

CHARLWOOD PARISH COUNCIL
Serving the communities of Charlwood, Hookwood and Norwood Hill
DRAFT MINUTES OF THE FULL PARISH COUNCIL MEETING
HELD IN THE PAVILION, CHARLWOOD ON
MONDAY 16TH OCTOBER 2023 AT 8:00PM

PRESENT

Cllr L Scott – Chair

Councillors: C Evans, W Hill, D McCorquodale, R Parker, A Rawlinson, T Stacey, A Tyson-Davies.

In attendance: Janette Coulthard (Clerk), H Hill (Assistant Clerk), 2 x Residents

| | | |
|-------|---|---|
| 42/23 | 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE | |
| | Apologies were received and accepted for Cllr Bloom. | |
| 43/23 | 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST | |
| | None | |
| 44/23 | 3. MINUTES | |
| | <p>3.1 Comments from the Chair – Cllr Scott opened the meeting and asked the PC for their approval to co-opt Angela Rawlinson as a member of the Parish Council (PC) to fill the Casual Vacancy. The PC unanimously APPROVED the co-option. Angela Rawlinson signed the Declaration of Acceptance of Office which was witnessed by the Clerk. Cllr Rawlinson then joined the meeting as a Cllr.</p> <p>Cllr Scott also mentioned MVDC’s Strategy Consultation and ask if the PC was happy for her to review and draft comments for the PC to review or if they wished to nominate another Cllr to do this. IT WAS AGREED that Cllr Scott would take on the task.</p> <p>3.2 The minutes of the Parish Council (PC) meeting held on 18th September 2023 were approved, and signed as a true record of the meeting by Cllr Scott and will be uploaded to the website.</p> <p>3.3 The minutes of the Services & Amenities (S&A) Committee meeting held on the 18th September were approved, and signed as a true record of the meeting by Cllr Stacey and will be uploaded to the website.</p> | LS |
| 45/23 | 4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS | |
| | <p>4.1 A resident raised a concern regarding the Dog Mess bins stating that a new one was needed in Green Lane at the lfield Road end. There were a lot more dog walkers since the path was improved. The resident advised that a lot of dog mess was just being left and not picked up by the owners and asked if the PC could request an additional bin be installed by MVDC. IT WAS AGREED that Cllr Stacey would mark the relevant spot on a map and send it to Cllr Scott. IT WAS ALSO AGREED that the Clerk would request MVDC install an additional bin.</p> <p>4.2 A resident asked if the PC had been consulted about the installation of the traffic monitoring wires across the road at Hookwood. IT WAS AGREED the Clerk would try to find out who had commissioned the traffic survey at Mill Lane, Hookwood, Reigate Road, Hookwood and outside the Recreation Ground in Charlwood residents.</p> <p>4.3 A resident mentioned that MVDC’s Strategy Consultation was open to everyone and wondered if the PC wanted to put it on Facebook. Cllr Scott suggested it might be better to wait until the PC had formulated its comments and share them alongside the information about the Consultation. The PC felt it was better to wait.</p> <p>4.4 A resident mentioned she had received a letter about the Housing Needs Survey. Cllr Scott advised it was mentioned in the Newsletter which was about to be published. She also advised it originated as a result of very small development of 3 houses and not related to the proposed Hookwood development.</p> | TS JC JC |

| | | |
|-------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | <p>4.5 The Clerk reported that she had received a question via email from a Resident asking if the creation of a Junior Football pitch had been cancelled. Cllr Stacey advised it had not been cancelled but he was having trouble contacting the person who was working with the previous Clerk to get it created. Cllr Stacey suggested initially putting in a Goal at the Pavilion end of the proposed pitch while the PC was waiting to make contact. IT WAS AGREED that Cllr Stacey would get a quote for the Goal and installation. Cllr Hill raised concerns about the potential parking chaos that may arise with a Junior Football team resident on the Recreation Ground. He fully supported a local Charlwood team but the PC needed to be cautious about allowing out of area teams to be resident. Cllr Stacey proposed that the PC proceed with a single Goal for local children to use and monitor the parking issues. The PC agreed this was a good idea and to proceed on this basis.</p> <p>4.6 The Clerk reported that a resident had asked via email if the PC had registered to submit a Relevant Representation to the Gatwick DCO, she advised the PC she had responded to the resident confirming that the PC had registered. Cllr Scott asked if the registration had been accepted and the Clerk confirmed that it was accepted.</p> <p>4.7 The Clerk reported that a resident had asked via email if there were going to be Speedwatch sessions and what the latest status was on the Traffic Calming measures. Cllr Stacey confirmed he would be sending out a booking for Speedwatch this week. The Clerk advised that Traffic Calming would be discussed under the relevant agenda item.</p> <p>4.8 A resident had written in via email advising that Charlwood at Christmas would be happening on Sunday 3rd December between 4pm and 6pm and Cllrs were welcome to attend. The Christmas Tree would be delivered on Friday 1st December and decorated on Saturday the 2nd December.</p> <p>4.9 A resident also emailed the Clerk about Dolby Brook works and asking for the PC to clear the brook. Cllr Stacey stated he felt we needed to understand what the Diocese was going to do with the land before agreeing any further works. IT WAS AGREED the Clerk would contact the Diocese to find out what they wanted to do with the land and PC's lease. Cllr Evans wanted confirmation there was agreement that the PC would have first refusal if the land were to be sold. Cllr Stacey also mentioned that he had met with an environmental officer who said that in retrospect clearance work already carried out would not have been carried out now due to the impact on the risk of flooding. IT WAS AGREED that Cllr Stacey would send the Clerk some background information so she could draft a letter to the Diocese.</p> | <p>TS</p> <p>JC</p> <p>TS JC</p> |
| 46/23 | 5. CRIME | |
| | <p>5.1 To discuss actions that can be taken in the wake of the multiple work Van break-ins experienced in the Parish. – Cllr Scott reported that the Clerk had requested that a representative of the Police attend the meeting to aid the discussions but no one was available. She advised there were several in the area. However, the Police would try to send a representative to the next meeting. Cllr Stacey asked where the break-ins occurred. Cllr Scott advised there was one on the corner of Misty Gardens, one directly opposite, one in Withey Meadows and two on Russ Hill. The Clerk read the response from the Police to the request for a representative at the meeting.</p> | |
| 47/23 | 6. PLANNING, HIGHWAYS AND ENVIRONMENT | |
| | <p>6.1 Report of Planning Committee and recommendations on applications to four weeks ending 29th September – Cllr Scott proposed that the comments submitted by the Planning Committee for applications to the 29th September as detailed in Appendix B be approved and submitted to MVDC. APPROVED. Cllr Scott also asked the PC for approval to submit the comments made by the Planning Expert relating to the proposed Hookwood housing development. APPROVED.</p> <p>6.2 Neighbourhood Plan – Cllr Scott reported she contacted the Suffolk Council group with a tool kit to create Neighbourhood Plans but did not hear back from them. Cllr Scott advised she had contacted another group with a tool kit and was in the process of gaining access to that to make sure the PC's current draft Neighbourhood Plan could be developed to be compliant with plans that had</p> | |

