CATERHAM VALLEY PARISH COUNCIL

(CINCORPORATING VALLEY AND HARESTONE WARDS)

CATERHAM VALLEY PARISH COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes of the meeting of Caterham Valley Parish Council Planning Committee, held in The History Room, Caterham Valley Library, Stafford Road, Caterham on Wednesday 21st February 2018 at 7.00pm

Cllr Nicole Morrigan
Cllr Cherie Callender
Mrs Deborah Brent – co-opted member
Mr Peter Brent – co-opted member
Mrs Annette Evans – co-opted member

Mrs M Gibbins - Clerk to Caterham Valley Parish Council

M I N U T E S

1. **Apologies for absence:** to receive and accept apologies for absence.
   Cllr Peter Roberts due to a work commitment

2. **Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest:** To receive any disclosure by members of personal pecuniary interests in matters on the agenda, the nature of any interests, and whether the member regards the interest to be prejudicial under the terms of the new Code of Conduct. Anyone with a prejudicial interest must, unless an exception applies, or a dispensation has been issued, withdraw from the meeting.
   There were none declared

3. **Public session:** a period of up to, but no longer than 15 minutes, to hear questions or statements from members of the public. Individuals are allowed to speak for a maximum of 3 minutes.
   Cllr Alun Jones attended the meeting to speak on application TA/2018/49

4. **To consider and make comment on the following Planning Applications:**
   4.1 **TA/2018/70**
   Display of 2 internally illuminated fascia signs and 2 internally illuminated projected hanging sign (Advertisement Consent)
   66-68 Croydon Road, Caterham CR3 6QD
   **Case Officer: Paige Barlow**
   **Comment: Leave to TDC Officers**

   4.2 **TA/2018/155**
   Erection of pitched roof over existing garage. Installation of ground floor window to north elevation.
   Beechwood, 58 Dome Hill, Caterham CR3 6EB
   **Case Officer: Jessica Hampson**
   **Comment: Leave to TDC Officers**
4.3 TA/2018/82
Demolition of existing office building. Erection of 20 apartments including associated parking and landscaping
Maybrook House, 97 Godstone Road, Caterham CR3 6RE  
Case Officer: Christopher Hall
Comment: The Parish Council request that it is ensured that parking is unallocated otherwise there is insufficient parking for the application if parking is allocated according to the Design and Access Statement. The form of the S106 agreement has been agreed with Tandridge District Council and the Draft Heads of Terms were to be submitted alongside this application however this does not appear to be in the documents on the TDC website. The Parish Council requests a copy of the Draft Heads of Terms.

4.4 TA/2018/169
Excavation of land and erection of retaining wall in association with formation of additional hardstanding and extended vehicular crossover.
175 Stafford Road, Caterham CR3 6JL  
Case Officer: Jessica Hampson
Comment: Leave to TDC Officers however, attention needs to be given to drainage and ensure there is sufficient runoff to mitigate any flooding issue.

4.5 TA/2018/49
Conversion of property into 7-bedroom HMO in association with erection of part single/part two storey side and rear extension. Formation of vehicular crossover.
78 Farningham Road, Caterham CR3 6LJ  
Case Officer: Jessica Hampson
Comment:
Parking
The Parish Council has not objection to this type of proposal and appreciates the need for affordable housing in the area, however this application, in this location, is unacceptable.

The property is defined as a HMO and whilst at 7 rooms, based on the Tandridge Parking standards, this would require 3 clearly defined spaces. 14 people could be residing at this property. Adequate car parking at this whole site is imperative as 49% of people in the local area use their cars for work (as detailed in the Neighbourhood Statistics of the 2011 census). There is no guarantee that new residents at this property will not have cars and it will be difficult to legally stipulate this proviso in the lease. 14 people could have 14 cars. TDC maximum Parking Standards of one and a half spaces unallocated or 2 spaces allocated should therefore apply.

Based on parking stress on Farningham Road exceeding 100% as referenced in the planning appeal ref APP/M3645/W/16/3163824 and following the appeal of planning application refusal of the addition of a dwelling at 74 Croydon Road, any under provision on this road would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of Farningham Road residents.

The appeal noted “In Farningham Road, where there are fewer restrictions, the survey counted only one free space in the afternoon. This is similar to the availability I saw during my site visit at 1130 on a Tuesday. While I saw spaces available in the restricted bays on Croydon Road, I saw only 1 free space in Farningham Road, where I also noted illegal and inconsiderate parking and residents using cones to keep access to their driveways free. This suggests that the streets within 200m of the site, on Monday to Saturday, would be unable to absorb the additional on-street parking generated by this proposal for periods greater than 1 hour.”

