

**Application: 2024/393**

**Location: Lochiel, Ricketts Hill Road, Tatsfield, Westerham, Surrey, TN16 2NB**

**Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of new dwelling**

**Ward: Tatsfield and Titsey**

**Decision Level: Committee**

*Constraints – Green Belt, Areas of Special Advertising Consent, Ancient Woodland(s) within 500m, Biggin Hill Safeguarding, D Road Classification,*

**RECOMMENDATION: PERMIT subject to conditions**

This application is reported to Committee following a Member request by Councillor Allen. The reasons for the call in include:

1. Failure to meet on site renewable energy requirement.
2. Failure to meet minimum parking requirements.
3. Contrary to Local Plan Policy DP13 as the building is materially larger than the one it replaces. As a result, it is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and Very Special Circumstances have not been demonstrated to outweigh this.
4. Poor design and out of context with its rural village setting.
5. Contrary to the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan Design Policies.

### **Summary**

1. The site is located within the Green Belt. The proposal would comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt which, by definition, is harmful to the Green Belt. However, it is considered that Very Special Circumstances (VSC) exist which would outweigh the harm caused in that respect and through the limited harm to openness that has been identified.
2. The design of the proposed replacement dwelling is considered acceptable and would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, nor to the amenities of neighbouring residents. Adequate provision is made for parking and amenity space and, subject to conditions, the proposed development would not have a harmful impact on biodiversity. Further conditions could be imposed to ensure that adequate provision is made for electric vehicle charging, renewable energy provision and that control is exercised over further development on the site.
3. As such, the development is found to be acceptable in accordance with Policies CSP1, CSP2, CSP3, CSP11, CSP12, CSP14, CSP17, CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008, Policies DP1, DP5, DP7, DP10, DP13, DP19 of the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014 and Policies TNP02G, TNP03A, TNP04A, TNP08A, TNP08B of the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan (2024). The application is therefore recommended for approval by Officers.

### **Site Description**

4. The site falls within land designated as Green Belt and is outside of the Tatsfield settlement boundary, which ends further to the west. The site is comprised of a detached 3-bedroom bungalow and attached garage located on the west side of Ricketts Hill Road. The site is surrounded by other residential properties and has accommodation for off-street parking to the front of the dwelling.

## **Relevant History**

5. GOR/2964 - House or bungalow on about 1/4 acre on land - Approved 04/09/1957.
6. 2022/923/NH - 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 4 metres, and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.3 metres (Notification of a Proposed Larger Home extension) - Prior approval not required 12/08/2022.
7. 2022/922 - Erection of single storey side extension (Certificate of Lawfulness for a Proposed Use or Development) - Planning permission is not required 12/01/2023.
8. 2023/688 - Erection of single storey side extension (Certificate of Lawfulness for a Proposed Development) - Granted 21/07/2023.
9. 2022/924/NH - Erection of first floor extension to form house from bungalow. (Prior approval class AA Part 1 Schedule 2) - Prior approval required and given 24/08/2022.

## **Key Issues**

10. The site is located within the Green Belt and a key consideration is whether the proposal would constitute inappropriate development and, if so, whether very special circumstances exist that would clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm. Other key considerations are the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the amenities of neighbouring residents, the standard of accommodation proposed, access and highway safety, parking provision, landscaping, biodiversity and renewable energy.

## **Proposal**

11. The proposal would involve the demolition of the existing dwelling at the site and the erection of a new dwelling.
12. The proposed dwelling would be two storeys, with a maximum ridge height of 7.3 metres and eaves height of 4.8 metres. The dwelling would feature two-storey gable end projections to the front and the rear, with the front incorporating a porch. The cross gable form of the dwelling would break up the massing of the building and has been amended since the application was first submitted.
13. On the ground floor, a reception room, study and open plan kitchen, living and dining room is proposed. The rear elevation includes large bifold doors which open out onto the rear garden. On the first floor, 5 bedrooms and 4 bathrooms are proposed with the master bedroom also featuring a Juliet balcony that would be sited centrally within the rear elevation.
14. The materials proposed include a mixture of Yellow Stock Brick, off white/cream rendered walls, slate tiled roof, black double-glazed windows and doors.

## Development Plan Policy

15. Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 – Policies CSP1, CSP2, CSP3, CSP11, CSP12, CSP14, CSP17, CSP18
16. Tandridge Local Plan Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014 – Policies DP1, DP5, DP7, DP10, DP13, DP19
17. Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan (2024) – TNP02G, TNP03A, TNP04A, TNP08A, TNP08B

## Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPGs) and non-statutory guidance

18. Tandridge Parking Standards SPD (2012)
19. Tandridge Trees and Soft Landscaping SPD (2017)
20. Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard (2015)
21. Surrey Design Guide (2002)

## National Advice

22. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2023)
23. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
24. National Design Guide (2019)

## Consultation Responses

25. Consultation responses summarised below.

Surrey County Council Highways	Received: 28/05/2024
“The proposed development has been considered by THE COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY (CHA) who having assessed the application on safety, capacity and policy grounds, recommends the following conditions be imposed in any permission granted:	
1. The proposed driveway / parking area shall be constructed using a bound surface material for at least the first five metres back from the edge of the public highway.”	

