MINUTES of a Meeting of Tatsfield Parish Council held on the 12th October 2026 in the Meeting Room, Aileen McHugo Building, Westmore Green, Tatsfield TN16 2AG commencing at 8.00 p.m.

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

In Attendance: Samantha Head (Clerk)
Martin Allen (TDC) (arrived at 8.34pm)
Jacquie Thomson (SCC)
Jeremy Pursehouse (Shadow Cllr – East Surrey Council)

And 9 parishioners

The meeting commenced at 8.00 pm

1. **APOLOGIES**

4411/1026 David Pinchin had sent his apologies. These were received and accepted by members.

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

None

3. **Approve and sign the MINUTES of the previous meeting held on 14th September 2026**

4412/1026 It was resolved that the minutes reflected a true and accurate record of the meeting held on 14th September 2026. They were duly signed by the Chair.

4. **Public Participation**

- A query on the June minutes on the PC website and a second (?) PC website.

5. **Officer's report**

- The Clerk confirmed that the AGAR had been published on the website ahead of the required deadline.
- The second half of the Precept for 2025-26 has been paid to the PC.
- The fire alarm and extinguishers at the AMB have been serviced. 5 extinguishers have been replaced. New batteries for the control panel and sensors are due next year.
- The PC has agreed cuts for next year of the sight lines on Ricketts Hill Road. Nick Dance has offered to cut FC playing field at the same price as this year.

6. **PLANNING:**

(a) Planning Team for October: Sue Dowse and Kim Jennings

4413/1026 It was resolved that the planning team for October would be Sue Dowse and Kim Jennings.

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

TA/2026/916 Development Site West of The Orchards, Westmore Green, Tatsfield TN16 2AG
Development of up to 12 units associated infrastructure, vehicular and pedestrian access (Outline application with all matters reserved except access)

This planning application seeks outline permission (with all matters reserved except access) for an unallocated residential development of up to 12 dwellings on a 1.33 hectare greenfield site situated in the Metropolitan Green Belt outside the Defined Village boundary.

While the applicant proposes 50% affordable housing, an on-site infiltration drainage basin, and a new vehicular junction off Approach Road, the scheme represents an inappropriate residential expansion that fails to satisfy national 'Grey Belt' or 'Golden Rules' criteria.

Furthermore, the application is procedurally defective by omitting illustrative masterplan for layout and parameter plan drawings for building heights/massing, rendering its submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal fundamentally incomplete.

The proposal relies on a new access route requiring hedgerow clearance and a junction constructed on Parish Council owned Common Land (Westmore Green), while introducing a highway safety hazard adjacent to the known accident bend by the Tatol Bed subject to frequent accidents in dense winter fog.

4414/1026 Comment: Tatsfield Parish Council formally objects to outline planning application 2026/916.

While the applicant seeks to justify residential development on this parcel by citing district housing delivery shortfalls, the Parish Council believes that there are clear planning grounds demonstrating that the application represents inappropriate, harmful, and undeliverable development in the Metropolitan Green Belt.

It is our belief that the proposal fails on multiple grounds:

1. **Unallocated Green Belt land:** The site is previously undeveloped Green Belt land outside the Defined Village boundary. While the land was evaluated during the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan process (as site TNP-18), it was formally rejected for allocation by the Tatsfield community. Furthermore, while the land is under consideration within Tandridge District Council's draft Regulation 18 Spatial Development Strategy Consultation (Local Plan 2026), it currently remains unallocated draft land, outside of the Defined Village Boundary and must be assessed as previously undeveloped Green Belt.

2. **Procedural indefiniteness, missing parameter plans, and deficient LVA:** Although seeking permission for up to 12 dwellings, the application fails to provide an illustrative masterplan, proper parameter plans, or quantum controls establishing building heights, massing, bulk, or floor areas. This creates an unacceptable level of uncertainty for the public and Tatsfield Parish Council, leaving the scheme open to uncontrolled interpretation at Reserved Matters stage. Because no maximum ridge or eaves heights have been established, the applicant's Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) fails to model proposed building heights and is fundamentally incomplete in its appraisal.

