1. **Site Details**
   a. What is the site’s name/reference?

   CR3NPCAT057  121-123 Tupwood Lane

   b. Where is the site located?

   The site is located on the east side of Tupwood lane within the green belt area of Caterham. The properties form the last two dwellings on the left as one drives south out of Caterham on Tupwood Lane.

   c. What is the site description?

   The site comprises two large detached houses with associated garaging and there large rear gardens now mainly laid to lawn and shrubs with trees along boundaries. The rear of 121 is also has a small stable block in the rear garden.

   The land slopes significantly down from Tupwood Lane and falls within the Character Area I of the Harestone Valley Character Assessment.

   The properties are approximately 1.2 km from the Station and High Street and at the edge of urban development.

   d. What are the adjoining uses to the site?

   The area to the north is predominately residential mainly single detached houses set in individual plots of varying sizes on the east side of Tupwood Lane as described in Character I of HVCA.

   Behind 119 Tupwood Lane, there is a single bungalow no. 117. Upwood Gorse has been divided into 4 residences.

   To the south the land is used for stabling and grazing and to the east wooded hillside. Across the road is the wooded area part of Upwood Gorse.
e. What is the site area (hectares)?

The owner agent indicates 1.3 ha but the HELAA application gives 1.2 hectares. However this includes a section to the south which stretches into previous green space beyond the original garden boundary and beyond the boundary of the Harestone Valley Character Area as defined by the purple boundary line on Policy documents and plans.

Part of this area has now been cleared and mainly laid to grass. The 2015 google picture shows the large area of trees on the back part of this area and the trees along its boundary with trees at the front continuing the tree line along Tupwood Lane.

Given that this could be considered “garden grabbing” and excluded under the definition of “Previously Developed Land” in the NPPF, it is very questionable whether all or any of this area should be included in the developable site area.

This could exclude 0.4/0.5 hectares from developable area reducing the site to under a hectare. The remaining tree areas on the other boundaries and mature trees inside the site would contribute towards reducing the developable area further.

f. What is the existing land use?

Residential and garden and open wooded space all currently Green Belt.

g. Who is/are the owner(s) of the site?

Mrs and Mrs P Brooks 123 Tupwood Lane CR3 6DF
Mr and Mrs N Walsh 121 Tupwood Lane CR3 6DF
h. What is the site’s planning history?

This site’s planning history is attached. This consists of pre 2000 archived applications mainly concerning adaptations to the existing houses. The majority of these were refused presumably on the basis of enlargement in Green Belt.

Planning Applications post 2000:

Application Number: 2002/430 Address: 121 TUPWOOD LANE CATERHAM
Application Number: 2002/737 Address: 121 TUPWOOD LANE CATERHAM
Application Number: 2002/849 Address: HEATHER COTTAGE 121 TUPWOOD LANE
Application Number: 2002/1619 Address: 121 TUPWOOD LANE CATERHAM
Application Number: 2004/1167 Address: 121 TUPWOOD LANE CATERHAM

However CAT 1366 and Cat 1815 relate to use of the land for further development which were refused presumably due to the Green Belt status of the properties. There are no records of appeals on the sites.

Discussions have been held with TDC Planners on developing the site.

i. Desk top research & planning policy considerations:

1. Any relevant planning policies
2. Is the site allocated for particular use in the Local Plan?
3. Do any Local Plan designations apply to the site? For example:
   - Greenbelt / Public Open Space / Strategic open space / Village confines / extent of settlement
   - Conservation Area / Protected wildlife or habitat / Landscape character area
4. Do any other designations apply? e.g. National Park/AONB/Village Green / Local Green Space
5. Are there any emerging local planning documents with relevant policies or designations?

Site is designated as Green Belt DP 10 DP 13 DP 14 CSP1 CSP18 and CSP21

Landscape Character Area CW8


Should development be considered CSP 2, 4, 7, 11, 14, 15, and 19. DP1, 7, 8, 9.

Supplementary Planning documents: Harestone Valley Design Guidance.

The Site lies within Character Area I of Harestone valley Character Assessment.

Emerging policies within Neighbourhood Plan.
j. Are there national policy considerations that are relevant to the site? Are there policies, or is there evidence related to the regional strategy that is relevant to the site?

- National Planning Policy Framework.
- National Planning Policy Guidance.

k. Does the site feature in or are there relevant policies in other local planning documents e.g. supplementary planning document, Village Design Statement, Conservation Area Appraisal?

