

MINUTES of an Extraordinary Meeting of Tatsfield Parish Council held on the 16th July 2018 in the Meeting Room, Aileen McHugo Building, Westmore Green, Tatsfield commencing at 8.00 p.m.

Present: Mrs Nichola Stokoe (in the chair)
Mr Ian Mitchell Mrs Helena Garcia-MacLeod Mrs Althea Davies Mrs Kim Jennings Mr Mike Sarll

In Attendance: Samantha Head (Clerk)

And 2 parishioners.

The meeting commenced at 8.02pm

1. Apologies

None

2. Declarations of Interest* (relating to items on the agenda)

None

3. Approve and sign the MINUTES of the previous meeting held on 9th July 2018

1684/0718 It was resolved that the minutes reflected a true and accurate record of the meeting held on 9th July 2018. They were duly signed by the Chair.

4. Public Participation – a period of up to, but no longer than 15 minutes, to hear questions or statements from members of the public. Individuals are allowed to speak for a maximum of 3 minutes. No further participation by members of the public is permitted at any other time during the meeting.

None

5. Planning

a) Tandridge District Council – Draft Local Plan

The Chairman proposed that Ian Mitchell lead the discussion as he had been in the Chair at the meeting on 9th July which led to this extraordinary meeting being called.

Ian Mitchell began by stating that the trigger for this meeting was the TDC Planning Policy Committee meeting on 3rd July 2018 (which was viewable on the Internet). District Councillor Martin Allen said at that meeting "...I am disappointed with the Local Plan because I haven't been able to persuade the officers to let us build some houses in Tatsfield, so I will continue to pursue that ..."

This was raised at the last Parish Council meeting (9th July) when it became clear that the Parish Council was out of step with Cllr Allen's views. Neither the Parish Council, the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group nor the Neighbourhood Plan Housing Topic Group had reached a settlement on what was required regarding housing in Tatsfield. There is a deadline for 5pm on 17th July 2018 for District Councillors to put forward comments on the Draft Local Plan. Cllr Allen has drawn up what he wishes to say.

The Parish Council Chairman, Nichola Stokoe, has also met with Cllr Allen on 14th July and talked through all the points that he had made. Cllr Allen had taken all the Parish Council's points on board and felt that both he and the Parish Council were coming to the same conclusion, albeit from different angles. What did transpire is that Cllr Allen does not understand why the Parish Council has instigated a neighbourhood plan if it is so 'anti-housing'. Nichola Stokoe had explained that the Parish Council is not necessarily anti-housing but simply unable to reach a conclusion regarding housing needs until further information becomes available.

Cllr Allen's representation that "the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan has repeatedly asked of the officers to allow for the possibility that the Green Belt/Defined Village Boundary be moved to allow for a commensurate number of houses as allowed by the Very Special Circumstances and exceptional circumstances clauses", was countered by Nichola Stokoe as this was not the case. For any such representation to be made, the proposal would need to be voted on by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (which would require at least 50%

approval in order to be referred up to the Parish Council), in turn this would then need to be voted on by the Parish Council before being presented to TDC for consideration.

Nichola Stokoe also clarified that Cllr Allen has no more say than any other member of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.

It was also worth noting that the Green Belt boundary can be changed in a review rather than through the Local Plan. Cllr Allen had noted this.

Cllr Allen conceded, at the conclusion of the informal meeting with the Parish Council Chairman, that he would need to temper down his statement as it is factually incorrect.

Cllr Allen, however, wanted it noted that if further evidence came to light a Green Belt boundary review would be considered.

Mike Sarll questioned why Cllr Allen felt this strongly that the Green Belt boundary needed to be changed. Was it because a) at present only affordable housing can be built, b) he wishes to avoid another Westmore Road scenario – demolition of a bungalow and erection of three terraced houses, c) he has formed these views after speaking to other Neighbourhood Plan steering Group members / parishioners, d) this has come from a misunderstanding due to wearing his District Councillor hat v his NP Chairman hat?

Ian Mitchell stated that following what Cllr Allen has said, conclusions could be drawn that it is partly due to the restrictions which allow for affordable housing but not for private development - "there is no doubt a need for these types of houses but some members of the NP Steering Group believe, as do Surrey Community Action and AECOM that there is a need for a wider range of houses for the village to keep it vibrant thriving economically successful and a Parish where the future generations can remain rather than having to move out. The initial views of the public at the NP public presentation favour the building of houses obviously with certain restrictions". This is with reference to the Post-It note comment gathering exercise undertaken at the two public consultations held in the Village Hall in April and the comments received at the stall part- manned by NP representatives at the recent Scout Fete at the beginning of July.