3. **Physical and legal inability to facilitate access across Common Land:** The applicant's proposed vehicular access requires breaking through established boundary vegetation and constructing a road across registered Common Land (Westmore Green), which is owned and managed by Tatsfield Parish Council. The applicant has made no formal approach to, nor obtained agreement from, Tatsfield Parish Council to acquire rights, construct access or clear vegetation over Westmore Green. Because the Parish Council will not facilitate or grant consent for these works over its land, the access is physically and legally undeliverable.

4. **Severe highway hazard, restricted sightlines, and fog risks:** The proposed junction is in close proximity to a severe bend on Approach Road / Ship Hill (known locally as the Tatsfield Bend). This stretch suffers from poor visibility and a history of vehicular accidents with multiple car crashes into the Tatol bed on the junction of Ship Hill/Westmore Green/Lusted Hall Lane. This is exacerbated by the altitude of Tatsfield (over 225m AOD) which causes frequent, severe winter fog and near-zero visibility. Placing a new vehicular access in such close proximity to this bend and emerging from between existing trees seems very inappropriate in safety terms.

Detailed Grounds of Objection

1. Green Belt Inappropriateness and Invalidation of Strategic Allocations
The application site comprises 1.33 hectares of open greenfield land in the Metropolitan Green Belt. It is situated outside the red line boundary of the Defined Village of Tatsfield, falling within Character Area 1 (Village Centre) as designated on Map 09 of the statutory Development Plan.

No Infill Exemption (Policy DP12 & Policy TNP03A): The applicant attempts to portray the scheme as 'infilling'. Local Plan Part 2 Policy DP12 and Neighbourhood Plan Policy TNP03A strictly confine infilling to small gaps within an existing, substantially developed frontage inside the Defined Village Boundary. Siting 12 houses across a 1.33 ha field outside this does not constitute infilling; it is an inappropriate residential extension into open land.

- **Democratic rejection under Neighbourhood Plan:** During the formulation of the Adopted Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan (2024), this specific land parcel was evaluated under the Call for Sites as Site TNP-18. Following detailed technical reviews, the Parish Council and local community explicitly rejected allocating edge-of-village greenfield sites. The Plan formally adopted Option 5 (Do not allocate housing in the Neighbourhood Plan) to preserve the Green Belt.

- **Prematurity and unallocated status in emerging Local Plan:** While the land is being considered as part of Tandridge District Council's draft Regulation 18 Spatial Development Strategy Consultation (Local Plan 2026), it remains unallocated draft land still under review. Under national policy, unallocated draft proposals carry no statutory weight to bypass Green Belt policy. Until a new Local Plan is formally examined and adopted, the site remains 100% undeveloped Metropolitan Green Belt.

- **Failure of 'Grey Belt' & 'Golden Rules' Criteria (NPPF Policy GB7 & GB8):** Under the revised August 2026 NPPF, the land does not qualify as Grey Belt under Policy GB2, as it strongly contributes to preventing the merger of rural settlements and safeguards the setting of historic village assets. Furthermore, the major application fails the mandatory Golden Rules (Policy GB8):

    - *Strand A (Affordable Housing):* The 50% affordable housing offer is unproven and un-secured against un-priced on-site drainage and common land works.

- *Strand B (Infrastructure):* The scheme fails to deliver safe, legal highway access.
- *Strand C (Green Space & BNG):* The Statutory Biodiversity Metric confirms an on-site net loss of -0.44 habitat units (-9.65%) and breaks statutory trading rules, failing to provide accessible, nature-recovering green space.

2. Procedural Indefiniteness, Missing Masterplan/Parameters, and Incomplete LVA
While the applicant has submitted an outline application reserving layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping, the submission lacks basic illustrative and parameter controls:

- **Absence of Illustrative layout and Parameter Plans:** The application contains no illustrative layout showing how 12 dwellings, internal estate roads, turning heads, and open spaces could practically co-exist on the site. Furthermore, the applicant has failed to submit any Parameter Plans establishing maximum building heights, ridge levels, building envelopes, or floor areas.
- **Uncontrolled speculation at Reserved Matters:** Without parameter plans, statutory consultees, Tatsfield Parish Council, and local residents are left completely in the dark regarding the physical massing, scale, and density of the eventual development. If granted outline permission without parameter controls, the Local Planning Authority will lose the ability to prevent overbearing bulk, elevated ridge lines, or out-of-scale massing at the reserved matters stage.
- **Fundamentally Deficient and Incomplete LVA Assessment:** The submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal (the Terra Firma Consultancy) purports to assess the visual effects of the development on sensitive local receptors, including Westmore Green and the AGLV. However, because the applicant has set no parameters for building heights or massing, the LVA assesses an unquantified scheme. The LVA's Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and viewpoint analyses do not model proposed massing or ridge heights, rendering the visual assessment speculative, fundamentally incomplete, and incapable of proving compliance with Adopted Neighbourhood Plan policies TNP04A (High Quality Design) and TNP02D (Protection of Views).

3. Access over Common Land (Westmore Green) owned by Tatsfield Parish Council
Access is not a reserved matter; the applicant seeks full approval for the vehicular access layout off Approach Road under this application. However, the proposed access layout is physically and legally impossible to implement:

Encroachment and vegetation clearance on parish land: To construct the 5.0m wide bellmouth access road, 6.0m junction radii, and flanking footways, the applicant proposes to clear established, mature native trees, hedgerows, and scrub. This vegetation sits entirely on registered Common Land (Westmore Green) owned by Tatsfield Parish Council.

- **Absence of agreement or consent:** The applicant has made no formal approach to, nor held discussions with, Tatsfield Parish Council to acquire an easement, purchase rights, or seek permission to construct a vehicular access across Westmore Green.
- **Refusal to Facilitate Access:** Tatsfield Parish Council formally confirms that, as the landowner of Westmore Green, it will not grant access rights, consent, or permission for the destruction of its established vegetation or the construction of a roadway across its Common Land.
- **Conflict with policy TNP02F and Common Land protections:** Section 38 of the Commons Act 2006 strictly protects registered Common Land. Furthermore, Policy TNP02F (The setting of Village Greens) of the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan mandates that developments adjacent to Westmore Green '*must respect the open space contribution and contribute positively to its setting*'. Carving an engineered asphalt junction and footpath through Westmore Green destroys its rural enclosure, violates Policy TNP02F, and renders the access scheme un-deliverable.

4. Highway safety hazard, poor visibility, and climatological fog risks
The proposed access junction off Approach Road presents an unacceptable risk to local highway safety:

- **Proximity to hazardous bend (Tatsfield Bend):** The access point is sited in close proximity to the sharp bend where Approach Road transitions into Ship Hill. This bend is a known accident hotspot with a documented history of vehicle collisions. The Tatol planting bed and village sign on the bend is again currently being rebuilt after the last accident.

- **Deficient visibility splays and topography:** The local topography drops sharply, and the highway boundary is enclosed by dense tree belts. Vehicles emerging from the proposed 12-dwelling estate will suffer from severely restricted sightlines when looking toward oncoming traffic navigating the bend.

- **Fog hazards:** Standing at an elevation of over 225m AOD on the high dip-slope of the North Downs, Tatsfield experiences frequent, severe winter fog events. Low-cloud blanket conditions regularly drop visibility on Approach Road to near-zero. Introducing a new vehicular access where cars must turn across oncoming traffic in frequent, dense fog, set right on a blind curve creates an extreme risk of side-impact collisions.

- **Direct conflict with NPPF paragraph 115 and Policy TNP09F:** Paragraph 115 of the NPPF mandates that development '*must be refused if there are unacceptable impacts on highway safety'*. Furthermore, **Aspirational Policy TNP09F (Roads, traffic and safety)** of the Neighbourhood Plan protects the narrow, rural character of Approach Road and Ship Hill, prohibiting new access arrangements that compromise local safety or impact on country lane characteristics.

5. Unresolved flood risk, low permeability, and basin feasibility
The submitted Flood Risk Assessment (Aegaea Ltd) and Drainage Strategy contain technical deficiencies:

- **BRE 365 infiltration failure:** On-site soakaway testing executed in October 2025 recorded an exceptionally low infiltration rate of 1.57×10^{-6} m/s in the underlying weathered chalk and clay-with-flints.

