**Crowhurst Parish Council**

Minutes of the Crowhurst Parish Council Meeting held on Monday 18th January 2021 virtually via zoom due to Covid-19 at 7:30pm.

Present:

Councillors:

Mrs. L Siggery (Chairman)

Mr. M Higginson

Mr. G King

Mr. R Horsman

Clerk: Mrs. Emma Fulham

Public: Cllr Liz Lockwood and Cllr Lesley Steeds.

John and Heather Doust.

Clare Hollingsworth.

**Public Meeting.**

No questions from the public.

Cllr Steeds reported on the highways inspection she did pre-lockdown. She was happy to take back any reports to highways during the current situation. Crowhurst Road is due to be surfaced dressed or resurfaced hopefully in 2021. The Chair requested a full re-surface as a surface dressing would be a waste of money. Cllr Steeds confirmed 40mm is the depth for reportable potholes and must be the diameter of a football. The Chair would report the locations of the roadsigns in need of repair to Cllr Steeds.

Cllr Steeds also reported that Surrey County Council was being relocated from Kingston to Woodhatch, near Reigate.

The vaccination information was found to be useful by Cllrs. A possible use of the Parish grant for those struggling to pay for transport to Oxted was considered and the Council would consider financial help for those in need. The issues on the storage of vaccinations was also raised. The Council and Parish Watch had funds if required if the surgery needed funds for vaccination storage. Cllr Steeds would contact the surgery to see if financial help would be beneficial.

*Cllr Steeds left the meeting at 7:45pm.*

Cllr Lockwood reported on the Local Plan progress and the planning policy meeting this Thursday is yet to be given decisions to make to progress matters as the inspector had instructed.

Gatwick has a noise management board meeting later this month, Cllr Lockwood is the Tandridge representative and is happy to feedback any parishioner concerns. There is night flight consultation nationwide too which she would share the link to.

**Parish Council Meeting. (Started 7:55pm)**

1. To accept apologies for absence.

Cllr S Lock and District Cllr M Ridge

1. Declarations of pecuniary and disclosable interests in respect of matters to be discussed.  
   The Chair reminded the Council to declare when necessary.
2. To Approve Minutes from Parish Council meeting held on 16th November 2020.

**Unanimously approved as a true record.**

1. Matters Arising.

None.

1. To consider co-option onto the Council – Richard Horsman.

**Cllr Siggery proposed Richard Horsman to be co-opted and Cllr King seconded and there was a unanimous vote in favour.**

**The acceptance of office was duly signed in front of the Clerk.**

1. To receive reports from Councillors.

All reports where available are on the website.

Cllr Siggery expanded on the planning report decisions made. Mansion House planning comments were discussed under the planning report section but minuted under the agenda item as ratified.

|  |
| --- |
| **Reports from Councillors** |
| Communication |
| SSALC |
| Planning |
| Village Hall Committee |
| Roads, Ditches |
| Grass & Hedges |
| Footpaths |
| Eliot Place |
| Fishing Club |
| Local news, CPRE, SCREF |
| Gatwick |
| Defib & Phonebox |
| Clerk performance appraisal and objectives |
| Council Events (Litter picking, Footpath clearing) |
| Neighbourhood Plan |
| Business Plan development |

1. Correspondence.

The list had been circulated prior to the meeting. The Chair highlighted the following item with John Doust about the speed watch suspension until later in the year due to vulnerable volunteers.

1. Finance
2. To accept year to date account 2020/21

**The report had been circulated prior to the meeting and was accepted unanimously.**

1. To approve expenditure as itemised on the schedule.  
   The list had been circulated prior to the meeting as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| SAS | 120 |
| E Fulham | 407.31 |
| SCC Pension | 124.83 |
| HMRC | 101.8 |
| E Fulham | 111.44 |
| Tandridge planning | 156 |
| E Fulham | 427.51 |
| SCC Pension | 124.83 |
| HMRC | 102 |
| Vision ICT | 350.4 |
| Village Hall | 320 |
| St Silvan’s | 200 |
| St Silvan’s | 150 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Total | 2696.12 |
|  |  |

**All were unanimously approved.**

1. To approve Bank Reconciliation.

The reconciliation and bank statement had been circulated prior to the meeting.

**Both were unanimously accepted and would be signed by the Chair in due course.**

1. To review business plan.

**The business plan had been circulated and was unanimously accepted.**

1. To set budget for 2021/22.

**The budget had been circulated. The budget was then unanimously accepted by the Council.**

1. Update on Telephone Box project.

The Clerk reported on the telephone box planning process. Further fees had been requested and paid with a plan and the Clerk now awaited a response from TDC as to whether planning was required.

1. To review progress on the proposal for a trim trail / exercise equipment on the field adjacent to the village hall.

Finally the Clerk reported TDC had provided information on grant funding.

**The Council agreed the Clerk would apply for this and subject to what was agreed would bring the project back to the Council for a final decision on a budget and commence the formal approval process with TDC as the landowner and for planning permission.**

1. To review covid-19 grant update and covid-19 considerations going into the spring period and how best the Council can assist.

Some further spend from the grant was reported.

The Clerk had highlighted the grant each month but had no outstanding applications to consider.

**The Council agreed to review at the next meeting and to continue to publicise the scheme and get in touch with local charities to try to see if they are aware of any needs we can satisfy.**

1. To review latest draft of Neighbourhood plan and review consultation plans for Neighbourhood Plan to progress this.

The latest version had been circulated.

