

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

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 5 September 2024 at 7:30pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Blackwell (Chair), Sue Farr (Vice-Chair), Bassett, Black, Chotai, Chris Farr, Gray, Lockwood, Prew, Steeds and Duggan (Substitute) (In place of Sherry)

PRESENT (Virtually): Councillors

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Allen and Crane

ALSO PRESENT (Virtually): Councillors Windsor

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillors Sherry

93. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Chris Farr declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 4.2 (minute number 23) as he was a Godstone Ward District Councillor.

94. MINUTES FROM THE MEETING HELD ON THE 6TH JUNE 2024

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

95. 2024/393 - LOCHIEL, RICKETTS HILL ROAD, TATSFIELD, WESTERHAM, SURREY, TN16 2NB

The committee considered an application for the demolition of a detached 3-bedroom bungalow and the erection of a new dwelling.

The officer recommendation was to permit subject to conditions.

Councillor Jason Syrett of Tatsfield Parish Council spoke

Mr Des Harriot-Gayle, the applicant, spoke in favour of the application.

Following the debate, Councillor Lockwood proposed the following motions for refusal:

- 1. The proposed development would result in a dwelling materially larger than the dwelling it would replace and therefore constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt which, by definition, would be harmful to the Green Belt. No very special circumstances exist to clearly outweigh the harm that would be caused by reason of inappropriateness and the other identified harm. As such, the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the NPPF (December 2023) and to Policies DP10 and DP13 of the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014.*
- 2. The proposal, by reason of the design, bulk, form and massing would cause harm to the character and appearance of the site and area. As such, the proposal is contrary to Tandridge District Core Strategy Policy CSP18, Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan:*

Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014, the NPPF (December 2023) and the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan 2024 (TNP04A).

3. *The significantly larger dwelling is located on a site in an unsustainable location, without suitable access to public transport, services or local amenities. The proposal would also fail to provide sufficient on-site parking. This is contrary to the aims of the NPPF (December 2023), Policy CSP1 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy and the Tandridge Parking Standards 2012 (SPD).*
4. *The application has failed to demonstrate that the development would achieve a 10% (minimum) reduction in CO2 emissions through the incorporation of renewable energy technologies, contrary to Policy CSP14 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) and Policy TNP08B of the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan.*

The motions were seconded by Councillor Chotai. The motions were voted on by the committee individually. Motions 1 and 2 were lost. Following the failure of the first two votes, motions 3 and 4 were withdrawn by Councillor Lockwood.

RESOLVED – that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.

96. 2023/486 - RESERVOIR, NORTH PARK LANE, GODSTONE, SURREY, RH9 8ND

The committee considered an application for the variation of conditions for the use of the Reservoir, North Park Lane, Godstone, Surrey, RH9 8ND. The conditions to be considered for variation were condition 3 (use of site) and condition 8 (operating hours) of planning permission reference 2016/558.

The officer recommendation was to permit, subject to conditions.

Ms Anne Appleyard, an objector, spoke against the application.

Mr Tom Baker, the applicant, spoke in favour of the application.

During the course of the debate, Councillor Chris Farr proposed that the committee may benefit from a site visit to view the site from the adjoining land to observe the impact on neighbouring properties. Councillor Duggan seconded the proposal. Upon being put to the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED – that the application be deferred for a site visit.

97. CONFIRMATION OF DECISION TAKEN UNDER URGENCY POWERS – PLANNING ENFORCEMENT ACTION

The press and public were excluded from this item in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) on the grounds that:

- i) it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act; and

- ii) the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

The Head of Legal presented a report to the committee to confirm a decision taken under urgency powers in respect of planning enforcement action within the district.

R E S O L V E D – that the decision taken under urgency powers in accordance with Standing Order 35 of the Constitution be ratified.

Rising 9.02 pm