- **Inability to drain (half-drain failure):** The developer proposes an open-air infiltration basin. However, due to the poor ground permeability, the basin fails standard 24–48 hour half-drain down times, leaving standing water trapped for over 45,000 minutes (31 days) after a storm event.

- **Unproven deep-bore speculation:** To bypass this failure, the applicant speculates that deep-bore (borehole) soakaways might be installed beneath the basin. No deep-bore testing or hydro-geological risk assessments have been conducted to prove that borehole soakaways will not trigger chalk dissolution or localised groundwater flooding. Approving an outline access and site layout when the primary drainage feature is technically unviable breaches NPPF Paragraph 170 and TDC Policy DP21.

Conclusion:

This Outline Planning Application is flawed. The site is unallocated Green Belt land outside the Defined Village boundary, explicitly rejected by the community under the Adopted Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan (2024).

The application is procedurally defective, providing no parameter plans or building height limits, which leaves the visual impact unquantified and renders the submitted LVA fundamentally incomplete.
Furthermore, the scheme is physically and legally un-deliverable: the applicant requires vehicular access across registered Common Land (Westmore Green) owned by Tatsfield Parish Council, yet no agreement exists, and the Parish Council formally refuses to grant access rights or permit the destruction of its land.

Combined with severe highway hazards on a blind bend subject to extreme winter fog and a failing surface water drainage strategy, the application cannot be supported.

Tatsfield Parish Council formally requests that Tandridge District Council uphold the Development Plan and refuse planning permission for application 2026/916.

*Public participation:
Q - Is the PC presumably not prepared to sell land for access?
Q – Can the site be designated as Grey Belt?
Q – the application mentions affordable housing – what proportion of the total proposal would this be?
- There are no details plans yet.
- Wildlife is present on the site, despite not being noted in the outline planning application.
- James Millard stated that this is a rare opportunity for Tatsfield to influence the application (in terms of dwelling types and style). The site is a natural gap in the built form of the village. He does not own the land but has a promotional agreement with the Reeves Group to develop it. If this outline application is not successful, then the relationship with the Reeves Group will likely end.
- Concerns were raised regarding access.

Kim Jennings noted that the PC is consistent with all applications it is consulted on.

Jason Syrett noted that the application lacked an illustrative scheme i.e., a visual representation which is very normal in order to provide height parameters – essential for residents / the PC to ascertain what the development might look like.

TA/2026/559 Development Site South of Ship Hill 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) – Update planning statement received.
The applicant had submitted an updated planning statement. The PC has submitted an additional comment.
4415/1026 Comment: **OBJECTION:**

Tatsfield Parish Council is submitting this additional representation in direct response to the applicant's Planning Statement Addendum (September 2026). This representation cross-references and reinforces our previous representation and formal strategic objection submitted in July 2026.

The applicant attempts to leverage the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, August 2026) to argue that the national planning balance has shifted decisively in favour of granting outline consent for an 84-dwelling estate on Green Belt land outside the Defined Village boundary of Tatsfield.

Tatsfield Parish Council demonstrates below that the applicant's position is technically flawed, relies on a misapplication of revised NPPF policies (GB6, GB7, GB8, and S5), and completely ignores Tandridge District Council's concurrent publication of its draft Regulation 18 Spatial Development Strategy (Local Plan 2026). In the view of Tatsfield Parish Council, the application remains an inappropriate, harmful, and unsustainable development that must be refused.

Key Grounds of Objection to the Planning Addendum:

1. **Invalidation of Grey Belt Status under NPPF (August 2026) Policy GB2 & GB7**

The applicant asserts under Section 3 of the Addendum that under the August 2026 NPPF, the site automatically qualifies as 'Grey Belt' because its contribution to Green Belt Purposes (a), (b), and (d) (under Policy GB2) is 'weak or nil'. This claim is factually incorrect:

Contradiction of Spatial Strategy & Local Plan 2026:

In parallel with this application, Tandridge District Council have published its draft Regulation 18 Spatial Development Strategy Consultation (Local Plan 2026). The District Council's comprehensive evidence base identifies how it will meet its objectively assessed housing need (without allocating the Ship Hill site for housing). The emerging Spatial Strategy reinforces the spatial integrity of the Defined Village boundary of Tatsfield, confirming that the open countryside surrounding the village performs an irreplaceable Green Belt function.