Tatsfield Parish Council	Received: 21/05/2024
“Firstly, insufficient information has been submitted to fully assess this application. There is no Design and Access Statement and no Renewable Energy Statement setting out how the development will meet the 10% minimum renewable energy requirements on site (as required by the TDC Core Strategy Policy CSP14). The application further does not demonstrate it meets the requirements of the Tandridge Parking Standards SPD (Sept. 2012) for off-street parking for a dwelling of the size proposed. In any event, the proposed replacement building is materially larger than the building it is replacing and is therefore contrary to Policy DP13 of the adopted Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014-2029. As a result, it is	

inappropriate development in the Green Belt and Very Special Circumstances have not been demonstrated to outweigh this. The proposed dwelling is materially larger than the dwelling it replaces representing a 130% increase in built volume from 357 cu.m to 823 cu.m (as per the applicants own calculations). The proposed development also represents poor design and is very out of context with its rural village setting. The proposed interpretation of neo-Georgian design in off-white render, cream brick with porticoes and black aluminium multi-pane windows is completely out of context with its neighbouring houses and will create a negative effect on street scene. The proposed development is therefore contrary to DP7 of the adopted Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014-2029 – which states: ‘All new development will be expected to be of a high quality design. Development should integrate effectively with its surroundings, reinforcing local distinctiveness and landscape character’. The Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan (supported at public referendum on May 2nd, 2024 and shortly to be adopted by TDC as planning policy) should now be given significant weight. This proposal is also contrary to the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan Design Policies TNP04a (‘General’ and ‘New or replacement dwellings’ sections).”

Surrey Wildlife Trust	Received: 17/07/24
<p>We acknowledge that the ecological information submitted to inform the planning application has been undertaken by SWT Ecology Services, a fully owned subsidiary of Surrey Wildlife Trust. Surrey Wildlife Trust’s Ecology Planning Advice Service maintains impartiality when reviewing any documents submitted to inform a planning application, and any resulting advice and recommendations we provide are equally impartial.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application is for a replacement dwelling – the existing dwelling will be demolished. The Applicant has submitted a Bat Presence/Likely Absence Survey report which details the likely absence of a bat roost from the building B1. Building B2 and B3 are assessed to have negligible suitability. The report concludes “<i>During the surveys, no bats were seen emerging or returning to roost. Bats are therefore considered likely absent. Compensation and enhancement measures detailed in Section 6 and 7 should be implemented, to maintain the conservation status of bats</i>”. The recommendations of SWT Ecology Services should be followed if the application is granted.</li> <li>• The Preliminary Roost Assessment report by SWT Ecology Services has now been submitted to accompany the Bat Presence/Likely Absence Survey report. The Preliminary Roost Assessment appears to be valid to inform the Bat Presence/Likely Absence Survey Report</li> <li>• SWT Ecology Services detail that the report is valid for one year. The report was approved in July 2023; therefore, the conclusions and survey data appear to remain valid. We would advise that the development proceeds in line with the recommendations of SWT Ecology Services.</li> <li>• We do not know the date that the application was made to the LPA but note that it was validated in April 2024. We would advise that as a precaution, the LPA assess whether ‘Minor’ mandatory biodiversity net gain is relevant to the planning application. We understand that</li> </ul>	

the LPA has assessed that the application is exempt from mandatory biodiversity net gain.

Locality Team	Received: 17/05/2024
"To help & encourage residents to recycle waste, the kitchen of each new dwelling should be designed with built in storage areas for refuse, recyclables, and food. This will allow for the easy storage of waste until it can be transferred to external bins. A combined internal capacity of 35 to 40 litres should be provided. This isn't clear in the plans if this has been provided. 180L refuse, 240L recycling, 23L food caddy and a 240L garden waste bin (should the resident wish to sign up for the service). Bins will need to be purchased before property can be added to waste round. Bins will need to be presented by the closest point to the highway without blocking the highway."	

## Public Representations/Comments

### 26. Third Party Comments –

#### General comments/do not object

- Proposal is materially larger than existing dwelling, but acknowledges the existing lawful development certificates.
- Should permission be granted, permitted development rights should be removed.
- Proposal will enhance the road scene and have a pleasing appearance and less impact than what can be achieved under permitted development.
- Less impact than permitted development.

#### Objections

- Street scene elevation is misleading.
- Proposal will be out of character.
- Development would have a harmful impact to the Green Belt.

## Assessment

### Procedural note

27. The Tandridge Development Plan is formed of Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008, Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014-2029, Caterham, Chaldon & Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan 2021, Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan 2019, Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan 2024 and Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan 2016, as well as the Surrey Waste and Minerals Plans. Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require decisions to be taken in accordance with the development plan, unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise.

28. The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions and its policies have to be taken into account in dealing with applications from the day of its publication, [with the exception of policy in paragraph 76 relating to the five-year housing land supply] (NPPF December 2023, paragraphs 2 and 224). It is important to note that even though the adopted Development Plan predates the publication of the most recent NPPF, the majority of policies remain up to date. Policies will be given due weight in accordance with their degree of consistency with the NPPF (December 2023, paragraph 225).

## Status of 'Our Local Plan 2033' and its Evidence Base

29. Tandridge District Council submitted 'Our Local Plan 2033' for independent examination in January 2019. The Inspector's Report was published on the 20 February 2024, bringing the examination to a close. The Inspector's final recommendation was that the submitted plan should not be adopted due to soundness issues.
30. Therefore, the adopted Development Plan remains the Tandridge District Council Core Strategy 2008, the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014-2029, the Caterham, Chaldon & Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan 2021, the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan 2019, Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan 2024 and the Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan 2016, along with the Surrey Minerals and Waste Plans.
31. The evidence base technical studies published as part of the Examination for 'Our Local Plan 2033' have been saved and re-published following the withdrawal of 'Our Local Plan 2033'. As part of the preparation of a new Local Plan for the District, the Council will be reviewing its these technical studies to ensure the new Local Plan is supported by relevant and up-to-date evidence. Until such time that these technical studies are withdrawn, they remain capable of being a material consideration for planning applications.