| | | |
|-------|---|---------------------|
| | <p>already been approved. Cllr Stacey mentioned that there had been no discussions since February, that there was not a Committee in place and a Residents Survey had not been conducted. Cllr Scott advised that the pause was because the PC was waiting for MVDC to agree the Parish area and the PC was therefore unable to move forward.</p> <p>6.3 Mole Valley Local Plan – Cllr Scott confirmed this was still in the ‘Pause’ stage.</p> <p>6.4 Environmental Matters – Nothing to report</p> <p>6.5 Fly-tipping/Litter – Cllr Scott referred back to the Resident’s question regarding the Dog Mess bin issue. She confirmed the PC would ask for another bin and look at increasing signage to remind people to clear up their dog mess. Cllr Stacey mentioned that there had been reports of residents using public bins to dispose of household waste and asked if a reminder could be included in the PC Newsletter asking residents not to do this. Cllr Scott advised she would try to fit something in to the Newsletter if there was room.</p> <p>6.6 To retrospectively approve a donation of £300 to River Mole River Watch in lieu of the work by Simon Collins to support Charlwood Paris Council’s response to planning application MO/2023/1125 – Development on Land to the West of Reigate Road, Hookwood. APPROVED.</p> <p>6.7 To consider if the Parish Council wants to support the Climate & Ecology Bill which requires the Secretary of State to achieve climate and nature targets for the United Kingdom; to give the Secretary of State a duty to implement a strategy to achieve those targets; to establish a Climate and Nature Assembly to advise the Secretary of State in creating that strategy; to give duties to the Committee on Climate Change and the Joint Nature Conservation Committee regarding the strategy and targets; and for connected purposes. IT WAS AGREED that the Parish Council would support the Bill.</p> | |
| 48/23 | <p>7. SERVICES AND AMENITIES</p> | |
| | <p>7.1 Withey</p> <p>7.1.1 Cllr Stacey reported that all the playground had been completed and the official opening had taken place. He advised there was an item outstanding relating to the Climbing frame and costs etc. would need to be put in budget for next year. The Clerk mentioned the issue of the positioning Play Boards raised by Hookwood Memorial Hall Trust (HMHT). Cllr Stacey confirmed he had agreed with HMHT that the Play Boards would be moved. He mentioned that the PC would need to find an independent contractor to do this.</p> <p>7.2 Pavilion</p> <p>7.2.1 Cllr Stacey reported that everything was fine at the Pavilion although the timer on the automatic lights needed to be reset and this would be done once the Clock’s went back. Cllr Stacey and the Asst. Clerk to agree a date.</p> <p>7.3 Recreation Ground</p> <p>7.3.1 The hedge between the Recreation and Millenium Field needed repair. It was agreed at the S&A Committee to cut out the Ivy and see how the hedge changes after cutting out the Ivy before taking further action.</p> <p>7.4 Millennium Field</p> <p>7.4.1 To agree the next steps after receipt of the Contractors Tree Survey – Cllr Stacey reported he had not received costs of the works identified by the Tree Survey and hoped to receive it next week. Cllr Stacey advised that the next step would be to have the Withey surveyed and then go out to obtain additional quotes. Cllr Hill ask the Clerk if she had seen a Resident’s Request regarding the trees near Kings Whim, the Clerk confirmed she had and she would update the resident.</p> <p>7.5 New leases: Millenium Field and the Withey</p> <p>7.5.1 Cllr Parker had updated the S&A Committee at the meeting earlier today advising the work on the leases was ongoing.</p> <p>7.6 Other Items</p> <p>7.6.1 Cllr Stacey reported that nothing has happened with regard to the Hovel and this was dependent on the whether the Diocese was going to sell Glebe Field as there was no point putting money into something the PC was not</p> | <p>TS/HH</p> |

