



(INCORPORATING 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 20th November at 6:30pm

Cllr Nicole Morrigan - Chair
Cllr Ines Salman
Cllr Cherie Callendar
Cllr Jenny Gaffney
Cllr Alun Jones (part-time)
Mr Peter Brent - Co-opted member
Mrs Annette Evans - Co-opted member

Mrs M Gibbins
Clerk to Caterham Valley Parish Council

MINUTES

1. **Apologies for absence:**
There was none received
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 was none declared
3. **Public session:** There were two members of the public present regarding application TA/2018/2425.
4. **To consider and make comment on the following Planning Applications:**
 - 4.1 TA/2019/1808
Detached outbuilding in rear garden for use as a garden room
14 Tupwood Gardens, Caterham CR3 6EW *Case Officer: Hannah Middleton*
Comment: The Parish Councillors have concerns about the trees in the back garden and would request conditions be put in place to protect them should the application be approved.
This proposed development will be a large single building in the back garden, approximately 9 feet tall, 17 feet wide and 11 feet long. It is not a very big property and seems quite high and large for a garden room.

The Harestone Design Guide states 'landscape, level of tree cover and open space are dominant characteristic with the buildings being subservient to the landscape'.

Design Principle L 2: Buildings must provide high levels of visual privacy in relation to the character of Harestone Valley and not unduly impact on the amenity of neighbours. There should be space between properties and this is flush against the neighbour's property. Neighbours concerns should be taken into consideration in relation to height and proximity to neighbouring property.

Design Principle GS 3: Development should not lead to unacceptable lopping, topping or felling of trees, removal of shrub areas and boundary hedges as these contribute to the character and amenity of the Harestone Special Residential Character Area and its wooded character. All tree works should only be carried out with prior approval by the Council.

7.5 Where development proposals straddle existing plot boundaries, it should be ensured that existing planting, in particular mature trees, are retained and impact on them is minimised. Development proposals should positively integrate existing planting into their layout.

7.6 Where long back gardens or large plots are a key characteristic of an area (areas B, C, H, I and south and eastern part of D) back-land development should be avoided in order to retain the open wooded character of these areas.

4.2 TA/2019/1641

Change of use of cow shed to a residential dwelling (retrospective)

The Bungalow, Tower Farm, War Coppice Road, Caterham CR3 6AS *Case Officer: Georgina Betts*

Comment: The Parish Council object to this application for the following reasons:

The applicant started this development in February 2017 and completed it in June 2017.

Prior to this he had applied for planning permission to station a mobile home on the property. If he applied for planning permission to station a mobile home on the property, he must surely have realised he would need permission for a change of use of cow shed to a residential dwelling. Had an application actually been submitted at the time the works were started, it is unlikely that permission would have been granted as the land is Green Belt and AGLV. This retrospective application is a cynical attempt to bypass the planning rules and process.

It is also interesting that there is another application TA/2019/1639 which is also retrospective and requests the part change of use of tack room, stables and equestrian office to a residential dwelling. In the Planning Statement for TA/2019/1639, the applicant says he is a single parent with three children. The children are obviously grown up as his grandchild is 6 years old. He says he has also moved his elderly parents onto the site which relates to the second retrospective application TA/2019/1641. The mobile home is also still in use, housing his 19 year old daughter and her partner.

In the Planning Statement for this current application, the applicant says he has lived in the building ('cowshed' - now a 3-bedroom property) for 2 years. The 'tack room' has been occupied since 2014. Should permission be granted for this application, this is then effectively 3 homes on farm land. Is there sufficient parking provision for all three units at this site?

The applicant appears to have slowly moved his entire family onto the site, turning equestrian buildings into residential accommodation, without planning permission, to accommodate them. This is not acceptable on Green Belt / AGLV land and sets a dangerous precedent for other future applications.

We are concerned that the two applications are being reviewed by two different officers as their combined impact should be viewed as a whole.

There are no details of the drainage to facilitate the new accommodation – the applicant says the existing built form being capable of being served by a soakaway, but no information is provided.

The applicant has altered the original buildings but not amended them to incorporate a 10% carbon reduction. We would have concerns that this would not happen if retrospective permission was granted and a condition should be imposed if this application is approved. It is a farm and yet no ecology survey was done because the applicant says ‘the building has been occupied for some years’.

