

BURSTOW PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting of 19th May 2020 held via email between the Planning Committee members and the Parish Clerk

Open Forum – it was not possible for members of the public attended

Attendance: Committee Chairman Debbie Hale, Chairman Ian Wates, Cllrs Ashleigh Bolton, Bob Locke and Trevor Brock

- 1 No apologies
- 2 No declarations of interest
- 3 Dispensations – none required
- 4 The minutes of Tuesday 28th April 2020 were agreed as a true record of the meeting and will be signed when the Committee next physically meets.
- 5 Matters arising – None
- 6 **Planning Applications for Consideration**
TA/2020/703/NH - Hollybush Farm, Shipley Bridge Lane, Shipley Bridge RH6 9TL
Erection of a single storey rear extension, which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 8 metres, for which the maximum height would be 2.76 metres, and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.76 metres (Notification of a Propose
Noted

TA/2020/668 - 14 Park Road, Smallfield RH6 9RZ
Demolition of the attached bungalow. Erection of two semi-detached three bedroom houses.
Modification to site access in order to provide two driveways. (Outline Planning for access, appearance and scale)
The existing dwelling is a small, semi-detached bungalow, with a separate bungalow to its immediate left from the kerbside. The proposal involves separating the two existing attached bungalows and replacing one with a two semi-detached two storey dwellings. The site is located within the Green Belt. The Parish Council strongly objects to the proposal for the following reasons
 - It is Green belt and the proposed changes would have a serious and permanent hard to the character and openness of the GB
 - There are no special circumstances that outweigh this harm
 - Smallfield is one of just 5 larger rural settlements that are inset from the GB in Tandridge. The GB performs a vitally important and effective means of preventing sprawl outside of Smallfield and should therefore be protected.
 - Sustainability - We also consider the proposed site to be utterly inappropriate as it is approximately 1200 m from the centre of Smallfield. The Manual for Street considers that there should be a range of facilities within 800m. This location is 1200m from shops and slightly further to the primary school. The NPPF, at paragraph 103, also states that significant development should be focused on location which are or can be made sustainable through limiting the need to travel and offering a **genuine** choice of transport. This site does not realistically offer genuine choice.

- The site is narrow and to put two semi-detached dwellings where there is a single small bungalow would be over intensification of the site

Recommend: Refuse

TA/2020/812/NH - 52 Careys Wood, Smallfield RH6 9PB

Erection of single storey rear extension, which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 4 metres, for which the maximum height would be 3.6 metres, and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 metres. (Notification of a Proposed Larger Home Extension)

Noted

TA/2020/681/TPO - 10 Charlotte Grove, Smallfield RH6 9AR

Oak (T2 of MWA Arboricultural Report) - Fell, considered responsible for root induced clay shrinkage subsidence damage.

Noted, agree with Tandridge Tree Officer's recommendation

TA/2020/745 - Woodside Cottage, Copthorne Bank, Copthorne RH10 3JD

Demolition of an existing single storey, flat roof rear extension and replacement with a new single storey, flat roof extension.

Recommend Permit

TA/2020/773 - 3 Hayes Walk, Smallfield RH6 9QW

Erection of rear dormer window and installation of roof lights in association with the conversion of the loft space into habitable accommodation (Certificate of Lawfulness for an Existing Development). Planning permission is not normally required. However, permission is required where you extend or alter the roof space and it exceeds specified limits and conditions.

These are specific to "*the enlargement of a dwellinghouse consisting of an addition or alteration to its roof*" as detailed in [Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the The Town and Country Planning \(General Permitted Development\) \(England\) Order 2015](#) (as amended).

One of these conditions is that no part of the alterations made to a roof must exceed the height of the existing roof: This alteration appears to be equal to the height of the existing roof but due to its prominent location the alterations are clearly visible and obtrusive from the public highway and the perception is that the roof line is now considerably higher.

Any new windows on side elevations must be obscure and non-opening unless the opening is greater than 1.7m above floor level. This application does not appear to comply with the regulations.

The town & Country Planning Order also prohibits the addition of balconies yet the applicant has inserted fully glazed doors, with opening handles to both sides, in the new dormer to the rear of the property.

The full length glazing to the rear of the property now offers an unimpeded view of neighbouring gardens, taking away any feeling of privacy they may have. The applicant has also inserted a peaked roof where only a flat roof dormer had been indicated. This addition further increases the feeling of dominance and does not fit within the local streetscene.

The Parish Council has been informed that nearby affected properties have not been informed by the planning authority of this application.

For these reasons the Parish Council does not consider the application meets the threshold for Lawful Development.

Recommend: Require applicant to submit a full planning application for determination by the planning authority.

TA/2014/1809/Cond4 - Land West Of, Grasslands, Cooper Close, Smallfield.

Details pursuant to discharge Condition 9 (Flooding resilience and resistance measures) of planning permission ref: 2014/1809 (appeal ref: APP/M3645/W/15/3135733) dated 5th February 2016 (Erection of up to 51 dwellings. access only (outline))

The Parish Council and Burstow Flood Action Group have the following comments to make regarding the application to vary the drainage from the agreed layout

Whilst in principle the amendment does not significantly alter the original drainage proposal. The new pipe network is only being split and all the surface water ends up in the same place, which is the new balancing ponds with their discharge control valves which will be located in the north-west corner of the

site adjacent to Weatherhill Road. (See the attached letter from the developers' consultants which states this.)