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| | <p>responsible for. Cllr Stacey asked whether the Parish Council should be looking to earn an income from Glebe Field as the farmer kept sheep on it. Cllr Evans mentioned that she had asked the question previously and as advised that no charges were imposed as the farmer kept the fences in good order and so it was offered on a 'quid pro quo' basis. IT WAS AGREED to continue on this basis. Cllr Stacey also mentioned he had obtained a quote for £85 for a key cabinet for all the spare keys held by the Parish Council. He also requested that a key register be set up so everyone knew who had which keys. APPROVED. IT WAS AGREED the Clerk would order the cabinet and create the key register. The Clerk asked if a different lock could be obtained for the gate to the Recreation Ground as it was very difficult to open especially in the dark. Cllr Hill mentioned that he has to open the lock several times a week as hirers found it difficult to use. He said he would work with Cllr Stacey to find a solution.</p> | JC |
| 49/23 | 8. PARISH MATTERS | |
| | <p>8.1 Traffic Calming & Car Parks</p> <p>8.1.1 Cllr Stacey asked if there were any updates. He advised he had an email proposing dates for a meeting with SCC and asked if a meeting had happened. Cllr Scott said she attended a meeting in July with SCC but had not heard anything since and nothing was mentioned at the meeting about traffic calming. IT WAS AGREED the Clerk would contact SCC to try to get a meeting and Cllr Scott would find the email so the Clerk could pick up who to write to.</p> <p>8.1.2 Cllr Stacey also reconfirmed that the planning application for the Car Park had been submitted about a month ago but was not on the MVDC website yet as they had raised questions about the crossover. The technical drawings were currently being worked on for the crossover to the road. Once that had be done they would go to MVDC and then then we would have an open planning application. Cllr Stacey asked if the planning application was granted would the PC move forward using the PC's funds or would it wait to raise funds from grant applications. The cost for the Carpark being c. £100K Cllr Scott advised that the PC could apply for grants but asked if the Parish Council would be happy to move ahead alongside applying for grants. IT WAS AGREED the PC would be happy to proceed on that basis. Cllr Parker advised that JBTMT would be likely to match funding if the PC committed to funding at least 50%.</p> <p>8.2 Parish Council Communications</p> <p>8.2.1 Newsletter update – Cllr Scott reported that the Newsletter was nearly ready to be published and asked for volunteers for delivery. The majority of Cllrs were able to offer help.</p> <p>8.3 Community Events and Affairs</p> <p>8.3.1 Cllr Scott mentioned she would be attending the SALC AGM next week. Charlwood at Christmas was on the 3rd December.</p> <p>8.4 Wickens Orchard</p> <p>8.4.1 Cllr Stacey advised that the grass cutting and hedge cutting work had been done including the grass cuttings being removed and that the repair of the bench was outstanding. Cllr Scott mentioned that the hedges at Sewill Close needed cutting and to advise Clarion. IT WAS AGREED to check the hedge before asking.</p> <p>8.5 Russ Hill Hotel</p> <p>8.5.1 The Clerk reported she had not received any updates. Cllr Stacey mentioned that the residents were still riding their bicycles without lights which would be more dangerous with it getting darker earlier. Cllr Scott mentioned that she had been speaking to DC Cllr Loach and the Hotel had agreed for a space to be allocated for the residents to grow produce. A discussion was held regarding other issues relating to other issues related to the residents. IT WAS AGREED the Clerk would ask for an update.</p> | JC |
| 50/23 | 9 GATWICK MATTERS | |
| | <p>9.1 Cllr Evans mentioned a meeting that would be happening on the 17th October. Cllr Scott confirmed she would be attending. Cllr Scott also a GATCOM event last week which was focussed on a tour of Pier 6 which would serve 11 and not 17</p> | |

