MINUTES of a Meeting of Tatsfield Parish Council held on the 13th July 2026 in the Village Hall, Westmore Green, Tatsfield TN16 2AG commencing at 8.00 p.m.

Present: Ms Kim Jennings (in the Chair) Mr David Pinchin Mr Jason Syrett Mrs Sue Dowse Mr Dave Mitchell Mr Simon Cook Mr Martin Elmer

In Attendance: Samantha Head (Clerk)
Martin Allen (TDC)
Jacquie Thomson (SCC)
Ryan Bloomfield (Shadow Cllr – East Surrey Council)
Jeremy Pursehouse (Shadow Cllr – East Surrey Council)
PC Steph De Sousa – Youth Engagement Officer
PCSO Georgia Kidd

And 120 parishioners

The meeting commenced at 8.0 pm

1. APOLOGIES

None

2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** (relating to items on the agenda)

4371/0726 Jason Syrett declared an interest in item 10c – Boundary Dispute. He took no part in discussion or agreement on this item.

3. Approve and sign the MINUTES of the previous meeting held on 8th June 2026

4372/0726 It was resolved that the minutes reflected a true and accurate record of the meeting held on 8th June 2026. They were duly signed by the Chair.

4. Public Participation

Kim Jennings asked if any members of the public had any comments / questions other than for the planning applications listed on this meeting's agenda. This item was then deferred until item 6b.

5. Officer's report

- The Clerk confirmed that the AGAR had been submitted to the external auditor ahead of the deadline.

6. PLANNING:

(a) Planning Team for July: Jason Syrett and Sue Dowse

4373/0726 It was resolved that the planning team for July would be Jason Syrett and Sue Dowse.

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

TA/2026/559 Development of site South of Ship House, Ship Hill Tatsfield TN16 2AH
Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 84 dwellings with associated works (outline application with all matters reserved except access, layout and scale).

This is an Outline Planning Application seeking permission for the demolition of the existing stables structures and the erection of 84 residential dwellings on a 4.22-hectare site to the South of Ship Hill, Tatsfield, Surrey (TN16 2AH).

The application seeks to determine access, layout, and scale parameters at this outline stage, reserving all other matters.

The application relies heavily on national 'Grey Belt' provisions under the recently updated National Planning Policy Framework to justify development within the Green Belt.

The developer proposes a layout of houses and flats featuring a 49% affordable housing allocation, alongside on-site roads and open spaces that include engineered Sustainable Drainage System attenuation basins.

Geographically, the site sits outside of Tatsfield's Defined Village boundary, currently functioning as agricultural grazing land and paddocks. The layout proposes primary vehicular entry points and sightline clearance along Ship Hill, while bordering Church Hill to the east. The site footprint directly overlaps the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) consultation zone for the high-pressure National Gas Transmission main and also sits within an archaeologically sensitive area.

Jason Syrett noted that the Parish Council had drafted an 8,000 word objection, which had been circulated to all councillors ahead of this meeting. He would, however, read out an abridged version of the full objection at this meeting:

4374/0726 Comment: **Executive Summary of the Objection:**

Tatsfield Parish Council strongly objects to this application. In our detailed 8,000 word objection, the Parish Council has outlined this proposal as a speculative, estate-scale urban expansion onto sensitive greenfield land outside the village's defined settlement boundary. Our objection highlights severe technical deficiencies across multiple planning disciplines, arguing the proposal fundamentally breaches the statutory Development Plan including the adopted Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan. In summary:

1. Rejection of the 'Grey Belt' Claim
The developer seeks to bypass strict Green Belt protections by classifying the 4.22-hectare site as 'Grey Belt' under **NPPF Chapter 13**. The Parish Council firmly rejects this interpretation:

- **Failure of Granularity:** National policy mandates highly granular site assessments. While a small timber stable yard exists, the remaining 3.5 hectares consist of open grazing fields that strongly safeguard the countryside from encroachment.
- **Breach of Green Belt Purposes:** The site provides a key part of the green buffer around the village preventing Tatsfield from merging with Biggin Hill and nearby rural building clusters, and it preserves the historic setting of the village.
- **Breach of National 'Golden Rules':** The required 49% affordable housing allocation is unproven and economically unsecured. Furthermore, the proposed layout fails to provide usable, high-quality public green space, instead presenting engineered, waterlogged Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) basins that also result in an on-site biodiversity loss.