Althea Davies asked if Cllr Allen would be happy to modify his comments.

Nichola Stokoe said that there were two options: either to reach a compromise regarding a statement from Cllr Allen or if Cllr Allen is going to submit his statement then the Parish Council should consider submitting Ian Mitchell's suggested response.

When a question was asked what exactly the NP could propose, Ian Mitchell confirmed that a Neighbourhood Plan must not do less than what is set down in a Local Plan, which in turn must not do less than what is set down by Government. The NP goes to the inspector to check that all is in order and this is then put forward in a local referendum.

Mike Sarll said it was not clear if there is a need for additional housing. If it proved this was the case, would the whole village boundary be redefined or just a small section? Ian Mitchell said this would be something which was in the control of the NP Steering Group to suggest / recommend and for the Parish Council to agree and act on.

It should be noted, however, that TDC has said that there is no intention to move the defined village boundary and no intention to impose more housing on Tatsfield. If a change is made now to the defined village boundary, the Parish Council would have no control over where this might move as there is currently no adopted NP in place for the parish. Similarly, if a need for housing was established, the NP Housing topic group could define a need for the different types of housing needed. It should be noted that there will be strong views on this issue from parishioners, potentially from those with large back gardens inside the current defined village boundary, but this is unknown until a call for sites is issued.

Ian Mitchell concluded that essentially Cllr Allen is jumping the gun with his proposed statement. It may transpire that, at the end of the process, there is a need for a large number of houses and a change of the defined village boundary but this is, at present, unknown. As per the Parish Council's draft submission re Tatsfield housing needs point 3: 'A clear local need for five shared ownership and nine affordable rent homes in Tatsfield was established in the report of the 2016 Housing needs Survey commissioned by the parish council from Surrey Community Action' – shows that an affordable housing need has been established but this is not the case for general housing need.

In point 6 of the Parish Council's draft submission re Tatsfield housing needs: 'As part of our Neighbourhood Plan process, a Housing Needs Assessment was commissioned from AECOM – a desktop exercise which concluded that:

'Following the presentation and comparison of the quantitative projections, an objectively assessed housing target of 167 dwellings be built over the Plan period was derived.'

The AECOM survey has not taken into account any subsidiary information e.g. infrastructure. The figures are largely based on census and predictions of births and deaths.

At a meeting at TDC with representatives from the NP Steering Groups (Martin Allen, Nichola Stokoe, Jon Allbutt and Hugh Corrance), the AECOM report was mentioned. The TDC officers said it should be used as a guide. Similarly, at the Housing Group meeting on 12th July 2018, James Garside said it was too soon to make proposals to TDC.

It was agreed that the Housing Needs Survey, when returned, will provide local evidence as it will give all parishioners a chance to express their views.

Nichola Stokoe had analysed the comments made during the Affordable Housing Needs Survey from 2016 and extracted matching comments to Cllr Allen's Post-It note exercise.

1685/0718 Althea Davies agreed to analyse the Post-It notes to see if any further information needed to be highlighted and circulate to members by Tuesday morning.

1686/0718 It was resolved to submit the following to Cllr Allen, with open copies to Sarah Thompson, Nicola Walters and Emma Saines at TDC:

Dear Martin

At the meeting of Tandridge District Council's Planning Policy Committee on Tuesday, 3rd July 2018, you said:

"... I am disappointed with the Local Plan because I haven't been able to persuade the officers to let us build some houses in Tatsfield, so I will continue to pursue that ..."

Following the Parish Council meeting of 9th July 2018 and the informal meeting you had with the Parish Council Chairman on 14th July 2018, we understand you are making a further representation to the TDC Planning Policy Committee concerning Tatsfield and Titsey Ward.

Tatsfield Parish Council held an extraordinary meeting on Monday, 16th July 2018. At the meeting, we set out our position as follows:

Defined Village Boundary

1. We wish to make it clear that the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan process has yet to reach the stage of making any formal recommendations or requests for the Defined Village boundary to be changed. The topic has been raised by individual participants, but no settled view has been established.
2. The terms of reference clearly state any proposals need to go to a vote in which a majority is needed to carry a proposal. That proposal is then sent to the parish council to discuss and decide. None of that process has taken place.

