
From: TLAG TandridgeLaneActionGroup <admin@tlag.org.uk>
Sent: 17 May 2026 18:46
To: TLAG TandridgeLaneActionGroup <admin@tlag.org.uk>
Subject: PLEASE READ - 500 home planning application at South Godstone

Dear TLAG Supporter,

Many of you will be aware of the recent planning application for a development of 500 homes to the north of South Godstone. Comments on this application (**reference 2026/394**) need to be submitted by the end of May. The extent and outline of the scheme is shown on the attached plan and masterplan.

I have now reviewed the application documents and I believe that people should object to the scheme, mainly because of its scale, but also because of the lack of any meaningful infrastructure proposed alongside it as well as a significant loss of well performing green belt land.

For the avoidance of doubt and as I have said before, TLAG is not against housing development per se and in fact we have always argued that every town and village in the district should take its fair share of housing numbers. This has always been our proposed spatial strategy, rather than dump everything in one place as was proposed to happen with a garden village in the previous, failed local plan.

However, whilst we would support some housing development on the edge of South Godstone, we do not support something of this vast scale, which will swamp the village. In your response to the council, which you can do via the link below using the application reference, I would suggest that people highlight the following key concerns:

<https://tdcplanningsearch.tandridge.gov.uk/#TDCInfo>

1. The land is green belt, not grey belt. As such, this scheme would represent ‘inappropriate development in the green belt’ which is not justified or supported by very special circumstances. The land in question performs important green belt functions and as such development here would not be appropriate. We dispute the applicant’s assertion that this is grey belt land. We would argue, same as the land to the south of the village, whilst the site may be capable of being treated as Grey Belt in definitional terms it has not been demonstrated that the development would avoid fundamentally undermining the purposes of the Green Belt. The proposal would give rise to significant harm in respect of Purpose (c), by reason of encroachment into the countryside, and would materially reduce the openness of the Green Belt in this location.
2. This land is not an allocated site in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan being prepared by Godstone Parish Council, which carries some weight in decision making, albeit subservient to the Local Plan.
3. Also, part of the site (west of the A22) is part of an AGLV (Area of Great Landscape Value). TDC’s own guidance says this about AGLV’s: “The AGLV covers parts of the dip slope of the North Downs and Low Weald. The landscape here is similar in quality to the Surrey Hills but does not hold national significance. Under Tandridge’s [Core Strategy](#), AGLV lands are rigorously protected to preserve scenic views, prevent prominent or harmful developments, and conserve the character of the countryside.”
4. The applicant also seeks to argue that the sustainability credentials of the site are “*without question*”, due in part to the existence of Godstone train station which it claims is a critical form of infrastructure. Everybody knows this train shuttles backwards and forwards between Redhill and Tonbridge and does not go to London, nor is it used by commuters. It is not a justification for a scheme like this, as was proved when the garden village proposal was defeated.
5. By the applicant’s own admission, part of the site sits within an ‘Area of High Archaeological Potential’.

6. The council has not yet published its draft Local Plan or the HELAA (Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment). As such the application is premature, notwithstanding the lack of a demonstrable 5 year housing land supply.
7. The number of cars that will come onto the roads will cause significant traffic issues, both on the arterial route which is the A22 and also local roads. Nearby villages such as Tandridge will also be affected, which already suffer from bad traffic congestion.
8. It is well known that there are significant capacity issues on the A22 and at Jn 6 of the M25. Indeed, the Inspector for the recently failed local plan said that no meaningful amount of development should happen in its vicinity until this was resolved. And yet the applicant's highways consultant suggests that *"the impact of the proposals upon the highway network is considered to be negligible."* We would strongly dispute this. As with the refused application to the south of the village, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that adequate provision will be made for sustainable modes of transport.
9. One of the applicant's reports suggests that *"An assessment of walking, cycling routes within the vicinity of the site has been undertaken demonstrating that the site is located within a reasonable walking and cycling distance of existing and proposed local facilities and amenities. The Site is therefore considered to be a reasonable location for sustainable development."* We would question what local facilities and amenities there are as the village only has a petrol station with a small shop as part of it and very little else.
10. There is no specific proposal for any additional school places, although there does appear to be an allocation of a 0.4 hectare site for potential expansion of St Peters primary School. There appears to be no provision whatsoever for secondary school places though.
11. There is no specific proposal for a doctor's surgery, but one of the applicant's reports acknowledges that the impact of the proposed development would exacerbate the local deficit of provision. As such the applicant is offering land for the provision of local healthcare services, the exact scale and nature of which are yet to be determined. We would suggest that much greater detail is needed in this regard in order for informed decisions to be made and this matter should not be delayed until further down the line.
12. There is no meaningful employment in South Godstone, so all these new residents will commute out, mostly by car.
13. Tandridge District Council has recently refused consent for a similar, but smaller scheme of 200 homes to the south of the village. I attach a copy of the Officer's report where I have highlighted what I consider to be some of the key arguments, many of which are also relevant to this application. I would encourage you to read this and use these arguments in your responses.

I hope this helps and you will feel able to respond, using these points as the basis for your objection. The deadline for responding is 31st May. To respond simply click on the application reference and then choose 'Comment'.

Regards,

David Hughes
For and on behalf of TLAG