2. Conflict with the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan (TNP)
Adopted in June 2024, **Policy TNP03A** explicitly restricts new housing to locations within the Defined Village Boundary. The community democratically rejected edge-of-village greenfield allocations during its site assessment process, resolving instead to safeguard the countryside.

3. Severe Highway Safety and Capacity Constraints
The applicant's Transport Statement fails to reflect the physical realities of Ship Hill and Church Hill. These are narrow, historic country lanes lacking standard widths or formal footways. Church Hill operates essentially as a single carriageway width track bounded by steep embankments; adding 366 daily vehicle movements creates severe collision risks and conflicts with **Policy TNP02B**. Additionally, a formal holding objection from the **Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority** warns that the steep, constrained access cannot safely accommodate a 26-tonne emergency fire appliance footprint.

4. Ecological, Heritage, and Safety Risks

- **Biodiversity Deficit:** The layout incurs a mandatory **12.69% net loss in on-site habitat units**, explicitly violating **Policy TNP02G** which requires a 10% net gain. The open fields serve as critical foraging terrain for Schedule 1 raptors (Red Kites) and protected mammal corridors (Badgers).
- **Landscape and Dark Skies:** The development sits directly within **Notable Viewpoint 8**, replacing a protected rural vista with an urban landscape. It also fails to supply an illuminance model complying with **Policy TNP02J** for natural darkness.
- **Unresolved Hazards:** The site holds a high potential for sub-surface remains of the 18th-century Tatsfield Parsonage House. Furthermore, a high-pressure **Major Accident Hazard Pipeline** runs directly south of the site, introducing unquantified public safety risks within the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) consultation zone.

Conclusion
Because an outline application cannot legally lock down layout, scale, and access parameters while these fundamental physical, environmental, and infrastructure constraints remain unresolved, Tatsfield Parish Council requests that Tandridge District Council uphold the Development Plan and **refuse planning permission**.

Kim Jennings invited members of the public to make comments / raise questions (period of public participation):

- A resident queried that they had not been able to submit a comment to TDC via the online portal.
- Question – Who owns the land in the first instance? Are there any covenants on the land?
- Question – Is there an option for the community to club together to purchase the land?
- Statement – When Neighbourhood Plans were first introduced in 2011, it was made clear that once a NP is ratified (adopted), it cannot be overturned. So what was the point of doing all the work for the Tatsfield NP, which protects the green spaces, for it to be ignored now? Also, if this application is approved, can a condition be attached whereby the accommodation only goes to local people?
- Question – Has serious attention been paid to drainage? Already, in winter, rain runs off local roads and down Old Lane and Ricketts Hill Road, causing flooding. This development would surely add to this.
- Question – Would proposed dwelling foundations change the water table levels in the fields?
- Question – If this 'estate' is built, will it be adopted by the local councils (currently TDC and SCC) for maintenance of roads, street lighting etc? Would the green spaces on the development be handed over to the PC to maintain?
- Query – The Road Traffic Plan highlights cycling as a feasible method of travel for residents on the 'estate'. Query that it is not due to all the speed humps up Ship Hill.
- Comment – Construction traffic – lorries – would struggle to access via Church Lane – 12ft at the narrowest point.
- Question – Would there be an unofficial entrance via Church Lane.

- Question – What strain would this put on the school? TPS currently has just 5 vacancies across the whole school.
- Statement – The Construction Report says Church Lane would not be used but is it realistic to divert all this through the village? How will buses pass lorries? Pollution? Also, it appears that the vehicle splay is insufficient.
- Statement – If this development goes ahead, it seems as though it would create a 'separate Tatsfield' or a 'Tatsfield Part 2'. According to the plans, there would only be one access point in and out. Seems that it would be very separated from the rest of Tatsfield.
- Comment – There was a significant lack of consultation. A local resident stated that he had met separately with the developers. Their feeling was that it would be refused by the LPA and then allowed on appeal as it meets Grey Belt criteria, has a sustainable bus service and protects the openness of the Green Belt.
- Comment – Tatsfield is not a NIMBY village. It has absorbed many smaller scale developments over the years. It is important to state this.
- Comment – There appears to be lots of shortcoming
- gs in the application. What would stop the developer reading all the objections and then submitting a scaled down application which would be approved?
- Statement – Drainage and sewerage issues abound. Lusted Hall Lane has regular back ups in the sewer pipes. Would this development not add extra pressure on the existing system which is very old and not properly maintained?
- Question – Can an independent traffic survey be commissioned?