| | | |
|-------|---|---------------------|
| | <p>planes. The week before that Cllr Scott attended the Surface Access meeting. She advised there was a presentation from Metro Bus about their new hydrogen powered buses. Metro Bus currently had 5 hydrogen buses with another 35 on order. There was a presentation from a representative from GWR who talked about some pilot schemes with trains with batteries that could leapfrog the non-electrified track allowing the decommissioning of diesel trains. Cllr Scott also reported that there was mention of the difficulty for pedestrians at Gatwick and the need for initiatives to improve this.</p> | |
| 51/23 | 10 REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE | |
| | <p>10.1 Payments received and cleared payments - NOTED</p> <p>10.1.1 The Clerk gave a brief rundown of the finances for the month referring to the additions document contained in Appendix A. The Clerk highlighted that other half of the precept £45,125 had been received and three Ecotricity gas bills had been cancelled leaving the PC with £148 credit on the gas bill. Cllr Scoot mentioned the deal that MVDC had done with Laser on energy which required them to purchase energy 12 months in advance. She was confident that staying on our monthly payment agreement with Ecotricity would be the right option. Cllr Stacey asked if we could try to find out more about the MDVC deal. IT WAS AGREED the Clerk would investigate.</p> <p>10.1.2 The Clerk gave an update on her research into opening an account with Starling Bank. The upshot of which was that Starling Bank did not provide Bank Accounts for Parish Councils. The Clerk advised her research showed that Lloyds Bank seemed to provide the best services for Parish Councils. IT WAS AGREED the Clerk would work make the Lloyds Account the one for day to day business. Cllr Scott suggested that Parish Council should look at the option of moving some money to a higher interest savings account. IT WAS AGREED the Clerk would investigate savings accounts and what the PC could do with in the legislation.</p> <p>10.1.3 The Clerk asked how the normal process for the Budget and the Cllrs confirmed that their expectation was the Clerk should provide the draft budget. Cllr Stacey asked for the budget to include a 3/5-year plan so auditors could see where the PC was planning to spend money.</p> <p>10.2 Accounts for payments and authorised transfers (See Appendix A) – APPROVED</p> <p>10.3 Cllr Scott asked for approval for a budget to print the Newsletter. IT WAS AGREED that Cllr Scott could have a budget of up to £100.</p> | <p>JC</p> <p>JC</p> |
| 52/23 | 11 REPORTS FROM REPRESENTATIVES | |
| | 11.1 Nothing to report other than that already mentioned. | |
| 53/23 | 12 PROCEDURES AND STANDING ORDERS OF THE COUNCIL COMMITTEE | |
| | Nothing to report. | |
| 54/23 | 13 GOVERNANCE | |
| | 13.1 To note that certified AGAR sections 1 & 2, the external Auditors Certificate section 3, and the Notice of Closure of the external Audit were published and uploaded to the Website by the statutory deadline of the 30.09.23. NOTED | |
| 55/23 | 14 EMPLOYMENT MATTERS | |
| | <p>14.1 Job Descriptions</p> <p>14.1.1 Cllr Stacey reported that he had drawn up a list of requirements for what the PC needed in terms of Grounds work and maintenance and that the next step was to set up a meeting with S&A Committee, Staffing and the Groundsman. IT WAS AGREED the Clerk would set up a meeting.</p> | JC |
| 56/23 | 15 PUBLIC COMMENTS | |
| | <p>15.1 A resident mentioned the sheep at Glebe field and wondered when the lease was taken out by the PC for Glebe field.</p> <p>15.2 A resident mentioned that two ladies who lived in Willow Corner had complained about the state of area and asked the PC to raise a complaint with Clarion Housing</p> | |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----------|
| | <p>to try to get the area cleared up. Cllr Scott suggested raising the issue with DC Cllr Loach. IT WAS AGREED the Clerk would contact Clarion Housing. Cllr Scott said she would visit the area and take a look.</p> <p>15.3 A resident asked if the issue of traffic around the airport had been raised in connections with the plan to increase air traffic and the expansion of the airport. Cllr Scott urged the resident to sign up as a relevant party to submit comments on the Gatwick DCO but reassured the resident that this was raised at Gatwick meetings.</p> <p>15.4 Cllr Parker mentioned he had been asked by DC Cllr Loach to broach the idea of running a food festival in Charlwood. Other Villages held them and they seemed to be very successful. The PC agreed that it was a good idea. Cllr Scott suggested holding a harvest food festival in 2024.</p> <p>15.5 A resident raised a question about the improvement work to the recreation ground hedging. Cllr Scott informed the resident that it was already on the list of actions for the PC.</p> | JC |
| 57/23 | 16 DATES OF FORTHCOMING MEETINGS | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13th November 2023 - Services & Amenities Committee Meeting – at the Pavilion 4.30pm • 13th November 2023 Planning Committee Meeting at the Pavilion – 8:00pm • 20th November 2023 Full Parish Council Meeting at the Hookwood Memorial Hall – 8:00pm • 11th December 2023 Planning Committee Meeting at the Pavilion – 8:00pm | |
| 58/23 | 17 CLOSED DISCUSSION | |
| | The section of the meeting was a closed discussion and therefore not minuted. | |

There being no other business the Chair closed the meeting at 9:52pm

Signed as a true record of the meeting, and approved at the Full Parish Council Meeting of the 20th November 2023

Signed.....

Appendix A

| Incomings between 31 st August and 30 th September | | | | Total |
|--|--|--|--|------------|
| <u>Lloyds Bank</u> | | | | |
| 04/09/23 | Charlwood Village Football Club | | | £3,770.00 |
| 04/09/23 | Road Runners Club | | | £90.00 |
| 05/09/23 | Shah N | | | £50.00 |
| <u>Barclays Bank</u> | | | | |
| 05/09/23 | Elysium Healthcare | | | £1,135.00 |
| 08/09/23 | Mole Valley District Council – Precept | | | £45,125.60 |
| 15/09/23 | – Ifield CC | | | £1,260.00 |
| 29/09/23 | – Alan Knight (Rejected payment) | | | £216.00 |

| <u>Direct Debits</u> | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|---------------|------------|--------------|
| 13/09/23 | The Key Holding Company | Pavilion | | £31.88 | |
| 13/09/23 | SES Business Water | Pavilion | | £32.99 | |
| 20/09/23 | Ecotricity | Energy Pavilion | | £246.84 | |
| <u>Payments to be approved tonight</u> | | | | | |
| | | | Amount | VAT | TOTAL |
| Horley Glass | Adjust & Service Pavilion Bifold doors | | £160.00 | £32.00 | £192.00 |
| Hugo Fox | Website subscription (Silver) 15% Discount | | £203.90 | £40.78 | £244.68 |
| Hookwood Memorial Hall | Hire for 20/11/23 | | £60.00 | | £60.00 |
| Mulberry & Co. | Payroll | | £105.00 | £21.00 | £126.00 |
| NALC | Ticket for Cllr Scott – Making the Planning System Work for Local Councils | | £43.37 | £8.67 | £52.04 |
| Nigel Jeffries Landscapes Ltd | June, July & September Withey Grass Cutting Invoice 16498, 16633 | | £330.00 | £66.00 | £396.00 |
| PKF Littlejohn | External Audit | | £420.00 | £84.00 | £504.00 |
| Prime Commercial Cleaning | Pavilion Clean August 23 | | £240.00 | | £240.00 |
| Surrey ALC Ltd | SALC AGM & Conference | | £20.00 | £4.00 | £24.00 |
| ESP Scotland Ltd | Invoice 23700956 Huntsman with climbing walls, Rota Roka, Birdnest metal swing, Grass matting, Twist Cone, Wetpour Repair (Swings), | | £17,000 | £3,400 | £20,400 |

