

BURSTOW PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting of 23 March 2021, held via Zoom

Open Forum – Several members of the public attended the meeting and some wished to address the Committee.

Mr Phil Hagel, a resident, asked the following matters be noted

- 1- The finish level of the proposed development looks to have any dwellings raised a minimum of 600mm above ground level to mitigate against flood risk. He believes this would have a negative impact upon the privacy of residents living in the surrounding bungalows
- 2- The land is designated as a private garden
- 3 – The proposal is out of character with the surrounding area of predominantly bungalows
- 4 – Flooding: A previous Tandridge DC map showed the area as being a mix of flood zone 2 and 3 and Mr Hagel would like to know why and by who it was downgraded to a flood zone 2. Should the Council be minded to approve this application, Mr Hagel requests an Exception Test be required to be carried out first to fully understand any flood risks
- 5 – Mr Hagel considers the proposed entrance to the site is unsuitable to be used as an access point.

Mr Tom Saville, a resident, stated the following

He has been a resident of Hayes Walk since it was first built in 1987. The proposed development land was originally designated a children's play area/amenity space and a covenant was placed upon the land by the developer. Later on the land was sold to a private individual and re-designated as a garden area. He believes that Shanley Homes are looking to have the covenant lifted but Smallfield residents would prefer that it remain.

There are historic problems with sewage/waste water drainage on the Hayes Walk site and residents are concerned that any more development would exacerbate these problems. Mr Saville also stated he agreed with everything Mr Hagel has said.

Mr Peter Bond stated that he was a member of the Council at the time consent was given for the Hayes Walk development. He recollected that there was an understanding that flooding in the area was a concern and for that reason, an area of land was to be left undeveloped, as a holding area for flood water. This may have been recorded in the South of Downs Plan 1984/85

When asked, other members of the public declined to speak but many said they were in accord with the two gentlemen who had addressed Council.

Attendance: Committee Chairman Debbie Hale, Chairman Ian Wates, Vice-Chairman Bob Locke, Cllrs Ashleigh Bolton and Linda Herwig

- 1 Apologies received and accepted by Committee from Cllr Brock.
- 2 Declarations received from Cllr Hale with regard to TA/2021/166 – 12 Charlotte Grove, Smallfield. Councillor Hale lives in the development adjoining the proposed development site. As she lives at the opposite side of the estate this application has no impact upon her home.
- 3 Dispensations – none requested
- 4 The minutes of Tuesday 23rd February 2021 were agreed as a true record of the meeting.
- 5 Matters arising – None
- 6 Planning Applications for Consideration
TA/2021/166 – 12 Charlotte Grove, Smallfield

Demolition of bungalow and erection of 14 no. houses with associated landscaping, parking and vehicular access (Outline only)

Committee discussed the application in detail and several Councillors expressed concerns that the houses were priced too high for local residents to afford and that there was no 'affordable housing' quota. Therefore, there was no real benefit to current residents in having additional housing built. The waste water system is already very stressed leaving several areas of the village unable to use a toilet, take a shower, etc during periods of heavy or prolonged rain for fear of incurring foul water flooding internally. It was suggested that perhaps the field has performed its function well and that flooding may become more frequent should the site be developed. All members recognised that it was a difficult situation for residents of Charlotte Grove and Hayes Walk. They had bought their homes believing the roads to be cul-de-sac and that there would be no further development beside them.

It was recognised by the Planning Committee that the proposed site is located within the confines of Smallfield as a larger rural settlement, inset from the Green Belt.

Following discussion, the Parish Council resolved to object to this application for the following reasons.

Flooding – the site is believed to have an important role in managing the flood risk to the village. It is recognised by the Environment Agency, Surrey County Council, Tandridge District Council and the Flood Forum that Smallfield is particularly vulnerable to flooding due to a confluence of matters. The geology is such that Smallfield sits on heavy clay soil with very poor drainage opportunities. The village is surrounded by several higher areas such as Outwood and Bletchingley. During wet weather there is considerable run off from these areas bring large amounts of storm water to the village. Smallfield, somewhat unusually, has a combined storm and waste water system that was 'culverted' during the 1960's. This restricts the amount of water that can be contained and results in flooding in the village and/or prevents residents from being able to access their waste water system at home for fear of it leading to internal flooding. There is a further constraint in getting water 'away' from Smallfield. The area drains in an east-west direction, feeding into the River Mole. When the M23 was constructed all the storm water was re-directed through several pipes that go under the motorway. With all the repeated development the system has become more and more stressed. We are concerned that there is insufficient capacity within the system to support additional development.

When the original extension (Hayes Walk) to The Cravens was submitted for planning approval, Tandridge District Council originally refused consent due to flooding concerns and the need to retain an area of land for the storage of water. At this time an Inspector was in the process of adjudicating on The South of Downs Local Plan. Bryant Gomes, the developer, believed there was capacity on the proposed site for between 55 – 60 dwellings instead of 37 units as scheduled in the Plan. The Inspector noted that the original limiting factor was the area lost from development due to the limitations imposed by the 1968 flood plain. He noted that some topsoil had been removed for motorway purposes and following consultation with Thames Water led to agreement for the excavation and provision of a flood plain area. That flood plain area is now being presented by Shanley Homes as being suitable for development for 14 dwellings. We disagree and believe it is imperative the land remains as is for the storage of water when necessary.

