



Nutfield Parish Council Notes

Nutfield Village Hall

21st July 2021

Meeting opened at **6:30pm** and closed at **7.35pm**.

Email: parishclerk@nutfieldpc.com Website: www.nutfieldpc.com

Councillors (Cllrs) present:

Cllr John Clarke
Cllr Aled Duggan
Cllr Sue Ford
Cllr Stephen Hall (Chairman)
Cllr Rigel Mowatt (Vice Chair)
Cllr Ian Reeve

Apologies:

Cllr Amanda Earl
Cllr Dean Holborn

Attending:

25 parishioners
Eleanor Nicholson (Jennings
Nicholson Associates)
James McClean (Nutfield Green
Park).

In attendance: Nicky Chiswick (NC), Clerk

Cllr Hall opened the meeting highlighting that the Parish Council were facilitating the meeting between the public/parishioners and the developers of Nutfield Green Park. All people on the stage were introduced.

Questions were sent to the Clerk prior to the meeting and Cllr Hall asked each question and there were open questions at the end.

Questions and answers are below

PLANS

Question

The plans are using out of date boundary lines as the land ownership at the back of 4, 5 and 6 hunters gate have changed.

Answer – For legal reasons the application boundary line has been put on land registry boundary line on the title deeds. Aware of overlapping boundary at Marsh but not aware of Hunters Gate boundary issues and happy to look at if detail is given.

Question

This appears to be an independent developer formulating this plan. Surely Tandridge District Council and/or Surrey County Council have a clear 1, 5, 10-year plan in place that at least conceptually dictates the general philosophy on development of the District and County? I see no evidence of how this development fits into a greater plan. An explanation of this is required please, so local residents at least can understand how this fits into the “bigger picture”.

Answer – To be sent to TDC

Question

This development is within the “curtilage” of our Victorian Folly Tower, which is a grade 2 listed building. It is our understanding that building that negatively impacts the outlook of a listed building is not permitted.

Within the curtilage of this development there are, several other listed buildings. The Surrey CC listed buildings group must be fully consulted on this.

Answer – A historic buildings assessment has been carried out and Historic England will be one of the statutory consultees on this. There are no listed buildings within the curtilage of application site.

Question

This is an Outline planning application for "Access and Layout". Could you please confirm what, in this context, you understand by the word "Layout"? Does this simply mean the road layout? Or does it also mean the layout and number of buildings?

If the latter (i.e., the layout and number of buildings), would outline approval signify council consent in principle for the construction of the buildings?

Answer – It is an outline application, not full application. There would be a 2nd Round application (if outline approved) for detail look and form. Final architectural. Outline application would be - The number of buildings, the access points and the impact of the scheme.

Question

Given the type of residents identified; the elderly and those in need of care - the points relating to traffic access, increased risk and danger are further cause for concern. Surely a new care facility is better placed in a new development near to East Surrey hospital, where there is plenty of open space nearby?

Answer – Cannot comment on East Surrey Hospital space allocation, but there has been recent informal dialogue with the Chief Executive of East Surrey in regards to the diagnostic suit and MRI units, as the NHS have the to take the diagnostics out of hospitals to release the pressure to look after people. Clear that space is for hospital activity and not for elderly care. Care Homes are out in the community, not in hospital sites. Part of plan is just not for houses alone, but other services. Message received that affordable homes are required, not large homes which is reflected in the application

Question

Have you consulted any local businesses for competition reviews for any activity areas planned e.g., gym/nature trail etc?

Answer – A Professional Business User appraiser has carried out a need assessment. Happy to engage with local businesses to work together.

Question

Bearing in mind the land in question is Green Belt and not previously identified or reserved by Tandridge DC in any Local Plan for possible residential or commercial use, could you please confirm that this outline application will be laid before the Planning Committee, or possibly full Council, to ensure that such a major development, and such a departure from council policy to date, is properly scrutinised by elected councillors? Without such scrutiny, and a fully discussed explanation to justify the departure from the current Local Plan, I could easily imagine legal challenges and requests for a call-in to the Secretary of State.