## Green Belt

32. The application site is located within the Green Belt and the NPPF December 2023 advises that the fundamental aim of Green Belts is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence and, to this end, paragraph 152 of the NPPF says that new development in this area would be considered as inappropriate and therefore harmful and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
33. Local Plan Policies DP10 and DP13 expand on provisions of the NPPF, 2023 and Policy DP10 says that within the Green Belt, planning permission for any inappropriate development which is by definition harmful to the Green Belt will normally be refused. Proposals involving inappropriate development in the Green Belt will only be permitted where sufficient very special circumstances are considered to exist, to the extent that other considerations clearly outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm. Local Plan Policy DP13 further elaborates how development in the Green Belt may be justified and says that unless very special circumstances can be clearly shown to exist, the Council will regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt.
34. Policy DP13 states that unless very special circumstances can be clearly demonstrated, the Council will regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. This is generally consistent with the content of the NPPF, with the exception of the requirement for it to be in the same place. Policy DP13 sets out the exceptions to this, one of which is Part F:
35. *The replacement of buildings within the Green Belt (outside the Defined Villages), where the proposed new building:*
  1. *Is in the same use as the building it is replacing;*

2. *Is not materially larger than the building it is replacing; and*
3. *Is sited on or close to the position of the building it is replacing, except where an alternative siting within the curtilage demonstrably improves the openness of the Green Belt.*

36. The proposed development is for a replacement dwelling within the site of the existing property. In this regard the proposal would accord with the first part of Part F of policy DP13. It is noted that the proposed replacement building would also be located in approximately the same position as the existing dwelling and be used for the same purpose, i.e as a residential dwellinghouse. The proposed development therefore complies with points 1 and 3 of Part F of DP13.

37. The second test relates to whether or not the building proposed would be materially larger than that which it would replace. Neither the NPPF of Local Plan policy contain guidance on what would constitute a replacement building that is materially larger and the Council uses both a mathematical assessment as well as a visual appraisal to judge whether or not a replacement building is materially larger.

38. In this regard, the following assessment of the existing and proposed built form at the site has been undertaken with regards to area and volume calculations:

#### **Existing buildings**

Name	Plan	Footprint m <sup>2</sup>	Volume m <sup>3</sup>
Existing dwelling	558-02C and 558-03C	131	357

#### **Proposed Dwelling**

Name	Plan	Footprint m <sup>2</sup>	Volume m <sup>3</sup>
Dwelling	558-11K	138	844
Percentage increase		5%	136%

39. With regards to the size of the proposed dwelling, it has been calculated that the existing volume of the property today is 357m<sup>3</sup>. The proposed replacement dwelling would have a greater volume of 844m<sup>3</sup>, which would represent an increase in volume of 487m<sup>3</sup>, or 136%. As a result, it is considered that the proposed dwelling would be materially larger than the existing property on the site and would therefore constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

40. In terms of effect on openness, by being taller than the existing building and of greater overall bulk, the dwelling would have a more imposing visual impact than the existing dwelling and cause a loss of openness in visual terms. However, the dwelling would be in the same position as the existing dwelling and not cause sprawl beyond the footprint of the existing built form. As such, whilst there would be an effect on openness, this would be limited.

41. With regard to the purposes of the Green Belt that are set out at Paragraph 143 of the NPPF, the proposal would not cause the unrestricted sprawl of a large built-up area, cause neighbouring towns to merge, cause encroachment into the countryside, effect the setting and special character of historic towns or

undermine urban regeneration. As such, the proposal does not conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt.

42. Overall, the proposal would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt and cause limited harm to openness. In such circumstances, it would be necessary to consider whether there are any very special circumstances which would outweigh the harm that is caused by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm identified. This report therefore goes on to consider whether any other harm is caused by the proposed development before making an assessment of whether there are any very special circumstances.

### Character and Appearance

43. Paragraph 131 of the NPPF December 2023 states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. It goes on to state that planning decisions should ensure that developments will function well, add to the overall quality of the area, be sympathetic to local character and history (whilst not discouraging innovation) and establish a strong sense of place. It also states that development that is not well designed should be refused.
44. Policy CSP18 of the Core Strategy requires that new development should be of a high standard of design that must reflect and respect the character, setting and local context, including those features that contribute to local distinctiveness. Development must also have regard to the topography of the site, important trees or groups of trees and other important features that need to be retained.
45. Policy DP7 of the Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies requires development to, inter alia, respect and contribute to the distinctive character, appearance and amenity of the area in which it is located, have a complementary building design and not result in overdevelopment or unacceptable intensification by reason of scale, form, bulk, height, spacing, density and design.
46. Policy CSP21 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 advises that the character and distinctiveness of the Districts landscapes and countryside will be protected for their own sake and that new development will be required to conserve and enhance landscape character.
47. The application site is located within Character Area 3 of the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan. Policy TNP04A of the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) states that new development should contribute to local distinctiveness and make a positive contribution to the overall appearance and character of built development within the parish. New development should also result in high-quality design. TNP outlines that development proposals for all new or replacement residential buildings should respect the character and the nature of existing buildings in the immediate locality. In addition, they should respond positively to the following design criteria:
  - A) be single or two storey and reflect the height of surrounding buildings and front onto the road;