| | | | | |
|------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | Switch Panel Frame – post mounted, 3 in a row game panel, ball maze game panel, swing installation, block paving edging perimeter, removals, surface removal, site set-up, post installation playground inspection, delivery charge, less deposit paid. Invoice 23700849 - Wetpour Band Repair Totals | £1,799.00 £18,799.00 | £359.80 £3,759.80 | £2,158.80 £22,558.80 |
| Helen Hill | Expenses – Supplies for Pavilion (Toilet Paper, Bin Liners, Kitchen Towel, Air freshener, handwash, Beer Glass, Spoons/Bowls) | £35.89 | | £35.89 |
| Helen Hill | September Salary | £544.00 | | £544.00 |
| Janette Coulthard | September Salary | £TBC | | £TBC |
| River Mole River Watch | Donation in lieu of contribution from Simon Collins to planning response for Hookwood development | £300 | | £300 |

Appendix B

Planning applications considered by the planning committee 05/10/23 for October 2023 PC meeting.

5.1 MO/2023/1280/PLAH – Hidecote Cottage, 9, The Street, Charlwood, Surrey, RH6 0BY – Replacement and change of cladding to Annexe structure, Insertion of casement window to front right of annexe structure and replace existing shiplap door with composite door.

Link: <https://planning.agileapplications.co.uk/mole/search-applications/results?criteria=%7B%22query%22:%22MO/2023/1280%22%7D&page=1>

Charlwood Parish Council has no comment.

5.2 MO/2023/1277/PLA – Berry Farm, Blanks Lane, Charlwood, Horley – Erection of 2 No. mushroom tunnels, 1 No. agricultural storage barn and associated works.

Link: <https://planning.agileapplications.co.uk/mole/search-applications/results?criteria=%7B%22query%22:%22MO%2F2023%2F1277%22%7D&page=1>

Charlwood Parish Council supports the comments and objections from the neighbours, also comments from the environment agency on the grounds of flood risk.

5.3 MO/2023/1380/ECL – Millfield House, Russ Hill, Charlwood, Horley, Surrey, RH6 0EL- Certificate of Lawfulness for an existing use in respect of Millfield house being a single dwelling house in excess of 4 years.

Link: <https://planning.agileapplications.co.uk/mole/search-applications/results?criteria=%7B%22query%22:%22MO%2F2023%2F1380%22%7D&page=1>

Charlwood Parish Council objects to retrospective applications but has no comment on the application itself.

5.4 MO/2023/0844/PLA – Longacre, 42 Reigate Road, Horley, Surrey, RH6 0HJ – Extension to existing commercial unit/workshop (Use Class Sui Generis: building of bespoke horse boxes) and creation of staff and HGV parking area on the site (Site partly in Reigate and Banstead).

Link: <https://planning.agileapplications.co.uk/mole/search-applications/results?criteria=%7B%22query%22:%22MO%2F2023%2F0844%22%7D&page=1>

Charlwood Parish Council has no comment.

5.5 MO/2023/1419 - Land at Povey Cross Farm, Reigate Road, Hookwood, Horley, Surrey, RH6 0AP - Outline application for the consideration of access in respect of the demolition of one residential dwelling (Use Class C3) and delivery of up to 116 No. new homes (Use Class C3), up to 4,250sqm floorspace for specialist housing for older persons (Use Class C2), up to 350sqm Use Class E floorspace, creation of a new vehicular access, public open space, landscaping and associated works.

Link: https://planning.agileapplications.co.uk/mole/application-details/124398?fbclid=IwAR3ToioDeT6FhJSwVxwD8mKzMTFhdC-ql228JpoTnHrqX2BXHJ_4yf89Er0

Charlwood Parish Council has agreed to defer comment on this application until the November planning meeting when planning specialist Colin Smith will be invited to attend.

5.6 MO/2023/1125 - Land to the West of Reigate Road, Hookwood, Horley, Surrey - Outline application with all matters reserved except means of access for residential development of up to 446 dwellings (Use Class C3), community building(s) up to 1,500sqm. (Use Class E and/or F), gypsy and traveller

pitches up to 0.2ha, public open space, landscaping, surface water drainage and all associated infrastructure.

Link: <https://planning.agileapplications.co.uk/mole/application-details/124059>

Charlwood Parish Council supports the comprehensive response developed by Colin Smith (see below).

Mr A Gardner
Senior Planning Officer
Planning Department
Mole Valley District Council
Pippbrook
Dorking
Surrey
RH4 1SJ

Our ref MV/23/06
Your ref MO/2023/1125
15.09.23

Dear Mr Gardner,

Development on Land to the West of Reigate Road, Hookwood; reference MO/2023/1125

I refer to the above site and the outline planning application with all matters reserved except means of access for residential development of up to 446 dwellings (Use Class C3), community building(s) up to 1,500sqm. (Use Class E and/or F), gypsy and traveller pitches up to 0.2ha, public open space, landscaping, surface water drainage and all associated infrastructure. I have been instructed by Charlwood Parish Council to review the submitted application documents and prepare a response to the application. Having reviewed the application documents, the Parish Council wish to **OBJECT** to the proposed development.