Since a large part of the application covers a commercial development (private care home, private sports facilities, private health clinic, retail, and cafe), all on a Green Belt green field site, could you please explain why the developer has not been asked to submit a separate planning application for this? Arguments for and against this commercial development may be quite distinct from those for the nearby proposed housing estate.

For the proposed smaller housing estate off Church Hill, could you please explain why this also is not the subject of a separate planning application?

Answer – To be sent to TDC

INFRASTRUCTURE

Question

Service infrastructure in the area is also at capacity. The north-western end of the development area borders Nutfield Marsh. Development in this area has already impacted on the ability for the mains sewerage to cope with demand and prevailing difficulties ongoing. How does the developer propose to create a service infrastructure to accommodate the new dwellings without impact on the existing?

Answer – A service assessment has been made and there will be requirement to upgrade certain pump sewers and will be part of the developer's commitment and a community sum will be provided for infrastructure upgrades.

Question

If their proposal for houses at 'Church Meadow' on Nutfield Marsh gets approval, what allowance have they made for completely replacing the sewage pumping station that at present is totally inadequate for the existing houses and regularly breaks down in wet weather and has on numerous occasions flooded my garden and even the Marsh Common itself with raw sewage?

Duplication

Question

We have an NHS GP surgery already and plenty of places to put in another if we really need. There is no need for a new housing development for a GP surgery. Surely with our recent experience with COVID the move is towards less face-to-face GP consultancy. I doubt there is any need for an additional surgery.

Answer – In discussion with Alliance for Better Care (have 40 GP surgeries in surrey) – they are actively looking for more providers.

Question

According to nutfieldgreenpark.co.uk "The partners of Nutfield Green Park have been considering for some time how to regenerate and repurpose the former Laporte Works alongside Nutfield village for wider public benefit."

I question what any of these benefits are for the Nutfield Village residents. Particularly when removing any of the National Planning policy frameworks list of green belt development exceptions that have clearly been applied to the application.

According to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), there are 5 key exceptions for obtaining planning permission on Green Belt land.

Below are these points and how they do not take into consideration Nutfield Village at all, both as a beautiful village, or its residents.

1. Building for agriculture and forestry.

- The current land is not derelict or urban, it is ancient woodland and countryside. It is used by many walkers, runners, dog walkers, cyclists, and families on a daily basis. It is also used by farmers for livestock (sheep), and home to wildlife including deer, ground nesting birds, newts, grass snakes, door-mice, badgers, bats, and insects.

2. Facilities for outdoor sports and recreations, cemeteries, and allotments.

- The proposed development sprawls the entire length of Nutfield High Street and dwarfs the High Street Football recreation ground and pitches and Beautiful Cemetery. Under a mile away off Mid Street is a further sports ground, cricket pitch and an allotment. Towards the Merstham side of the development is another cricket pitch, and Mercers Lake - home to the Aqua Sports Park offering a range of water sports activities.

3. Extensions to existing buildings

- There are not any current buildings of the site.

4. Replacement to existing building with something not much larger

- There are not any current buildings on the site.

4. Limited infilling of villages

The proposed development area site currently provides openness to the village of Nutfield and stops urban sprawl from the nearby town of Merstham - particularly the Water Colours development.

5. Development of previously developed land.

The former Laporte Works site is now a well-loved area of natural beauty, open space, and a home to wildlife. It does not need to be re-developed, and it is not derelict or urban.

I put it to you that there have been little if no considerations to the Nutfield Village residents, and that Green Park is merely a housing development disguised as a "Green Park". Please can you tell me otherwise?

Answer – NNPF does not specifically look at sport, health, and wellbeing in the countryside. (2019/2020 to promote active in the countryside). That is our ethos at the site specifically in line with that policy. Special circumstances allow green belt development and the suite of things on offer will hopefully allow approval.

AIR QUALITY

Question

The air quality we will have from the pollution the emissions from these additional cars and lorries will be significantly reduced, yet this proposed site is supposed to be built sensitively to protect the very environment it will be harming?