Failure of Green Belt Purpose GB2(b) (Preventing Merger):

As set out in Section 1.3.1 of our July 2026 Objection, the site fulfils a primary structural planning function by providing a green separation buffer between the Defined Village boundary of Tatsfield, remote rural landmarks (such as Grade II listed St Mary's Church), and the built-up boundary of Biggin Hill (London Borough of Bromley). Urbanising 4.22 hectares of open grazing land causes a direct, permanent loss of visual and spatial separation, directly violating NPPF Policy GB2(b).

Absence of Granular Evaluation:

National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) sets out that Grey Belt evaluations must be 'granular'. The minor footprint of a timber stable block and rubber menage does not justify reclassifying 3.5+ hectares of open, undeveloped paddocks as Grey Belt. The parcel strongly performs the core function of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment (Purpose GB2(c)).

Non-Compliance with Policy GB7(1)(g):

Under NPPF Policy GB7(1)(g)(i), Grey Belt development is only exempt from being inappropriate if it does 'not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the plan area'. Unilaterally breaching the settlement edge at Tatsfield sets a destructive precedent across the District's entire northern Green Belt boundary, undermining the plan-led strategy embodied in TDC's draft Regulation 18 Consultation.

2. **Persistent Failure to Satisfy the National 'Golden Rules' (NPPF Policy GB8)**

The applicant claims in Section 3.22 of the Addendum that the scheme complies in full with the national Golden Rules (Policy GB8) and therefore attracts 'substantial weight'. On the contrary, the scheme fails all three statutory strands:

Strand A (Affordable Housing): While the applicant offers a 49% affordable split, this remains a paper promise. Under PPG guidance, site-specific viability cannot be used to reduce this quota. Because the applicant's layout incorporates unresolved, un-priced off-site liabilities (including off-site Biodiversity Net Gain unit purchases), the financial viability of delivering 49% affordable housing alongside required infrastructure remains unproven.

Strand B (Infrastructure & Fire Safety): The Addendum claims compliance with infrastructure delivery. However, as detailed in Section 6 of our July 2026 Objection, the Surrey Fire and Rescue Authority (SFRS) maintains an active holding objection (dated June 24, 2026). The applicant has failed to provide technical scale data proving that 26-tonne high-reach appliances can navigate the steep gradients of Ship Hill or turn safely within internal 6.0m street corridors. Fixing layout and scale at outline stage while emergency infrastructure remains unverified is inappropriate.

Strand C (Accessible Green Space & Nature Recovery): Policy GB8(1)(c) mandates good quality, accessible green space that 'supports nature recovery'. As established in Section 3 of our July 2026 Objection, the applicant's open space layout is dominated by engineered, steep-sided SuDS infiltration basins designed to catch heavy clay runoff. These basins do not constitute usable dry parkland, and their construction directly causes an 'on-site net loss of 12.69% (-2.52 habitat units)', breaking national trading rules.

3. Unresolved Technical Deficits and Environmental Non-Compliance

The Planning Statement Addendum focuses narrowly on national housing targets while failing to resolve the fundamental physical and environmental constraints identified in previous statutory consultations:

Unmitigated Harm to Notable View Point 8 (Policy TNP02D): The Addendum does not address the destruction of Notable View Point 8 (View across from Ship Hill over fields towards the old school building) protected under the Adopted Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan. Replacing an open rural landscape with an urban housing layout violates Policy TNP02D and Objective 10.

Pre-Determination Archaeological Failure (Policy TNP06B): The Addendum ignores the statutory objection from the SCC Senior Archaeologist (Nigel Randall, dated June 25, 2026). The site contains a high probability of sub-surface heritage assets associated with the 18th-century Tatsfield Parsonage House. Deferring field trial trenching to post-determination conditions while fixing outline layout and drainage basin footprints violates Policy TNP06B(e).

