

MINUTES of an Extraordinary Meeting of Tatsfield Parish Council held on the 27th April 2020 in the Meeting Room, Aileen McHugo Building, Westmore Green, Tatsfield commencing at 8.00 p.m.

Present: Ms Kim Jennings (in the chair)
Mr Jason Syrett Ms Alex Davies Mr Ian Hayman Mr Ashley Clifton Mr Stephen Mittins
Mr David Pinchin (joined at 9.04pm, left at 9.25pm)

In Attendance: Samantha Head (Clerk)
Cllr Martin Allen

And 4 parishioners.

The meeting commenced at 8.30pm

Before formally starting the meeting, Kim Jennings noted the historic importance of this being the first virtual Parish Council meeting. She also took the opportunity to express condolences, on behalf of the Parish Council and the wider community, on the passing of Barry Bull and Brian Cook, both long-standing and active members of the local community. Kim Jennings had sent sympathy cards from the Parish Council to both families.

1. Apologies

None – David Pinchin was not present at the beginning of the meeting.

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

3066/0420 Jason Syrett declared an interest in item 11a –Tatsfield Green, Boundary Dispute. This item was discussed under Part 2 and Jason Syrett left the meeting prior to this section of the Part 2 meeting commencing and did not therefore take part in the discussion or agreement for this item.

3067/0420 Stephen Mittens declared an interest in item 7b –ref: TA/2020/410 Holly Cottage, Barnfield Road, Tatsfield TN16 2LG as he had received notification of this application and was a near neighbour and therefore took no part in the discussion or decision for this planning application.

3. Approve and sign the MINUTES of the previous meeting held on 9th March 2020

3068/0420 It was resolved that the minutes reflected a true and accurate record of the meeting held on 9th March 2020. They were duly signed by the Chair.

4. Receive and Accept the Minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meeting held on 18th February 2020

3069/0420 It was resolved to receive and accept the minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meeting held on 18th February 2020.

5. Public Participation – there will be a period of 5 minutes at the beginning of the meeting, to hear questions or statements from members of the public. The public are requested to keep their question(s) brief. There will also be an opportunity for the public to ask questions at the end of the meeting. This will be a period of 5 minutes. In addition, it will be at the Chairman's discretion to invite comment from any member of the public at any point during the meeting, should the Chairman feel it helpful to the item under discussion.

- A parishioner commended the Parish Council on its response and actions in assisting the community in dealing with Covid-19.
- A parishioner commented that she had been unable to view the appeal documents relating to APP/M3645/W/20/3246871 at the TDC offices.

6. Officer's report on actions outstanding since the previous meeting

- The Clerk had completed and submitted a review from the Valuation Office Agency in respect of the ground floor office space at the AMB.
- The Clerk had received notification from Unity Trust Bank that due to the interest rate reduction by the Bank of England, the PC savings account's interest rate will reduce to 0% from 21st May 2020.

- The Clerk confirmed that all grants agreed by the PC for 2020-21 have been paid.
- The Clerk has received notification that the PC had been given 100% business rates relief for 2020-21.
- The Clerk noted that the PC had not yet received the half-yearly precept payment from TDC. She confirmed that she would be chasing this up.

7. Planning

a) Planning team for this meeting: Jason Syrett and David Pinchin

3070/0420 It was resolved that the planning team for this meeting would be Jason Syrett and David Pinchin.

b) To determine the Parish Council's position on Appendix A:

TA/2020/559 2 Rag Hill Close, Tatsfield TN16 2LR

Erection of first floor extension over existing garage to front elevation.

- Within the Green Belt, outside of the village settlement.
- A previous application for a first-floor extension over the garage (TA/2019/1997) was refused by TDC and has been currently appealed. TPC returned no comment on this application in 2019. It was refused for being a disproportionate addition to the existing house. The house has previously been extended with a single storey side extension in 2014 and previous to that with a first-floor rear extension in 1991.

This proposal is for a smaller first floor extension over the garage than that proposed and refused in 2019 – approximately half of the size.

Consistent with the Parish Council comments in 2019, the proposal is that we have no comment.

3071/0420 Comment: No comment.

