

ITEM X

Application: 2022/1415

Location: 10 Westerham Road, Oxted, Surrey, RH8 0ER

Proposal: Lowering of bank to front of the dwelling and formation of single parking space with retaining wall (retrospective)

Ward: Limpsfield

Constraints: Ancient Woodland, Biggin Hill Safeguarding, SPZ3, TPO10, Urban, Wooded Hillside

RECOMMENDATION: Grant Planning Permission

1. This application is reported to Committee following a call-in request from Cllr Blackwell.

Summary

2. Planning permission is sought for the lowering of the bank at the front of the dwelling and the formation of a single parking space with a retaining wall. Given that the works have largely been completed, the proposal is made retrospectively.
3. The site is also subject to a concurrent Appeal as submitted against the Council's decision to refuse permission for the erection of a dwelling in the rear garden under TA/2021/2067.
4. The current application follows on from the previous application TA/2021/2103 and seeks to overcome the previous reasons for refusal in respect of the design and external materials and the landscaping scheme which officers consider would assist in lessening the impact on the amenities and privacy of adjoining neighbours otherwise impacted by headlight glare.
5. It is considered that the amendments to the design of the development, including changes to the materials, plus a landscaping scheme would help to protect the amenities of adjoining neighbours and would lessen the impact on the character of the area and to neighbouring property amenities. There are no objections raised on any other ground, accordingly approval of planning permission is recommended.

Site Description

6. The site consists of two storey detached dwelling set within a generous plot, located on the south side of the A25 Westerham Road in the urban area of Oxted and in the parish of Limpsfield. The plot is set in a steep rising incline with land levels increasing from the front of the site at the north to the rear of the site at the south. Currently the rear of the plot has a fence erected subdividing the site. However, at the terminus of the shared drive is a single garage serving the subject dwelling – No 10 Westerham Road.
7. Access to the site is via a shared private drive which serves the site and a number of other dwellings. A further private drive runs behind a retaining wall and is parallel with the A25 facilitating access to the front of the site and the adjoining neighbouring property No 8.



Figure 1 site location plan

8. The subject car parking space is located within the parallel private driveway and is set forward of the front of the dwelling. The surrounding area is residential.

Relevant History

9. 2021/2103 - Retrospective permission for works to Lower bank to front of house to form parking space with retaining wall. Amended plan submitted 16.08.22 showing brick set base + Aco strip Drain. Refused 02.09.22.
10. TA/2021/2067 -Erection of a single detached three-bedroom house. Additional 'Highways evidence' from i- Transport submitted 05.07.22. refused.28.09.22 Appeal submitted.
11. 2021/1625 - Erection of a single detached three-bedroom house. Withdrawn 27.10.21
12. 99/535 - Demolition of existing single storey extension. erection of detached garage. Approved 21.07.99
13. PDE/94/183 –Further information requested regarding previous additions. likely not to require pp further info sent 9/12/94. confirmed pp not required

Proposal and Key Issues

14. The site is in a Category 1 settlement, Policy CSP1 states that in the built up areas where the majority of new development will take place and development will take place on previously developed land, it also affirms that within the built up areas it will be important to ensure that new development is of a high standard of design and that the character of the areas is protected.
15. The key issues for this application are whether the current proposal overcomes the previous reasons for refusal and if the development is acceptable with regards to character and appearance of the area, residential amenities and highway safety.
16. Planning permission is sought for a car parking space. Given that the works have largely been completed, the application is made retrospectively.

17. The earth and part of the site frontage have been excavated and due to the rising incline towards the rear of the site, a retaining wall has been positioned to prevent the earth slipping. Officers visited the site again and can confirm that the retaining wall has a single skin breeze block construction; the surface is tarmac. The submitted plan shows that the tarmac surface would be replaced with a permeable paving surface, which is necessary as the area exceeds 5m² - is circa 23.5m². The permeable surface and Aco strip drains would allow surface water to drain naturally. The plan also shows a retaining wall of less than a metre in height 0.9m which extends the width and depth of the trapezoid area of hard surface, the proposed surface includes brick sets and 2 x Aco style strip drains either side of the entrance/exit point. The parking space has a depth of 3.9m, a width of 5.2m nearest the dwelling and a maximum width of 7.7m for the entrance/exit. In support of the proposal a swept path analysis was also submitted to demonstrate the turning within the site to enable exit in forward gear.
18. A planting scheme and visual representation has been submitted following Officer comments. This shows a mix of climbing plants, tall evergreen shrubs, evergreen hedges and evergreen grasses.