Need for Affordable Housing

3. A clear local need for five shared ownership and nine affordable rent homes in Tatsfield was established in the report of the 2016 Housing Needs Survey commissioned by the parish council from Surrey Community Action.
4. As a result of this mandate, we are exploring how to meet this need by searching for a 'rural exception site'.

General Housing Need

5. A matching need for general housing development in Tatsfield has not yet been established.

- 6. As part of our Neighbourhood Plan process, a Housing Needs Assessment was commissioned from AECOM – a desktop exercise which concluded that:

‘Following the presentation and comparison of the quantitative projections, an objectively assessed housing target of 167 dwellings to be built over the Plan period was derived’.

- 7. AECOM's figure is the result of looking at estimates ranging from a target of 31 (TDC Core Strategy) to 199 (MHCLG). AECOM says 61 would be the figure if it were taken proportionately from a district-wide requirement for 2006-2026, although it appears that 30 of these dwellings have already been built.
- 8. It is therefore premature to use the AECOM projection of 167. We need locally derived evidence for a figure.
- 9. That will come from the report of the Neighbourhood Plan’s 12-question Housing Needs Survey which is due to be distributed shortly to every household in Tatsfield by the Neighbourhood Plan Housing Group.
- 10. Only then will we have the evidence required to demonstrate what need there is from within Tatsfield for further housing during the Tandridge Local Plan period.
- 11. Should that evidence indicate that the need could not be met from within the boundary of the Defined Village, we understand that the National Planning Policy Framework allows for such boundaries to be moved in subsequent reviews of the Local Plan.

For and Against new development – comments summarised from the report of the Surrey Community Action Housing Needs Survey 2016

740 surveys distributed and 222 were returned

30% return rate (10-35% usual response rate so this is considered a good response)

For	Against
To allow development only in the village centre is ridiculous. An allowance of sympathetic building away from the centre should also be appropriate to meet current housing needs.	No further development on the greenbelt. The school was a con the land was supposed to be returned to greenbelt but now housing and nursery.
Many people want to downsize to a retirement property with communal gardens within walking distance of the village	Tatsfield has very poor facilities any further strain would be unacceptable.
New homes should be affordable.	Green belt land should not be built on.
A small safe development to downsize would be appreciated.	Tatsfield charm is the fact it is a village. Too much building/development will turn into suburbia
Small bungalows for the over 55s with no possibility to extend	Plenty of large plots in the village which could accommodate 2 or 3 houses rather than one large house.

Village needs affordable properties for those brought up in the village.	Already had 2 new developments in the last few years any more would take away the rural village atmosphere.
Small houses for older residents to downsize	Biggin Hill is very close if people needs properties.
No more mansions – starter homes or shared ownership.	We will lose the atmosphere. We do not want to become overdeveloped, too large and crowded.
Good quality houses is a must for any community	Each new development will just become a large development – part of the sprawling concrete jungle.
A lack of big houses in Tatsfield.	We do not need more housing in Tatsfield
Shortage of small detached bungalows near village centre	No further expansion of the village or development on green belt.
Village children need affordable homes	No new developments would be good for Tatsfield.
No affordable homes locally	We moved to Tatsfield as it was rural and peaceful and would rather it didn't becomes more populated and built up.
Bungalows for older people	To prevent small properties being extended make Tatsfield all green belt not a village in the green belt.
	No more houses we have enough already
	Any more houses will spoil the feel or the village.
	Do not build on the green belt. Soon it will disappear and green fields and wildlife a thing of the past.
	There has already been sufficient development in Tatsfield.
	Green belt should be maintained.

No more house building in Tatsfield to take one down and building 4/5 in place is madness.

Village does not have facilities for more houses

More houses would put too much pressure on school and would spoil character of village.

There should be no more housing developments built in Tatsfield.

The rural setting of the village has already been spoiled due to housing estates.

Overbuilding is unacceptable.

I would hate to see Tatsfield become built up and to lose its village charm.

If we continue building in Tatsfield we will become an extension to the London Borough of Bromley. That is not why we moved here.

Too many single residence plots having numerous houses squeezed on. Tatsfield will lose its charm if this is to continue.

I moved to Tatsfield because it is a small village. Any housing will spoil the village.

Rural village which should be kept from sprawling. New homes should be in the centre.

Too many developments cramming multiple homes on sites. Becoming a dormitory village.

Please do not build any more houses. Its too overcrowded and losing its village appeal.

Village is losing its character. Too many developments. It must stop. We do not want any more.

In danger of losing community spirit and village status by overdevelopment.

Too much greedy infilling.

The meeting closed at 8.42 pm