TA/2020/515 Waylands Farm, Tatsfield Approach Road, Tatsfield TN16 2JT

Existing dwelling. (Certificate of Lawfulness for Existing Use or Development) (Amended Description)

- Within the Green Belt, outside of the village settlement.

This proposal has been submitted to try to clarify inconsistencies within the TDC decision made on a previous application (TA.2019/2078) to confirm the use of the existing mobile home at Waylands Farm as a residential dwelling.

Consistent with the Parish Council comments in 2019, the proposal is that we have no comment.

3072/0420 Comment: No comment.

TA/2019/2216 Land West of Thistle Cottage, Shaw Road, Tatsfield TN16 2BX

Erection of residential dwelling and associated works. (Amended address and description)

There has been a change of description/address but no changes to drawings uploaded. Our comments as previously submitted still stand and have been received.

The Parish Council agreed that no further action is required.

APP/M3645/W/20/3246871

TA/2019/2010 34 Westmore Road, Tatsfield TN16 2AX

Demolition of existing bungalow and buildings and erection of 2x3 bedroom semi-detached houses.

- This application was refused by TDC on 16th January 2020.
- An objection was submitted by the previous Parish Council in December 2019.
- A petition of 64 residents' signatures was also submitted in objection to the application with a long list of reasons why the application should be refused.

The reasons for refusal stated by Tandridge District Council were as follows:

1. The proposal, by reason of its scale, bulk, design and lack of spacing to both side boundaries would result in a cramped form of development which causes significant harm to the site, street scene and surrounding area. The proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site with the parking dominated frontage harming the character and appearance of the area. This harm to the visual amenity of the area would be exacerbated by the lack of landscaping opportunities. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) and Policies DP7 and DP12 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (2014).

2. The proposal by reason of its scale, raised land level and proximity to the northern boundary would appear overbearing and overpowering and result in adverse overshadowing causing significant harm to the amenities of the occupants of No. 36 Westmore Road. Furthermore, the proposal by reason of the tight plot would result in an unacceptable living environment for future occupiers of the new development through the lack of usable garden amenity space serving one of the new dwellings and the lack of refuse and recycling and cycle storage facilities. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) and Policy DP7 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (2014).

3. The application has failed to demonstrate that the development would achieve a 10% (minimum) reduction in CO2 emissions through the incorporation of on-site renewable energy technologies, contrary to Policy CSP14 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008.

There appear to be no new points or propositions raised in the Appellant's Statement of Case. As the TDC reasons for refusal are consistent with the previous Parish Council points of objection we see no need for further representation to be made at this stage.

The Parish Council agreed that no further representation was required. It would continue to monitor the progress of the appeal.

TA/2020/574 The Firs, Maesmaur Road, Tatsfield TN16 2LD

Removal of existing front dormer windows. Erection of two-storey side extension, single-storey rear extension, rear dormer window and rooflights in front roof slope.

- Detached house located within the Green Belt (outside of the defined village)
- No previous planning history on TDC website (however previous sales details and visually suggests two previous extensions)

This house sits on one of the unmade roads outside of the defined village and though partially screened directly from the front by tall evergreen trees, is open and visible from each side. The property is set partly down from the road level, built on a sloping site and has a significant fine mature oak tree located behind the house in the rear garden.

This application proposes a rear single storey extension that unifies across the back of the house increasing the living area and adding a dark room. The previous garage is converted to a gym. At first floor level, 2 dormer windows are to be removed and replaced with 7 rooflights of various sizes on the front elevation. A large box dormer is added across the back of the first-floor increasing volume at roof level and extending over the former garage.

It is very difficult to judge the exact volume increase of the proposals.

3073/0420 Comment: Tatsfield Parish Council objects to this application on three grounds:

1) Poor design:

It is the view of the Parish Council that these proposals negatively affect the design of the existing property and the setting of Maesmaur Road and surrounding Green Belt. The property is currently a confident two-storey dormered and

bay windowed house with a side garage. The proposed omission of the dormers and replacement with seven rooflights of varying sizes alongside the increased roof massing and window in replacement for the garage door make the front elevation incongruous.

Equally, the proposed rear elevation is a poor composition of window styles and shapes and proportions.

