



(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 8<sup>th</sup> August at 7:00pm

Cllr Nicole Morrigan  
Cllr Peter Roberts  
Cllr Cherie Callender  
Cllr Ines Salman  
Cllr Jenny Gaffney  
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

---

## MINUTES

1. **Apologies for absence:** received and accepted apologies for absence from:  
Cllr Alun Jones due to a prior 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.*  
Mrs Annette Evans declared an interest in application TA/2018/1298 and did not contribute to the discussion.
3. **Public session:** there was no member of the public present.
4. **To consider and make comment on the following Planning Applications:**
  - 4.1 TA/2018/1330  
Erection of studio flat  
74 Croydon Road, Caterham CR3 6QD  
*Case Officer: Mark Dennett*  
**Comment: The Parish Councillors request this application is refused on the grounds as detailed:**
    - CSP 19 states a residential density of 75 units per hectare in town centres. This site is .025 hectare, which equates to a maximum of 2 units. There are already 7 residential units on the site and this application for a further 1 bedroom (2 person studio) ground floor flat and 'garden' on what is currently part of the existing garage parking is gross overdevelopment of the site.

- The 3 parking spaces that were approved in the original planning application are being removed by the developer, along with the bin storage area for the existing units, to allow for the extra residential unit. The developer states that there is available parking provision in the area to allow for the removal of the parking spaces. We would strongly disagree with this statement. Local roads are already saturated with resident parking and more overflow parking into these roads will exacerbate already existing parking problems. The Inspector at Appeal agreed with this fact and dismissed an earlier application.
- We draw your attention to the recent 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.
- In addition, 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.
- We would also draw attention to the appeal decision notice concerning this site <http://tdccomweb.tandridge.gov.uk/Planning/StreamDocPage/obj?DocNo=23873879&content=obj.pdf> issued 2nd March 2017 and the impact the changes will have are clearly set out and recognised by the inspector following a site visit.

*“The appellant’s parking beat surveys show that overnight, 24 spaces were available within 200m of the site. In addition, many of the areas under daytime parking restrictions, such as single yellow lines, would be able to accommodate parking such that there would be no risk of overnight parking placing unsustainable pressure on the parking in the neighbouring streets. However, while the daytime survey shows 11 spaces available within 200m of the site, it is unclear how many of these were in the bays on Croydon Road which restrict parking to only one hour and no return within 1 hour, between 0830 and 1800 Monday to Saturday.*

*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. I appreciate that CS Policy CSP1 promotes development in sustainable locations and that LP Policy DP1 promotes sustainable development. However, LP Policy DP7 requires development to maintain existing off-street parking spaces where necessary and not to result in additional on-street parking where this would cause congestion, or harm to amenity or highway safety. CS Policy CSP18 says that development must not significantly harm the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of factors which include traffic and any other adverse effect.”*

Based on the above assessments, it is clear that any development at this location will have a significant impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties due to the displacement of vehicles on to neighbouring roads. The assessment of Surrey Highways that there is no impact on the safety of road users as a result should be ignored as there are clear safety risks that have been identified in the Tandridge 2017 parking review and the consultation regarding the addition of partial double yellow lines on Colin Road due to dangerous parking. This application should be refused as the proposed development is contrary to DP7 Parking.

- Whilst ownership of the car parking spaces is moot, consideration should be given to the original planning application that approved the site with parking. There is no use for this space other than parking and it should be noted that the changes made by the

developer appear to be a cynical attempt to circumnavigate the planning rules. These are parking spaces build for the flats and to date there has been no change of use through the planning system approved.

According to the letter from Lex Sterling Solicitors, the 7 current units have been 'sold on a leasehold basis without rights to any on-site parking space. The owners of the properties have pedestrian access only. The parking area at the property remains in the ownership of the freeholder of the site.' The original application was granted with parking so how has this been allowed. The application form states that 'the current parking spaces are inadequate for the current average size vehicles'. This is an interesting comment when councillors have seen cars parked in the garage area.

- There is little or no amenity space for the current residents and the view from the car park looks out onto a high wall. There will be little natural light in the potential new unit. The plan currently displays a garden space which based on the current car park layout is accessible by the other 7 flats in the block. In delivering an outside space for the proposed eight flat, this will remove that space from the use of the other residents.
- The parking assessment included in the application is from June 2016. It attempts to show that parking is available. However, the methodology is deeply flawed. This was supported by the planning appeal.
- The body of the paper suggests that all of the parking highlighted on the Croydon Road is unrestricted, with the detail hidden in the appendices that it is in fact limited to only 1 hour Monday to Friday from 8.30 - 18.00.
- The summary claims overnight parking stress in the area of 70.7% and the daytime parking stress figure at 86.4%. However, this is not accurate as it does not consider restrictions on bays and addition of an increase of Double Yellow Lines in Farningham Road and Colin Road by Surrey County Council.
- 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.
- 3.5 states that the availability and opportunities for public transport should be taken into account. 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. The 2011 Census stated that 49% of people in this area travel to work by car.
- The parking technical note submitted as part of the application assumes that the loss of the 3 spaces and the addition of 1 car for the new dwelling. Whilst the applicant suggests the flats are not sold with parking, the parking survey suggests otherwise and does restate the fact that there will be displaced parking. The assumption that the loss of the 3 spaces and the addition of 1 car would increase demand by 4 spaces is also incorrect. The block at 74 Croydon Road consists of 4 x 1 bed flats and 3 x 2 bed flats. The current Tandridge requirement for this building if requesting permission today would be 10.5 spaces, and with the additional flat, that permission should now be 12 spaces. This whole development is grossly under-provisioned.