- B) be designed to reflect and respect the textures, materials, shapes, styles, massing, and proportions of buildings in the immediate area;
  - C) use natural and re-used materials wherever practicable;
  - D) include components such as doors, windows, the height, pitch, and ridges of roofs which have regard to those already present in the vicinity; and
  - E) avoid use of flat roofs, or UPVC components.
48. The prevailing character of the area is residential, with dwellings and their gardens surrounding the site at all sides. There is a mixture of bungalows and two-storey dwellings throughout the locality, most of which are detached. Neighbouring sites immediately adjacent to the application site feature dwellings that are similar in scale and form, with large frontages and similarly sized gardens. There are other examples of dwellings which have been extended or replaced locally, the varied form and appearance of other dwellings within the area will be set out in more detail below.
49. The design of the existing property is reflective of its age and other similarly aged dwellings that are located around it, being of sufficiently simple appearance to be low-key in the locality and not attracting the attention of a passer-by. The existing footprint spans approximately 131m<sup>2</sup> including an attached garage to the side. Whilst the nature of the property is a single storey bungalow, the maximum height measures 5.2 metres tall and is therefore relatively tall for a single storey dwelling.
50. Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing bungalow and its replacement with a two storey 5-bed detached dwelling. The proposed dwelling would be located over a similar footprint as existing, with an increased separation to the northern boundary from 0.5 metres as existing to 2.8 metres as proposed. The design would portray a modern dwelling located in an established residential area.
51. The replacement of the existing property with a new dwelling would be acceptable and would not cause harm to the overall character and appearance of the area. The proposed dwelling would be 2-storeys in height, incorporating a pitched roof design with the roof form remaining respectful to the existing and prevailing street scape. The maximum ridge height would be approximately 7.3 metres with an eaves of 4.8 metres. When compared with the existing, this is an increase of 2.1 metres. Whilst it is noted that concerns have been raised about the accuracy of the representation of the other dwellings on the proposed street scene elevation, it is clear that the proposed dwelling would be of comparable height to the dwelling at 'Clouds', due to the changing topography of the area and, for the same reason, the ridge would sit at a lower height than the roof of the dwelling of 'Westcombe'.
52. The design would comprise a modern appearance. Whilst this may not replicate the existing nature of the bungalow, there is a mixture of design techniques and styles within the vicinity and noted examples of other front gable features, such as 'Green Gables' to the southwest of the site which features a central gable, and the recently approved dwelling (in construction) at 'Tarnhelm'. The gable frontage is therefore not considered to result in an unduly prominent dwelling and is not considered out of keeping within the prevailing streetscene.
53. The use of render and yellow stone brick to the external façades is also different to the appearance of the existing dwelling. However, this is considered acceptable given the appearance and use of materials within the immediate

area. Other neighbouring properties such as 'Green Gables' also share the use of render and as such, the proposed materials would not appear out of place within the area. Further details in respect of materials can be secured through the imposition of a planning condition to request specific information.

54. The replacement dwelling would maintain a degree of separation to the side boundaries of the plot with 2.8 metres to the northern boundary and 2.3 metres to the southern boundary. This is considered important to ensure that the dwelling does not fill the entire width of the plot with adequate space being maintained around the dwelling. The proposed footprint would be marginally greater than the existing at approximately 138m<sup>2</sup> which is an increase of 7m<sup>2</sup>. This figure does not include the enlargements demonstrated under permitted development which has the potential to increase the existing footprint to a total of 203m<sup>2</sup>; however, this will be addressed below under Very Special Circumstances. Given the scale of the site in relation to the size of the dwelling, the development is not considered to represent overdevelopment of the application site. Moreover, adequate amenity space would be accommodated for to the rear of the dwelling with parking maintained to the front of the application site.
55. The level of hardstanding within the frontage would be greater to accommodate parking. Following Officers comments this has been amended to retain an acceptable level of soft landscaping which is considered an important characteristic within the streetscene.
56. For these reasons, the proposed development is considered to accord with design aspirations of Policy CSP18 of the Core Strategy, Policy DP7 of the Local Plan, TNP04A of the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan and the NPPF.

#### Residential Amenity

57. Policy CSP18 of the Core Strategy advises that development must not significantly harm the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of overlooking, overshadowing, visual intrusion, noise, traffic and any adverse effect. Criteria 6-9 of Policy DP7 of the Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies seek also to safeguard amenity, including minimum privacy distances that will be applied to new development proposals.
58. The above policies reflect the guidance at Paragraph 135 of the NPPF, which seeks amongst other things to create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users of development.
59. The site is located in a well-established residential area, although is semi-rural in design and character where established planting and vegetation is a key characteristic of the area. Through the introduction of the first floor with a higher maximum ridge height and higher eaves, the replacement dwelling would be of greater bulk. The dwelling would therefore inevitably have a greater visual impact from within neighbouring properties surrounding the site.
60. The closest neighbouring properties to the application site would be 'Clouds' to the north, 'Westcombe' to the south. The amenities of these neighbours has been considered below. Other residential properties surround the site, including 'Tarnhelm' and 'El Cumbre' to the east, but are considered to be sufficiently distant from the proposed dwelling for the development to have a negligible impact on the amenities of the occupiers of those dwellings.

61. The property north of the application site, 'Clouds', is a bungalow that is similar in scale and form to the existing bungalow at Lochiel. The proposal would result in a two-storey dwelling, with a greater overall height, adjacent to this side. It is noted that this neighbouring dwelling has side facing windows along the flank elevation at ground floor. The proposed layout of the application site would create a larger separation from 0.5 metres to 2.8 metres to this side, which in combination with the separation on the neighbour's side of approximately 3 metres, would sufficient remove built form. Given the relationship of the proposal and existing built form between these neighbours, taking into consideration the separation, the replacement dwelling is not considered to result in significant harm to neighbouring amenity to this side by reason of overbearing or overshadowing effects.
62. The proposed development would have a similar relationship to the property south of the applications site, where a separation distance of 2.3 to the boundary would be demonstrated and built form would generally fall in line with the flank elevation of this dwelling. The height of the replacement dwelling would be similar to this neighbour with a reasonably shallow roof pitch to ensure that it does not result in overbearing or overshadowing effects. This neighbour also has a side facing window to the first floor; given the separation, this relationship is also considered acceptable with regards to overshadowing effects. The impacts to this neighbour are also not considered significant to warrant a reason for refusal.
63. The internal layout of the first floor is such that any windows to the flank elevations would serve windows and therefore in the event of an approval, will be conditioned to remain obscure glazed to protect amenity.
64. As set out above, the effects on all other nearby residents (including the dwellings opposite the application site) has been considered but, due to the scale, orientation and positioning of the development and the separation distances between properties, it is not considered that the living conditions of the occupiers of any other properties would be affected to an extent that would justify the refusal of the application.
65. For the reasons outlined, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of the potential impact upon the residential amenities and privacy of existing properties and therefore no objection is raised in this regard against Policy DP7 of the Local Plan (2014), Policy CSP18 of the Core Strategy (2008), Policy TNP04A of the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan and the NPPF.

