

CATERHAM VALLEY PARISH COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes of the meeting of Caterham Valley Parish Council Planning Committee,  
held via the on-line TEAMS remote set-up  
on Wednesday 24<sup>th</sup> June at 6:00pm

Cllr Peter Roberts  
Cllr Cherie Callender  
Cllr Alun Jones  
Cllr Jenny Gaffney  
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 Nicole Morigan
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 was no member of the public present
4. **To consider and make comment on the following Planning Applications:**
  - 4.1 TA/2020/834/TPO  
Yew (T1) - To Crown reduce mature Yew tree located in the rear garden by approximately 2.0m. The tree will also be lifted to give 4.0m ground clearance.  
9 Loxford Close, Caterham CR3 6EU *Case Officer: Alastair Durkin*  
**Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to the Arboriculturist**
  - 4.2 TA/2020/931/NC  
Change of use from Use Class B1 (office) to Use Class C3 (residential unit) to form a ground floor flat with 1 or 2 bedrooms (Prior Approval).  
3 Mount Pleasant Road, Caterham CR3 6LP *Case Officer: Paige Barlow*  
**Comment: The Parish Councillors object to the loss of office space. The emerging Local Plan and the emerging Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan has identified a shortfall of office space in Tandridge District and in particular in Caterham. Consideration must be given to neighbours worries.**

### 4.3 TA/2020/930

Erection of front extension to form porch. Erection of two storey rear extension.(Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed use or Development)

57 Dome Hill, Caterham CR3 6EF

*Case Officer: Hannah Middleton*

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

### 4.4 TA/2020/970/NC

Conversion of the existing class B1(a) offices to class C3 dwelling houses

Clearway Court, 139 to 141 Croydon Road, Caterham CR3 6PF *Case Officer: Georgina Betts*

**Comment: Caterham Valley Parish Council object to this application for the following reasons: A piecemeal development of 4 separate applications on a single site is a cynical attempt by the applicant to circumvent planning rules that would support more parking, lower density and the provision of affordable housing.**

This application is one of 4 on this site. Permitted Development has been granted for 16 units in the current building and the developer has submitted an amended permitted development application to increase this to 19. With a further application for another 6 units in the roof of the current building, there would be 25 units on the site with 25 parking spaces. There has also been a further permission granted for 9 units in a separate building at the back of the site totalling 34 units with 35 parking spaces.

### DENSITY

- This Permitted Development site is 0.12 hectare. CSP 19 states a residential density of 75 units per hectare in town centres, which for this site equates to 9 units. Even at a density of 100 units per hectare, this would only allow 12 units and not the 19 that is now proposed for this site. Therefore, this additional proposal adds to the gross over-development of the site.
- It is interesting that in the 2017 planning statement for the original Permitted Development of 16 units, the developer says 'the Council had no control over this change of use'. One can only assume they believe the same for this application to amend the original approval. However, the question we would ask is at what point does the density become unacceptable or can the applicant amend again and add more units. We believe this proposal is unacceptable.
- With the original Permitted Development application for 16 units, the developer said that 'each dwelling has also been designed to meet the technical standard in terms of minimum floor areas and width and storage requirements'. This means apartments of minimum Government size requirement and therefore maximum profit for the space, to the detriment of the mental wellbeing of the residents. The occupancy of the 25 units is expected to be around 60 people. Adding the additional 19 people in the 9 apartments at the back of the site, this total rises to approximately 80 people who will be crammed into quite a confined area, a concern in a Covid world.

### PARKING

- If application TA/2019/1801 for 6 additional units in the roof of the current building is also approved, there will 25 parking spaces for 25 units, which is well below TDC's Parking Standards 2012 of 38 unallocated or 50 allocated spaces.
- The Tandridge Parking Standards 2012 state that there should have 1½ spaces unallocated or 2 spaces allocated with developments. The original application for 16 flats had 24 spaces. With this application and the additional application for the 6 units in the roof, the allocation has been reduced to 25 spaces for 25 units. The developer has previously used

applications for neighbouring properties in Croydon Road as examples of applications that have been granted, and with minimal parking, close to Clearway Court. However, these applications date before the TDC Parking Standard 2012 were introduced. The parking allocation in the 2012 Standards is of a higher specification following a review of the issues the lower number caused. The Adult Education and Social Services site at Croydon Road is one of the more recent developments where sense prevailed and adequate parking as per TDC's own standards was provided.