Jason Syrett outlined the next steps. There are a further 13 days from today to submit comments (deadline 26th July). TDC's decision date is currently set at 21st September but applications of this size often take longer to conclude. Due to the number of objections already logged, it will go to planning committee for a decision. The applicant may be asked to submit additional information, surveys, etc. The Parish Council will do its best to provide updates.

TA/2026/595 Land Adjacent to Cedar Cottage, Ninehams Road, Tatsfield TN16 2AN
Erection of 1x self-build dwelling and associated parking and landscaping.
This full planning application seeks permission for the erection of a single two-storey, four-bedroom self-build dwelling with associated parking (three spaces), turning facilities, and landscaping. The 0.06-hectare application site is located on land adjacent to Cedar Cottage, on the eastern side of Ninehams Road, Tatsfield (TN16 2AN). The land is currently used as domestic garden land associated with Cedar Cottage.
The site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt, positioned approximately 110 meters outside the designated Defined Village boundary of Tatsfield. Because the site sits outside the settlement footprint, the applicant relies heavily on 'Grey Belt' policy provisions introduced under Paragraph 155 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
The applicant argues the scheme represents appropriate Green Belt development because the site allegedly does not strongly contribute to core Green Belt purposes, stands in a sustainable location (a 9-minute walk to the village centre), and will help alleviate Tandridge District Council's acute five-year housing land supply shortfall. A small section of the eastern boundary falls within a Potential Site of Nature Conservation.
4375/0726 Comment: Tatsfield Parish Council objects to this application on the following basis:
Invalidation of the 'Grey Belt' Claim and Harm to the Green Belt
The applicant's core justification rests entirely on a flawed interpretation of the 'Grey Belt' exception under NPPF Paragraph 155. To qualify as Grey Belt, land must either be Previously Developed Land (PDL) or land that 'does not strongly contribute' to the statutory purposes set out in Paragraph 143.
The site fails this test. By definition in the NPPF glossary, residential garden land in rural areas outside of an urban footprint does not constitute previously developed land. Furthermore, this site forms part of a dense, continuous woodland edge that frames the eastern boundary of Ninehams Road. It serves a critical role under NPPF Paragraph 143(c) by safeguarding the open countryside from encroachment and preserving the rural setting of Tatsfield. Siting a prominent, two-storey residential dwelling into an open, green gap permanently erodes the openness of the Green Belt. Because the site strongly contributes to Green Belt purposes, it cannot be classified as Grey Belt. The proposal is therefore inappropriate development, which is harmful by definition and lacks the 'very special circumstances' required for approval under Tandridge Local Plan Policy DP10.
Direct Conflict with the Housing Settlement Strategy
This proposal directly undermines the democratically adopted Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan (adopted June 2024). Policy TNP03A of the Plan explicitly restricts new residential developments to locations within the Defined Village Boundary. The application site is located entirely in the open countryside, 110 meters outside the Tatsfield Defined Village boundary line at the far end of a very long unmade track.
Policy TNP03A only allows exceptions for modest infilling within a substantially developed frontage or brownfield redevelopment inside the village boundary. This proposal does not meet those criteria; it represents back land development that carves into a semi-natural woodland buffer. Speculative applications like this undermine local planning control and are not compliant with Tandridge Core Strategy Policy CSP1, which directs sustainable growth to established settlement centres.
Sustainability and Highway Constraints

