



Our Local Plan

Settlement Hierarchy: Addendum (2018)

June 2018

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Preferred Strategy	6
3. Messages and comments raised during consultation	7
4. Changes, clarifications and amendments identified.....	8
Methodology	8
Settlements.....	10
5. Conclusion	13
Appendix 1: Updated scoring table	14
Appendix 2: Settlement Hierarchy.....	16

What this document <i>is</i>	What this document <i>is not</i>
<p>Is supportive of the objectives which guide plan-making as set out in Our Local Plan 2033, guided by Topic Paper 01 - Issues and Objectives (September 2015).</p>	<p>Does not make any decisions regarding whether a settlement should accommodate growth in terms of houses or other development, or recommend whether it should be inset from the Green Belt or not. Such decisions can only be made through the plan-making process and the Local Plan itself.</p>
<p>Identifies which settlements are best equipped, in sustainability terms, to accommodate additional development.</p>	<p>Given the presence of Green Belt in the District, the allocation of any additional growth would most likely require a revision to the Green Belt boundary and this can only be done where exceptional circumstances are demonstrated. It is not within the remit of this document to demonstrate where exceptional circumstances exist.</p>
<p>May identify obvious gaps or opportunities for service and facility improvement to settlements which would be of benefit to the sustainability of an area and its communities and businesses.</p>	<p>Does not consider whether a settlement has the capacity for development in terms of available sites etc. This, once again, is not within the remit of this document and would need to be considered, where necessary, through the preparation of the Local Plan.</p>
<p>Will set out a clear settlement hierarchy for settlements in the district, both large and small, and categorise them in a way that can be used to inform the plan-making process with the relevance of the NPPF and the Government's commitment to sustainability in mind.</p>	

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Members of the Planning Policy Committee agreed to commence the preparation of a new Local Plan which, once adopted, will replace the Core Strategy (2008). The purpose of the Local Plan will be to set out a new strategy for the district which will guide the development of homes, provide employment and enhance the natural and historic environment.
- 1.2 To ensure the Local Plan balances the needs and aspirations of our communities and the district in an up to date context, the Council is preparing and reviewing its evidence base. One piece of evidence that is key to preparing the Local Plan and understanding the district is the settlement hierarchy. The importance of a settlement hierarchy or review of settlements and their function is essential for Local Authorities to demonstrate that the role played by settlements in an area has been thoroughly considered.
- 1.3 The [Settlement Hierarchy](#) document was published in December 2015, alongside the first public consultation from December 2015 – February 2016 regarding the Local Plan: Issues and Approaches document. The Settlement Hierarchy, as well as all other evidence base documents, was open to consultation and comments were received which were responded to in the [Statement of Consultation](#) (published 2016). Comments were also received in relation to the Settlement Hierarchy document during the second public consultation from November – December 2016 on the Local Plan: Sites Consultation, which were acknowledged in the [Statement of Consultation](#) (published 2017). A third public consultation took place between August and October 2017 on the Local Plan: Garden Villages, and a limited number of comments were made on the Settlement Hierarchy, and responded to in the [Statement of Consultation](#) (published 2018).
- 1.4 In March 2017, the Planning Policy Committee agreed a [Preferred Strategy](#) to help guide the Council's approach when developing the Local Plan. It did not set out in detail where new development would take place but it gave guiding principles to where development would be directed towards.
- 1.5 As the settlement hierarchy was over two years old and there have been a number of consultations, the Settlement Hierarchy has been reviewed to ensure it is fully up to date and reflects the district's settlements current level of sustainability. In addition, since the agreement of the Preferred Strategy, and in response to comments made through public consultation, its contents are clarified and amended, where necessary, to allow for any significant changes that may have taken place.
- 1.6 This Addendum (2018) to the Settlement Hierarchy (2015) has been prepared to update and clarify the Council's position relating to the district's settlements

and their sustainability. The document will set out the main comments raised through consultation, highlight changes in the data and evaluate the hierarchy in light of the agreed Preferred Strategy.