- The Officer's comment in the summary report for an additional 6 units in the roof says 'The development would not harm the character and appearance of the area nor would it harm the amenities of nearby residents. Appropriate levels of parking and amenity areas are provided on the overall site and given its urban context and connectivity'. None of the local residents would agree with this statement and the Parish Council and the residents have consistently argued for better parking provision. The lack of parking provision in Caterham is also acknowledged in the emerging Local Plan and the emerging Caterham, Chaldon & Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan.
- Croydon Road already has parking stress in excess of 100% and has become a dangerous slalom course for buses and traffic trying to get in and out of Caterham. Existing parking restrictions are already ignored and pavement parking, blocking passage for pedestrians, has become the norm. Residents will attest that the parking survey does not in any way reflect the current parking situation on Croydon Road. People park on the single yellow lines on Croydon Road in the evening when they are not penalised by parking tickets. However, these cars have to be moved from 8.30am when one hour restrictions come in force, meaning it is not possible to park there during the day on 6 days of the week.
- The applicant has stated that the site is in a highly accessible location which is another of their reasons for the lack of parking. Parking continues to be a major concern and this issue was highlighted in applications for both 74 Croydon Road and 64 - 66 Beechwood Road, where officers stated that the adverse impact on on-street parking were major considerations for refusal.
- The assertion that an under-provision of parking will encourage use of alternative modes of transport has consistently been proven to be false in an area where car ownership continues to increase. It is time that the cumulative effect of all developments in Caterham is taken into account when an application is considered. Exacerbating the current situation is not acceptable. Therefore, it is vitally important that adequate parking as per TDC's Parking Standards 2012 is provided and that this current application is reviewed in conjunction with application Ta/2019/1801 and TA/2019/275.

#### AMENITY

- The TDC Trees and Soft Landscaping Supplementary Planning Document November 2017 requires gardens proportionate to the development, yet landscaping is minimal and amenity space is almost non-existent which impacts on the mental and physical wellbeing of the residents, particularly in a Covid world. There is no safe outside areas for children to access, which is even more important when a number of the flats have no access to even a balcony.

#### AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- With this new application for 25 units, the developer should provide affordable housing at 34%, the current Core Strategy requirement. Even at the Emerging Local Plan requirement of 20%, this development needs affordable units to meet the needs of the local population. If this application is approved along with application TA/2019/1801 34 units with no affordable housing provision. The developer is using prior approval in

order to avoid having to build any affordable housing.

- Should this application be approved we request that it be considered with the original Clearway Court application and provision should be made for affordable housing.

### FLOODING

- The proposal also adds to the stress on the existing drainage system. Caterham has had extensive flooding issues over the last number of years, much detailed in representations from the Caterham Flood Action Group.
- The Waterman report, submitted as part of the Church Walk development, confirmed what has been suspected. Thames water confirmed that there are capacity issues in the network that serves Croydon Road and Caterham Town Centre which leads to foul water flooding at times of peak rainfall. As this new information has now come to light, any increase in development that contributes to the cumulative effect of the capacity constrain must be stopped until a suitable solution (the increase in sewer capacity along Croydon Road) is implemented.
- It is time that the cumulative effect of all development is taken into account when an application is considered by the TDC planning department.

This application is against the policies in the draft Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan.

Caterham Valley Parish Council objects to this application and strongly requests that it be refused. Should the officer be minded to approve, we also request a condition that the parking provision remains unallocated. Furthermore should the officer be minded to approve Cllr Alun Jones will take to Full Committee.

#### 4.5 TA/2020/936

Amendment to Elevations. Second Floor Layout and Parking of Planning Permission reference TA/2017/2324

Vanetta, 5 Tillingdown Lane, Caterham CR3 6RU

*Case Officer: Humphrey Mpezeni*

**Comment: The Parish Councillors do not consider that the applicant has addressed previous issues. The site lines detailed in the cross section do not take into account the height of the proposed wall as such will impact on the privacy of 200A Croydon Road and therefore request the change is refused. The Parish Councillors request that the Officer checks the building layout re bulk and scale**

#### 4.6 TA/2020/776

Demolition of existing dwellings and the erection of a residential block containing 12 No. flats with parking and cycle store within the lower ground floor and associated works. Enlargement of No.62 Beechwood Road's driveway.

64 & 66 Beechwood Road, Caterham CR3 6NB

*Case Officer: Alex Taylor*

**Comment: Caterham Valley Parish Council object to this application for the following reasons.**

#### Density

- This site is 0.12 hectare. CSP 19 states a residential density of 38 to 55 units per hectare outside town centres. At a density of 55 units per hectare, this equates to 6.6 units. This is therefore overdevelopment of the site.