Development Plan Policy

- Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 – Policies CSP1 and CSP18
- Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014 – Policies DP1, DP5, DP7, DP8
- Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan 2016 – not applicable
- Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan 2019 – Policies LNP4, LNP14.
- Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan 2021 – not applicable
- Emerging Tandridge Local Plan 2033 – Policies TLP18, TLP37 and TLP50

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

- Tandridge Parking Standards SPD (2012)
- Surrey Design Guide (2002)

National Advice

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- National Design Guide (2019)

Statutory Consultation Responses

County Highway Authority

19. The County Highway Authority has undertaken an assessment in terms of the likely net additional traffic generation, access arrangements and parking provision and are satisfied that the application would not have a material impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining public highway. The County Highway Authority therefore has no highway requirements.

20. Note to Case Officer – A vehicle is likely to undertake a number of manoeuvres to enter/exit the parking space however these will take place on private land and will not have any impact on the public highway.
21. Additional comments – It is noted that this application was previously refused and that additional information has now been provided by the applicant, relating to planting.
22. In our original response Officers noted that the development would not have an adverse impact upon the A25. The additional information/submission does not alter that position.
23. It is acknowledged that access to the parking space is compromised and that ease of access and egress to it may be difficult for some larger cars. However whilst this may sometimes result in a need for careful manoeuvring it does not impinge upon the free flow or safety of traffic on the A25. As a result our previous response of 'no objections' remains.

Limspfield Parish Council

24. On review of this application, as per our comments for the previous application (2021/2103) for the same/similar retrospective works, we do not feel the space created is sufficient and in an awkward position and agree the concerns registered by Surrey County Council.

Other Representations

Third Party Comments

25. Design, character:

- Brick slips on wall are veneers stuck on breeze block and will remain visible.
- Space is narrow between house and back wall.
- Quality of build – no foundation or vertical strengthening/steels. Single skin wall laid onto aggregate would slip on to drive.
- Adding planting will result in roots going under wall and it collapsing due to shrub roots pushing onto wall causing movement and cracking.
- Landscaping – unsuitable clematis is climbing deciduous and Jasminum is a climber so not appropriate as trailing plants are climbers and will not screen the wall.
- Hebe won't hedge and will take 5 years to grow and require more width swamping any other plants.
- Plants not in keeping with existing planting creating unmanageable mess. Visual representation shows delphinium and none of plants in scheme.
- Visual representation is full of errors and therefore not true.
- Permeable paving + Aco drains not yet added despite previous application drawing stating this.
- Excavations to form this space go below the foundations of the dwelling adding concern.
- Removal of garden frontage has had negative impact on the look of No 10 therefore request garden is reinstated.
- Far too small a space for modern car, even more so with greenery hanging over edges.

26. Safety:

- The parking space cannot be accessed and exited in a forward gear without encroaching on to the drive of No 8. Therefore, parking and turning will result in reversing out making it dangerous with risk of collision from anyone entering the drive from Westerham Road as the access road is on a blind bend. The swept path submitted with the previous refused scheme shows that reversing for 20m then performance a contorted multi point turn that would bring the driver into the path of oncoming vehicles and damaging the wall. The current submission has not changed the parking and turning, and the planting scheme will not improve this.
- Damage to wall, curb and green verge of No 14 – **Officer response: this is a civil matter and sits outside of the red line of the site – however, the concern about manoeuvrability is noted and considered in the Assessment under Highway Safety Issues.**
- Access to site is narrow + wall damage already evident.

27. Drainage:

- Aco drains not acceptable as they drain to soil.

28. Impact on neighbours:

- Light pollution from headlights at night in awkward manoeuvring, landscaping will not change this

29. Other matters:

- Cynical attempt by the developer to make significant changes in order to make the application for the dwelling at the back acceptable.
- No good reason for retrospective application, developer and applicant fully aware permission was needed to excavate land.
- Previous reasons for refusal not overcome – size awkwardness lack of front garden, prominence and biodiversity impact remain.
- Surprised to see planning scheme for refused parking space, more so as other criteria have not changed. Developer circumventing planning rules.
- No objection to amendment – planting scheme No 25016027, however retain concern as the swept path of entry entails reversing at base of Broom Hill junction. This road is used by 8-10 residents plus guests tradespeople, postal workers.
- Location plan - Applicant has submitted site location pan117/0004/100/A from refused scheme 2021/2067 with misleading information including parking spaces to the east of 10 is in different ownership or part of access and that no additional garage to the south at the top exists. **Officer response: this plan was superseded.**
- Applicant's Planning statement states 2021/2067 is under consideration this is not true it was refused on the 28th September 2022 prior to submission of the proposal.