Answer – A noise, air and light pollution survey has been carried out and complies with EU standards for air quality.

Question

Will any compensation for noise/dirt pollution be offered to any residents during development?

Answer - No but would like to create liaison group together to get dialogue between all parties.

TRAFFIC/ACCESS

Question

Access: I know the Surrey Highways Authority has approved and agreed to the roundabout on the A25 to slow traffic down, however nothing has been mentioned with regards to the entrance for Church Meadow. Has it been approved by the SHA and if not why not, and why was it omitted from the report? It is on a blind bend with no line of sight when exiting the proposed development and turning right

Answer - Patrick Parsons – (Traffic consultants) carried out full traffic safety audit - Church Meadow was included, copy to be sent to NPC to circulate. All access routes have been reviewed and concluded it was safe at national speed limit speeds.

Question

Can the Developers please clarify what they aim to do regarding Park Works Cottages, is it still going to be an emergency vehicle access road and why is this needed if there are two other access areas? What clearance are they aiming to do and how will they stop cars accessing the road from the development.

Answer - Park Works Road is owned by the trust. No plan for permanent access. Only to be used by emergency vehicles with bollards set up.

Question

The only access to the 'Church Meadow' site for heavy lorries bringing in and removing materials will be Cormongers Lane which is narrow and has several places where even two cars cannot pass easily. There is also a notorious ice spot on the bend near Mercers Park entrance on Nutfield Marsh Road that regularly sees cars ending up in the ditch in Winter. To slide into a large lorry head on at speed is a frightening thought.

Duplication

Question

Highways and the suitability of local roads to accommodate vehicle movements from an additional 239 residences. Church Hill, Nutfield Marsh Road and Cormongers Lane are already used as a cut through for many commuters and vehicles from the Watercolour development. What measures will be taken by the developer to minimise the impact on the already congested network infrastructure and in particular the 2 roads named above that are unsuitable to sustain increased traffic flow.

Not only will the entrance to 'Church Meadow' will be directly opposite two historic 17th century Grade 2 listed cottages but it is also on a dangerous bend, with cars regularly hitting the kerb with one recently completely leaving the road, overturning, demolishing the fence and ending up in the garden of Charman

Cottage.

Answer – No further improvements although, Surrey Highways have asked for us to look at Cormongers Lane T Junction, Church Hill T junction and 5 other locations for traffic/junction capacity in Godstone. Junction capacity which SCC have deemed acceptable.

Question

Since the A25 and our local roads are already regularly badly potholed from the normal heavy traffic using them, how they propose to persuade local residents and the council that the impact on his new development will not have an adverse effect on this and will subsequently increase the tax burden on local residents in maintaining them?

Answer – Responsibilities for the Highways are SCC. There is a commuted sum for infrastructure improvements that includes highway works and commitment for schooling.

Question

The current road and traffic amenities already fall short of their purpose. The A25 is heavily congested and used as an alternate route from the M23 and M25 frequently by Heavy good vehicles. The damage caused by this traffic along with the overuse of HGVS from Mercer's South Quarry (J&J Franks) as well as Patteson Court Landfill Site leads to constant damage to the road surface. The Green Park development could lead to a huge increase in HGVs passing through the village daily, thus damaging the roads further, bringing more congestion to a stretch of road with no road crossings, traffic lights or speed cameras, and increase the noise and air pollution dramatically.

The average car per household in Surrey is 1.5. Meaning a further 239 homes would bring a further 358 cars to the village. This number will push an already overused road system beyond its limit, and no doubt led to accidents on already dangerous roads. It is not something two substantial car parks and electric charging points will solve.

Please can you explain how the Green Park will do anything but make the current road issues we already have even worse.

Duplication

Question

Will there be any traffic calming measures put into High Street, Church Hill, Nutfield Marsh roads for the already over used village roads (outside proposed roundabouts)?

Answer – none have been asked for by SCC.