There is a long history of applications going back to 1987 for this site. There have been several refused Certificates of Lawfulness. It appears that the site has multiple occupants in a variety of accommodations on the site, all of which are in the Green Belt.

Biodiversity Checklist – no surveys have been done as there seems to be an assumption that none are required.

Surrey County Council has requested conditions be imposed regarding the electricity supply should this application be approved and we would support this.

This application is against the emerging CCW Neighbourhood plan policies.

4.3 reference Crowhurst Road – this is an isolated development not in the vicinity of Crowhurst Road.

4.5 It is claimed the building redundant in 2017 which is spurious as it was allegedly originally used as hay storage. The owners still keep livestock (horses) who eat hay so to claim the building was surplus to requirements seems suspect. hay storage

4.9 Why were there windows in a barn and if not original, when were they installed?

4.12 If the Officer is minded to approve this application the Parish Council requests that a caveat is included to prevent the buildings being sold as separate dwellings.

Caterham Valley Parish Council request this application be refused.

4.3 TA/2019/1801

Erection of new building containing 4 x 2 bed and 5 x 1 bed flats together with associated parking.

Rear of Clearway Court, 139-141 Croydon Road, Caterham CR3 6PF *Case Officer: Georgina Betts*
Comment: Caterham Valley Parish Council does not agree with the developer’s comment in the Planning Statement of October 2018 that this application overcomes all of the Planning Officer’s objections to the previous application TA/2018/1594.

The original application for TA/2018/1594 ‘Erection of new building containing 9 flats (4 x 2 bed, 5 x 1 bed) together with associated car parking’ was also dismissed by the Appeals Inspector who agreed with the original TDC Planning Committee reason for objection in the ‘the proposed flats, as a result of the provision of habitable accommodation (bedrooms) without windows with clear glazing, would fail to provide a suitable standard of accommodation for future residents, thereby contrary to Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2: Detailed Policies – Policy DP7.

We also believe that this current application TA/2019/1801 should be considered in conjunction with TA/2019/275 (Extension to the roof of the building to create a third floor; change of use of ground, first and second floors to flats following prior approval for conversion to residential, together with car parking). That application for 25 flats has not yet been determined. Should both applications be approved, there would be 34 units with minimal parking on this small site.

Affordable Housing The application should be considered in line with the Clearway Court application TA/2019/275 and provision should be made for affordable housing as, with the addition of a potential 9 units, the total number of apartments would be 34. The current TDC Core Strategy 2008 has an affordable requirement of 34%. The draft TDC Local Plan

has a requirement for 20% affordable housing which would be the minimum expected in the case and would equate to 6.8 units. Therefore, at a minimum, there should be 6 affordable units. The assumption would be that with a piecemeal development, the developer feels they can get away with none.

Density - CSP 19 states a residential density of 75 units per hectare in town centres. This site is 0.07 hectares which equates to a maximum density of 5.25 units for application TA/2019/1801.

Built Form - The proposed building is located in the car park of the existing office block which has Permitted Development for 16 units with an application for another 9 units pending as an extension on a further upper floor (34 units). It is over development of the site due to the restricted site size. The proportions of the building are not appropriate for the site on which it is located.

Character and Layout - This application contravenes TDC Policy DP7 for Character and Layout - The block does not contribute to the character and layout of the local area. It is monolithic and located at the back end of a former office block overlooking a railway on one side and a builder's yard on the other.

Parking - This proposal includes parking for 10 cars, which is 3 ½ spaces lower than the level required by the Tandridge Parking Standards 2012 if the parking remains unallocated. The developer has used applications for 131 and 137 Croydon Road as material considerations when determining this application. The referenced applications were granted permission in 2007 and 2008/2009. Tandridge adopted its Parking Standards in 2012 which has parking requirements of 1 ½ spaces unallocated and 2 allocated spaces per unit. As the Tandridge Standards are the most recent to be published, it is these that should be adhered to. Parking in the Croydon Road and all the surrounding roads is saturated and 10 spaces for 9 units is completely inadequate.

We draw your attention to the refusal of planning permission for TA/2017/1282 in the nearby Beechwood Road on the grounds that inadequate parking provision cannot be acceptable in roads that are already at saturation point. Also application TA/2018/49 at 78 Farningham Road was withdrawn following over 50 objections from local residents, again many related to an under-provision of parking.

