plan. In particular the first part of the policy sets out the way in which proposals which would involve the loss of existing commercial and employment uses would be considered. The approach seeks to add local value to Policy EE2 of Local Plan Part 1. Proposals for the redevelopment or change of use of a site where the most recent use was employment to another use should be supported by evidence that the applicant has taken all reasonable steps over a sufficient period to establish that there is no likely prospect of any employment use. Such evidence could include demonstrating that actively marketing the property on a realistic basis, for a period of 12 months was unsuccessful and conversion for occupation by micro business or small businesses is not an economically viable option’</i></p> <p><i>After paragraph 3.100 add a new paragraph to read: ‘Policy H16.3 comments about the need for new development to provide appropriate technology. It does so on a proportionate basis to take account of the different levels of development which will come forward in the Plan period. The NPPF states that advanced, high quality and reliable communications infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social well-being. Even before the Covid 19 pandemic, the Plan area, with its higher level of self-employment than the rest of England, had</i></p>	Consequential changes to the recommended modifications to Policy H16 (RM26) and to ensure that the element of policy and supporting text from Policy H10 is placed into the wider context of this policy.	Accepted

Recommended modification number (RM)	Policy/ paragraph reference	Modification	Reason	WBC decision
		<p><i>seen a growth in the need for suitably provisioned workspaces within the town. During the pandemic lockdown it has become important for households to have access to high-quality telecommunication and internet connection. Ensuring new development has adequate telecommunications and information technology infrastructure is essential given that working from home is likely to continue throughout the Plan period'</i></p>		
RM28	Policy H17	<p>Replace the policy with:</p> <p>'Insofar as planning permission is required, development proposals affecting the ground floors of premises which retain Class E uses (shops, financial and professional services, food and drink, business, non-residential institutions, assembly & leisure) will be supported.</p> <p>Within the defined primary shopping areas proposals for the change of use from a Class E use will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that the proposal would not have significant harmful effects on the frontage concerned and the vitality and viability of the town centre or would not result in an over-concentration of non-retail uses.</p> <p>Proposals for the use of upper floors in the primary shopping areas will be supported where it can be demonstrated that they would not have an unacceptable impact on the continuing vitality and viability of the ground floor use in the primary shopping area concerned'</p>	<p>To bring the clarity required by the NPPF as the policy is unclear in its effects as it comments that proposals should 'seek' to retain Class E uses in the relevant buildings. Secondly the retention of such uses would not need planning permission. In general terms the policy is complicated as it refers to Class E uses which cover a wide range of town centre related uses whereas the policy's title and the intent of the policy is focused on retail uses.</p> <p>To offer support to proposals which would retain Class E uses, safeguard existing uses in the primary shopping areas and refine the submitted approach towards the use of the upper floors of premises in such locations.</p>	Accepted

Recommended modification number (RM)	Policy/ paragraph reference	Modification	Reason	WBC decision
RM29	Paragraph 3.108	<i>In paragraph 3.108 replace the first sentence with: 'To prevent loss of key retail frontages in the High Street/West Street and Wey Hill, Haslemere'</i>	To provide clarity on the remit of the policy.	Accepted
RM30	Policy H18	Delete 'including development outside the settlement boundaries' from the policy	In the wider context of national and local policy this part of the policy is unnecessary.	Accepted
RM31	General Text	<i>Modification of general text (where necessary) to achieve consistency with the modified policies.</i>	It will be appropriate for Waverley Borough and Haslemere Town Councils to make any necessary consequential changes to the general text to achieve consistency with policies modified as a result of the Examiner's recommendations.	Accepted
RM32	General Text	<i>Modification of general text (where necessary) to reflect the update to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) made on 20th July 2021.</i>	It will be appropriate for Waverley Borough and Haslemere Town Councils to make any necessary minor changes to reflect the date of the revised NPPF and its revised paragraph numbers.	Accepted

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 Waverley Borough Council confirms that the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2032, as modified, complies with the legal requirements and basic conditions mentioned in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act and complies with the provisions of Sections 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and can therefore proceed to referendum.
- 4.2 It is recommended that the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2032 should proceed to a referendum based on the neighbourhood area defined by Waverley Borough Council on 19th February 2013. The Examiner has confirmed that this is an appropriate area.
- 4.3 This decision has been made according to the advice contained in the above report in response to the recommendations of the examiner made in a report under paragraph 10 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act (as applied by section 38A of the 2004 Act) in relation to the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2032.

5. Authorisation under delegated authority

- 5.1 Under sections M.3 xx and M.3 xiii respectively of the Waverley Borough Council Scheme of Delegation dated June 2020, the Head of Planning and Economic Development has delegated authority to make all decisions, take all actions and exercise all powers in respect of the Council's Development Management, Planning Policy and Planning Enforcement functions in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Localism Act 2011.

Signed:



Zac Ellwood, Head of Planning and Economic Development

Date: 10 August 2021

APPENDIX A – Confirmation from Haslemere Town Council regarding examiner’s recommendations

Email from Haslemere Town Council dated 23rd of July 2021:

Dear Matthew and Sam

I confirm that Haslemere Town Council has no objection to the modifications recommended in the Independent Examiner's report. We look forward to receiving a copy of Waverley's decision notice in due course.

With kind regards

Pippa

Pippa Auger

Deputy Town Clerk
Haslemere Town Council

01428 654305

www.haslemeretc.org