Question

The local transport infrastructure is already at its limit. There is no spare capacity in the local road network to handle the construction works or to support the development once it is complete (as the development is extremely car transport focused). There are already many over-crowded roads and junctions. This development will cause traffic congestion, traffic accidents, injuries, and deaths. Prior to this development getting anywhere near approval an extensive INDEPENDENT road traffic survey and related risk assessment will be essential. Then all mitigating measures identified must be incorporated in any development application. Significant improvement in road traffic infrastructure is required before this development could be considered. Such infrastructure improvements in themselves will cause major congestion in the local road network for many months and are not required without this development.

Duplication

Question

Does Tandridge District Council have the resources to oversee and control the traffic infrastructure improvements and then the massive development works? As residents we need a clear plan please on how all works are to be regulated, controlled and managed. This cannot be done by the developer as they have a vested interest in making money. A full "client" (council) management team is required to oversee and control this large, invasive, work scope. Has the developer built this into their plans and costed it? I imagine TDC does not want to foot the bill for this extra management manpower?

Answer – To be sent to TDC

Question

The recent Local Plan for a Garden Village in South Godstone has been put on hold because of the unsuitability of the infrastructure to cope with additional substantial traffic from Junction 6 of the M23 at Godstone and the subsequent inability of the A25 and roads leading off it to deal with this excess. Can the developer explain how he believes his development with the extra minimum 900 odd cars from the proposed Nutfield Green Park will not clog up our roads and cause gridlock in our area?

Answer – 3.5K houses (South Godstone) are far greater than our proposal, capacity of the junctions is greater for 3.5K houses. Not seen traffic assessment for South Godstone. Traffic Modelling at South Godstone by TDC and this forms part of the TDC local plan. Should direct question to TDC. Travel plans are required to how to use public transport, cycling, walking (i.e., running a small electric minibus to Redhill)

HOUSING

Question

Housing needs: what are the current housing needs in Tandridge? We think this plan has been based on outdated figures and that there is no gap between need and supply and therefore we don't need any contribution to Tandridge housing. This therefore isn't a valid justification for the proposed development. How have you demonstrated that there is a shortage of housing in this area?

Answer – This is a TDC question. TDC are obligated to a 5-year land supply, but only have 1.92 years, even with this site application there is only 2.86 years. Affordable housing requirement 456 units annually, and TDC have a deficit of about 2000 houses. Following Government directive.

ENVIRONMENT

Question

Nutfield Marsh and The Moors are areas of special scientific interest with a thriving population of the protected, great crested newt. Recent development at Watercolour (which currently remains ongoing) has increased footfall in these areas presenting a threat to the stability of the wildlife population that thrives in the areas. How does the developer propose to negate any further impact on the biodiversity of the locality to protect this precious eco system?

Answer – Aware of GCN in the pond, fishing lakes and other side of road. There will be one year of mitigation works before construction works start which include building more biodiverse habitation. Latest government guidelines of improving biodiversity net gain is 10% we are at 26.1%. Significant amount of work to translocate them safely and to appropriate habitat.

Building more habitat – Early discussion Natural England, on open swimming pond, change detail so they do not get destroyed.

Habitat creator, not habitat destroyer. Not wholesale destruction

2 more ponds to increase newts with transition pond on scrub land that has low biodiversity value.

Further surveys to take place.

Question asked in regard to works that took place in 2020 – noted that the clearing that took place with an onsite ecologist. Date of work was in line with statute dates of clearing.

Question

There is ancient woodland with badgers and wildlife on the land – how will these be reserved as they venture further than the woodland.

Where will all the wildlife go once development starts as there are many deer/foxes/badgers/other animals living in that whole area?

Answer - Areas where there is no construction will be fenced – one active badger set on the west side (no development taking place here, badger fencing placed on construction site.

Question

How will any tree or landscaping be carried out sympathetically given that whole swathes of trees/rough bushes were obliterated unnecessarily last year during peak bird/other animal nesting season?