- 1.7 It is worth re-stating that this document, along with the Settlement Hierarchy (2015), **should not be considered in isolation of the wider evidence base of the Local Plan**, and they represent just one piece of an extensive suite of evidence and technical studies.

2. Preferred Strategy

- 2.1 In March 2017, the Council agreed its Preferred Strategy to help guide the approach when developing the Local Plan. It outlines the areas which will be considered for development and the approach to infrastructure, economic development and the natural environment. The Preferred Strategy can be summarised as follows:

**“The Local Plan will provide much needed homes and infrastructure by delivering a strategic development which accords with the principals of a Garden Village for the long-term, and to focus development to our urban and semi-rural service centres for the shorter term, whilst also supporting our Neighbourhood Plans.
The Green Belt boundary would only be amended in locations where the Green Belt purposes are not served, and where exceptional circumstances are demonstrated”**

*Summary of Tandridge District Council Preferred Strategy – March 2017
Emphasis added.*

- 2.2 Significant to the Settlement Hierarchy is the reference made to urban (Tier 1) and semi-rural service (Tier 2) settlements and their developmental focus in the short-term. These settlements, identified through the 2015 Hierarchy, are:

Tier	Settlement
Urban Settlements (Tier 1)	Caterham on the Hill
	Caterham Valley
	Hurst Green
	Oxted
	Limpsfield
	Warlingham
	Whyteleafe
Semi-Rural Service Settlements (Tier 2)	Godstone
	Lingfield
	Smallfield

- 2.3 The Preferred Strategy, having been agreed, triggers the need to review the evidence collated in the 2015 Settlement Hierarchy, to ensure the hierarchy continues to reflect the most up to date position on the sustainability of these settlements prior to the submission of the Plan to the Planning Inspectorate.

3. Comments raised through consultation

3.1 To date, the Council has carried out three stages of public consultation in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations (2012) to help inform what the Plan should include (see paragraph 1.3).

3.2 The table below illustrates the key summary of comments received across the three consultations that the Council wishes to clarify its position further in Chapter 4:

- that settlements had been incorrectly categorised in the final hierarchy
- that the sustainability of settlements in the district had been overstated
- that the methodology used, including the approach to train stations, chemists, private car travel and usage, was incorrect
- that the scoring of service provision for certain settlements needs revisiting
- that the use of terminology, such as urban, was misleading
- that the relationship between the districts settlements and out-of-district settlements, such as East Grinstead, had not been fully considered

3.3 As the above is a summary of responses, it should be noted that the table does not contain reference to all comments received on the Settlement Hierarchy.

4. Updates and clarifications to the Settlement Hierarchy

Methodology

4.1 Relationship with out-of-district settlements

- 4.1.1 The relationship between out-of-district settlements, such as Redhill or Crawley, with Tandridge's settlements was recognised in the original analysis (see Settlement Hierarchy 2015, paragraph 7.26 – 7.30).
- 4.1.2 Residents of Felbridge rely on neighbouring East Grinstead for services such as healthcare facilities, secondary schools and a train station for day to day needs. The nearest state secondary school is within 1 mile of the settlement boundary, however healthcare facilities, a train station and convenience / retail opportunities lie a more considerable distance from the settlement boundary, particularly for those residents in the west of Felbridge.
- 4.1.3 The proximity of East Grinstead plays a role in Felbridge's sustainability, but the settlement itself can only demonstrate a basic level of provision and as such is categorised as a Tier 3 (rural) settlement.
- 4.1.4 The settlement of Copthorne, directly abutting the southern border of Tandridge District, is considered to be a sustainable 'Local Service Centre' by Mid Sussex District Council. Whilst no settlement in Tandridge borders Copthorne, residents in nearby settlements such as Smallfield and Burstow logically may draw on its services and facilities, including a doctor's surgery and educational provision.
- 4.1.5 However, Tandridge Council has no administrative power to allocate an out-of-district settlement within the settlement hierarchy; therefore sites in Tandridge bordering Copthorne submitted for consideration as part of the Local Plan process cannot be considered to be in a sustainable location. Yet, to show that all reasonable alternatives had been considered through the plan-making process, those sites submitted were still subject to evidence testing, until otherwise ruled out on grounds including landscape and ecology¹.