Policy context

The development plan for the area consists of the Core Strategy adopted in 2009 and the Local Plan Saved Policies. The Local Plan was adopted in 2000. Planning applications should be determined in accordance with the policies of the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Core Strategy- the relevant policies of the Core Strategy are listed below;

- CS1- Where Development Will be Directed
- CS2- Housing Provision and Location
- CS3- Balancing Housing Provision
- CS4- The Provision of Affordable Housing

- CS5- Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople
- CS13- Landscape Character
- CS15- Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
- CS16- Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities
- CS17- Infrastructure, Services and Community Facilities
- CS18- Transport Options and Accessibility
- CS20- Flood Risk Management

Local Plan- the relevant saved policies of the Local Plan are set out below;

- ENV4 - Landscape Character
- ENV22 - General Development Control Criteria
- ENV23 - Respect for Setting
- ENV25 - Landscape Design of New Developments
- ENV56 - Housing Development Affected by Noise
- ENV65 - Drainage
- MOV2 - The Movement Implications of Development
- MOV15 - Provision for Cyclists In Development Proposals

It is of note that the applicant's Planning Statement sets out at paragraph 5.2.4 that "*The Core Strategy did not supersede the Local Plan 2000 in its entirety and a number of policies within it were saved. These saved policies principally relate to more day-to-day planning applications such as home extensions.*" It is noted that none of the saved policies of the Local Plan are listed in the Planning Statement, or considered in the Planning Assessment section (Section 6). The Planning Assessment section refers to some of the policies of the Core Strategy and the emerging (or "paused") Local Plan, but not the currently adopted Local Plan. There is a requirement for development proposals to be compliant with **all** policies of the development plan. This principal was reinforced in the *TV Harrison CIC v Leeds City Council* ([2022] EWHC 1675 judgement. In this case, the local planning authority granted themselves planning permission for the development of an allocated site for 61 affordable homes in accordance with a particular policy of the adopted Site Allocation Policy, but failed to consider the other implications of a policy which required the Council, as developer, to provide new greenspace and relocate the existing sports facilities. The decision to grant permission was quashed on the basis that the Council failed to consider the other policies of the development plan. It is clear from this judgement that it is necessary to consider the development plan as a whole. The applicants have failed to do this.

As well as the above mentioned policies, the Council have adopted a number of Supplementary Planning Documents. Various sections of the NPPF are also relevant to the proposed development.

Principle of development

The proposed development site is an allocated site in the emerging development plan (policy DS41). This site is identified as a draft allocation for 446 dwellings, together with gypsy and traveller pitches and associated infrastructure. However, the emerging development plan has been paused, pending potential changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In summary, the changes are those set out in the indicative changes to the NPPF consultation published in December 2022, and relate to the Government's proposals to exclude sites within the Green Belt from being allocated as housing sites, with the consequential effect that Council's would not need to meet the objectively assessed housing need. Given the extent of the Green Belt within Mole Valley, if the changes are included within the published version of the NPPF following the consultation period, then the emerging development plan would need to be revisited with major modifications to the allocations of sites, particularly those in the Green Belt, such as the application site.

Whilst there was a recently published updated version of the NPPF at the beginning of September, this was purely in response to the recent changes highlighted in the Energy Bill. However, it is anticipated that further changes will be made to the NPPF in relation to the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill which is progressing through Parliament. The Council's current position is that the emerging development plan is "on pause" indefinitely, pending the anticipated changes to the NPPF. As a result, the emerging plan should be afforded little weight in the determination of the application.

Given the above, and the requirement in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), that the determination of planning applications is required to be in accordance with the Plan unless material consideration indicate otherwise, for this application, the development plan comprises the Mole Valley District Council Core Strategy adopted October 2009 and the Mole Valley District Council Local Plan adopted 2000.

According to the policies map of the adopted development plan, the site is within the Green Belt. Within the Green Belt, there is a presumption against new buildings apart from a limited number of exceptions set out in paragraphs 149 and 150. The development does not fall within any of the exceptions to the erection of new buildings in the Green Belt, and therefore is inappropriate development. As the NPPF makes clear there is a presumption against inappropriate development unless very special circumstances (VSC) apply that outweigh the harm by way of inappropriateness, and any other harm. The VSC will be addressed below, but it is submitted that there are no VSC that outweigh the harm by way of inappropriateness and other harm.

Policies CS1 and CS2 advise that new development will be directed towards previously developed land within the built up areas of Leatherhead, Dorking, Bookham, Fetcham and Ashted. The site is not previously developed land within the built up areas of the settlements identified.

Given the policies of the currently adopted development plan, there is a presumption against the development, and therefore in principle, the development should not be accepted.

Impact on the Green Belt

As highlighted above, the development falls outside of the exceptions to the erection of new buildings in the Green Belt, and is therefore inappropriate by definition. It is also necessary to consider the impact of

the development on the openness of the Green Belt. The NPPF sets out that the essential characteristics of the Green Belt are its openness, and also its permanence.

Paragraph 137 of the NPPF also sets out that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Paragraph 138 of the NPPF sets out the five purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is *“to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment”*.