Answer - Least valuable woodland taken. Will plant 1800 trees on the eastern bank.

Question

I have seen no indication that this development is carbon neutral and sustainable? Given it is replacing open green belt countryside and woodland surely this is a basic planning requirement in the 21st century?

Answer - not a planning requirement, but we will build to the current high standard. Built to a 'future home standard'. No gas boilers from 2026, biomass boilers, and highest possible insulation, lowest possible carbon operation.

GENERAL

Question

Will the Church Hill car park road be used for any access for development or long term?

Answer – Access – there are two plans for access – (option one) nothing on Cormongers Lane or Church Hill and use the roundabout into site, (option two) phased traffic plan using Cormongers Lane.

Nothing coming through Church Hill. Church Hill car park will rent for £1 a year through a formal agreement. No development/permanent or development access through the church car park

Question

What will happen with the historic air raid shelters in that area?

Answer – One in development that is not listed – it will be removed.

Question

How can we be assured that there is a 'clean' application with TDC happening given there have been discussions by some local residents of some 'sweetening' deals already taking place with residents bordering the housing plots?

The Church car parking is adequate. Any time I have driven past it, there does not seem to be much congestion – even on Sundays or for weddings.

In our own case, this development is adjacent to +/- 50 metres of our North property boundary. It will have a detrimental impact on our property outlook and will likely result in new housing overlooking our property. Currently we have a tree line of 100 year old+ trees which go back from our boundary over 50 metres.

Answer – To be sent to TDC

Question

Traffic and access - The access roads have been altered a number of times from the initial plans. Currently the plans will now take all traffic for the 329 units (I am including the 100 extra 'beds' which are effectively apartments) as there will now be considerable traffic travelling parallel with the back of the houses on Parkwood Road, causing noise and dust disturbance along with loss of privacy on green belt land. Why is this now being considered as an entrance when it is so close to the other roads leading onto the already overused A25?

Answer – Location has been determined by SCC. Preferred access was at Pimlico Hill (Quarry Access). Road will be tarmacked, not dust track.

Question

Traffic and access - Existing evidence of car crashes on the A25 through the Nutfield section show a significant number of these accidents occur at the junctions between the adjoining roads to the A25, this additional road will cause further traffic to build up and as it is so close to Parkwood Road junction is likely to cause further accidents as drivers accelerate out of the roundabout onto what is a blind bend. The current proposals will create dangerous driving conditions to the residents of Parkwood Road and Blacklands Meadow. How will you ensure the safety of residents and drivers in Nutfield?

Answer – Cannot answer – trying to make sure everything is safe as possible (via roundabout)

Question

Plans and infrastructure - Will there be charges for the activity park and what are they planned to be

Question

Plans and infrastructure there is mention of phase 2. What exactly is planned.

Answer – there is no phase two now as this was a plan for extra sports facilities on the land to the west that is now up for sale.

Question

Traffic and access - HGV movement, I've seen figures for inert materials and soils, what for the building development

Answer – *do not have the figures but will send them across.*

Question

My question if it is to do with the wider proposed development site at Church Meadows is as follows:

There are many drawbacks to the proposed development site at Church Meadows, in your own words, what are your top three drawbacks and concerns that we should be aware of, with the proposed development of the location?

Question

Plans and infrastructure School places in the local school will be severely impacted. When less than 20 homes were built in South Nutfield at Queens Court this brought additional families taking up more of the already sought-after school places. How can nearly 300 houses be acceptable?

There are requirements by SCC to size of developments and when you must provide a school. South Godstone was over this, NGP is under it. There will be a commuted sum for those purposes.

Question

Plans and infrastructure - Local dentists are not taking any more NHS patients and my sons are due to be seen in October for their 6 monthly check-up which is now over a year overdue, but this was their soonest availability. How can they cope with 300 additional families?

Answer – *No formal requirement for dentistry. More than happy to set up a dentist in wellbeing centre.*

Question

Traffic and access - Having a roundabout on any stretch of the A25 between Nutfield and Redhill is going to cause severe congestion especially at peak times. There are also houses on both sides of the road right next to where it's being planned, and they will be subjected to braking / standing traffic noise as well as increased fumes where vehicles currently just pass.