The applicant claims the location is sustainable, citing a 9-minute walk to village services. However, the applicant admits there is an absolute absence of pedestrian footpaths or street lighting along Ninehams Road and Johns Road - both are unmade tracks without street lighting or footpaths.
Forcing future residents to walk or cycle down unlit, narrow, winding rural unmade lanes shared with vehicular traffic creates severe risks to pedestrian safety, conflicting with Tandridge Local Plan Policy DP5 (Highways Safety and Design) and Neighbourhood Plan Policy TNP02B, which seeks to protect the rural, un-urbanised characteristics of village roads.
Environmental Impact and Inadequate Mitigation
The application conflicts with NPPF Chapter 15 and Local Plan Policy DP19 regarding biodiversity protection. A section of the eastern plot boundary overlaps a designated Potential Site of Nature Conservation.
The applicant claims exemption from statutory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) because it is a self-build unit. However, Policy TNP02G of the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan carries no such exemption; it requires all developments to protect local biodiversity networks and enhance landscaping. Eradicating established garden vegetation and building immediately adjacent to dense woodland ('Gorsey Down Farm Woodland' identified as an important 'local wooden lung' in the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan) threatening established local wildlife corridors. This area is well established habitat for badgers, Roe and Muntjac Deer and Red Kites.
Additionally, the eastern sector of the site suffers from recognised surface water flooding. Introducing a dwelling and hardstanding in a known flood-risk zone creates risk to the new occupiers and increases runoff rates, directly contradicting the flood prevention mandates of Local Plan Policy DP21.
Conclusion
Tandridge District Council is urged to refuse this application. The proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt, conflicts with a number of Neighbourhood Plan policies, and threatens local landscape character.

TA/2026/752 52 Mirabilis, 65 Paynesfield Road, Tatsfield TN16 2BG
Erection of single storey rear extensions (5m from main house and 2.78m from existing garage).
This proposal aims to create a larger, multi-storey family home by adding a rear extension that introduces a new ground-floor living and dining space.
Tatsfield Parish Council previously reviewed a larger version of this application in October 2025 (TA/2025/1060). At the time there were concerns from adjacent neighbour about its volume and impact on their property. That application was subsequently refused by TDC and at appeal.
This application represents a comprehensive redesign following the previous refusal by Tandridge District Council and a dismissed appeal by the Planning Inspectorate (in May 2026), both of which cited severe overbearing and overlooking impacts on the immediate neighbour at No. 67.
To directly resolve these conflicts, the amended design drops the extension's height by approximately 1 metre in height, lowers its floor level by 1.7 meters to eliminate a previously contested raised balcony, and internalises the patio staircase to ensure all external amenity spaces remain completely at natural ground level.
4376/0726 Comment: No comment

TA/2026/579 Greensleeves, Maesmaur Road, Tatsfield TN16 2LD
Demolition of existing side and rear extension and garage. Erection of new single storey side and rear extension, enlarged garage, and hip to gable with rooflights and three-gabled dormer to rear in association with conversion of loft to habitable accommodation. Removal of chimney and installation of flue.
Previous planning history – erection of a garage in 1982 – approved.
This application seeks permission for the extensive modernisation and enlargement of Greensleeves, an unaltered 1940s detached bungalow on Maesmaur Road. The applicant notes they submitted a pre-application submission to TDC. The proposal includes:
Replacing the existing single-storey side and rear extensions to accommodate a larger kitchen and utility room and adding a ground-floor gym/spare bedroom.
Converting the loft space into a master suite and additional spare room, achieved by replacing the hipped roof with gable-ended walls and installing front rooflights and a three-gabled rear dormer.
Demolishing the structurally unsound garage and replacing it with a widened version featuring a complementary pitched roof.
Creating a formal front entrance with a timber-framed porch, removing a redundant chimney, and installing a stove flue.
The project increases the ground floor footprint by only 1.5m2, while generating 72m2 of new habitable roof volume at first floor. The overall roof height is unchanged. The design of the proposal is ok.
4377/0726 Comment: Though Tatsfield Parish Council do not in principle object to this application, we would note that the application proposes significant full height south facing glazing to the new roof rooms (as well as the ground floor), with no openable vent windows shown to the bedroom and music room. There is as a result, a high risk of summer overheating to these rooms, and we urge the owners to review this further before securing planning and proceeding with building regulations/construction.

TA/2026/579 Sparrows Hern, Old Lane, Tatsfield TN16 2LN
Erection of two storey rear/side extension.