Unreconciled High-Pressure Gas Pipeline Hazard: The applicant has failed to resolve the contradiction in their engineering files regarding National Gas Transmission's High-Pressure Major Accident Hazard Pipeline, whose HSE Outer Consultation Zone covers a large portion of the residential layout. Determining an outline layout without formal HSE/PADHI safety clearance presents an unquantified risk to public safety.

Dark Night Skies Non-Compliance (Policy TNP02J): The layout introduces an intensive artificial lighting footprint on an unlit rural edge without providing a technical lighting model proving compliance with Environmental Zone E1 (Natural Darkness) limits. This threatens confirmed day roosts and foraging corridors for common pipistrelle and brown long-eared bats.

Highway Safety & Country Lane Constraints (Policies TNP02B & TNP09F): The applicant relies on a County Highway Authority response to claim transport sustainability. However, as detailed in Section 5 of our July 2026 Objection, introducing 366 daily vehicle trips onto Ship Hill and Church Hill (narrow, sub-standard country lanes with severe vehicle-passing deficits and restricted sightlines) creates an unacceptable hazard to highway safety under NPPF Paragraph 115 and breaches Policies TNP02B and TNP09F.

Updated Conclusion and Action Requested

The applicant's Planning Statement Addendum (September 2026) relies on a selective reading of the revised NPPF to force an inappropriate development onto protected Green Belt land. The proposal is not a modest village infill scheme; it is an estate-scale urban expansion that directly violates the spatial strategy, housing constraints, landscape protections, design standards, and dark skies policies of the Adopted Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan (2024).

The site fails to qualify as Grey Belt under NPPF Policy GB2/GB7, and Tandridge District Council's draft Regulation 18 Spatial Development Strategy (Local Plan 2026) demonstrates that local housing targets can be met without destroying this rural buffer. Furthermore, the application breaches all three national Golden Rules (Policy GB8) and leaves critical public safety, fire access, archaeological, pipeline, and biodiversity constraints completely unresolved.

An outline application cannot legally lock in layout, scale, and access parameters while these fundamental physical and policy constraints remain unaddressed.

Tatsfield Parish Council formally requests that Tandridge District Council uphold the Development Plan, support its emerging Local Plan 2026 Spatial Strategy, and refuse planning permission for application 2026/559.

TA/2026/1128 Hill Cottage, Johns Road, Tatsfield TN16 2AP
Erection of raised roof with Dormers to front elevation to provide additional habitable accommodation within loft space.
This application is to raise and add dormer windows to one wing of an L-shaped detached house. As a result, it converts loft height storage space to one extra bedroom and a bathroom. The roof levels would then align. The dwelling is located centrally within a large plot with no long term impacts expected to neighbours. Materials and windows to match existing.
4416/1026 Comment: No comment

TA/2026/1225/T Moorhouse Sands and Pit, Westerham Road, Westerham TN16 2EU
Proposed base station installation. The removal of existing lattice tower and all associated equipment. The installation of new 25m Lattice tower. The removal of existing 6no tower . Antenna apertures to be replaced by 6no antenna apertures. The addition of 2no dishes. Works within equipment cabin . Development of ancillary works thereto.
A lot of documents have been redacted but from what is shown, it appears that this application is for a replacement of the existing mobile tower with associated works. It is positioned in a wooded area near to the M25.
4417/1026 Comment: No comment

TA/2026/989 The Manor House, Ricketts Hill Road, Tatsfield TN16 2NE
Installation of Air Sourced Pump Heating System.
This is a large stand-alone Grade 2 listed home in acres of land. With no overlooking or noise problems for the neighbours.
4418/1026 Comment: No comment

7. FINANCE:

(a) Finance Team for October: Kim Jennings and Sue Dowse

4419/1026 It was resolved that the Finance Team for October would be Kim Jennings and Sue Dowse.

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

4420/1026 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 October.

