# Garden Village Challenge Meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Location:</th>
<th>Date/time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land at South Godstone (South) and Land West of Edenbridge</td>
<td>29 June 2017: 4pm (JFR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attendees:**

- Cllr Martin Fisher
- Alan Barry - Bonnar Allan
- Cllr Peter Bond
- Nigel Rankine - Bonnar Allan
- Cllr Keith Jecks
- Steven Fidgett - Bonnar Allan
- Cllr Chris Botten
- Liam Herbert - Chelgate Limited
- Cllr Gillian Black
- Martin Taylor - Lichfields
- Louise Round
- Eric Williamson - Telereal Trillium
- Sarah Thompson
- Marie Killip

**Notes:**

- Introductions made.
- Cllr Fisher set out the Council’s position in terms of what the GV must deliver and the community benefits that must be delivered.
- Members emphasised that they were only seeking to allocate one broad location to be delivered for the plan period to 2033 and whilst it was acknowledged that the promoters were representing on two locations, the plan would not allocate both.
- Members asked how they would seek to overcome any conflict of interest in terms of promoting the two sites (South Godstone and Land West of Edenbridge). Promoters acknowledged that they understood the merits of each location for different reasons but stated that the merits of South Godstone as a location were currently more apparent than land west of Edenbridge. This was due to need to accord with Sevenoaks DC emerging Plan which was not as advanced as TDC plan, the central location of South Godstone and the wider benefits it could bring to the district for Tandridge in terms of infrastructure which would not be as obvious in terms of the Edenbridge site which is more closely related to Sevenoaks district.

**South Godstone**

- Presentation given by promoters on South Godstone
- Promoters were asked about their involvement in the construction of the development and how they would ensure delivery. Members were informed that they would remain part of the process and enter partnership with house builders through joint venture agreements.
- Questions relating to the rail network raised by Members and lack of direct to London access. Promoters confirmed ongoing discussions with GOVIA about the capacity of the line and any opportunities that would arise from the development.
- Members raised concerns about the impact on Lingfield station and station car parks. Promoters said this would be mitigated by encouraging modal shift to better public transport services including bus and an increase in frequency of trains from South Godstone.
- Members raised transport of all types as an issue in this location including A22 and ‘knock-on’ impacts to J6 of M25 and at Felbridge/East Grinstead. Promoters had considered possible solutions including a relief road for the A22, but this would be looked at further.
- Members asked questions about education and whether work on the catchment area had been done. Promoters confirmed that there would be benefit to the entire district in terms of access to ‘through-education’ from primary to sixth form and the new school would take pressure from Oxted School and those north of the district, preventing the need to send children out of the area for their education.
- Officers raised questions relating to the land availability and whether the land was under the control of the promoter. Promoter confirmed that some parcels had been secured and others were in progress through legal agreement etc.

- Officers raised questions and concerns over the land assembly and how the promoter would overcome the appearance of sprawl, due to the land parcels included in the proposal.

- Members raised questions about affordable housing both in terms of the ability to deliver social affordable and also market affordable and how this proposal would assist in delivering much needed homes that were attainable to the community. Promoters stated that this would be done by utilising land capture and the design and mix.

- Members asked whether any approach had been made to the promoters representing on land north of South Godstone, promoters confirmed they would be happy to do this if the need arose.

- Members raised concerns over access to health care and reinforced importance of adaptable and lifetime homes including telecare, not a reliance on ‘retirement products’. Promoters said they could incorporate this if their location were to be chosen.

- Cllr Fisher expressed a concern about how employment provision would be provided as it wasn’t apparent.

**Land West of Edenbridge**

- Members questioned the role of the land west of Edenbridge if the promoter felt that opportunities of South Godstone were more apparent to Tandridge district.

- Members questioned the role of Edenbridge in terms of how it best met the Council’s strategy given the edge of district location and in response to the promoters presentation of South Godstone.

- Officers raised concerns about the deliverability of this location on reflection of the strategy set by Sevenoaks in the preparation of its Local Plan and its ability to deliver within the Tandridge plan period to 2033. Promoters did not feel that the location was totally ruled out by the Sevenoaks strategy and felt that the location had merits.

- Officers raised questions about the extent of discussion between promoter and Sevenoaks DC, promoters confirmed this had not been extensive as TDC were more advanced in their plan-making.

- Promoters did not give a presentation on Land West of Edenbridge due to time constraints of attendees and on reflection of Member and officer concerns and agreed to consider all of these more fully. Promoters did provide information on the location to be viewed outside of the meeting.

- Members thanked promoters for attendance. Meeting ended.