The table 3.1 suggests that 24 spaces were available overnight on Wednesday 18th May. The document says they exclude single yellow lines. This has been done however, 1 hour restricted bays have been included. This would assume that all cars would leave their property by 8.30am in the morning and return by 6pm. This is clearly not the case. Excluding the 23 bays that are available on Croydon Road (all of which are in 1 hour restricted time, Mon-Fri, 8.30-18.00), the available parking is only 1 space. If you assume there will be 4 additional cars requiring space on the road, this results in a parking stress off 107% and not the 70.7% figure stated.

- Table 3.2 looking at the daytime demand shows both Colin Road and Farningham Road at 100%. Again, assuming as per the methodology in the submission that there are only 4 cars displaced, there would be a parking stress of 110% when excluding time-restricted bays. If you assume parking stress based on the Tandridge requirement for this type of development of 12 spaces, the parking stress would be 130%.
- It is interesting also to note that further subdivision of the flats appears to have happened to the property since the last time (now 7 units from the original 5) increasing the assumed parking stress of Colin Road and Farningham to 130% up from the original application, which would have resulted in 124% parking stress.
- Table 3.3 again, based on cars parking in unrestricted bays, the parking stress on the developers methodology of 4 on street spaces required would be 105% and on the Tandridge requirement for that block would be 119%.
- What also must be noted is the measurements for Farningham Road vary between tables 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 with 36 spaces noted in table 3.1 for Farningham Road, with only 34 noted in table 3.2 and 3.3 leading us to question the quality of the survey.
- Whilst the light assessment does indicate that the light levels will be sufficient, it must be noted that the assessment is based on light coloured floors and white walls. Whilst this colour palette does deliver the required lux levels, it will prevent future owners from making the flat their own without there being an impact on lighting levels which have been linked to people's wellbeing. Aubergine bathroom suites were once the fashion, but would you make a planning decision based on keeping them? As such, it would not provide a satisfactory environment for the occupiers of the proposed dwelling and is contrary to DP7.

It should also be noted that light values have decreased from what was previously proposed creating a more dank and dark environment for residents with a reduction in the average lux levels on the same assumptions from 338 lux to 267 lux and a decrease in average daylight factor from 2.8 to 2.2 which would create an environment that would be substandard for the occupier.

- On a separate note, we would like to bring the following to the Planning Officer's attention. There is an item on <https://auctionhouselondon.co.uk/lot/?lotID=72967> which is LOT 26: STORAGE AREA TO THE REAR OF 74 CROYDON ROAD, CATERHAM, SURREY, CR3 6QD, which appears to have been SOLD FOR £8,000. The website has the following information:  
AN UNDERGROUND STORAGE AREA MEASURING APPROXIMATELY 37 SQ M (398 SQ FT) TO THE REAR OF AN EXISTING BLOCK OF FLATS. OFFERED WITH PLANNING PERMISSION SUBMITTED FOR THE ERECTION OF A SELF-CONTAINED FLAT WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING SPACE (SUBJECT TO OBTAINING ALL

RELEVANT CONSENTS). GUIDE PRICE: £13,000+

Tenure: Leasehold. A new 125 year lease will be granted upon completion.

Notes: A planning application (ref: PP-07081488) was submitted to Tandridge District Council on 26th June 2018 to convert the current storage area and create a new build 2 person self-contained studio ground floor flat and garden at the rear of 74 Croydon Road. Freeholders consent for any possible works will be granted at nil premium.

#### 4.2 TA/2018/1298

Variation of conditions 2 and 3 of planning application TA/2015/2259 dated 3 March 2016 to allow for minor material amendments

71 Harestone Valley Road, Caterham CR3 6HP

*Case Officer: Hannah Middleton*

**Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers**

#### 4.3 TA/2018/1297

Continued use of premises as a restaurant without compliance with Condition 2 of permission reference TA/99/P932 dated 2.11.99 (hours of operation) (Certificate of Lawfulness for an existing use or development)

8 Croydon Road, Caterham CR3 6QB

*Case Officer: Mark Dennett*

**Comment: The Parish Councillors have no objections and wants to encourage business to have trade however because of the specific and included facts of this application they do not want it to set a precedent for other businesses.**

---

**Date of the next meeting of the Planning Committee:** will be held in the History Room, Caterham Valley Library, Stafford Road, Caterham, on Wednesday 29<sup>th</sup> August 2018 at 7:00pm

---

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