- Harestone Valley Character Assessment. Character Area I
- Harestone Valley Design Guidance

l. Does the site feature in assessments undertaken to support the Local Plan e.g. Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), Sustainability Appraisal?

- A HELAA submission has been made as CAT 057. Where in current consultation the site is designated Amber.
- Under the Tandridge Landscape Capacity and Sensitivity Study the site is considered moderate in both sensitivity and landscape value.

2. Desktop evidence review
   a. Is the site in flood plain / known to be affected by flooding?

   No.

   b. Could the land be contaminated by a former use or activity? Would development require the remediation of contaminated land?

   Unlikely.

   c. Are there any nearby sources of noise of air pollution which could affect the site?

   No.

   d. Does the site contain a valuable mineral resource?

   Unlikely.
e. Is the land of agricultural value / official designation of agricultural land?

No.

f. Are there any ‘Listed’ buildings on or close to the site?

Opposite the site is Upwood Gorse.

g. Could the site contain any archaeological remains?

Unlikely

h. Are there any issues of capacity on the local road network (congestion and/or parking)?

Tupwood Lane winds steeply down to Godstone Road. There are some difficulties with congestion at rush hours due to street parking and at the junction with Godstone Road.

i. Are there any known legal considerations relevant to the site e.g. covenant?

Not as far as we are aware.

3. **Onsite considerations**

a. Access / How is the site accessed / Is it easily accessible from the highway?

The site currently has two accesses, one from each of the existing properties on Tupwood Lane. These accesses wind down the slope to the front of the houses to avoid being too steep.

b. Is the site accessible by public transport, cycling and walking?

There is no public transport in Tupwood Lane and walking and cycling access from the High Street involves a steep climb up Tupwood Lane from Godstone Road. Public Transport is available in Town Centre and Godstone Road approximately 1.2 km away.
4. **Existing features**

   a. Are there any physical constraints affecting the site e.g. access, slope, pylons?
      Will the topography of the site constrain development e.g. steep slopes?
      Are there any power lines, pipelines or other infrastructure crossing or affecting the site?

      There are no physical constraints crossing the site.

      The site slopes steeply down W-E away from Tupwood Lane. The owner’s indicate the slope to be an average of 9 degrees. OS indicates site slopes down west east from contour 210 to contour 195 i.e. approximately 15 metres drop in 105 metres from Tupwood Lane to the rear boundary indicating a steeper slope at a 14 % gradient which is a slope of approximately 8 degrees.

      The rear boundary to the east is defined by a steep ridge line along the eastern boundary just beyond the boundary fence leading then to further slope down.

      In addition to east west slope, the site also slopes from the top Northwest corner to bottom South east corner. The slopes are not consistent and there are a number of level areas causing the site to be stepped and this topography could facilitate development behind the existing houses although access due to steep east/west

   b. What natural features are there e.g. any trees, hedgerows, watercourse?
      Are there features of particular biodiversity value?
      Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, badgers, great crested newts etc.?

      There are a number of mature trees on the site both on the boundaries and within the site itself all of which contribute to the privacy of the existing site and its wooded ambience.

      The lower part of the site is naturally wooded similar to the woods below. This belt is significantly wider in 123 as shown on google photograph.

      The remaining area has largely been cleared to grass with three ponds. A number of mature trees have been retained within the cleared area and along the boundary between 121 and 123 and along the boundary with 117 and 119 Tupwood Lane.

      Given the proximity of the site to open woods and fields and the ponds on the site, a biodiversity/ecological study would be required prior to any planning application.
c. Are there any health and safety constraints e.g. nearby major hazard site?

No.

d. Are there existing buildings that could be retained or converted?

There are two existing detached houses on the site which could be retained.

e. Are there important views into or out of the site?

The sites mark the end of the urban area of Caterham and the beginning of the rural green space surrounding Caterham. As such they demark this boundary when driving in or out of Caterham along Tupwood Lane. The large gardens and open aspect leads easily into the woods and fields beyond.

f. How might development at the site affect the skyline?

Given that the land continues to slope upwards across Tupwood lane and the presently wooded area below the site it is unlikely that development would affect the skyline although it might be visible from across the Valley on the Tillingdown side.

g. Are there any public rights of way affecting the site?

No.

h. Information to record about neighbouring sites and the surrounding area.
What are the neighbouring uses? (What are the existing uses and are there any development proposals?). Are any of the adjacent uses, ‘bad neighbours’ giving rise to noise or fumes that could impact the development?
Could the original site be expanded into neighbouring sites?