The proposals are therefore contrary to TDC Local Plan, Detailed Policies Part 2 DP7:B2

2) Green Belt harm:

We have further assessed the proposals against Policy DP13 and considered factors such as the size of the original building, the bulk, height, mass and prominence of the extension/ alterations and the impact of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt.

Though there is no previous listed planning history on the TDC planning portal, the original house has previously been extended to the side and to the rear. Previous sales particulars for the property state that the original house is Victorian and later had additions in the 1960s and again in 1980.

It is the view of Tatsfield Parish Council that, though not necessarily significant in volume increase in this instance, when assessed in the cumulative against the original Victorian property and against the other relevant factors in DP13.3 we do conclude that these now represent disproportionate additions in terms of the original dwelling and that harm would therefore be caused to the openness of the Green Belt.

The proposals are therefore contrary to TDC Local Plan, Detailed Policies Part 2 DP13:E.

3) Impact on existing mature oak tree:

There is an existing and significant mature oak tree in close proximity to the rear elevation of the existing house that is not shown or noted in the applicant's drawings (this is a requirement under policy DP7:B13).

This tree should be protected by a Tree Preservation Order as it makes a significant contribution to the visual amenity of the local landscape in this area of the village due to its size, form and maturity. It is also understood that the tree is very likely to be used for roosting bats.

It is the view of Tatsfield Parish Council that the proposals are therefore also contrary to TDC Local Plan, Detailed Policies Part 2: DP7-B13 and also Key Consideration 4 of the TDC Trees and Soft Landscaping Supplementary Planning Document 2017.

If approved, strict planning conditions and arboricultural and wildlife measures must be put in place to ensure that this tree, its habitants and its root system are properly protected and this significant tree retained.

TA/2020/410 Holly Cottage, Barnfield Road, Tatsfield TN16 2LG

Erection of two-storey rear extension, single-storey side extension and replacement front porch.

- Located within the Green Belt outside of the Defined Village.
- There were three previous applications during 2019 relating to extensions to this property:
- 2019/1432: Refused (No TPC comments were received on this)
- 2019/1738: Split decision (TPC objected due to scale of extension)
- 2019/2198: Approved (TPC objected due to scale of extension)

This application represents a resubmission of the scheme previously submitted under application 2019/1432 with only minor amendments to the first-floor roof profile to the rear.

This is an application for extensions to an existing two storey detached house located on Barnfield Road. The proposed two storey rear extension represents the size of a large living room at ground level and a bedroom and a bathroom at first floor level. The side extension is an increase from the existing utility room in this location. The porch is also replaced with a larger porch.

The alterations/extensions are proposed in complimentary materials and a 'barn style' mansard roof design that are complimentary in design to that of the existing house.

As this property is located within the Green Belt, the key consideration here is whether the proposed extensions are 'disproportionate' to the original house as existing at 31 December 1968 or as originally built since. (NPPF Section 13 and Tandridge Local Plan policies DP10 and DP13(E) are the relevant Green Belt Policies.)

We conclude that the proposed extensions are significant in size (approximately 60% increase in built volume) and create a disproportionate addition to the original house. As a result, the development is inappropriate development and causes harm to the openness of the Green Belt. It is contrary to NPPF and Tandridge Local Plan Green Belt policies.

3074/0420 Comment: Tatsfield Parish Council **objects** to this application.

These proposals represent very similar proposals to those submitted under application TA/2019/1432 which was previously refused by Tandridge District Council in 2019.

We conclude that the proposed extensions are significant in size and create disproportionate additions to the form and size of the original dwelling.

As a result, the proposals are Inappropriate Development and therefore cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The proposals are contrary to NPPF Section 13 (para. 145) and Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies DP10 and DP13(E).

There are no obvious special circumstances that would outweigh the harm identified.

3075/0420 The Clerk was requested to inform Tandridge Planning of the Parish Council's decisions.

- c) Peer Review: to consider a planning application on behalf of Woldingham Parish Council TA/2020/463 Hollingden, Church Road, Woldingham CR3 7JH**
Erection of single storey attached double garage.

Summary:

This is a planning application for a new attached double garage to be added to an existing house on Church Road in Woldingham. Tatsfield Parish Council have been asked for a peer review of this application by Woldingham Parish Council due to conflicts of interest on their committee. This report contains an independent view on the submitted application.