Duplication

Question

Traffic and access The HGV movements is going to severely impact all of us living on the A25. We already have a huge amount on movements because of the Landfill (which was already here), now the sand quarry (which was only approved in recent years) but a development of nearly 300 houses, it's absurd. The Noise / Vibrations / damage to property which is caused by the larger vehicles is going to affect quality of life.

Duplication

Additional questions from the floor

Affordable Housing question

Answer - 84 units will be affordable housing (some shared ownership and some rent). Johnathon Flint has liaised with TDC regarding what the requirements are for the size of houses needed. TDC require 35% new homes to be affordable and it meets the criteria.

Engagement Strategy – who have you engaged with as mentioned earlier?

Answer - Redhill Wetlands

Activity Park – is there a charge for the activity park and what is the idea behind it?

Answer - Modern interpretation of sport – Sport England (2019 strategy to encourage new forms of physical activity) are excited about the principle with the objective of getting people out to green spaces, not conventional Sport. Series of trials with digital equipment to compete against each other. Pay as you go with no private membership. No price point now – operated as a commercial enterprise with a charity backing.

Question in response to the above – you are taking free green space and turning it into paid for activity on green

Answer - Taking private land and turning into activity park – so yes with as much nature as possible

We have plenty of activities – Aqua Park, Football Prich, recreation grounds, Allotment, cemetery – doesn't seem like you are working the parishioners and not answering our questions.

Answer – what else would you like to see

Question moved on, by interruption of next question

What benefits do these properties bring to the community?

Answer - Houses that are starter homes, for young professionals, and for downsizing as this is what is missing in the community.

What is forecasted profit for the project?

Answer - Not at liberty to give that figure. There has to be a profit to justify the project. The trust is maintaining the activity park and wellbeing centre.

Are you providing a bursary for GP training as there is a shortage of GPs?

Answer – this aspect is being outsourced to Alliance for Better Care, so no bursary given.

All amenities are full in the local area – a small corner shop will not be sufficient. What are the plans

Answer - There will be a unit the size of a mini-Waitrose/Tesco Express available and depends on what businesses take up the other units. 10,000 square foot available for retail available in total and reports have showed a need. There will be a need to upgrade fibre internet and will be part of the services upgrade.

What are the key negative drawbacks of the plan?

Answer

1. Large work to take place with the environmental aspects at the front end (takes longer than you think along with the further studies)
2. Build quality
3. Delivery the scheme

Traffic analysis

Answer - More formal comments required on the traffic analysis via NPC - two sessions took place (real time monitoring). Monitoring strips on Church Hill and Cormongers Lane. Happy to set up workshop

When did the test get carried out?

Answer - 2 phases - one prior to lock down, and one September 2020

Cllr Hall – confirmed that there will be a NGP page on NPC website that will hold any further documents received.

Pinch Points – your report states that the width of the A25 it is 7 meters, but there are points which are only 5 meters wide. With the data provided within the application this would mean HGV movement every 2 minutes during construction. If some go through Redhill and some Nutfield, it will be movement every 4 minutes. Traffic reports need to be carried out at these pinch points.

Answer – Noted and Partick Parsons will be review. Working group to be put together to look at and work together.

Quite a lot of landfill on that area with double decker bus, many other items and sulphite sludge – how does that work?

Answer - Area is old land fill, not contresable waste (gas and methane) aspect. Largely filled in the 1950/60/70's (soil, concrete, rubble) - there is old Sulphite Sludge, but cannot be built on, but can be used for to build the sports park – gentle mounding. They will have 70 bore holes

Balance of power between trust and developers?

Answer - Not conventional set up. Trust will maintain large part (key facilities - car parks, roads, park and well-being centre). Placed to build this first.

Developers to buy the land (care home and residential) and they will sell care home – to G Group and sell housing to consella homes.