It is possible that the site might be expanded into adjoining residential plots on the northern side although this is unlikely to increase significantly the net new units.

There are no bad neighbours.
i. What is the local style of buildings – materials, scale, density?

This is best set out in HVCA under Area I and H.

In view of the character of the area, the constraints of trees and slopes and the location of the site, density should be low with larger than normal plot sizes to maintain the openness of the site and work within the existing topography. 8-10 dwellings per hectare might be appropriate.

j. Could development at the site cause any issues of overlooking or loss of privacy for neighbouring uses?

There could be overlooking and loss of privacy in respect of 117 and 119 Tupwood Lane.

The slope of the site would require greater separation of houses to avoid overlooking.

k. Physical infrastructure and local services considerations
Is the site connected to local utilities (such as water, energy supply and sewerage disposal)?

It is assumed that there are local services in Tupwood Lane although drainage /sewerage disposal may be a problem. The present properties are on soakaways and septic sewerage.

l. Does the site have high speed broadband connection?

Probably

5. Local facilities and services
a. How close are the following local services and facilities? Where is the nearest: School (primary & secondary) / GP practice / Pharmacy / Local shops / Post Office / Library / Play space / Sports centre and/or pitches.

Town centre is approximately 1.2 km away. There is no public transport service in Tupwood Lane. St John’s School lies below the site but whilst there are footpaths through the woods the main access would be from Godstone Road at a distance of 1.3 km. Nearest Doctors is in Eothen Close adjacent to town centre and other facilities are generally available in and around the town centre.
b. What is the capacity of local schools?

Currently there is capacity within local schools

C. Are local services accessible by public transport, cycling and walking?

The steep slope of Tupwood Lane makes access to the site difficult by cycle or walking. Public transport is only available in Godstone Road or Town Centre.

6. Community Infrastructure Levy

a. What are the priorities for local infrastructure improvements linked to the development of this site?

See Neighbourhood Plan.

Deliverability

Starting to think about whether development of the site is deliverable and viable...

7. Suitability - potential constraints on development

a. Is there a record of local opinion towards development of the site?

Development in the Green Belt is not supported by the majority of the Community although there is no specific record of local opinion on this site. Main objection would be for any major intensity of building on this site and against any extension of the urban area into green space.

8. Availability

a. Is the land owner willing for their site to come forward for development?

Owners have put forward the site for development under HELAA process. In the application they confirm that the site could be made available within 5 years.

b. Are there any factors which might prevent or delay development e.g. tenancies, leases?

Not as far as we are aware
9. **Summary**

- Desktop research findings
- Planning policy considerations
- Onsite considerations
- Infrastructure & local services
- Deliverability

Over what timeframe might the site become available for development - in years, 1-5 | 6-10 | 10+?

The key planning issue for this site is its designation as green belt and its location at the boundary with the designated area of Harestone Valley in the Caterham Valley Parish. Tupwood Lane presently forms the effective and definable Green Belt demarcation within the Harestone Valley Character Area boundary.

The site plays an important part in maintaining the open green character and helping to consolidate the effectiveness of the Green Belt boundary by preventing urban sprawl moving further out of the built up area of Caterham.

The site provides a definable and visual boundary to the boundary between urban development and the rural and green character of the areas beyond.

Building development of this site is considered to be unacceptable for the following reasons:

- This site is highly valued for its contribution and support of the open green character of this part of the green belt. Our Neighbourhood Plan states that for development in the green belt to be acceptable it should not be located in a visually prominent location, and it should provide specific community benefit which strongly overcomes any harm caused by the loss of green belt amenity. Development of this site would not accord with either of these aims.

The CR3 Forum believes that this site fully supports two of the five purposes set out for Green Belt status namely:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; CR3 area and Countryside;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and

Its present status and use is sustainable as residential within the green belt.

Finally given that there is an adequate identified supply of brown field sites identified within the emerging CR3 Neighbourhood Plan available for housing, there are no special circumstances identified which would support development of this site.

In conclusion, the CR3 NP cannot support the development of this site at this time.

However if the existing Green Belt Boundary was altered to remove the site from its Green Belt status under the current TDC Green Belt review, the CR3 NP would support development of the site at a reduced developable area restricted to within the Harestone Valley Character Area, low density and retaining existing wooded areas and mature trees. Development should then accord with statutory policies and those of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and HVDG.
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