#### Living conditions for future occupiers

66. Policy DP7 also requires that development provide acceptable living conditions for occupiers of the new dwellings. In terms of internal accommodation, the proposed dwellings should satisfy the minimum dwelling sizes set out in the Government's Nationally Described Space Standards. The Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard 2015 sets out requirements for the Gross Internal (floor) Area of new dwellings at a defined level of occupancy as well as floor areas and dimensions for key parts of the home, notably bedrooms, storage and floor to ceiling height.
67. Proposals should provide a satisfactory environment for the occupiers of both the existing and new development, and appropriate facilities should be provided for individual and communal use including bicycle storage, amenity

areas and garden areas (proportionate to the size of the residential units and appropriate for the intended occupiers); as well as facilities for the storage and collection of refuse and recycling materials which are designed and sited in accordance with current Council standards, avoiding adverse impacts on the street scene and the amenities of the proposed and existing properties.

68. The proposed 5-bed dwelling (as show on the submitted drawings) would have a gross internal floor space (GIA) of approximately 235sqm. As a result, the proposed dwelling would conform to the required space standards contained within the Nationally Described Space Standards with regards to internal floor space. In addition, the fenestration arrangements would be sufficient to provide natural light and adequate outlook for all habitable rooms associated with the dwelling.
69. The proposed amenity space would remain the same as existing and is considered sufficient to accommodate the proposed dwelling and provide suitable living conditions for future occupiers.
70. As such, the quality of the future accommodation would comply with the provisions of Local Plan Policy DP7.

#### Parking Provision and Highway Safety

71. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF December 2023 states that 'development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.'
72. Policy CSP12 of the Core Strategy advises that new development proposals should have regard to adopted highway design standards and vehicle/other parking standards. Criterion 3 of Policy DP7 of the Local Plan also requires new development to have regard to adopted parking standards and Policy DP5 seeks to ensure that development does not impact highway safety.
73. Policy TNP04C of the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan states that the location, layout and design (including materials) of all new vehicle parking areas, whether private or public, should:
  - a) not have an undue negative impact on the quality of the landscape or biodiversity.
  - b) reflect the positive elements of the surrounding environment especially the semi-rural nature of the village.
  - c) make use of existing buildings and landscape features to shield views of parking areas.
  - d) keep signage, lighting and markings to a minimum (if required at all).
  - e) treat entrances, verges and boundaries to minimise their visual impact.
  - f) use permeable surfaces to minimise surface water run-off.
  - g) maintain green links and wildlife corridors between properties.
74. The County Highway Authority has indicated that the current proposal would not have any significant adverse impact on highway safety, access and parking. The proposed dwelling would be provided with at least 3 parking spaces located to the front of the property. This would accord with the adopted standards which require a minimum of 3 spaces. Consequently, there would no additional car parking pressures in the area and, in line with the comments

of the Highway Authority, it is agreed that there would be no reduction of highway safety at or in the vicinity of the site.

75. The proposed parking arrangement is also considered to have regard to landscaping, ensuring that an area of soft landscaping is retained within the frontage and would respect other aspects of the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan where relevant.
76. Whilst the proposed dwelling is not in a location that has immediate access to public transport, shops or services, this is equally the case for the existing dwelling at the site. Consequently, it is not considered that any objection can reasonably be raised on the grounds of locational sustainability.
77. Subject to the inclusion of the aforementioned planning conditions, it is assessed that the proposal would not negatively impact upon highway safety and as such comply with the provisions of Core Strategy Policy CSP12 and Local Plan Policies DP5, DP7 and the NPPF.

### Renewable Energy

78. Paragraph 159 of the NPPF provides that new development should be planned for in ways that avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts from climate change and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions via location, orientation and design. This is reflected in Policy CSP14 which requires that for development resulting in 1-9 new dwellings a 10% saving in CO2 emissions through the incorporation of on-site renewable technologies should be achieved.
79. Policy TNP08A of the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan outlines that proposals for renewable and low-carbon energy generation will be supported where the proposed developments:-
  - a) Do not cause harm to the openness and setting of the National Landscapes or the Green Belt.
  - b) Are located and of a scale that are appropriate to character, setting and the wider landscape and does not harm the Notable Views defined in Section 02.10.
  - c) Do not create an unacceptable impact on the amenities of local residents.
80. Policy TNP08B goes on to state that new developments should demonstrate that they meet a high level of sustainable design and construction and will be optimised for energy efficiency, targeting zero carbon emissions. This includes:-
  - a) Siting, orientation and shading of windows to optimise passive solar gain,
  - b) The use of high quality, thermally efficient building materials,
  - c) Installation of energy efficiency measures such as high levels of insulation, triple glazing and heat recovery.
  - d) All new development should incorporate on-site energy generation from renewable sources such as solar panels.
81. The applicant has not submitted any information regarding renewable energy provision. However, it is considered that the site is capable of achieving the

minimum Policy requirement and therefore in the event of an approval, a condition would be imposed upon the permission to ensure that appropriate details are submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and subsequently implemented, thereby ensuring that the development would accord with the abovementioned policies. Whilst the comments of Tatsfield Parish Council are noted about the submission of insufficient details, planning permission should not be refused where a proposal can be made acceptable through the imposition of a condition and, as such, the application should not be refused for this reason.