Though Tatsfield Parish Council do not in principle object to this application, we would note that the application proposes significant full height south facing glazing to the new roof rooms (as well as the ground floor), with no openable vent windows shown to the bedroom and music room. There is as a result, a high risk of summer overheating to these rooms, and we urge the owners to review this further before securing planning and proceeding with building regulations/construction.
4378/0726 Comment: No comment

TA/2026/553 2 Sunnybank, Old Lane, Tatsfield TN16 2LH
Proposed rear landscaping works to form new retaining wall and external steps.
This proposal is for the introduction of some low retaining walls (made of steel stanchions and timber sleepers) around a new levelled patio area at the back of the house.
4379/0726 Comment: No comment

7. FINANCE:

(a) Finance Team for July: Sue Dowse and David Pinchin

4380/0726 It was resolved that the Finance Team for July would be Sue Dowse and David Pinchin.

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

4381/0726 Members approved the Clerk's request. Items on Appendix B were duly approved. Payments and supporting invoices were checked and signed by members of the Finance Team for July.

(c) Receive monthly bank reconciliation reports

This item was deferred until next month.

(d) Receive Budget v Actual YTD spend report

As item 7g.

8. Notified Items

a) Furze Corner project - update

Jason Syrett reported: Over the last 18 months the Parish Council has been seeking funding to regenerate the playing fields and rebuild the pavilion. Tatsfield Parish Council submitted a full Community Infrastructure Levy funding application for the regeneration of Furze Corner in April this year, asking for a total sum of £815,000. This included the £450,000 granted conditionally in 2025. Unfortunately, last year we were unable to secure the conditional match funding). Following the outcome of the Tandridge District Council Planning Policy Committee on 18th June, I am pleased to confirm that Tatsfield Parish Council have been awarded a total grant of £802,459.41. Though this is around £12,500 below our full application value, it remains a substantial funding pot for the project and we are now mobilising the Furze Corner Steering Group to proceed with the project. The Furze Corner Steering Group are meeting tomorrow (Tuesday 14th) at 8pm in the AMB building. If any residents are keen to support us in delivering the project, you are welcome to come along. This will enable us to deliver a replacement sports pavilion sized at around 140sq.m and the required improvement works to the playing fields. We are hoping that we will be able to start work next summer. We are pleased to also announce that the Parish Council are now also in detailed discussions with a local football team to offer use of the Furze Corner pitches for youth training and matches from later this summer. We are committed to bringing formal sports back to Furze Corner at the earliest opportunity and remain in touch with Tatsfield Cricket Club (who are playing away this season).

A parishioner asked the question about whether there were any conditions regarding the timing and completion. Jason Syrett confirmed there were no restrictions.

b) Furze Corner – Asset Transfer proposal

The Parish Council currently holds a 25-year lease for Furze Corner. The lease has been running for 18 months now. TDC is now offering to transfer the freehold to the PC. There would be legal costs involved.

Cllr Jeremy Pursehouse indicated that there was a pot for legal costs and the PC may not have to pay anything.
Kim Jennings noted that if the PC took over the freehold, then it would be liable for all running costs.
4382/0726 Members agreed in principle to the proposal for the PC to take over the freehold of Furze Corner, provided that the access road could be included.

c) **Furze Corner – Licence**

The PFA has previously held a licence to serve alcohol at the clubhouse. The PC was sent an email offering the licence but it transpires that it was for the club and cannot be transferred.

d) Furze Corner – Resolution Letter for Authorised Signatory

Jason Syrett proposed that the Clerk be the notified person
4383/0726 Members agreed the proposal.

e) Biggin Hill FC – grant application for pitch maintenance funding

Martin Elmer provided the following details: Biggin Hill FC was looking to apply for a grant of £25,000 which would be paid out over 6 years. The Parish Council would need to contribute £12,000 over the 6-year period (£2,000 a year). The grant is for football clubs not local councils as it is from Surrey FA.
4384/0726 Members agreed to defer this to a later meeting.