- The property is located within the Green Belt outside of the defined village.
- The property was originally two houses and combined into one and has a number of previous applications for detached garage construction and front extensions to the house through to 2018.

Site Description:

The dwelling is a large two storey detached property located to the south western side of Church Lane, outside the village of Woldingham. The site slopes from the east down to the west with plenty of off-street parking available.

Relevant History:

2013/1129: Conversion of two dwellings back into one dwelling – Certificate of Lawfulness for a proposed use granted 9 October 2013 – implemented

2017/2329: Erection of part first floor/part two storey front extension – Approved on 3 January 2018 – works implemented

2018/2164: Single Storey front extension – Approved 15 January 2019 - assumed works implemented.

Key issues: relate to the impact on the Green Belt, amenities of neighbour properties and character and appearance.

Review:

The drawings show a proposal for an attached single storey pitched roof double garage with a lobby that connects to the existing house on the main front elevation and ties into some currently dilapidated store buildings which are shown to be restored.

The key issue, due to the location of the dwelling being within the Green Belt, is whether the proposed extension, when taken cumulatively with implemented extensions from previous consents, results in inappropriate development.

With reference to the officer's report from the last application on this property (TA/2018/2164) it was assessed and stated within the report that the volume increase of that proposed extension taken together with any previous additions would add approximately 56.7m³ (2.1%) over the size of the original building.

Given the size of this attached garage proposal in the context of the large original building and other previous extensions (based on the evidenced increase in 2018/2164), it is felt that cumulatively this proposal would not represent a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling and therefore does not result in inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Recommendation:

Send this report to Woldingham Parish Council with the conclusion that Tatsfield Parish Council suggests to them that no comment is necessary on this application.

8. Finance

a) Finance team for this meeting: Alex Davies and Jason Syrett

3076/0420 It was resolved that the finance team for this meeting would be Alex Davies and Jason Syrett.

b) Authorise payments (including authorisation of internet banking) detailed in Appendix B

3077/0420 Items on Appendix B were duly approved.

c) Authorise payments (including authorisation of internet banking) detailed in Appendix B.1

3078/0420 Items on Appendix B.1 were duly approved.

d) Consider request for rent payment holiday from Chartwell Cancer Trust (Under Part 2)

This item would be discussed under Part 2.

9. Notified Items

a) Closure of the PC, Village, Neighbourhood Plan and History Group websites

Alex Davies gave the following update: She commended all those involved in setting up the new websites, which were all up and running before 31st March (the date when Surrey Community closed the existing websites). Alex Davies further reported that all the new websites were running smoothly.

b) Covid-19 PC response and actions

Kim Jennings gave the following report:

The PC had a very successful first response to the crisis. The PC responded quickly, all residents were contacted early on and there was a good response from everyone. Individuals have been and continue to be supported by Kim, Stephen and Ian. Sheree's Store has been able to provide supplies and has been bolstered by a delivery service for those unable to leave home – Kim thanked Stephen and Ian for their assistance with the deliveries. The PC has also set up a prescription collection service. It was agreed that the PC needed to continue as outlined above for as long as the crisis continued.

Kim Jennings further noted that TDC had requested that all residents should refrain from having bonfires. The PC added a request for no fireworks.

The PC wished to commend all the rainbow drawings and teddy bears that had been displayed around the parish – the PC would eventually like to collate these pictures in a large display.

Cllr Martin Allen requested that all those involved in the Covid-19 response are recognised at the end of the crisis.

c) Risk Assessments

Alex Davies had compiled a risk assessment document based on the findings made by Alex Davies, Kim Jennings and Jason Syrett earlier in the year. Several recommendations were made and the Clerk had suggested the following actions: the boiler door on the side of the Village Hall needed to be sanded and repainted - the Clerk suggested seeking a quote from the contractor who refurbished the front porch. Moss on the AMB and VH roof – the Clerk had looked into this for the previous PC and it is very expensive to have it removed, with the prospect of it growing back quickly. The window cleaner had been employed to clear the

gutters several times a year. Suggested no further action. Noticeboards on Tatsfield Green and in the village centre – the Clerk suggested investigating the cost of repair versus the cost of replacement.