### Biodiversity

82. Policy CSP17 of the Core Strategy requires development proposals to protect biodiversity and provide for the maintenance, enhancement, restoration and, if possible, expansion of biodiversity, by aiming to restore or create suitable semi-natural habitats and ecological networks to sustain wildlife in accordance with the aims of the Surrey Biodiversity Action Plan.
83. Policy DP19 of the Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014 advises that planning permission for development directly or indirectly affecting protected or Priority species will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the species involved will not be harmed or appropriate mitigation measures can be put in place.
84. The application is accompanied by a Preliminary Roost Assessment and a Bat Presence/Likely Absence Survey Report, prepared by SWT Ecology Services. Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) has reviewed the proposal and makes the following observations (in summary, including comments made):
  - The Applicant has submitted a Bat Presence/Likely Absence Survey report which details the likely absence of a bat roost from the building B1. Building B2 and B3 are assessed to have negligible suitability. The report concludes *“During the surveys, no bats were seen emerging or returning to roost. Bats are therefore considered likely absent. Compensation and enhancement measures detailed in Section 6 and 7 should be implemented, to maintain the conservation status of bats”*. The recommendations of SWT Ecology Services should be followed in the event that the application is granted.
  - The Preliminary Roost Assessment report by SWT Ecology Services has been submitted to accompany the Bat Presence/Likely Absence Survey report. The Preliminary Roost Assessment appears to be valid to inform the Bat Presence/Likely Absence Survey Report.
  - SWT Ecology Services detail that the report is valid for one year. The report was approved in July 2023; therefore, the conclusions and survey data appear to remain valid. We would advise that the development proceeds in line with the recommendations of SWT Ecology Services.
85. Biodiversity net gain is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021). Under the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain, subject to some exceptions, every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that the biodiversity gain objective is met (“the biodiversity gain condition”). This objective is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to

the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat. One of the exemptions, meaning that the biodiversity net gain condition does not apply, is for self-build development. These are developments which consist of no more than 9 dwellings, are carried out on sites which are no larger than 0.5 hectares and consist exclusively of dwellings which are self-build. The applicant has indicated that the dwelling would be self-build, and the development would meet the other criteria to benefit from this exemption.

86. With the inclusion of a compliance condition, the proposal would comply with the requirements of the NPPF and CSP17 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 and Policy DP19 of the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2- Detailed Policies 2014. For that reason, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in regards to biodiversity.

### Landscaping and Trees

87. Policy CSP18 of the Core Strategy required that development must have regard to the topography of the site, important trees and groups of trees and other important features that need to be retained. Criterion 13 of the Local Plan Policy DP7 required that where trees are present on a proposed development site, a landscaping scheme should be submitted alongside the planning application which makes the provision for retention of existing trees that are important by virtue of their significance within the local landscape.
88. The Tandridge Trees and Soft landscaping SPD (2017) outlines the importance of landscaping which applies to urban and rural areas and advises that it is *'essential that the design of the spaces around building is given the same level of consideration from the outset as the design of building themselves'*. Trees are not only a landscape environmental benefit but, as the SPD outlines, a health benefit for people which enhances their environment.
89. Policy TNP02G of the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan states that new development should retain and, where practicable, enhance the overall rural character of the parish and its biodiversity, wildlife and habitats.
90. The Tree Officer was consulted, and his comments are as follows: *'The revised plans now show three silver birch trees and a slightly enlarged frontage soft landscape area with shrub planting indicated. However, there is very little detail, and whilst I think the space for a nice planting scheme is now available, we would require much more detail under condition. It may be that alternative tree species are also sought. I recommend that our standard pre commencement soft landscaping condition is applied.'*
91. Subject to this condition, no objection would be raised on the grounds of the impact on trees or landscaping.

### Very Special Circumstances

92. As discussed above, it is considered that the proposed development would comprise inappropriate development within the Green Belt which would have a greater impact on openness than existing development on the site.
93. In such circumstances, and in accordance with paragraph 152 of the NPPF, inappropriate development is, by definition, considered harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 153 of the NPPF goes on to state that when considering any

planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

94. The applicants have referred to the planning history of the site and specifically to the prior approvals under ref: 2022/923/NH for the erection of a rear extension, 2022/924/NH for the erection of an additional storey and a Lawful Development Certificate under ref: 2023/688 for the erection of a side extension. The combination of extensions considered under permitted development would result in a net increase of 578m<sup>3</sup>. Including the existing dwelling, the volume of built form at the site would then total 935m<sup>3</sup>. This would increase the volume by 162%. In addition, the spread of built form at the site would be worse as the alternative proposals would enable a footprint increase of 204 square metres, which is 66 square metres more than this proposal. The applicants therefore claim that this is a worse alternative, mathematically, than the proposed replacement dwelling subject to this planning application.
95. Case law has determined that the existence of a fallback position can be an important material consideration and be factored into an assessment of whether the Very Special Circumstances exist to enable development in the Green Belt that would otherwise be deemed inappropriate. It is particularly relevant in this instance to have regard to the cases of *Mansell v Tonbridge And Malling Borough Council [2017] EWCA Civ 1314* whereby it was held that it was "plainly appropriate and indeed necessary" for a fallback position to be considered and given weight. That case also drew from *Samuel Smith Old Brewery (Tadcaster) v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2009] J.P.L. 1326* whereby it was set out that, to be considered as a fallback position, there has to be a real prospect of an alternative development taking place but, in order to be deemed a real prospect, it only has to be a possibility rather than probable or likely. In other cases, inspectors and the courts have found that in a degree of clarity and commitment may be adequate. In *Mansell and Tonbridge* case, planning permission had originally been granted and, through the courts, this decision was upheld.
96. In this case, the applicants have obtained certification and confirmation that developments could occur which would result in a dwelling much larger in volume than the proposed dwelling, with a footprint significantly greater than the size of the existing dwelling. By going to the extent of seeking a Certificate of Lawfulness and submitting a Prior Notification application, it is considered that there is sufficient provisions in place for fallback position to be deemed a real prospect.
97. If the fallback position was to be exercised, in the event that this application was refused, the resulting dwelling would be of a piecemeal appearance with a significantly greater footprint, thereby overdeveloping the rear of the application site and extending built form much closer to the northern boundary. In contrast the proposed dwelling would have a significantly smaller footprint with a proportionate increase in the height of the building. The resulting design would inevitably be bulkier with a gable frontage. However, this is considered a better alternative than significantly increasing the footprint at ground floor along with a first-floor extension also. Furthermore, the resulting bulk and mass of the replacement dwelling would be comparable to other surrounding properties and therefore not visually disproportionate within the prevailing streetscene. As a



