

Planning Comments from the Parish Council meeting of Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2018

TA/2018/1818/NH – 61 The Cravens, Smallfield

Erection of single storey rear extension, which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6m, for which the maximum height would be 3.8m, and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.8m

**Recommend:** No objection, subject to neighbours consultation; Permit

TA/2018/1818 – Melody, Church Road, Burstow

Loft extension (CLOPD)

**Recommend:** Noted

TA/2018/1981 – Hollesley Farm, Normans Road, Smallfield

Change of use of former piggery into dance studio (Class D2)

**Recommend:** No objection; Permit

TA/2018/1907 – Malpas, 8 Raleigh Drive, Smallfield

Proposed single storey side and rear extension

**Recommend:** No objection; Permit

TA/2018/1978 – 38 Orchard Road, Smallfield

4.5m rear extension with flat roof and lantern rooflight

**Recommend:** No objection, subject to neighbour's consultation; Permit

TA/2018/1955 – Pembray, 116 Redehall Road, Smallfield

Proposed single storey rear/side extension

The Council notes that this address is in the Green Belt, however the scale of the proposal is small, especially in view of previously permitted extensions

**Recommend:** Permit

TA/2018/1592 – Land to North of Effingham Road, Burstow

Change of use of land to a private gypsy and traveller caravan site consisting of 6 pitches, with each pitch incorporating a mobile home, detached outbuilding (dayroom), touring caravan and 2 car parking spaces.

Planning control in the UK is plan-led. The Guidance (para 20) correctly states that the planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. What is to be taken into account, and is a material consideration in planning decisions, is the policy set out in the Guidance as a whole – it is not the fact that the application is made by a person or persons who is or are within the definition in the Guidance. The Guidance does not say that the gypsy status of applicants for planning permission is the only consideration; it is a material consideration only and needs to be balanced with other material considerations, including not only the provisions of the development plan, but the contents of the Guidance itself.

- This application site is not included in the draft Local Plan for Tandridge. TDC have evaluated a number of G & T sites put forward in the HELLA (SMA 018, DOM 018, SMA 017, SMA 032, SMA 033, SMA 034) which if brought forward would offer an additional 21 pitches in the area. Therefore, sufficient pitches would be available through the Local Plan and this site not be required.
- Premature to predict inadequate supply through the Local Plan when it has not yet been ruled on by an Inspector.
- Settled status – The Gipsy & Traveller Community is considered nomadic. In this application the presence of the mobile home units and the ‘day room’ (providing dining, cooking, washing and living facilities) are permanent structures and therefore should be considered in the same light as any other application in the Green Belt, and by definition harmful and causing permanent damage to the openness of the Green Belt and should not be permitted
- Un-neighbourly – The NPPG 25 states *“Local planning authorities should very strictly limit new traveler site development in open countryside that is away from the existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan. Local planning authorities should ensure that sites in rural areas respect the scale of and do not dominate, the nearest settled community, and avoid placing an undue pressure on local infrastructure.”* The application site is a landlocked area with residential gardens adjoining it on the south and west borders and a car bodyworks unit to the east. This site, in our opinion, does not comply with NPPG para 25
- *Green Belt consideration – The application site is within the Green Belt. The NPPG very clearly states that any development within the Green Belt is considered inappropriate and thus harmful to the openness of the Green Belt. The NPPG (“16 Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. Subject to the best interests of the child, personal circumstances and unmet need are unlikely to clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt and any other harm so as to establish very special circumstances”)* goes on to clarify that there is no special exemption for Gipsy & Traveller status. The applicant does not, in our opinion, offer any very special circumstances, specific to this site that outweighs harm to the Green Belt
- Site density – the proposed application site would be densely occupied by 6 pitches. This proposal is in our opinion too dense and inappropriate for the geographical setting. Residential gardens, adjoining the application site are of reasonable proportion, consistent with a rural setting; whereas this application proposes modest garden curtilage that is no in keeping.
- Highways access – access to the site is through a narrow land, bordered on both sides by residential gardens. Sight lines are restricted and the road is a 50MPH and near to a traffic light junction. Nearby dwellings highway access is historical and precedes the current scale and speed of Effingham Road. Entrance and egress, of 6 touring caravans and vehicular traffic movements of residents occupying the 6 pitches, would, in our opinion, present a hazard not only to residents living on the application site but also other road users.
- Sustainability – The proposed site is not considered to be in a sustainable location. The NPPG promotes development in sustainable location over and above development in rural, inaccessible, areas Occupants would be forced to travel by private vehicle to access all services such as education, health, shopping, leisure and so would not comply with the NPPG.

- Access to the proposed site is by a private entrance not owned by the applicant. Site plans included within this application appear to include the access as part of the area owned and controlled by the landowner. However, this access is owned by a land management company and it is unclear what rights of access would be conferred upon residents living on the G&T site.
- Flooding – The rear border of the application site is formed, in part, by a waterway. A Flood Zone 3 area is less than 50 yards away. We are concerned that this flood zone would be increased due to water runoff from hard standing in this site.

**Recommend:** Refuse