As you will recall Surrey CC reviewed the original design of the drainage system and in particular the balancing ponds / control valve, and concluded that the surface water flows into the culvert in Weatherhill Road would be no greater than the previously existing runoff discharge rate – and consequently they could not object to the proposal.

We question whether the existing Thames Water pipe that the developer now proposes to connect part of the new pipe network into has sufficient capacity to cope with this additional water. The Parish Council understands that the water utilities are not statutory consultees and there is an expectation they will provide sufficient capacity as it is demanded. However, we see no reason why Thames Water should be required to increase capacity simply because the developer has made errors in their original application. For example It would be possible to continue with the two balance ponds if the developer was prepared to remove one dwelling from the corner of the site.

Recommend: That Tandridge require a S106 contribution from the developer, in addition to CIL, to ensure that sufficient capacity is provided by Thames Water are existing residents do not suffer any detrimental effects from the developers mistakes.

TA/2020/508 - Allingham Farm, Copthorne Bank, Copthorne RH10 3JD

Demolition of some outbuildings and conversion of the remainder of the outbuildings into four single storey dwellinghouses with associated garden areas and parking (Amended Description).

This site is located within the Green Belt. There is a history of applications for this site where consent has been sought for a number of new dwellings.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 213 states that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the Framework. Due weight should be afforded to them according to their degree of consistency with the Framework, Policy DP10 point out that only in exceptional circumstances will the Green Belt (GB) boundaries be altered and that this should be through a review of the GB. This echoes the beliefs behind paragraphs 136 and 143 of the NPPF.

Policy DP13 says that subject to a list of exception, the construction of new buildings in the GB is inappropriate. Again this aligns with paragraph 145 of the NPPF

Smallfield is one of just 5 larger rural settlements that are inset from the GB in Tandridge. The GB performs a vitally important and effective means of preventing sprawl outside of Smallfield and should therefore be protected

The Manual for Street considers that there should be a range of facilities within 800m. This site does not have shops, schools, medical or other services within this distance. Residents living there would need to walk along an unlit road to access the nearest shop, approximately 1400km away in Copthorne, West Sussex. The nearest train station is in Horley, over 6km away. The site is in an unsustainable location and would leave residents dependant on private vehicle for transport.

We disagree with Plot 1's measurement of 58sqm, the Parish Council believes it to be closer to 52sqm and in general we believe that the proposal is offering poor quality, noticeably small living space for potential occupants. For a one-bedroom flat to house two occupants the NLSS requires a minimum footprint of 50sqm. This is reduced to 39sqm for one occupant (37sqm if shower instead of bath)

For a double room to meet the National Living Space Standards a bedroom intended to hold a double or twin bed must have a floor area of 11.5sqm. Only Plot 2 meets that standard!

NLSS's also require a minimum width of 2.75m wide in the first bedroom. Plot 4, at most only measures 2.4m.

For a 1-bed, one person occupying, single floor dwelling there is a requirement of internal storage of 1m. Plots 1, & 3 do not meet that standard and Plot 2 has no storage at all.

Recommend: Refuse

TA/2020/764 - 3 Effingham Croft, Dowlands Lane, Copthorne RH10 3HX

Demolition of existing single storey side section. Erection of two-storey side extension.

This site is located within the Green Belt and so any development is considered inappropriate and harmful. However, as the footprint remains similar and so the harm to the Green Belt is minimal we do not object to this application.

Recommend: Permit

TA/2020/783 - Redeside, 129 Redehall Road, Smallfield RH6 9RT

Erection of a detached outbuilding. (Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed use)

7 **Decisions and Appeals**

- TA/2020/460 – 16 The Cravens, Smallfield
Erection of single storey side extension and garden building **Refuse**
- TA/2020/369 – 6 Field Walk, Smallfield
Erection of single storey rear extension **Refused**
- TA/2020/332 – 46 Orchard Road, Smallfield
Demolition of existing utility room; Erection of single storey side extension (CLOPD) **Granted**
- TA/2020/310 – Byways, Chapel Road, Smallfield
Erection of single storey rear extension **Refused**
- TA/2020/292 – Redeside, 129 Redehall Road, Smallfield
Erection of single storey side and rear extension to garage, with conversion of garage into habitable accommodation **Approved**
- TA/2020/358 – Samri, Effingham Road, Burstow
Erection of single storey side extension (CLOPD) **Refused**
- TA/2020/468 – Samri, Effingham Road, Burstow
Erection of two storey front extension **Refused**
- TA/2020/474 – 10 Weatherhill Road, Smallfield
Extension of width of existing vehicle crossover **Approved**

8 **Items of an urgent nature brought to Committees attention for inclusion on a future agenda – None**

There being no further business the meeting closed. The next planning meeting is scheduled

Signed.....Dated.....