**The Council agreed to contact Locality in regards to the free health check to move it forward. The Clerk had already contacted a planning consultant for outline costs for approval.**

1. To review planning applications and ratify application decisions made between meetings.

**The Parish Council ratified their earlier comments circulated prior to the meeting.**

*Cllr Horsman did not take part due to a business interest declared.*

**Mansion House 2020/2044**

**Crowhurst Parish Council Objects to application 2020/2044 - Demolition of three agricultural buildings and conversion of two buildings to form 2 dwellings, on the following grounds:**

It is again noted that this is yet another application for development on this site following many attempts over several years. This remains vexatious in nature since all previous applications have been refused on the grounds of inappropriate development in the Green belt and most significantly, in this case, dwellings close to a Listed building and Architectural and Historic Area and non-sustainability of the location. Nothing has changed since the previous applications and therefore another application should fail again on these same grounds.

It is vexatious because the applicant is aware of this and persists with every conceivable twist and turn that a developer with deep pockets can dream up at considerable cost to a financially hard pressed District Council and which is borne ultimately by the Tandridge taxpayer. This is hardly the behaviour to be hoped for from a large landowner in the heart of our community.

In order to again correct the applicant, Crowhurst is not a village, at best it is a dispersed village, consisting of 9 discreet settlements. There is no centre nor any significant services or amenities, which are at least 3 miles away from this site in either direction.

**Green Belt**

The proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would fail to preserve the openness of the Green Belt. There are no very special circumstances present to clearly outweigh the harm caused by inappropriateness.

The development of dwellings in an otherwise agricultural environment would have significant adverse impact upon the openness of the environment resulting in significant encroachment into the countryside.

The proposal is contrary to policies DP10 and DP13 of the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 - Detailed Policies (2014).

The proposal would result in an intensification of use of the site, which is on the ridge of a hill and visible for miles around and as such would fail to reflect the character and appearance of the site and surrounding historic buildings and area. It is therefore considered that the proposal is contrary to Policies CSP18 and CSP21 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) and Policy DP7 of the Tandridge District Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies (2014)

**Historic Buildings**

The development would have serious material impact to the setting of at least 3 historic buildings and detract from the character and openness of the environment. The proposed development is to the rear of and adjoins Mansion House Farm House, a Grade II\* listed building of significant historical importance.

It will also impact on the open countryside setting of St Georges Church (Not St Giles’ as noted in the Planning application), Grade II listed together with historic Yew tree and tombs, Church Farm House, Grade II listed. These historic buildings are located high upon a natural ridge in completely open countryside. The development would be in full view of several homes in Crowhurst including Grade I listed Crowhurst Place.

**Sustainability**

The proposed development is located in an unsustainable location with no access to public transport, other than a twice weekly bus service, the proposal would therefore lead to a car-reliant form of development which would be contrary to NPPF and Policy CSP1 of the core strategy DPD 2008, and Policy DP1 of the Tandridge Local Plan: Part2 - Detailed Policies 2014.

The proposal would have impact upon the rural character of the area contrary to policies CSP18 and CSP21 of the core Strategy DPD 2008 and Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2- Detailed Policies.

There is no pedestrian footpath, street lighting or public transport in Crowhurst Lane.  The proposed development is likely to add at least 4 cars worth of additional pressure, access will be via the existing track, which has poor sight lines and is immediately opposite St Georges Church which has no parking facilities, thus many vehicles are regularly parked by the verge on both sides of the Lane, this is further compounded when Weddings and Funerals take place.

**Environmental impact**

The proposal does not include any features which support the Climate Emergency statement made by Crowhurst Parish Council. Crowhurst Parish Council require that all new development proposals have limited external lighting and have renewable energy sources and electric vehicle charging points included in the proposal. Given its location, a sustainable and non-carbon producing form of heating and energy is a requirement.

Tree planting is also a requirement within the Climate Emergency statement, requiring a tree to be planted for every 10m2 of build.

The increase in housing intensity would without doubt increase all the associated noise, light pollution, activity and clutter, thus diminishing the peace and tranquility of the area and with it being on top of a Green Belt ridge, would be seen from miles around.

**Visual Impact on the Historical Heart of Crowhurst**

The erection of 2 large homes, with associated car parking and domestic paraphernalia will have a massive detrimental effect on the open countryside and the surrounding area and neighbouring residences. This urbanisation, sited high on the natural ridge would be visible for miles around, particularly from the many public footpaths and in full view of several homes including the Grade I listed Crowhurst Place.

**Privacy**

The proposed development will overlook and encroach upon the privacy of neighbouring properties particularly Mansion House Farm House, The School House, and Altar Cottages.

**Size and Scale**

The Council are finally very concerned over the size and scale of the barns in relation to Mansion House which as currently designed would create a dwelling bigger than the historical house. The use of excessive glass would also create a glare to nearby properties and not be in keeping within the rural location.

1. Items for Reporting or Inclusion in Future Agendas.

Trim trail

Climate Change actions

Telephone Box

Neighbourhood Plan

Noticeboards

The Chair thanked the Council for their initiative for a community Christmas tree. Whilst this was paid for by the councilors themselves they agreed as it was successful this would be repeated and this could be paid for from the Council budget in 2021.

**Dates of Next Meetings:**

15th February Planning (if required) and 15th March Parish Council

Meeting closed at 9:20pm