f) Tandridge District Council Local Plan – consultation

The consultation went live on 6th July. Sue Dowse, Kim Jennings, Martin Elmer and Cllr Martin Allen went to the public presentation in Warlingham. Tatsfield will host another presentation on 20th July between 15:30 and 20:00 in the AMB which will be led by members of TDC's Local Plan team. The deadline for comment is 17th August.
Jason Syrett had circulated a suggested response.
4385/0726 Members approved the comment and requested the Clerk submit it to TDC.

g) Parish Council Risk Assessments

Simon Cook gave the following report: He and Martin Elmer had carried out the risk assessment. They had not done one for Furze Corner as that needs to be updated. There was nothing of particular note, except for speeding along Approach Road and the parking situation in the village centre. It was queried whether yellow lines were needed.
4386/0726 Members received and accepted the risk assessments.

9 Reports from County Councillor, District Councillor, Village Organisations and External Organisations

a) County Councillor

Jacquie Thomson gave the following update: She had been assisting local residents with the proposed transport issues for Oxted School.

b) District Councillor

Cllr Allen gave the following update: Cllr Allen noted that he was pleased that he was able to persuade officers and Council Leader Catherine Sayers to hold a Local Plan meeting in Tatsfield. He is now working more closely with group leaders and senior officers at bi-weekly meetings to try to get TDC into order for a smooth handover to the new UA. Focus is on CATs and options to spend funds. This also includes shoring up the failing leisure centre (3 out of the 4 boilers are not working efficiently). In other matters, work is underway to reduce the number of enforcements outstanding. The CE has been discussing the failure of the rubbish collection service with Biffa (albeit Tatsfield has not been unduly affected). The Titsey Estate application for 6 Padel courts has been called in on behalf of the residents of Broomlands Lane. Cllr Allen has received a response from the elected leader of the new East Surrey Council as to why the Warlingham Ward and the wider Old Tandridge area has not got any representation at senior levels for both officers and councillor positions. His response has been printed on page 19 of the Parish Magazine. Business as usual continues at TDC, albeit slowly. There is a further meeting with the Housing Regulator and fears are growing that TDC will be put into administration. Cllr Allen continues to attend BHACC meetings and monitors overflying of the NSA.

c) Shadow Unitary – East Surrey Council – Councillor(s) reports

Ryan Bloomfield gave the following update: He continues to attend training sessions. He also attended a Standards Committee meeting. The next full council meeting will be held on 29th July.
Jeremy Pursehouse gave the following update: Councillors have been allocated to committees. All power is in the hands of the Lib Dem executive (cabinet). All work is focussed on getting the UA ready for the Vesting Day. Cllr Pursehouse sits n the Constitutional Committee, as well as the Audit & Governance Committee. East Surrey Council and West Surrey Council has written to Government stating that they wish to be involved in a strategic authority, with a view to having a mayoral authority.

d) Police

No report

e) VHMC

No report

10 Parish Council Land / Property

To receive updates, discuss matters and where relevant agree on proposals relating to:

a) MUGA

- **MUGA management (Under Part 2)**

This item would be discussed under Part 2.

b) Westmore Green

- **Playground refurbishment project**

Kim Jennings gave the following report: She had met the playground designer and Katherine Dainkeh who confirmed that plans would be available to review in September. She had introduced them to the Primary School Headmistress and the idea was for the school, children to have an input. Funds raised so far totalled £5,500, there was still some way to go to reach the £10,000 target. Crafting sessions would be run during the school holidays. On 10th September there will be a musical bingo night in The Ship. All monies raised will go to the playground refurbishment.

- **Tatol bed refurbishment**

This is scheduled to start at the end of July and will take 3 – 4 days.

c) Tatsfield Green

- **Boundary Dispute (Under Part 2)**

This will be discussed under Part 2.

11 Meetings to attend/ correspondence

- Local Plan consultation – Monday 20th July 15:30 – 20:00
- Claire Countinho will be holding a constituency surgery on 17th Jul between 12:00- 13:30 in the AMB.
- There is a SALC Councillors forum on Wednesday 17th June at 19:30.

12 Matters for reporting or Inclusion in a Future Agenda

None

Final public participation:

- Motorbikes and cars continue to race up Ship Hill.

The meeting closed at 9.55pm

The next Parish Council meeting will be held on Monday 14th September 2026 at 8pm.