Effect on living conditions of existing neighbouring residents in Charlotte Grove and Hayes Walk – In a recent planning appeal concerning the Woodlands Garage, Chapel Road (TA/2019/638) the Planning Inspector upheld the Tandridge decision to refuse planning consent in part due to the negative impact the development would have. He considered the placing of the proposed development would be apparent in views from some inhabitable rear windows, conservatory and garden of one house in particular. The development to the rear of Charlotte Grove would have several properties facing on to the back of eight existing bungalows in Charlotte Grove and would, in our opinion, have a severe and negative impact upon the residents of these properties, both in terms of privacy and overbearing impact of having two storey houses constructed. This could be mitigated somewhat by replacing the current proposal with chalet style properties, thus reducing the overall ridge height of the development. Whilst the developer is proposing to fence the boundaries, being bungalows, this would not have any impact in preventing views from the second floor of the development into neighbouring gardens and habitable rooms.

Access road – It is difficult to assess whether there is sufficient room for vehicles to turn and enter/exit the proposed development but residents have raised concerns that it is too narrow. However, residents living in numbers 10 and 14 Charlotte Grove will be negatively impacted by the demolition of number 12 and subsequent replacement by a road. One of the properties will suddenly go from having a view

out of the windows onto a residential garden to having a public highway and associated vehicle and pedestrian traffic passing by them.

Construction traffic – The proposed application suggests a 14-month build schedule, Whilst not a permanent fixture, for the duration of the construction, residents will experience all the usual disruption, noise, dust and inconvenience that is associated with any building work. Most of the Charlotte Grove residents are elderly and retired, spending a far greater portion of their day at home than younger, more active age groups. If consent is given, careful planning of a construction implementation plan should have regard to these residents and the parish council would like to work with any developer to represent these residents.

Recommend: Refuse

TA/2021/84 – 72 The Cravens, Smallfield

Erection of a pitched roof over the existing flat roof to the front elevation

Recommend: Approve

TA/2021/252 – 3 William Gardens, Smallfield

Erection of outbuilding for home office

Recommend: Approve

TA/2021/327 – 4 Firbank, 146 Redehall Road, Smallfield

Erection of first floor rear extension including alterations

This dwelling has been extended previously and we note that this proposal is significantly smaller than the previously refused application. The applicant also states that very special circumstances apply due to the mother being registered disabled. She requires a special bed but at present this cannot be accommodated as their bedroom is too small. We note the dwelling is located within the Green Belt

Recommend: Approve

TA/2021/255 – Tranter's, Hathersham Close, Smallfield

Single storey outbuilding in garden (CLOPD) *Legal Determination*

Recommend: Noted

TA/2021/284 – Jaxsland Farm, East Hill lane, Copthorne

Single storey side and rear extensions (CLOPD) *Legal Determination*

Recommend: Noted

7 Decisions and Appeals

TA/2021/110/NH – Hollybush, Shipley Bridge Lane, Shipley Bridge

Erection of one additional storey to existing dwelling. (Notification of a Proposed Larger Home extension) *Prior approval required and given*

TA/2021/86 – Oak Lodge, Chapel Road, Smallfield

Erection of single storey rear extension. (Certificate of Lawfulness for Proposed Use or Development) *Granted*

TA/2021/54 – 34 Heather Walk, Smallfield

Erection of two storey side extension with car port below. *Approved*

TA/2020/2297 – Former Workshop, Rear of Greeleas, 10 Redehall Road, Smallfield

The erection of 4no. affordable bungalows and 2no. general needs bungalows with associated access, parking, landscaping and other associated works. *Refused*

TA/2020/2234 – Bridle Cottage, Green Lane, Horley

Demolition of existing single storey side extension. Erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear extension *Refused*

TA/2020/2013 – Smallfield Sports Assoc, Plough Road, Smallfield

Temporary siting of external metal storage container from 1st February 2021 - 31 December 2023 (Certificate of Lawfulness for a Proposed Use/Development). *Granted*

TA/2020/1453 – Marholm, Chapel Road, Smallfield

Erection of a 2 storey side/infill extension *Granted*

TA/2019/638 – Woodlands Garage, Chapel Road, Smallfield

Demolition of all buildings on site; the erection of a two storey building to accommodate 4 flats, erection of 2 ½ storey building to accommodate 6 flats and 1 retail unit on the ground floor, with storage space at the rear and ancillary parking and landscaping. *Dismissed*

- 8 Items of an urgent nature brought to Committees attention for inclusion on a future agenda

There being no further business the meeting closed at 19.40. The next planning meeting is scheduled for Tuesday 13th April 2021

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