(c) Items for expenditure: lights for Tatol Bed – JCG Electrical Services £2333.80 plus Vat $466.76 Total = £2800.56 (to be ratified)

Supply of 2 watt IP68 Nitelux spike spot light fitting.
(5 year manufacturer warranty)
8 £100.00 £800.00
Supply of 25 watt IP68 Nitelux spike spot light fitting.
(5 year manufacturer warranty) to light big trees
2 £190.00 £380.00
Supply of Nitelux 5m lead 6 £16.80 £100.80
Supply of Nitelux T-piece connector 9 £12.00 £108.00
Supply of 105 watt IP68 Nitelux transformer.
(3 year manufacturer warranty)
1 £65.00 £65.00
Supply of timed photocell to turn lights on at dusk and off at dawn 1 £80.00 £80.00
Labour per hour per electrician 16 £50.00 £800.00
Subtotal (exc. VAT) £2,333.80
Total Vat £466.76
Total inc. VAT £2,800.56
Total paid £0.00
Balance due £2,800.56
4421/1026 Members agreed the above expenditure.

(d) AGAR 2025-26 – External Audit

The Clerk confirmed that the audit had been passed with no matters raised. All required documents for the PC website were posted by the legal deadline.

(e) Receive monthly bank reconciliation reports

4422/1026 Members received the monthly bank reconciliation reports. These were signed and dated by two parish councillors.

(f) Receive Budget v Actual YTD spend report

4423/1026 Members received the budget v. actual YTD spend report.

(g) Parish Council insurance policy renewal (to be ratified)

The Clerk had a RCA surveyed and produced in September, ahead of the insurance renewal date. This has resulted in a reduction in the insurance premium of almost £1000 (£988.55) this year. The premium of £2087.49 was paid on 30th September (renewal date) so that the PC's cover didn't lapse (as per the agreed action at the September meeting). To be ratified please.

4424/1026 Members ratified the above expenditure.

8. Notified Items

a) Furze Corner project – update

TDC has been in touch to update the PC on the access track condition. TDC is proposing laying a new surface for the turning into the access road up to or just beyond the access gates, most probably using crushed stone which will help drainage. For the remainder of the track up to the start of the car parking area proper, the surface will be scarified and a dense aggregate material will be rolled in and compacted. It is anticipated that this will then mean that the track will require little significant maintenance for at least ten years. This work will hopefully be undertaken in November.
The PC Chairman has requested that the hedges and brambles are dealt with as the hedge cutting that the PC has done a short while ago has not lasted and there is already a lot of regrowth. The bramble roots need to be dug out.
Discussions continue with TDC regarding funding package and how this will progress.
Members of the Steering Group have met with Sports Club Ltd who will submit a proposal for managing the project which would then provide evidence for the release of the CIL funds.
BHFC is still doing their own ground maintenance but still enjoying matches there. They are using temporary nets and goals as they are unable to apply for a grant until TDC grants permission for occupation by the club. Martin Elmer will go back to BHFC and explain the reasons why the PC cannot enter into an exclusive use agreement for FC playing fields.
The padlock for the main gate has been removed and new chain and padlock fitted. So far, the culprit has not been identified.

b) **Remembrance Service 2026**

This year's Remembrance Service will be hosting in conjunction with the Church and will be on Sunday 8th November. Kim Jennings to read the Kohima, Dave Mitchell to read out the list of wreath layers, Simon Cook to read a poem and Martyn Saines will read the Roll of Honour. A representative from the church will give a bible reading. It was confirmed that, due to this year's service being on Sunday, the cadets are unable to attend but the scouts will parade. Simon Cook to contact the RBL to find out who the poppy seller is for Tatsfield and to order some more large poppies for posts. Kim Jennings will bring a gazebo for the sound system.

c) Emergency Plan

The Clerk has reviewed the Emergency Plan and made some minor updates. Martin Elmer has contacted all volunteers and checked that they are a) happy to be included on the plan for another year and b) that their list of skills / equipment is still accurate. It was noted that although the plan has historically focussed on flooding / snow, given this year's prolonged heatwave, it may be that the PC has to enact the plan in the event of a period of extreme heat - mindful of vulnerable residents who may require support and long / dry grass which could pose a wildfire risk. It was noted that all grit bins have been filled.

d) Request to close the MUGA for firework display Friday 13th November from 15:00