3079/0420 Members agreed to the above suggestions.

d) Linear verge / verge cutting and weed spraying schedules

The PC had been contacted by Steve Cunnah from SCC regarding the verge cutting and weed spraying schedules. Stephen Mittins will liaise with Jon Allbutt regarding the cutting / spraying schedule and contact SCC when he has a preferred schedule.

Stephen Mittins had also spoken to Ian Hudson at TDC regarding the trial wild flower meadow on Westmore Green. The ground had been prepped the week before and would be sown the following week. Signs would be needed to inform local residents and also advise not to walk across the area in order to allow the wildflowers the best chance to grow.

The prospect of linear verges along Approach Road needed further thought and discussion, possibly at another meeting. Stephen Mittins agreed to follow this up with Cllr Becky Rush.

Kim Jennings also noted that James Longley had been asked to continue maintenance of the footpaths he is under contract to maintain. He would also shortly be carrying out weed spraying in the VH / AMB car park.

e) Dumping of garden waste in Millennium Wood by a RHR resident

Kim Jennings noted that she had received reports of garden waste being dumped in Millennium Wood. This is fly tipping. A notice had already been put on Tatsfield Talk. It was agreed that this would be monitored. If there were more incidents of fly tipping of garden waste in the parish, further action would be taken.

f) Surrey Recovery Co-ordination Group

Kim Jennings had been invited to join the SRCG by the Council leader, Tim Oliver. It is a reference group of elected representatives. Kim Jennings is there in an advisory capacity in case any issues arise in a village setting. Surrey hospitals are coping well and there is ample critical care space, there are two monitoring areas within Surrey (at Gatwick airport and Chessington World of Adventures), the police are concerned that there may be an increase in crime once the lockdown restrictions are eased, and there is a lack of mortuary space in the county but the CC is taking action to provide more space. The next meeting of the SRCG will take place on Friday 1st May.

10. Reports from County Councillor, District Councillor, Village Organisations and External Organisations

a) County Councillor

There was no report.

b) District Councillor

Cllr Allen gave the following report:

TDC has provided grants and the like without any promise from Central Government of reimbursement. TDC is forecasting a possible deficit of £5.1m.

There have been no committee meetings at TDC but the first Zoom (virtual) meeting is due to take place on 7th May.

TDC is focussed on caring for the vulnerable residents of Tandridge. To that end, Cllr Allen has reminded TDC that Tatsfield residents are served by GP surgeries outside of Surrey.

Planning – TDC is aiming to run a near normal service, using photographs in place of site visits.

TDC will be paying the monthly £45k bill for the district's leisure centres in spite of them being closed as a result of the Government's guidelines.

c) Airport

David Pinchin gave the following report:

I attended a Zoom version of the Consultative Committee on Thursday 16 April along with Becky Rush and Martin Allen. Not surprisingly, the current coronavirus pandemic featured heavily on the agenda. In fact, the airport has remained open throughout the present crisis, whilst adhering to Government guidelines regarding the restriction of movement to only essential travel. All flights are now required to submit fully detailed flight plans which have to be approved in advance by the air traffic control team. The airport has denied some non-essential flights.

Essential movements include incoming and outgoing repatriation flights, the import and export of goods including medical equipment and other essential supplies, essential business flights eg engineers supporting ventilator production, and statutory requirements such as pilot licence renewals and air worthiness certificates for aircraft.

The flying of light aircraft (Light General Aviation activity) has ceased completely apart from the odd exceptions for maintenance and licensing. I was impressed by the way the airport has continued to support local businesses, some tenants and partners at the airfield through initiatives such as rent holidays and other financial assistance packages.

Regarding the overflying of our village, there had only been 3 actual complaints during the first quarter of 2020 plus 14 other track deviations identified automatically, all of which resulted in minor

infringement warnings to pilots.