4.2 Terminology – use of the word urban

- 4.2.1 As stated in the Settlement Hierarchy (2015), *“although none of the settlements in the district can be considered ‘urban’ when compared against those such as Croydon or Redhill, Tandridge does have settlements which are large enough and sufficiently developed to be considered urban in the local context. The built character and development pattern of these settlements contributes to their urban nature which distinguishes them from*

¹ Landscape Capacity and Sensitivity Study – Burstow (2017) and Site Based Ecology Assessment Volume 2 – Domewood and Dormansland (2017)

other settlements in the district" (emphasis added). The Council will continue to refer to Tier 1 settlements as urban in its documentation.

- 4.2.2 However the Council will omit reference in future documentation to the use of the phrase 'urban conurbation' as it is misleading and does not reflect the character of built-up or contiguous settlements in Tandridge, as a conurbation typically refers to large, metropolitan cities such as London.

4.3 Chemists

- 4.3.1 In the Settlement Hierarchy (2015), GP surgeries and chemists were considered separately, and if present in a settlement, would both attribute 1 point in scoring. Through consultation, respondents disagreed that these services were given an equal weighting.
- 4.3.2 The Council's position and response to this, is that GP surgeries and chemists are intrinsically linked with the service they provide. If a prescription was generated through a visit to a GP, and a chemist was not present in the settlement, travel would be necessary in order to pick up the prescription. Likewise pharmacies are able to offer many services to residents and are increasingly recommended as the first point of contact for medical needs².
- 4.3.3 It is worth noting that through sensitivity testing (by removing the scores for chemists, and attributing points only to the presence of GP surgeries) the changes to scoring and initial rankings of the settlements is negligible, and not significant enough as to alter a settlements place in the hierarchy.

4.4 Train Stations

- 4.4.1 Tandridge is well-served by rail provision, with 11 stations across the district. As is known locally, the naming of stations does not always correlate with the name of the settlement, for example Godstone station is in South Godstone (not Godstone) and Nutfield station is in South Nutfield (not Nutfield).
- 4.4.2 Upper Warlingham train station is in Whyteleafe (along with Whyteleafe South and Whyteleafe stations). The Settlement Hierarchy incorrectly attributed 3 points to Warlingham for the Upper Warlingham station, and 6 points to Whyteleafe. The scoring has been amended to reflect that all three stations are in Whyteleafe (see Appendix 1). This adjustment does not alter the categorisation of Warlingham, as set out at paragraph 4.12.
- 4.4.3 Woldingham train station is located just outside the settlement of Woldingham and is accessible by footpath from the main built-up area of the settlement, although it is noted that the hill on Station Road can act as a barrier to some. The station is a valuable asset to the residents of Woldingham and its

² <https://www.nhs.uk/NHSEngland/AboutNHSServices/Pages/NHSServices.aspx>

presence must be accounted for in the scoring of the settlements sustainability.

4.5 Travel to Work Patterns and Car Ownership / Usage

- 4.5.1 The Council continues to consider the omission of these indicators (originally set out at paragraph 7.128 of the Settlement Hierarchy 2015) as appropriate; this is due to the associated factors of choice, behaviour, wealth, mobility and household composition, which distort a clear correlation with sustainability. Whilst land use planning can try and influence behaviour, it does not mean a location is not sustainable if people chose to use their car rather than a sustainable mode of transport.
- 4.5.2 For example, with regard to car ownership / usage this indicator varies greatly in rural Tandridge wards Chaldon (1.92 cars on average per household; 5.1% of households without a car) and Lingfield and Crowhurst (1.51 cars on average per household; 12.7% of households without a car) as well as more built up wards such as Whyteleafe (1.25 cars on average; 15.5% without a car) and Warlingham West (1.69 cars on average; 7.5% without a car)³.

