# Plans for housing and medical centre in Lingfield face local opposition



Proposals for a significant housing and medical development in Lingfield, Surrey, have encountered considerable opposition from local councillors and residents. The plans include the construction of 107 independent living homes and a new medical centre, situated on the edge of the village in green belt land, a designation intended to protect rural spaces from urban sprawl.

The proposed development, which is set for East Grinstead Road, aims to provide 79 apartments and 28 cottages specifically designed for senior retirement living. Additionally, it seeks to convert the historic Lingfield House, a notable late Victorian-era residence, for community use. Integral to the proposal is the replacement of the existing Lingfield GP surgery with a more extensive medical centre comprising 10 consulting rooms, alongside facilities for counselling and other medical services.

Dr Sal Qureshi, a local GP and representative of the surgery, underscored the necessity of the development, stating that should it be rejected, temporary structures such as portable cabins would be required to meet the growing demand for clinical services. He noted that the surgery has reached its limits in terms of clinical space and cannot expand further at its current site. Dr Qureshi argued that the proposed development would secure the practice's future for “potentially the next 50 years” and would attract new medical staff to address the needs of the expanding population.

The proposal faced vehement criticism during the planning meeting, primarily focused on its implications for the green belt. Tandridge District councillors voiced strong concerns about encroaching into preserved rural areas. Planning officers initially recommended rejecting the plans, citing a lack of exceptional circumstances to justify the development in this protected area, suggesting that it would not harmonise with its surroundings.

Councillor Martin Allen acknowledged the identified need for care provision within the district, stating that the scheme addresses key local requirements. Conversely, Councillor Peter Killick, representing Lingfield, argued that the establishment of a retirement village at the entrance of the village would irrevocably alter its rural character. He deemed the development “unnecessary” and inappropriate, particularly in light of an already perceived oversupply of retirement homes in the region.

While Councillor Liz Lockwood advocated for the development, highlighting potential improvements to access for both the surgery and local public transport, her arguments ultimately failed to sway the planning committee. Alongside the construction of housing and a medical centre, the developers, Merrow Wood Ltd, proposed to contribute £350,000 to the community, although there are no provisions for affordable housing as part of the plans. The developers stated that independent assessments had determined the project would not be financially viable for including affordable homes. Councillor Bryan Black expressed discomfort with the notion of developers “buying their way out” of providing such essential housing.

Following deliberations, the Tandridge District Council planning committee voted to reject the scheme by a majority on April 8. The discussions highlighted the ongoing tension between developmental needs and the preservation of green belt areas, with the future of community services in Lingfield remaining uncertain as local demographics evolve.
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