result, it is considered that implementing the development that is the subject of this application rather than the alternative represents a substantial benefit.

98. Should the permitted development scheme be exercised, which can be considered to be a distinct possibility in the event of a refusal, the enlargements would be an overdevelopment of the site with an excessive footprint and appear discordant to the original form of the property with a 'bolted on' appearance. In this case, it is considered that the redevelopment of the site would enhance and contribute to the character of the area opposed to the fall-back position.
99. The proposed dwelling would also be able to be required to be compliant with Policy CSP14 in relation to the provision of renewable energy and could be conditioned in the event of an approval to achieve a reduction in carbon emissions which cannot currently be controlled on site or if the alternative permissions were implemented. Whilst this is only afforded limited weight in this case as these aspects are a requirement of new build development, it is a benefit relative to the use of permitted development rights.
100. Given the circumstances of this case, it would also be appropriate to impose a condition to prevent permitted development rights being utilised which could cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt, such as the further extension of the dwelling.
101. The current proposal, therefore, offers an opportunity for a more comprehensive and coherent redevelopment of the site opposed to a more piecemeal form of development and, as a result, it is considered that there would be an overall betterment relative to the permitted development fall-back position.
102. In these circumstances, it is considered that very special circumstances exist which would outweigh the harm that has been identified. Therefore, the proposal can be found acceptable in light of the abovementioned national and local policies in relation to the Green Belt.

### Conclusion

103. The site is located within the Green Belt. The proposals would comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt which, by definition, is harmful to the Green Belt and also cause limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Even affording substantial weight to the harm that is caused in these respects, as required by the development plan and the NPPF, it is considered that very special circumstances exist which would outweigh the harm that has been identified.
104. The design of the proposed replacement dwelling is considered acceptable and would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, nor to the amenities of neighbouring residents. Adequate provision is made for parking and amenity space and subject to conditions, the proposed development would not have a harmful impact on biodiversity. Further conditions would be imposed to ensure that adequate provision is made for renewable energy and electric vehicle charging, and that control is exercised over further development on the site.
105. For the reasons outlined above, the application is recommended for approval.

106. The recommendation is made in light of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). It is considered that in respect of the assessment of this application significant weight has been given to policies within the Council's Core Strategy 2008, the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014 and the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan in accordance with the NPPF 2023. Due regard as a material consideration has been given to the NPPF and PPG in reaching this recommendation.
107. All other material considerations, including third party comments, have been considered but none are considered sufficient to change the recommendation.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**PERMIT subject to conditions**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. This decision refers to drawings numbered 558-00C, 558-01D, 558-02C, 558-03C, 558-04D, 503-05C, 503-06D received on the 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2024, 558-14F, 503-13D, 558-08K, 558-07K, 558-09K, 558-12M, 558-10M, 558-11M received on 10<sup>th</sup> July 2024. The development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved drawings. There shall be no variations from these approved drawings.

Reason: To ensure that the scheme proceeds as set out in the planning application and therefore remains in accordance with the development plan.

3. No development shall take place above ground level until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwellings hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise control over the type and colour of materials, to enhance the development are appropriate to the character of the area in accordance with Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008, Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014 and Policy TNP04A of the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan.

4. No development shall take place above ground level until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:

- means of enclosure
- car parking layouts (to include 3 spaces per unit min.)
- other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas
- hard surfacing materials
- minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc.).

- Details of all soft landscaping works including all proposed and retained trees, hedges and shrubs; ground preparation, planting specifications and ongoing maintenance, together with details of areas to be grass seeded or turfed. Planting schedules shall include details of species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities.

All new planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the completion or occupation of any part of the development (whichever is the sooner) or otherwise in accordance with a programme to be agreed. Any trees or plants (including those retained as part of the development) which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed, or, in the opinion of the District Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the District Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. The hard landscape works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of the development.

Reason: To maintain and enhance the visual amenities of the development in accordance with Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008, Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014 and Policy TNP02G of the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan.

5. No development shall start above ground level until details demonstrating how the development would satisfy the 10% reduction of carbon emissions through renewable resources have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The renewable energy provision shall thereafter be implemented and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure on-site renewable energy provision to enable the development to actively contribute to the reduction of carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with CSP14 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 and Policy TNP08A and TNP08B of the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan.

6. (i) The dwelling hereby permitted shall be constructed as a self-build dwelling within the definition of a self-build and custom build housing in the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (or any Act revoking and re-enacting that Act with or without modification).

(ii) The first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted shall be by a person or persons who had a primary input into the design and layout of the dwelling and who will live in the dwelling for at least 3 years.

(iii) Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling the Council shall be notified of the person(s) who will take up first occupation of the dwelling.

Reason: The development permitted was exempt from mandatory biodiversity net gain as set out in the Environment Act 2021 due to it being a self-build development. This condition is required to ensure the development is a self-build in accordance with the definition. If the development was not self-build mandatory biodiversity net gain would be required.

7. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless and until the proposed dwelling is provided with an electric vehicle charging facility in accordance with a scheme to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local

Planning Authority prior to its installation. The electric vehicle charging facility shall thereafter be retained at all times.

Reason: The condition is required in recognition of Section 9 "Promoting Sustainable Transport" in the National Planning Policy Framework 2023, to meet the objectives of the NPPF (2023), and to satisfy policy CSP12 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008, Policy DP5 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014 and Policy TNP04C of the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan.

8. Before the development hereby approved is occupied the side facing windows shall be fitted with obscure glass and shall be non-opening unless the parts of the roof lights which can be opened are more than 1.7m above the floor of the room in which the roof lights are installed and shall be permanently maintained as such.

Reason: To protect the amenities and privacy of occupiers of adjoining properties in accordance with Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 and Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014.

9. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details submitted as part of the Bat presence/Likely Absence Survey prepared by Ecology Services and the Preliminary Roost Assessment report.

Reason: To ensure that the ecological interests of the site and any protected species are adequately safeguarded throughout the development, in accordance with Policy CSP17 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 and Policy DP19 of the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014.

10. The proposed driveway / parking area shall be constructed using a bound surface material for at least the first five metres back from the edge of the public highway.

Reason: The above condition is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users, with reference to the National Planning Policy Framework December 2023 and the Surrey Local Transport Plan 4 (2022) and Policy TNP04C of the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan.

11. Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A, AA and B of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no form of enlargement of the dwelling hereby permitted shall be carried out without the prior permission in writing of the Local Planning Authority without.

Reason: To control further development of the site in the interests of the character of the area, amenities of nearby properties and openness of the Green Belt, in accordance with Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 and Policy DP7, DP10 and DP13 of the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014.

## Informatives:

1. Condition 2 refers to the drawings hereby approved. Non-material amendments can be made under the provisions of Section 96A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and you should contact the case officer to discuss whether a proposed amendment is likely to be non-material. Minor material amendments will require an application to vary condition 2 of this permission. Such an application would be made under the provisions of Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Major material amendments will require a new planning application. You should discuss whether your material amendment is minor or major with the case officer. Fees may be payable for non-material and material amendment requests. Details of the current fee can be found on the Council's web site.
2. The development permitted is subject to a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liability for which a Liability Notice will be issued. It is important that you ensure that the requirements of the CIL Regulations are met to ensure that you avoid any unnecessary surcharges and that any relevant relief or exemption is applied.
3. It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that the electricity supply is sufficient to meet future demands and that any power balancing technology is in place if required. Please refer to: <http://www.beama.org.uk/resourceLibrary/beama-guide-to-electric-vehicle-infrastructure.html> for guidance and further information on charging modes and connector types. Electric Vehicle Charging points shall be provided in accordance with the Surrey County Council Vehicular, Cycle and Electric Vehicle Parking Guidance for New Development 2022. Where undercover parking areas (multistorey car parks, basement or undercroft parking) are proposed, the developer and LPA should liaise with Building Control Teams and the Local Fire Service to understand any additional requirements. If an active connection costs on average more than £3600 to install, the developer must provide cabling (defined as cable route within the 2022 Building Regulations) and two formal quotes from the distribution network operation showing this.
4. Where details of materials are required please provide these via a link to a website or in another electronic format. Please make sure if providing a link that it is clear which material(s) is/are being proposed for use. Samples should not be provided unless specifically requested by the case officer.
5. The applicant should ensure that the proposed development will result in no net increase in external artificial lighting at the development site, in order to comply with above referenced legislation and the recommendations in "BCT & ILP (2018) Guidance Note 08/18. Bats and artificial lighting in the UK. *Bats and the Built Environment*. Bat Conservation Trust, London & Institution of Lighting Professionals, Rugby".
6. The applicant should take action to ensure that development activities such as demolition and vegetation or site clearance are timed to avoid the bird nesting season of early March to August inclusive.
7. The property will need at least 1 x 240 litre recycling bin, 1 x 180 litre refuse bin and 1 x 23 litre food caddy. Please note, this is a minimum - residents can purchase larger refuse bins at an additional cost, have additional recycling bins and subscribe to the garden waste collection service which uses 240 litre bins.

8. There should be a bin collection point at the edge of the property. Residents will need to wheel their bins to this point on collection day. The area must be large enough to place at least 1 bin and 1 caddy - the service is alternate weekly recycling/rubbish, weekly food waste, and fortnightly garden waste.
9. The bin collection point will need to conform to BS 5906:2005 Waste Management in Buildings Code of Practice, in respect to the maximum pull distances for bins for the crews. This being no more than 15m for up to 360 litre sized bins from where the vehicle can stop.
10. The pathway between the bin storage area and the bin collection point should be rendered with a smooth continuous finish (a cobbled surface or gravel is unsuitable for any type of wheeled container).
11. The pathway between the property and the road should also be rendered with a smooth continuous finish. This is in case the property requires an assisted collection.
12. The bins will need to be purchased from The Council in advance of the property becoming occupied.
13. The recommendation is made in light of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). It is considered that in respect of the assessment of this application significant weight has been given to policies within the Council's Core Strategy 2008 and the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014 in accordance with paragraphs 214 and 215 of the NPPF. Due regard as a material consideration has been given to the NPPF and PPG in reaching this recommendation.
14. The development has been assessed against Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 – Policies CSP1, CSP2, CSP3, CSP11, CSP12, CSP14, CSP17, CSP18, CSP21 Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014 – Policies DP1, DP5, DP7, DP10, DP13, DP19, The Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan Policies TNP02G, TNP03A, TNP04A, TNP08A, TNP08B and material considerations. It has been concluded that the development, subject to the conditions imposed, would accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to justify a refusal of permission.