Settlements

- 4.6 The following paragraphs address the scoring of certain settlements services and sustainability. An updated Scoring Table can be seen at Appendix 1. As outlined in the Settlement Hierarchy (2015) at paragraph 6.7, the scoring (and subsequent ranking) of settlements draws no conclusions on the final hierarchy as *“this is only determined following further consideration of additional aspects which could affect how sustainable a settlement is considered to be”*. Therefore, whilst the initial ranking of settlements may have altered slightly through identified changes to their scoring in this Addendum (2018), it is the detailed analysis that influences the overall hierarchy in the district within the Local Plan.

4.7 Blindley Heath

- 4.7.1 The original evidence collected suggested that there were two comparison shops in Blindley Heath. Following site visits, the Council has taken the view that the provision of comparison shops should be reduced to zero, as the units in the settlement consist of a motor garage, showrooms and other industrial uses. This change to the scoring does not alter its overall position in the hierarchy as it is considered that the services and facilities in Blindley Heath still provide a basic service provision, as set out in the Settlement Hierarchy (2015) at paragraph 7.78.

³ Surrey-i. 2011 Census in Surrey – Car availability
<https://www.surreyi.gov.uk/DrillDownProfile.aspx?rt=8&rid=715&pid=35>

4.8 Nutfield and South Nutfield

- 4.8.1 During the Issues and Approaches Consultation (December 2015 – February 2016), Nutfield Parish Council brought to the attention of the Council that they had only submitted one settlement survey which highlighted the services and facilities for the entirety of Nutfield Parish, instead of completing one survey per settlement, and thus had concerns that scoring had been inflated for both Nutfield and South Nutfield.
- 4.8.2 The Council acknowledges this concern, however it is considered that the difference between the settlements was recognised in the original hierarchy, with South Nutfield categorised Tier 3 and Nutfield as Tier 4. Likewise, and recognised by both parties, any subsequent amendments to scoring would not result in a change of categorisation for either settlement.
- 4.8.3 For completeness, the scoring has been updated at Appendix 1. In some cases, the Council did not agree with Nutfield Parish Council's interpretation of the methodology for determining scores for bus services (South Nutfield), recreational facilities (South Nutfield) and comparison shops (Nutfield).

	Indicator	Revised (2018) figure	Previous (2015) figure
South Nutfield	Community Facilities	3	4
	Comparison Shop	0	1
Nutfield	Community Facilities	2	3
	Recreational Facilities	1	4

Table 1: Summary of updated scores attributed to Nutfield and South Nutfield

4.9 Oxted

- 4.9.1 The original evidence collected suggested there were five health facilities (including GP surgeries and chemists) in Oxted. Having revised the data, it is acknowledged that the number of health facilities should be reduced to three from five. Oxted's initial ranking in the hierarchy (based on the scoring of facilities) remains tier one, and this change is not of a significant proportion as to reduce Oxted from a Tier 1 to a Tier 2 settlement as it continues to provide a wide variety of local services and facilities for residents.

4.10 South Godstone

- 4.10.1 The original evidence collected suggested that there were two comparison shops in South Godstone. Following site visits, the Council has taken the view that the number of comparison shops should be reduced to one, as one of the units in South Godstone has been demolished and work has begun to replacement the unit with housing.

4.11 Warlingham

4.11.1 As highlighted at paragraph 4.4 above, the scoring has been amended to accurately reflect that Upper Warlingham train station is in Whyteleafe. The station is on the periphery of Warlingham however so is still considered to contribute to the sustainability of transport for Warlingham residents.

4.11.2 Despite this alteration to the scoring, residents of Warlingham have immediate access to a wide range of services and facilities, both within the settlement and on its immediate peripheries, and it therefore remains categorised as a Tier 1 urban settlement in the hierarchy.

4.12 Woldingham

4.12.1 Through consultation, respondents stated that Woldingham should not be compared to Smallfield and Lingfield: the Council concurs, as is set out originally in the Settlement Hierarchy at paragraph 7.83 (emphasis added):

“Under existing planning policy, Woldingham is considered to be a Larger Rural Settlement and the policy does not restrict development as heavily as those that remain in the Green Belt. However, the character of Woldingham, as distinctively rural with low density homes, has not generated the level of development that would force an increase in service provision, but has still continued to experience infilling and piecemeal development which relies on the existing and basic level of services that are found there. On reflection of this it is felt that Woldingham should not be considered in the same context as Smallfield and Lingfield in the future and that it is actually more akin to the service provision of rural settlements.”

