

BURSTOW PARISH COUNCIL

Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting of Burstow Parish Council Planning Committee held at 6.30pm on Tuesday 9th December 2025, at the Centenary Hall, Smallfield

Open Forum

Present – Bob Locke, Ashleigh Bolton, Eddie Lord, Nick Bush, Donna Morris, and Andrew McLean

- 1 Apologies received from Cllrs Lewis and Hale for reasons accepted by Committee.
- 2 No declarations of interest and therefore, no dispensations
- 3 The minutes of Tuesday 28th November were signed as a true record of the meeting
- 4 No matters arising
- 5 Planning applications for consideration
2025/1236/Cond1– Land Adj. Alwyn, Green Lane, Shipley
Details pursuant to Condition 6 (Use of site), Condition 7 (Landscaping) and Part of Condition 9 (Biodiversity) of planning permission 2025/1236 (granted on appeal with ref. APP/M3645/C/24/3349392 dated 25.7.25 (Use of the land and buildings as a residential caravan site, and also the laying of hardcore).
The Parish Council notes that this application has not been submitted and validated within the timeframe proscribed by the Planning Inspector. The applicant has not complied with the Inspectors decision that requires the removal of the second static caravan and the removal of the ‘field shelter’. We are of the opinion that Tandridge should decline to determine given the breach of conditions and instead commence criminal proceeding for the failure to comply.

We also note that the application states that ground infiltration is sufficient to manage SUDs. The area is known to be very wet and the lane frequently has standing water. This has been exacerbated by the removal of all vegetation from the site and the hardcore laid over the area.

Recommend: Commence criminal prosecution for failure to comply with the conditions imposed by the Planning Inspector.

2025/466/Cond1 – Brookside, Antlands Lane, Shipley Bridge
Details pursuant to Condition 4 (Surface water drainage) of planning permission ref: 2025/466 dated 10th September 2025 (Extension to the front, side and rear at ground floor, and to the front and rear at 1st floor. Gable to a hipped roof with new dormer to the rear and 2 no. new full height squared bay windows to the front elevation).

Recommend: Approve subjects to Surrey County Council’s approval of details

2025/987 - North End Paddock, Church Lane, Burstow
Change of use of land from equestrian to a mixed use including a private gypsy and traveller caravan site for 8 static caravans, including parking. Revised siting of proposed stable block permitted under 2024/140. Retention of hard standing. (Part retrospective)

This application does not comply with either the NPPF (paragraph 20 of the Guidance) or Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (Policy B – Planning for Traveller Sites). They say that any decisions should be ‘Plan Led’ and consent should not be given merely in response to a planning application. The Guidance does not say that the gypsy status of

BURSTOW PARISH COUNCIL

Planning Committee

applicants in planning overrides all other considerations. Instead, it states that it is a material consideration only and needs to be balanced with other material considerations, including not only the development plan, but also the contents of the NPPG.

Policy A of the PPTS states that planning authorities should use robust evidence to establish accommodation needs. Tandridge District Council has an up-to-date assessment of needs and an interim policy regarding traveller sites.

Policy B, para 13 (PPTS) states that LPA's should ensure traveller sites are sustainable, economically, socially and environmentally. The proposed site is in a remote part of the Parish, with no access to public transport. The occupants would be required to use private vehicle for all trips and therefore this site does not align with Policy B, para 1.

PPTS: Policy C: - Sites in rural areas and the countryside

Para 14 – When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, LPAs should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community.

At a recent planning appeal hearing (Land next to Farfield) that Parish Council looked at the number of houses in the Green Lane area and also the number of caravans. There are 24 houses and a small number of apartments. Using drone footage, we conservatively counted 65 caravans within the area. It would contradict this policy to add any additional caravans in this area.

Both the NPPF and the PPTS seek to protect the Green Belt and both advocate against development in the Green Belt unless there are very special circumstances that apply. Tandridge District Council now has a 5-year land supply for Gipsy & Traveller pitches so there are no very special circumstances that would outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt and consent should be refused.

Policy H of the PPTS contains numerous paragraphs (24, 25 a & b, 26 & 28) all of which contra-indicate against consent being awarded.

We are aware of multiple caravans on G&T sites that are being rented out by Travellers to non-travellers. There are also frequent adverts on social media where travellers offer caravans to rent with the main criteria being that they will not accept tenants in receipt of housing benefit. There is never a mention that the proposed tenants be from the G&T community. Before any additional pitches are created in the Parish of Burstow, the LPA should ensure that these caravans are only occupied by members of the G&T community.

In multiple previous applications at this address, Surrey County Council, as the Lead Flood Authority, has objected citing the site is subject to flooding and drainage issues. No land that is prone to flooding can be considered as 'Grey Belt'. Therefore, it must be viewed as Green Belt land and subject to all the protections offered by the NPPF and the PPTS.

The application contains no SUDs plan, with the agent asserting that water butts will meet the drainage needs of the site and it appears as though the potential occupants of the 8 caravans will not generate any wastewater or sewage as there is no provision within the application to address these needs.

