

THE DISTRICT COUNCIL OF TANDRIDGE

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes and report to Council of the meeting of the Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 2 September 2021 at 7.30pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Blackwell (Chair), C.White (Vice-Chair), Connolly, Duck, Farr, Gray, Lockwood, Mansfield, Moore, Morrow, Prew, Ridge and Shiner

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Cooper and North

100. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 29TH JULY 2021

The minutes of the meeting were confirmed and signed by the Chair.

Committee Decisions (Under Powers delegated to the Committee)

101. 2021/82 - WOODRISING, THE RIDGE, WOLDINGHAM CR3 7AG

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of the existing building and tennis court and the subsequent erection of a two-storey building with accommodation in the roof space comprising two one bedroom, eight two bedroom and two three-bedroom flats with the provision of associated parking and landscaping.

The Officer's recommendation was to permit subject to conditions.

Mr Glenn Richardson, an objector, spoke against the application.

Cllr Deborah Sherry, Chair of Woldingham Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Mr Phillip Russell, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Connolly, on behalf of Councillor North, proposed the following separate motions for refusal:

1. *The proposal, by reason of its size, scale and layout, would constitute inappropriate development which is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and no 'Very Special Circumstances' have been demonstrated that clearly outweigh this, and any other harms. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies DP10 and DP13 of the Tandridge District Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies (2014) and paragraph 149 of the NPPF (2021).*
2. *The proposal, by reason of the type of development, number of units, size, scale and design would result in harm to the AGLV landscape and the setting of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty contrary to Policy CSP20 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) and paragraph 176 of the NPPF (2021).*
3. *The proposal, by reason of the number of units, site layout, design and mass of the proposed buildings, would result in unacceptable intensification of the site*

which would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area and fails to have regard to the local setting contrary to Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008), Policy DP7 of the Tandridge District Local Plan: Part 2 - Detailed Policies (2014) and Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan Policy L1 and the NPPF (2021).

4. *The site is located in an area that suffers from a lack of quality pedestrian and/or cycle links and a shortfall in public transport provision and is unsustainable in transport terms. Residents would be heavily dependent on the private car for access to normal day to day services and facilities, and the proposed development would be contrary to the sustainable objectives of the NPPF (updated July 2021), Policy CS1 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy and objectives within the Surrey Local Transport Plan (LTP3).*

Councillor Lockwood seconded each of the motions. Upon being put separately to the vote, the motions were carried.

As a result of the outcome of the vote, the Presenting Officer proposed the following further reason for refusal for the Committee to consider:

1. *In the absence of adequate information to the contrary, it has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the local planning authority that the proposed development would not have harmful impact on protected species or their habitats on the site. The proposals would therefore be contrary to Policy CSP17 of the Tandridge Core Strategy, to Policy DP19 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).*

Councillor Lockwood proposed and Councillor Mansfield seconded the motion. Upon being put to the vote, the motion was carried.

R E S O L V E D – *that planning permission be refused.*

102. 2020/1138 - WOODLAND COURT, 1 HARESTONE DRIVE, CATERHAM CR3 6HX

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of three existing two-storey terraced houses and the subsequent erection of a two-storey 8-bedroom Care Home with associated parking. The application also included the change of use of site from C3 to C2.

The Officer's recommendation was to permit, subject to conditions.

Cllr Jeremy Webster of Caterham Valley Parish Council spoke against the application.

Councillor Connolly proposed the following motion for refusal:

1. *The proposal by reason of its scale and layout would result in overdevelopment of the site resulting in poor amenities for future occupants and would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008), Policies DP7 of the Tandridge*

District Local Plan: Part 2 - Detailed Policies (2014), Policies CCW4 and CCW5 of the Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan 2021.

Councillor Duck seconded the motion. Upon being put to the vote, the motion was carried.

R E S O L V E D – *that planning permission be refused.*

103. RECENT APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED

The Principal Planning Officer advised that the following application had been allowed by the Planning Inspectorate:

TA/2020/1203 – 21 Whyteleafe Hill, Whyteleafe, CR3 0AG – the application had been refused by the Planning Committee on 3 December 2020.

104. ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN IS OF THE OPINION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AT THE MEETING AS A MATTER OF URGENCY

The Principal Planning Officer provided a verbal update to the Committee in respect of the site at 26-28 Church Lane, Oxted. The update confirmed that the applicant had submitted a section 73 application to vary the appeal scheme and legal agreement to reflect the sums agreed on the recent application with the Council's consultants. The decision on the application will be under the scheme of delegation as opposed to Committee. It was also noted that the appeal had been submitted and dates set for the Public Inquiry in December. The applicant has committed to withdrawing the appeal subject to the approval of the aforementioned section 73 application.

Rising 9.56 pm