

Tandridge District Council attended Nutfield Parish Meeting – 11th August 2021 (Georgina Betts - Principal Planning Officer)

Questions from parishioners from 21st July meeting

Question 1

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”.

[This planning application \(2021/1040\) is not part of the TDC plan – it is a speculative application.](#)

Question 2

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.

1. 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.
2. 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? [TDC do not encourage applicants to split applications due to possibilities of circumventing the affordable housing requirements etc.](#)

[Not sure if it will go to planning committee yet as the recommendation has not yet been made for approval or refusal. Can only go to planning committee if it is approved.](#)

Question 3

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, workscope. 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?

A scheme of this size would require a Construction/Transport Management plan. Anything that is required would be secured through a condition or a reserved matter. If it was approved, the costs would be between the County Highway Authority (CHA) and TDC planning enforcement office – they would monitor and make sure the plan was compliant.

Question 4

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 it be explained 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?

Trip generation will be investigated by County Highway Authority. They are fully aware of the Godstone Village plans. They will be considering current demand and congestion on the A25, and the position of the application in between Biffa and JJ Franks. Also, the high levels of HGV. Large project by CHA – taking lots of data, so no response from them as yet.

Question 5

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?

There is a district 5-year housing supply shortage – so TDC cannot justify 5 year of housing supply. This would therefore trigger paragraph 11d of the NPPF, which would question if it would support sustainable development (but a debate on whether this would happen would be required). There is a district housing need, but this would not override other needs. (Housing need would not outweigh green belt policy). Last year housing supply is at of 1.71 years, latest figures increased to approx. 1.9 years.

Question 6

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?

There are no deals with TDC, the application is totally a speculative application from developers following on from pre-application advice (which received negative feedback). TDC cannot condone any deals – they look at planning merits of the application. TDC looks at planning policy terms, not at conduct from developers.

Additional Question

2 years of noise and work with the Quarry – this is one side of the green belt area (towards Merstham). The other side of the road is this planning application and would take away any

green space. How would this be captured in the planning decision. What are happening to the public footpaths (fenced or open?)?

TDC are aware of the Quarry and its implications/impact – when reviewing the proposal site for residential it would be limited to the development stage only and the reduction in green belt. Development and construction is in the short-term harm not long-term harm. 25% of area being built on. It will look at overlooking loss of privacy, noise, and general disturbance for future occupiers.

This is an outline application - Hard landscaping (paving, fencing) comes at the reserved matters stage, so it is too early at this stage to discuss. The Designing Out Crime Officer for Surrey Police has been consulted – for example fear of crime has been highlighted in some responses. Resistance to fencing due to being green belt.

Design and Access and Planning statement highlighted those outdoor activities would be free (highlighted that this was not what the developers stated at the meeting on the 21st July – noted that it would be Pay as you Go).

Noted that Park Works Road is a full access point in relation to the application. Not an emergency access point.

GB will update NPC after the 25th August.