The application has repeatedly carried out development on the site without asking for permission beforehand. Indeed, over the Bank Holiday weekend in August 2025 the applicant deliberately developed the site at a time he knew the district council was

BURSTOW PARISH COUNCIL

Planning Committee

closed. He then breached the 'stop notice' multiple times and has ignored the injunction imposed by the court, stating no further development could take place. Whilst the injunction has been in force, he has added septic tanks/cesspits, imported bottled gas and allowed some of the caravans to be occupied.

Recommend: Refuse

2025/1160 – Land at Steeple Farm, Church Road, Burstow

Full application for use of land as a private gypsy and traveller caravan site for 6 pitches, including parking. Retention of hard standing. (Part retrospective)

The site is located within the Burstow Conservation area, that includes several listed buildings and county sites of architectural importance and areas of high archeological importance. The area includes Burstow Church and the John Flamseed Hall. John Flamseed was a Royal Astronomer.

Running through the site itself are Footpaths 453 and 454.

The site has previously been noted on Surrey County Council maps as a 'wet spot' and the Church Road has been impassable to cars on a number of occasions due to flood water.

There is no detail in the application of how foul water is to be managed. There is no main sewer in the area and the applicant appears to ignore that sewage will need correct disposal of. The Parish Council has concerns that the applicant may try to dispose of sewage via the nearby Redehall Stream.

The applicant appears to have carefully outlined his site map to exclude the portion upon which a stable block sits. Is that to deflect attention away from the outstanding enforcement notice? The applicant did not construct a stable block as per approved drawings and instead built a brick building that he informed various neighbours would be his house and not stables. Having carefully excluded that portion of the land from his site map, the Parish Council asserts that the land can no longer be considered previously developed/brownfield and all policies relating to the Green Belt must be observed. The applicant claims that because the land has been previously developed there is no need for him to state the very special circumstances regarding the protected status or needs of the children. The land is Green Belt by virtue of him excluding the 'stable' block and so must be refused.

The application site and proposal do not comply with either the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) or the PPTS (Planning Policy for Traveller Sites) in the following areas

Green Belt – The NPPF states that no development should take place in the Green Belt and Policy E of the PPTS states that development in the Green Belt should be considered harmful and not be approved.

Both the NPPF and the PPTS also state that applications should be assessed and determined with presumption in favour of sustainable development. This site is located by the small, very rural hamlet of Burstow, where there is no public transport and there would be a need for private vehicles for all travel. There are also no amenities in the area with the nearest shops, school, medical practice, etc all being located several miles away.

BURSTOW PARISH COUNCIL

Planning Committee

The PPTS also requires those assessing suitability of sites to ensure any traveller sites do not dominate the nearest settled community and, in exceptional cases where a LPA is burdened by large scale unauthorised development, there is no assumption that the LPA is required to plan to meet their traveller site needs in full. Within a very small radius of the application site, the Parish Council estimates there are in excess of 65 existing pitches (approximately 50% are unauthorised) and less than 30 houses.

The Tandridge Core Strategy (CSP9) and the IPPS require any development to not harm the character and appearance of the area. Due to the historic conservation area, development such as this would have a very detrimental impact upon the setting. Footpaths 453 & 454 are regularly used by walkers and the visual amenity and character of the area would suffer significant harm.

The proposed 'track' entrance would not be suitable for use by cars and any hard surface would further impact upon the conservation area

Recommend: Refuse

2025/1318 – Land Adj. to Oaklands Drive, Copthorne Bank
Erection of seven dwellings with access, associated garaging and parking.

Recommend: Approve.

- 6 Decisions and Appeals
- 2025/825 – 77 Woodside Cresc, Smallfield
Increased size of the current drop kerb to create wider access. Approved
- 2025/1148 – 75 The Cravens, Smallfield
Retention of the open fronted car port. Refused
- 2025/895 – 5 Vancouver Court, Smallfield
Demolition of conservatory. Erection of a single storey rear extension Approved
- 2025/1151 0 Normanscopse, Chapel Road, Smallfield
Lawful Development Certificate (proposed) use of a (C3a) dwelling as a children's home (C2) for up to two children, with a manager and two carers who will sleep overnight, working on a rota basis. Pp not required
- 2025/468 – Land South of Tagzvondeni Kennels, Shipley Bridge
Use of land as a private gypsy and traveller caravan site for 4 pitches, including parking.
Retention of hardstanding and widened vehicular access. (Retrospective)
- 2025/586 – 57 Park Road, Smallfield
Erection of a single-storey side extension with hip end pitch roof. Approved
- 2025/546 – Pond Cottage, 77 Redehall Road, Smallfield
Proposed single storey garage to the front of Pond Cottage. Refused

- 7 Urgent Items – None

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 18.57. The next scheduled meeting is due to take place at 6.30pm on Tuesday 13th January 2025

Signed Dated