“Whilst the development would provide a modest benefit of one additional dwelling to local housing supply, this is outweighed by the unacceptable harm it would cause to the amenity of future and surrounding occupiers, which is in clear conflict with the policies of the
development plan. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.”

Point 7 of the D & A talks about the proposal not significantly harming the amenity of neighbouring properties i.e. by reason of traffic or other general disturbance. The lack of parking will cause significant harm to the amenity of the local residents. The additional on-street parking in a road where parking stress routinely exceeds 100% would significantly impact congestion and harm neighbouring amenity.

Character and Layout
The modern looking extension will detract from the character of the existing street scene. Parking and bins to the front will leave a frontage dominated by parking which this type of property on this road does not have.

Built form
These are traditional semi detached symmetrical cottages, and the side extension will create a massive unevenness in the built form and will not be in keeping with the street scene.

Highway Safety
TDC’s Local Plan Part 2 detailed policies and DP7, General Policy for New Development on page 7 of the Design & Access Statement states that new development should maintain off street parking spaces but should not result in any additional on-street parking where this would cause congestion or harm to amenity or highway safety. Parking on Farningham Road is at a premium. People park on the footpath as there is a lack of available parking spaces which leads to pedestrians, those with buggies and mobility scooters having to use the road.

Recently an ambulance was unable to get through Farningham Road. The minimum widths are not sufficient for the fire service to access properties. Any additional traffic or displaced parking that this development would create will significantly increase the risk to life for existing and any future residents. For example, the police reported an obstruction on 30/1/18, 11:06 HOURS at Farningham Road (P18024038) with two vehicle parked badly. This led to an ambulance being unable to pass which had to turn round. Parking stress on this and other local roads means that people are unable to park considerately at all times as there are just not enough available parking spaces.

Refuse lorries regularly have issues accessing this road too.

Amenity
The property in its current form will significantly impact the amenity of all residents on the road due to displacement of parking and the lack of adequate parking provision on site.

The applicant references the NPPF paragraph 14 in 4.2 of the Design & Access statement where they say ‘at the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking’. The lack of parking is one reason why this is not a sustainable development.

The applicant then references the TDC Core Strategy and CSP 19 with regard to design that is ‘good enough to approve rather than bad enough to refuse’. This proposal does not meet criteria for good enough to approve.

Point 7 talks about the proposal not significantly harming the amenity of neighbouring properties i.e. by reason of traffic or other general disturbance. The lack of parking will cause significant harm to the amenity of the local residents. The displacement of the
current on-street parking in a road where parking stress routinely exceeds 100% would significantly impact congestion and harm neighbouring amenity.

HMOs are required to have internal fire doors installed due to the nature of the property. These close automatically and must have silent closures.

**Environment**
The proposed Property will not create an attractive living space for occupiers, with a low amount of communal space, a cramped kitchen relative to the maximum number of people who could occupy the property (14).

**Facilities**
The HMO does not have a suitable amount of communal space based on the number of people that could be occupying the property (14) leading to cramped and over crowded conditions.

The provision of 4 bins is not sufficient given the number of people that would be living in the proposed property and there has been no attempt at mitigating the bins facing on to the street. There is no provision of suitable screening which impacts on the prevailing street scene.

**Landscaping**
The current property has a sympathetic hedge bordering the garden, however all landscaping to the frontage is completely lost, to the detriment of the street scene.

**DP8 residential garden land development**
The property is currently unusual in design having a garden to the side, creating a natural break in development. The proposal will mean that the site becomes cramped and will appear over developed, removing an important visual separation between properties. The proposal does not present a frontage in keeping with this area of road.

The double storey extension will obstruct the views of the neighbouring property. The emerging Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan promotes the continuity of views for healthy living.

**DP21 Sustainable Water Management**
Residents complain about problems with utilities, there are already problems with drainage on Farningham Road. The removal of significant garden and the inclusion of hard standing parking will increase run off into drains that are already at capacity. There are known sewer capacity issues on the road, and the addition of what are essentially 7 additional dwellings will add significant stress to these drains.

**Sustainable Development**
There are no clear plans on how carbon emissions will be mitigated as part of the development.

The Parish Council requests that this application is refused however if the TDC Officers are deemed to permit the application the Parish Council request District Councillor Alun Jones to take this application to Committee.

**Date of the next meeting of the Planning Committee:** will be held in the History Room, Caterham Valley Library, Stafford Road, Caterham, on Wednesday 14th March 2018 at 6.30pm

Copies of Parish Council minutes are held by the Clerk and are available on the Parish Council web-site: [www.caterhamvalleypc.org.uk](http://www.caterhamvalleypc.org.uk)

Mrs M Gibbins, Parish Clerk, Salmons, Salmons Lane, Whyteleafe, Surrey CR3 0HB Tel: 07510 226989