Assessment

Procedural note

30. The Tandridge District Core Strategy and Detailed Local Plan Policies predate the NPPF as published in 2021. However, paragraph 219 of the NPPF (Annex 1) sets out that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply

because they were adopted prior to the publication of the Framework document. Instead, due weight should be given to them in accordance to the degree of consistency with the current Framework.

Location of Development

31. The site is within a category 1 settlement in the urban area of Limpsfield. Inter alia Policy CSP1 states 'within the built up areas it will be important to ensure that new development is of a high standard of design and that the character of the areas is protected'. This will be assessed below, subject to the proposal being acceptable in those respects, no objection to the principle of the development.

Character and Appearance

32. The NPPF states that that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, indivisible from good planning and should contribute positively to making places better for people. It also goes on to say that permission should be refused for development of poor quality which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.
33. 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. It goes on to say that 'the Council will protect the wooded hillsides in the built- up areas by ensuring that new development does not adversely affect the character of these areas and that there is no overall loss of tree cover'.
34. 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.
35. Limpsfield NP Policy LNP4 has the same sets out to achieve high quality design and well-designed proposals. This section of Limpsfield parish is set adjacent to the wooded hillside and as such dwellings are dotted amongst the treed backdrop, the house styles in the locality are largely traditional in form and use a muted palette of materials. Thus the built form blends with the semi-rural surroundings and does not appear prominent.
36. In the immediate locality the properties adjacent to the site are set back from the highway with vehicular access on to private drive which then leads to the A25.
37. The subject dwelling is a detached post-war two storey dwelling, prior to the works having been carried out it had an attractive grass verge, soft landscaping in the form of low shrubs, a lawned frontage and stepped pedestrian access to the front door entrance. As is the current situation, vehicular access and discreet parking for two vehicles is to the side of the dwelling at the east flank elevation whilst at the rear of the dwelling is an established lawn with border planting and large trees, the upper level of the rear garden though currently segregated by a 2m close boarded fence, is approximately 4m higher than the rear of the dwelling. At the top of the shared drive is a single detached garage.
38. The current appearance of the front elevation of the property and car parking space shows a significant change from its original appearance, with the loss of

the soft landscaping. The breeze block wall and capping and tarmac surface does not readily blend with the attractive landscaped frontage which was previously in place.

39. With the previous application summary it was stated 'The stark appearance of the breeze block walls appear commercial and incomplete with a rough finish are considered to appear out of place in this location and to jar with this pleasant residential enclave. No details have been supplied that the 0.9m breeze block walls and flat capping is to be rendered nor has a landscaping scheme been submitted.' At the time of drafting that report, no details have been supplied that the 0.90m breeze block wall was to be rendered nor had a landscaping scheme been submitted'. Therefore, this weighed against the proposal and formed a reason for refusal based on harm to character.
40. The subject proposal seeks to overcome this and a landscape scheme has been submitted, with materials for the wall and for the base. Consequently, although the excavation would remain, the harsh breeze blocks will not be visible and would instead have brick sets over. The tarmac surface would be replaced with paved surface and Aco strip drains will be added. Set against the brick sets which would reflect the palette of materials on the dwelling, the landscaping would be placed behind and around the perimeter of the wall. The effect of this would be to soften the appearance of the car parking space; in this respect a 'visual representation' has been submitted to indicate planting and to provide officers with a fuller comprehension of the scheme as proposed.
41. It is considered that the landscaping scheme would enable the car parking space to assimilate with the verdant surroundings and, in time to blend with the character of the dwelling and the verdant character of the area.
42. For the above reasons the proposal would not have a significant impact in terms of character and appearance and would comply with the provisions of Core Strategy Policy CSP18, Local Plan Policy DP7 and Policy LNP4 of the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan 2019.