The following request has been received from the PTA: I am writing to enquire about the MUGA being closed on Friday 13th November 2026 as Tatsfield Primary School is having their fireworks/laser display. The event starts at 5pm but we will have people arriving and setting up from 3pm.
Members noted that the MUGA should not be open at this time. This was a matter for the school which has use of the MUGA until 17:00

e) Christmas Lights and Switch On Event

Kim Jennings confirmed that Dan Burr was purchasing the Christmas lights and organising a cherry picker. All lights will be brand new and hopefully squirrel proof. Dan Burr organised a GoFundMe page last year which raised £1,500, the PC budgeted £750 and the Roseheath Foundation gave £1,000. The work will be carried out in the next few weeks. Sue Dowse confirmed that the switch on event will take place on 5th December and there will be a craft fair in the VH. There will be stalls, a BBQ, Christmas Wreaths and an area for children to write letters to Father Christmas who will return to the village on 19th December to grant these wishes. Jason Syrett to organise some Christmas music. The Tatsfield Singers will attend at 17:00.

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

a) County Councillor

Jacquie Thomson gave the following update: She had granted £200 to the Not So Young Club.

b) District Councillor

Cllr Allen gave the following update: Cllr Allen reported that a lot of time had been spent reviewing the Local Plan consultation responses and preparing for the HELAA publication. Both planning applications on Ship Hill are now in the HELAA but Cllr

Allen has stipulated that he wants 50% of housing for local people only. The 2nd consultation for the LP is due out on 16th October. The housing figure for Tatsfield is 115 over ten years.
Cllr Allen has attended meetings with Group Leaders and much of the focus is on trying to today up in time for the hand over to East Surrey Council. He has a licencing meeting on 15th October and other usual committee meetings.

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

Ryan Bloomfield was not at the meeting.
Jeremy Pursehouse gave the following update: He is becoming increasingly more despondent with the shadow unitary council. It looks like ESC will not be ready for Vesting Day. He is frustrated by the Executive model of doing everything. The controlling group is not cooperating with the other groups. Focus is currently on setting the constitution. The next big project is setting the budget and ensuring that all 5 existing districts and boroughs pay the same Council Tax.

d) Police

Simon Cook reported: There have been 34 arrests across Tandridge in the last month. Just one reported in Tatsfield – theft of a vehicle. Fly tipping is still an issue in White Lane, Beddlestead Road and Gangers Lane. There has been a huge fly tip on Approach Road. This week is Domestic Violence week. 30 Scam awareness booklets have been handed out in the shop. Surrey Police have issued the usual advice about scams, burglary prevention. The PSCO Georgia Kidd has been a regular presence in the village. There is a Meet the Beat date in November.

e) VHMC

No report

10 Parish Council Land / Property

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

a) Westmore Green

- **Playground refurbishment project**

Kim Jennings gave the following report: She has spoken to Catherine Dainkeh as the playground designer had promised plans at the beginning of September and has not been responding to emails. Catherine Dainkeh confirmed that TDC has the plans and she has asked that Kim Jennings share them with the school. Village fundraising is now at just over £8.5K. Once the target of £10k has been reached, this will unlock the TDC funding. It is still hoped that work will start at the end of November.

- **Tatol bed refurbishment**

The build has now finished and lights are due to be added this week. It will be planted on Friday. Many thanks to Ian Hayman and to Simon Cook for painting the Tatol sign.

11 Meetings to attend/ correspondence

- Simon Cook to attend a Fairtrade meeting in November (date tbc)
- Hallowe'en event on 31st October in the village centre 16:00-18:00 for under 11s.
- David Cowan from SCA – Rural Housing attending the start of the November meeting for a short presentation.

12 Matters for reporting or Inclusion in a Future Agenda

- TTRO road closure for the end of Ship Hill at the end of October.

Final public participation:

- Warlingham Christmas lights 21st November starts at 15:00 – lights switched on at 17:00
- NSYC thanked the PC for agreeing to repurposing of the additional grant monies. This will go towards a steam train trip.
- How tall will the new phone mast on Ship Hill be?

The meeting closed at 9.05pm

The next Parish Council meeting will be held on Monday 9th November 2026 at 8pm.