Paragraph 138 also identifies that one of the purposes of the Green Belt is prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. It should be noted that the substantial Westvale development to the north of the application site, accessed from the A217, is still being built out, and the land to the west of Ifield is subject to a large strategic residential development. These large developments are reducing the open space between neighbouring towns and the current proposal will extend the existing settlement west- further reducing the space between settlements. This would compromise the purpose of the Green Belt highlighted above.

The Planning Policy Guidance document on the Gov.uk website sets out the factors that can be taken into account in assessing the impact of a development on openness. These are that openness is capable of having a spatial and visual aspect- the visual impact of the proposal may be relevant-, the duration of the development and its remediability, and the degree of activity likely to be generated, such as traffic generation.

Of the four factors, the proposed development will have a significant spatial impact. There will be a spread of built form in a location that is currently undeveloped, and therefore open. The development will therefore have a negative impact on the spatial aspect of openness.

In relation to the visual impact, the site is currently open fields with strips and blocks of woodland throughout it. As the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) sets out at paragraph 8.4.3, the proposed development will represent an evident change to the site through the introduction of predominantly two storey residential development that would result in the permanent loss of the pastoral fields within the site. Whilst the LVIA seeks to argue that the landscape impact would be minimal, largely due to the flat lying topography and the existing landscape framework, which is described as strong. However, in Green Belt openness terms, the assessment is in relation to whether there will be a visual change, rather than whether the change is overtly visible. In this case, there is a clear visual change to the openness of the Green Belt, and this results in a negative impact.

The proposed development is designed to be permanent and not easily remediable. This results in a negative impact on the Green Belt. Equally, the existing site results in virtually no activity being generated. The proposed development results in a significant increase in the amount of activity being generated- not just traffic generation, but the impact of 446 households using the site and simply going about their normal day to day business. This will have a negative impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

Overall therefore, having regard to the four factors for assessing the impact of a development on the openness of the Green Belt, the impact would be negative and harmful. Consequently, the proposal is in conflict with policies CS1 and CS2 of the development plan.

Impact on the character and appearance of the area

The Council have adopted the Larger Rural Villages Character Appraisals SPD and the document includes a character appraisal of Hookwood. Under the heading Landscape Setting, paragraph 8.4 sets out that *“to the north and west is an agricultural landscape of open fields, mainly laid to grass, with some crops. Country lanes lead west to the village of Charlwood and north west into the rural landscape of the Open Weald. Moving north up the A217, there are pockets of development, but still a sense that the road passes through a rural landscape. Roadsides are often lined with hedgerows, there are plentiful mature trees and built development is patchy.”*

Into this highly rural area it is proposed to develop 446 new dwellings and associated infrastructure. There will inevitably be an impact on the character of the area, and it is clear that the character of the area to the west of the village will change from open, undeveloped rural fields to a suburban, developed housing estate. The LVIA seeks to address the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area. Table 8.1 identifies a number of viewpoints and seeks to quantify the significance of the effect of the development from those viewpoints. No highly sensitive “receptors” are identified, but the magnitude of the effect of the development ranges from None to Large. The significance of the effect ranges from Neutral to Moderate Adverse. It is clear that for some receptors, the proposed development will have an adverse effect. It is noted that the LVIA refers to the impact of a “predominantly two storey development”. There is no reference in the LVIA that there will be some three storey development on the site.

Section 8.7 reviews the visual receptors using public rights of way. Paragraphs 8.7.1 to 8.7.3 describe the impact on Public Right of Way 342. From this viewpoint, the LVIA confirms that;

“On balance, the Proposed Development will result in a pronounced change to views as the Proposed Development will replace undeveloped, agricultural land on the Site, however, the Landscape Strategy will provide improvements to the visual quality of the Site and will result in a Moderate Adverse significance of effect.”

It is clear from this example that the impact of the proposed development will only be mitigated by the use of landscape enhancement works. Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy sets out that *“landscape enhancement works may be required to avoid adverse impacts associated with new developments”*. By definition, if landscape enhancement works are being proposed, it must follow that these are proposed to avoid the adverse impacts of development.

As a result, the development is in conflict with policies CS13, ENV4, ENV22, ENV23 of the development plan.

Flooding

A note has been prepared by Simon Collins of the River Mole River Watch organisation. This note is appended to this letter and gives a detailed critique of the FRA submitted by the applicants, and also highlights wider issues to do with water and drainage in and around the site. In summary, the main objections are as follows;

1. The location of the development on Land West of Reigate Road (hereafter WORR) increases the population vulnerable to climate extremes in a sensitive catchment.
2. The risk of synchronising flood peaks causing a backwater effect and exacerbating downstream flooding is a concerning possibility in major flooding. Evidence of realigned Hookwood Common

Brook also gives rise to concerns over response to flood events due to its realigned elevated position above the flood plain.

3. Isolation (“islandisation”) of the site during floods presents a risk to residents in depriving them of safe egress and evacuation during extreme exceedance events.
4. There is a serious risk of blockages at culverts and bridges under the A217 which risks increasing flooding upstream on the site.
5. There was no bespoke detailed hydraulic modelling conducted for this development. The FRA leans heavily on previous modelling, some of it quite old. The site is uniquely challenging regarding flood risk from rivers and surface water and overspilling from the realigned section of the Mole around Gatwick. Without detailed bespoke modelling any claim that the site is safe for the lifespan of the development must be handled cautiously.
6. The water quality in the River Mole is already moderate to poor and the tributaries draining the site rated as Bad WFD water quality status: further development will risk further unacceptable deterioration.
7. The catchment is already in severe water stress and further growth adding to demand on finite water supplies is unsustainable.