Residential amenities

43. The pre-amble to Tandridge Local Plan Policy DP7 states 'the Council will always seek to safeguard existing and secure good standards of new amenity for all current and future occupants of land and buildings. This is achieved through the application of policy criteria relating to amenity, privacy and the provision of appropriate facilities. It goes on to say that 'whilst it should be understood that the planning system does not exist as a means of protecting the private interests of an individual against the activities of another, the Council regards the application of the principles of equity and good neighbourliness as generally appropriate in considering the acceptability of a development proposal'
44. Tandridge Local Plan Policy DP7 advises that 'permission will be granted where the following matters are effectively addressed.. Criterion 6 states ' the proposal does not significantly harm the amenity of neighbouring properties by reason of pollution (noise air of light), traffic, or other general disturbance'.
45. The nearest identified neighbours to the site are No's 14, 12 and 10a to the east, to the rear/south is Brackenwood Brassey Road, to the immediate west is No 8 Westerham Road, opposite to the north are No's 17-23 Westerham Road.

46. Numerous third party and neighbour comments have been submitted regarding the retrospective works. These include the awkward manoeuvring within the drive to allow a safe entrance and exit in forward gear and the damage to the retaining wall from various vehicles, including builders vehicles serving No 10. Other concerns raised included comments regarding substandard design of the car parking space and the surface water flowing from the garden and tarmacadam surface on to the driveway, vehicle noise and headlights glare.
47. Impact on No 14 – from the outlook of this neighbouring property there is the oblique view of the excavated car parking space from first floor windows and from entering the shared drive. Also, from this neighbouring property there would be a view of the additional car movements as they enter and exit the drive.
48. Impact on No 12 – from the outlook of this neighbouring property there would be a partial oblique view of the car parking bay, also the additional traffic movements from users of the parking space. However, on further review officers are of the view that the development would not result in a significant impact as to warrant a reason for refusal on privacy and amenity grounds.
49. Impact on 10a – from the outlook of this neighbouring property there would be a view of the car parking space as excavated upon entry to the driveway, however, due to the orientation and separation distance it is not considered that the amenities or privacy of this neighbour would be significantly impacted.
50. Impact on Brackenwood – as with No 10a, although the car parking space would be visible from entering the shared drive, due to the position of this neighbour and the separation distance it is not considered that the amenity and privacy of this adjoining neighbour would be significantly affected.
51. Impact on No 8 – from the outlook of this adjoining neighbour and due to its forward position currently there is a view of the car parking space as excavated, although it has been noted that a close boarded fence delineates the two property boundaries. This close boarded fence serves to screen part of the view of the car parking space and to protect the neighbouring amenity.
52. The comments of the neighbour regarding being blocked in by builder vehicles and users of the car parking space and noise and disruption are noted, however the access drive is shared by both neighbours. Moreover, the builder vehicles were on site during the renovation work to No 10 which, at the last site visit appeared to have been completed.
53. Regarding light and disruption it is considered that the planting/landscaping scheme which includes climbing plants, some of which are tall are considered to lessen the impact of headlight glare and shield oblique views of the parking space from this neighbour. The planting/landscaping would be controlled by the imposition of a condition to ensure that it would be maintained for 5 years.
54. Impact on 17- 23 Westerham Road – from the outlook of these adjoining neighbours the car parking space is not visible as it is located behind the boundary wall and hedges; as such it is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the amenity or privacy to these neighbours.
55. However, on balance officers consider that although the profile and location of the car parking space has not been altered that the use of the car parking space as for one domestic vehicle would not result in a significant level of harm on neighbouring amenities to justify a reason for refusal. Although it is accepted that

there would be increased traffic and light from the use of the car parking space, that these matters have been addressed as far as is practicable with the improvement to the design of the car parking space and that the development does not significantly harm the amenity of neighbouring properties by reason of pollution (noise air of light), traffic, or other general disturbance' and thereby accords with the provisions of DP7 as detailed above.

56. With conditions imposed the development as proposed is considered acceptable in terms of impact on the residential amenities and privacy. Therefore, no objection is raised in respect of the provisions of Core Strategy Policy CSP18, Local Plan Policy DP7 and Policy LNP3 of the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan 2019.