Parking on the Croydon Road is limited to only 1 hour Monday to Friday from 8.30 - 18.00. With restrictions on bays and addition of an increase of Double Yellow Lines in nearby roads by Surrey County Council, the lack of adequate parking will cause additional parking stress on already saturated local roads.

Point 3.4 in the Tandridge Parking Standards - Supplementary Planning document does note that "Town centres have small controlled parking zones and therefore town centre residential schemes with inadequate parking are likely to result in overspill parking occurring on nearby residential roads. Point 3.5 states that the availability and opportunities for public transport should be taken into account. The Planning Statement suggests that there is 'abundant public transport availability' due to the proximity of the site to the main town centre. Whilst the urban areas are relatively well served by rail, these are mostly radial lines from London, and do not provide easy opportunities to travel east-west or travel south from Caterham. Working in London is not a factor that significantly reduces car ownership in Caterham. According to the 2011 Census, 49% of people in this area use their cars to travel to work.

This development is therefore under-provisioned. Caterham Valley again will suffer from the cumulative effect of numerous applications with no consideration for the residents who live in the vicinity of these new developments. This continues to set precedents where applications for new development with an under-provision of parking appears to be the norm. The Adult Education Centre and Social Services sites on the Croydon Road have 38

units with 72 parking spaces. Why is this not used instead as a marker for new development in the area?

Should the Planning Officer be minded to approve this application, Caterham Valley Parish Council would request that the parking remains unallocated.

Amenity / Environment / Facilities - Whilst 9 flats would not suggest a significant increase in traffic, this would be in addition to other significant developments along Croydon Road and the cumulative impact of this has put the road under significant strain. As such the development would have a detrimental impact on the existing residents of Croydon Road and other surrounding roads as the overflow parking goes to these roads.

There is no separate pedestrian access considering the number of people who will be accessing the property if the application together with the parallel application is approved. The developer states in the Planning Statement that 'to minimise the impact the new dwellings have been designed with minimal floor to ceiling height of 2400mm and will utilise as slim as possible structural elements to intermediate floors and roof'. How will this impact noise levels between the apartments?

The 'Layout' section of the Design and Access Statement (September 2019) says 'the proposed site layout also places the maximum distance between the primary elevation of the new dwellings and the rear elevation of Clearway Court. This will minimise any sense of overlooking and privacy loss caused by the proposed windows on the front facade. In addition, the windows have been designed to be wide and shallow, using obscured glazing to ensure that these concerns have been addressed. Wider glazing is used along the west facade towards the railway line where there is no risk of overlooking or privacy loss. Top flats have reduced internal floor area due to sloping ceilings. Says these top floor properties benefit from natural light via a 'generous' terrace.

Caterham Valley Parish Council does not believe that this will mitigate the impact on the privacy of the neighbours at Cypress Court. In addition, if the developer is not acknowledging the view from one apartment straight into another why have they specified obscured glazing?

The Design and Access Statement also says 'each dwelling has been designed to meet the technical standard in terms of minimum floor area and width for bedrooms and storage requirements'. These apartments are minimum government size standard with 10 parking spaces for the 9 units. The developer plans to cram as many people as possible into these units and suggests a total of 19 people could be accommodated in these shoe boxes.

Added to the fact that there is no landscaping, there really is little or no amenity space for the current residents. Consideration should be given to the Trees and Soft Landscaping Supplementary Planning Document November 2017 which requires gardens proportionate to the development. There is no garden! It is essentially a block of flats in a car park. This will have an impact on the health and wellbeing of the residents, with no space provided for children to play.

Where landscaping is concerned the Planning Statement says 'grassed areas will be avoided due to the possible neglect and lack of maintenance that these kind of small areas are often subject to'. With flats there is usually a Management Company as there are service charge fees for the communal areas. It is the responsibility of the 'Management Company' to take care of communal areas so the 'lack of maintenance' is an issue for the Managing Agents and should not be used by the developer as an excuse not to have any green areas. With the 16 flats from the permitted development application at Clearway Court, and a potential 9 others from the second planning application which has not yet been determined, this would mean there are 34 flats with no amenity space.