But, most crucially, and as I reported to the February meeting, our own detailed monitoring and discussions with airport senior staff including the CEO David Winstanley, have resulted in the identification of a problem whereby some overflying incidents, whilst clearly visible to residents in the village, are not being identified on the airports tracking systems. It turns out that, without any consultation with the airport, National Air Traffic Services (NATS) gave some instructions to the tracking companies regarding the suppression of certain Secondary Surveillance Radar (SSR) codes, apparently for security reasons, which effectively meant that some aircraft are not tracked at all. The CEO is extremely concerned that this situation has arisen and is currently investigating. Despite recent disruptions, the new airport hangar, which is due to be the European home of Bombardier is still targeted for completion in April 2022, and the hotel completion date remains September 2020.

d) Neighbourhood Plan

Martin Allen confirmed that the Neighbourhood Plan would still be proceeding. The NP now has its own Facebook page. Questions have been posted for local residents to respond. There has not been a great response, so the administrators are looking to post punchier questions and polls.

e) Fairtrade

Alex Davies confirmed that there are no events at the moment. However, Barbara Hester has been successful in renewing the village's status as a Fairtrade village (until April 2022).

f) TIB

Stephen Mittins had circulated the following report to members of the PC:

During this difficult time and in the interest of following the government guidelines there was no meeting in February or March this year.

I have broken Jon's report down into bullet points below.

- The South and South East in Bloom organisers have announced that there will be no site visits this year. Instead we are invited to submit an expanded Judges Notes containing all the evidence of our work this year; this will be compared with the standard we set in 2019 and we will be informed if we managed to maintain last year's standards - this we intend to do.
- We have been in touch with our main sponsors to secure that we will receive the funding promised, so far no one has withdrawn; to date our fighting fund stands at £4228.73 and we are expecting that to grow.
- We have been informed that Biggin Hill Airport have cancelled the events they have planned for VE Day and the Battle of Britain; we have invited them to join us - restrictions permitting - to have a small ceremony at the Tatol Bed in July - they have accepted this - subject to restrictions and making final arrangements. We have been in touch with our growers (Barnsfold Nurseries and Instaplant) and they confirm that they are working and are on track with our orders. – Stephen Mittins and Kim Jennings would be the PC representatives.
- That leaves the question of how we can plant up and put out our mangers and hanging baskets; plant our containers in the village centre; plant the Tatol Bed - and then keep them tidy and watered - all within the restrictions on movement at that time.
- The TIB Organising Committee are all agreed that we must somehow make sure that Tatsfield looks great this summer - not only to lift the mood as we - hopefully - come out of the current crisis, but to commemorate the 80th anniversary of the Battle of Britain. We do not know what restrictions there will be in place at the end of May - we hope we will be able to make Tatsfield look great this summer.

We are considering the following:

- Revise the number of mangers and baskets - perhaps reduce the displays in the school - that is if they do not return for the summer term - reduce the numbers of hanging baskets in the village centre.
- A small team of volunteers receive the delivery of plants at the allotment site for safe keeping - perhaps combine the two May deliveries for the 30th May.
- A small team deliver the materials to make up our mangers etc to volunteers at their homes, and then collect the completed containers and put them up immediately - normally they are made up in one go in early May and looked after by the volunteers for four weeks.
- A small team of volunteers plant up the perennial border in early May.
- A small team of volunteers receive the plants and plant up the Tatol Bed in early June.
- A small team of volunteers carry out the watering through the summer. The special feature at the back of the Tatol Bed - three panels of original art (WW11 Theme) painted by Ben Holmes is on track to be completed and erected in early July.

Jason Syrett asked if TIB had volunteers from the same household to do the planting? Jon Allbutt confirmed this was the case.

3080/0420 Members resolved that the PC would support TIB's proposals, as requested, on the condition that the Government's guidelines would be strictly followed. Members requested that the Clerk emailed the PC's decision to all members of the TIB committee.

11. Parish Council Land / Property**a) Tatsfield Green****- Boundary dispute (Under Part 2)**

This item would be discussed under Part 2.

12. Meetings to attend / Correspondence

None

13. Matters for reporting or inclusion in a Future Agenda

None

It was noted that the next meeting would follow the usual schedule and be held on Monday 11th May 2020at 8pm.

Public Participation:

- Composting Group – Phil Brett is working very hard at the site. The rebuilding of the compost bins has been completed.

The meeting closed at 9.38 pm