4.12.2 The original hierarchy (2015) and the Addendum (2018) both reflect that Woldingham is a Tier 3 rural settlement, and Smallfield and Lingfield are Tier 2 semi-rural service settlements; which are deemed more sustainable and serve their residents with a good level of service provision and access to facilities.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 This Addendum (2018) to the Settlement Hierarchy (2015) was prepared to update and clarify the Council's position relating to the district's settlements and their sustainability in response to known changes and comments made through consultation. The document set out the main comments that arose through consultation, highlighted changes in the data and evaluated the hierarchy in light of an agreed Preferred Strategy.
- 5.2 From this review, no settlement has changed categorisation in the overall settlement hierarchy (Appendix 2), although the scoring for certain settlements has been updated (Appendix 1). The Council has responded to comments made through consultation and updated the hierarchy. This evidence base document has been refreshed to reflect the most up to date position on Tandridge districts settlements sustainability.
- 5.3 It is important to reiterate that this document forms one part of a wider evidence base which will be considered when the draft Local Plan is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

Appendix 1: Updated scoring table

Settlement	Access to Strategic road network	Broadband Access	Bus services	Community Facilities (Including Public House)	Comparison Shops	Convenience Shops	Cycle Routes	Education	Employment Premises	Health Provision (Including Chemist and GP facilities)	Post Office	Railway Station ⁴	Recreational Facilities	Total score	Initial Ranking based on score
Oxted	2	1	2	5	4	4	1	4	1	3	1	3	4	35	1
Whyteleafe	2	1	2	2	4	4	1	1	1	2	1	9	4	34	2
Caterham Valley	2	1	2	4	4	4	1	2	1	4	1	3	4	33	3
Caterham on the Hill	2	1	2	4	4	4	1	5	1	4	1	0	4	33	3
Warlingham	2	1	2	3	4	4	1	4	1	3	1	0	4	30	4
Godstone	6	1	2	3	4	4	1	1	1	2	1	0	4	30	4
Lingfield	0	1	2	4	4	4	1	1	1	2	1	3	4	28	5
Hurst Green	2	1	2	3	2	3	1	2	1	0	1	3	4	25	6
Smallfield	0	1	2	3	4	4	1	1	1	2	1	0	4	24	7
Bletchingley	2	1	2	4	1	3	1	1	1	0	1	0	4	21	8
Felbridge	4	1	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	20	9
South Godstone	2	1	1	4	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	3	4	19	10
Dormansland	0	1	2	4	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	3	4	19	10
Woldingham	0	1	0	2	4	1	1	1	1	0	1	3	4	19	10
Limpsfield	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	4	18	11
South Nutfield	0	1	1	3	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	3	4	17	12

⁴ Railway stations have associated with settlements which may not reflect the name, i.e. Godstone train station is located in South Godstone

Settlement	Access to Strategic road network	Broadband Access	Bus services	Community Facilities (Including Public House)	Comparison Shops	Convenience Shops	Cycle Routes	Education	Employment Premises	Health Provision (Including Chemist and GP facilities)	Post Office	Railway Station ⁵	Recreational Facilities	Total score	Initial Ranking based on score
Old Oxted	2	1	2	1	3	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	16	13
Tandridge	2	1	1	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	14	14
Tatsfield	0	1	2	3	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	4	14	14
Blindley Heath	2	1	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	13	15
Chaldon	0	1	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	12	16
Limpsfield Chart	2	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	17
Nutfield	2	1	2	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	11	17
Horne	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	10	18
Outwood	0	1	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	18
Chelsham	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	19
Farleigh	0	1	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	19
Burstow	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	8	20
Titsey	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	21
Crowhurst Lane End	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	22
Domewood	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	22
Fickleshole	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	22
Crowhurst	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	22
Dormans Park	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	23

⁵ Railway stations have associated with settlements which may not reflect the name, i.e. Godstone train station is located in South Godstone

Appendix 2: Settlement Hierarchy