Privacy - there should be a minimum distance between dwellings of 20 metres and this should be greater when there is a height differential due to the fact that the dominant

property can overlook the other property. Whilst the distance is 24 metres, the scale and height of the proposed development will overlook the lower floors in neighbouring Cyprus Court, impacting residents' privacy and amenity which is in contravention of Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2: Detailed Policies - Policy DP7. A number of residents have contacted Parish Councillors to raise their concerns.

The block is less than 24 metres from the Clearwater Court development which has recently been granted permitted development to flats. The sloping nature of the site would mean that the proposed new block would be significantly overlooked by the existing block on the eastern side, significantly impacting the amenity and privacy of the future residents.

Refuse Collection - This Council continues to have concerns about the collection of refuse. **Surrey County Council** - Surrey County Council has recommended conditions be imposed should this application be approved and the Parish Council would fully support them.

It is the opinion of the Parish Council that this current application has not improved on the previous one. Caterham Valley Parish Council strongly objects to this application and requests it be refused.

4.4 TA/2019/1835

Conversion of roof-space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and conversion of roof from hip to gable end including 4 x roof lights to front (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

25 Tupwood Lane, Caterham CR3 6DB

Case Officer: Tracey Williams

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to neighbours and TDC Officers

4.5 TA/2019/1850/TPO

Sycamore - Fell due to excessive shading of the garden. Replanted with Cherry or Silver Birch

22 Eothen Close, Caterham CR3 6JU

Case Officer: Alastair Durkin

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to the Arboriculturist

4.6 TA/2019/1853/TPO

T1-Beech - To reduce crown by 30% (3m) and thin by 10%.

15 Clareville Road, Caterham CR3 6LA

Case Officer: Alastair Durkin

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to the Arboriculturist

4.7 TA/2019/1872

Two storey side/rear extension

3 Milner Close, Caterham CR3 6JS

Case Officer: Hannah Middleton

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers with a request to ensure the extension does not exceed the permitted percentage increase

4.8 TA/2019/1752/TPO

Beech tree (T2) reduce and reshape canopy by 2.5 metres all round retaining healthy growth.

Lift canopy giving 4 metre clearance from ground level thin canopy by 25%. Part of a maintenance programme, maintaining tree to a suitable size for its location,

Mallard, 25 Loxford Road, Caterham CR3 6BH

Case Officer: Alastair Durkin

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to the Arboriculturist

4.9 TA/2019/1789

Single-storey side extension and external alterations to dwelling
143 Harestone Valley Road, Caterham CR3 6HS

Case Officer: Hannah Middleton

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers with a request to ensure the extension does not exceed the permitted percentage increase

4.10TA/2019/1924/TPO

Various tree management works as specified within the application documents
Pegasus Court, Stafford Road, Caterham CR3 6TD

Case Officer: Alastair Durkin

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to the Arboriculturist

4.11TA/2019/1768

Erection of timber raised deck, stairs and landscaping (Part Retrospective)

8 The Crescent, Bradenhurst Close, Caterham CR3 6FG

Case Officer: Hannah Middleton

Comment: The Parish Councillors expressed concern regarding the size and the impact of the proposed application on the amenity of neighbours and request that the neighbours comments are considered.

4.12TA/2015/2109/Cond1

Details pursuant to the discharge of condition No. 3 (Landscaping) of planning application reference: 2015/2109 dated 28/01/2016 (Demolition of existing garage. Erection of semi-detached dwelling with associated landscaping and parking)

102 Stafford Road, Caterham CR3 6JE

Case Officer: Kim Waite

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to neighbours and TDC Officers

4.13TA/2018/2425

Single storey rear extension

6 Woodlands Place, Caterham CR3 6SU

Case Officer: Tracey Williams

Comment: This application is retrospective however this is not stated on the application. The Parish Councillors have no objections provided the footpath is satisfactorily reinstated. The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers with consideration given to neighbours comments

5. Appeal

TA/2019/770

Demolition of existing garage. Erection of two storey side extension, alterations to existing roof, enlargement of existing front dormer, erection of rear dormer, external alterations and fenestration changes. Relocation of vehicular crossover and erection of car port

Rosecroft, 12 Weald Way, Caterham CR3 6EG

Date of the next meeting of the Planning Committee: will be held in the History Room, Caterham Valley Library, Stafford Road, Caterham, on Wednesday 11th December 2019 at 7pm

Copies of Parish Council minutes are held by the Clerk and are available on the

Parish Council web-site: www.caterhamvalleyipc.org.uk

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