It is also noted that Thames Water have identified an inability of the existing foul water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of the development. Whilst Thames Water have attempted, it seems, to enter into discussions with the developer, they seem to have been unable to do so. As a result, it is clear that there is an infrastructure issue to resolve, and until it is resolved, planning permission should not be granted.

Given the above and attached, the development is in conflict with policies ENV65 and CS20 of the development plan.

Highways

The contents of the Transport Assessment are noted. However, there are a number of concerns in relation to the assessment.

The Transport Assessment identifies that an emergency access would be provided to access Charlwood Road to the south. Figure 9 of the Statement provides an image of the potential surface material for the access;

Figure 9: Potential Surface Material for Emergency Access



The potential surface has presumably been designed in order to minimise the impact of an extensive length of metalled surface within the Green Belt and an area with a rural character. The Transport Assessment identifies this route as suitable for cyclists and scooters (accessing the nursery school to the south of the site in Charlwood Road)- however, the surface shown above would not be suitable or appropriate for cycles or scooters, particularly for young children. Equally, the provision of a hard surfaced route of a distance of over 700m in the Green Belt and an area of rural character would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.

The application documents set out that there is the possibility of extending existing bus services to serve the site. However, this would require a financial contribution by the developer to support this provision. This can be secured through a s106 obligation. It would be critical that the contribution should support the extended bus service in perpetuity in order to make it meaningful. There is no indication that this is proposed.

The proposed trip generation information set out at Table 5.1 indicates that there is likely to be 234 two way trips in the morning peak hour and 277 two way trips in the evening peak hour generated by the development. This only accounts for the residential use of the site, and does not include trips for the community use building, the use of which is currently unknown. The application documents state that this could be used for early years education provision. If it is, it is not clear whether the traffic generation figures account for the potential for the occupiers of the site to use this facility (and therefore the number of trips could potentially reduce), or whether the provision would need (in order to make it viable) to provide for pupils that are not within the development and have to travel to it- resulting in a likely increase in traffic movements.

The Transport Statement sets out four comparable sites used to provide the TRICS data. These are Knightwood Road Eastleigh, Margate Road Herne Bay, Norcott Road Reading and Hillard Road Billingshurst. Of these sites, Knightwood Road and Norcott Road are not edge of village locations- rather they are within large established built up areas. Equally, the Margate Road site is located on the edge of a larger settlement- a large town rather than a village. As a result, these sites are likely to be more accessible to local services and facilities. The consequence of this is that the vehicle trip rates are likely to be lower, and therefore skew the TRICS data downward. It is submitted that the assumptions used for the modelling are incorrect, and this has consequential impacts to the other outputs from the modelling.

In the light of the above, it is submitted that there are likely to be conflicts with policies MOV2 and CS18 of the development plan.

Noise

There is currently a Development Consent Order (DCO) for the provision of an additional runway to the north of the existing runway at Gatwick Airport. The Environmental Statement submitted with the DCO contains a section on noise impact. The Statement sets out the noise contours for the LAeq16h values in Book 5. In all cases, both with and without the proposed runway, the noise contours increase towards the site.

Economic Benefits

The appellants identify that there will be economic benefits of the development in the form of jobs during the construction phase, and also employment related to the provision of a community/early years building, and that the site is located close to Gatwick Business Park and Gatwick Airport.

Whilst there will be some employment during the construction phase these would be temporary jobs and would cease after the development is complete. The community building could be used as an early years facility but it is not certain and it is not clear how many jobs would be created. However, the 2021 census revealed that the economically active proportion of the Parish population (those in employment) was 63.8% (compared to the England rate of 57.4%), and the level of unemployment was 1.9% compared to the England average of 3.5%. Whilst the provision of jobs and employment opportunities should always be welcomed, the local area already performs well in relation to this measure, and it is not an area where jobs or employment opportunities are specifically and urgently needed.

There is also evidence in the public domain that suggests that the expansion and growth of air transport as a driver of economic growth is heavily caveated and it is doubtful whether this relationship holds true in the UK context. There are two reasons for this- firstly, business models and interactions have changed away from the primacy of face to face meetings and the diminishing returns delivered when adding new capacity to an already highly connected economy. Secondly, there is a significant tourism spending deficit, meaning that UK residents travel abroad and spend more than tourists from other countries spend when they visit the UK. In addition, air transport has a large footprint in the UK economy, supporting a large number of jobs. It is notable, however, that the employment potential of air transport has been declining rapidly in recent years as a result of efficiency savings or so-called productivity growth. In 2015, the air transport sector was among the sectors with the lowest jobs creation potential in the UK. (Source of information- "Losing Altitude- The Economics Of Air Transport In Great Britain" published in July 2023 by Dr Alex Chapman). Limited weight should be attached to this "benefit".

Planning balance

A number of conflicts with the adopted development plan have been identified. There are limited benefits delivered by the development, and any benefit related to the delivery of housing should be seen in the context of the Council being likely to be able to remove allocated sites within the Green Belt and to reduce the amount of dwellings to be delivered once the anticipated NPPF changes are made.

Notwithstanding the above, the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. The NPPF, which is a significant material consideration, indicates that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and

demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole- as set out in paragraph 11(d). In this instance, the benefits of the proposal have been considered but do not clearly outweigh the adverse impacts arising from the development, particularly in relation to the Green Belt and flooding.

Should you wish to discuss any of the above please do not hesitate in contacting me on the details below.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Christ', written in a light grey or blue ink.