Highway safety issues

57. The NPPF paragraph 111 states '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'.
58. Core Strategy Policy CSP12 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.
59. As noted above, the excavation and construction of the breeze block wall and tarmac surface – to be replaced has been completed. The plans show that a paved parking surface is to replace the tarmac surface and two Aco strip drains would be placed along the frontage. The landscaping scheme shows the mix of planting which would serve as a backdrop to the parking space as created. Given the nature of the proposal the views of Surrey County Highway Authority were sought. The response provided was that the development as located on private land was outside of the jurisdiction of the CHA.
60. The note to the case officer affirmed 'A vehicle is likely to undertake a number of manoeuvres to enter/exit the parking space. However, these will take place on private land and will not have an impact on the public highway'.
61. Comments have been received by neighbours and other third parties, also the Parish Council regarding concerns in respect of the development impacting on highway safety due to the narrowness of the drive and small space therefore requiring either multiple manoeuvres or reversing or using land outside of the site in order to exit in a forward gear.
62. The latest comments received on the 18th May affirm the following:
- 'We acknowledge that access to the parking space is compromised and that ease of access and egress to it may be difficult for larger cars. However, whilst this may sometimes result in a need for careful manoeuvring it does not impinge upon the free flow or safety of traffic on the A25. As a result, our previous response of 'no objections' remains.'*
63. The swept path analysis submitted with the previously refused scheme was reviewed by the County Highways Authority (CHA). The application details and

primarily the turning overlay suggested that the applicant had demonstrated that the necessary manoeuvre can be performed together with appropriate mirrors. Whilst the manoeuvre might not be ideal, it would not impact upon the A25, and thus the CHA have not objected on this basis.

64. Therefore, although the neighbour comments and Parish Council comments are noted, the CHA have not raised objections to the development as shown on the plans. The swept path analysis as submitted with the refused scheme TA/2021/2103 has been deemed to establish that although awkward the parking, turning and exiting in forward gear would be possible. The CHA had further noted that the manoeuvring site is on private land and therefore not in their jurisdiction.
65. In respect of public highway safety and as per the NPPF the proposal 'would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network' and although the damage to the wall is noted and the manoeuvring difficult, as the CHA Officer has noted this is on private land and therefore a highway safety reason for refusal could not be substantiated.

Conclusion

66. The design of the development is considered to respect the character and appearance of the site and area and would not result in significant harm to neighbouring property amenities. Although the parking space is awkwardly profiled and not ideally located, it is the view of officers that the landscaping scheme improves the aesthetic appearance of the scheme and enables it to assimilate with the verdant surroundings and established gardens.
67. In respect of highway safety notwithstanding the comments received, the site is on private land and the manoeuvres to achieve exiting in a forward gear have been demonstrated. Therefore, although it is accepted the parking space is not ideal, no objections have been received from the County Highway department in regard to Highway Safety impact and to such a degree that an objection is raised. No other objections are raised on any other ground and it is therefore recommended that planning permission be approved.
68. 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 the NPPF 2021 and the Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan 2019. Due regard as a material consideration has been given to the NPPF and PPG in reaching this recommendation.
69. All other material considerations, including third party comments, have been considered but none are considered sufficient to change the recommendation.

Other Matters

70. There is a requirement for the Council to show that it has complied with the statutory duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination and advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The protected characteristics are: age; disability; gender reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief;

sex and sexual orientation. There is no overt reason why the proposed development would prejudice anyone with the protected characteristics as described above.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMIT subject to the following conditions

Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall start 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 drawing numbered PLAN 117/005/P/100B dated Oct 2022 including the block plan and red-edged site location plan received on 26th October 2022, Driveway planting scheme rev A received on the 15th March 2023. 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. Notwithstanding the details as submitted, no further development shall start until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include:

- proposed finished levels or contours
- means of enclosure
- car parking layouts
- other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas
- hard surfacing materials
- minor artefacts and structures (eg. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc.).
- tree planting as mitigation for trees removed prior to planning permission being sought

Details of soft landscape works shall include 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 Local Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local 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 and Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014.

4. Notwithstanding the details submitted, no further development shall start until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the walls, paved surface and Aco strip drains 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, so as to enhance the development [and to ensure that the new works harmonise with the existing building and are appropriate to the character of the area 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.

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.

The development has been assessed against Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 Policies CSP1, CSP18, Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2: Detailed Policies – Policies DP1, DP7, DP10, DP12, Limpsfield NDP LNP 3 and 4 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.

The Local Planning Authority has acted in a positive and creative way in determining this application, as required by the NPPF (2021), and has assessed the proposal against all material considerations including the presumption in favour of sustainable development and that which improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area, planning policies and guidance and representations received.