#### Built form

- This proposal is not in keeping with the local streetscape. It is not appropriate to the

surrounding area in terms of land use, size and scale as the proposal includes 12 flats whereas the road is characterised by houses. The old Adult Education Centre building should not be used as a precedent as the old school building was retained and the only practical way to convert this was to convert it to flats. The other block is only 2 storeys high with 9 apartments and is not close to the pavement. Apartments are therefore out of character with the surrounding dwellings. The proposed building does not maintain and enhance the appearance of the area as the road is currently built up and the current property creates a natural break in the houses on the road. The potential new development creates homogenisation.

This development would be overbearing on 62 Beechwood Road

#### Parking & Traffic

- Parking stress on the Beechwood Road regularly exceeds 100%. There are also parking safety issues on the road as highlighted in a Surrey County Council parking consultation which necessitated double yellow lines by the Adult Education Centre development.
- Whilst the proposal delivers the number of parking spaces it does not give any dimension so we are not clear that it adheres to the Tandridge Parking Standards.
- There are also no visitor parking spaces so additional cars will need to be accommodated in Beechwood Road. It is also likely that some of the new occupants will have work vans etc which will end up parked on Beechwood Road which is already saturated, as many of the houses do not have off road parking.
- The addition of 12 dwellings will have a material impact on traffic flows on the road, considerably increasing vehicle movement per day into a road that is typically double parked with limited parking space.
- This development will add significant traffic to Beechwood Road, affecting all residents. Should this application be approved, we request that a condition is included so that the parking spaces remain unallocated. So often the parking allocation is changed to allocated after planning has been granted and this would be completely unacceptable on Beechwood Road where parking is at a premium and residents lives are already blighted by the overflow of parking from the new properties at the Adult Education Centre development which had an allocation of 2 parking spaces per unit.

#### Amenity

- Due to the nature of the sloping site and, as 62 Beechwood Road is stepped back from the road, the relative location and relative size of the new property as compared to what is currently on site will result in an impact on light and amenity for number 62. This should be considered for the current and any future owner of 62. 16 trees are being removed with only one being retained 'using special precautions'. We would request the tree officer reviews the removal of so many trees.

#### Privacy

- The rear of new property will overlook the garden of number 62 which will affect the privacy of current and future owners. We note that number 62 is not objecting to the proposal. However, the size of the proposal could lead to privacy and amenity issues for future residents.

#### Policy DP8 - Residential Garden Development

- This is a partly a back garden development as part of the new property is using the garden of the original house.

#### Sewers

- In additional to the properties on the AEC site, this will have a material impact on the sewer to cope at peak times. The assessment should not just look at the impact of the one property but should consider the aggregate impact of all extensions and developments in the last 5 years.

### Renewable energy and energy conservation

The Planning, Design and Access Statement for the application says that energy efficient measures will be incorporated into the building fabric and fitting of the scheme but there is there appears to be no reference to renewal energy and energy conservation as set out in the TDC design and access statement guidance notes. The application should also state what percentage saving in CO2 would be delivered through the incorporation of onsite renewable energy.

Caterham Valley Parish Council request that this application be refused. Should the Officer be minded to approve the application Cllr Alun Jones will take to Full Committee

#### 4.7 TA/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: Hanah Middleton*

**Comment: This is a retrospective application and the plans do not contain the finished levels and contours in the original planning condition. There is impact on the privacy of the adjacent property.**

#### 4.8 TA/2020/1000

Erection of first floor side and rear extension

4 The Riddings, Caterham CR3 6DW

*Case Officer: Hannah Middleton*

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

- There was a previous extension to this dwelling in 2017, which already represented a substantial expansion of the original property. TDC states that any previous extensions to a property will be included within the visual and mathematical calculations to determine the overall impact of the extensions as a whole. The rules say 'No more than half the area of land around the "original house" would be covered by additions or other buildings'. Thus, it may be argued that this new application is contrary to TDC guidelines for the size of an extension in relation to the size of the property when the two extensions are added together.
- There is also the question of whether the proposal is contrary to the Harestone Design Guide, specifically:
  - 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.
  - Design Principle L 4: Forms of development must respect their location, the size of the site and the character of the area.
  - Built Form - Point 5.5: The form of a building can have a negative impact on the view, when it is too bulky.
- It may be contended that the proposal is contrary to Policy CSP 18 Character and Design. This states 'Development must also have regard to the topography of the site, important trees or groups of trees and other important features that need to be retained. Development must not significantly harm the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of overlooking, overshadowing, visual intrusion, noise, traffic and any other adverse effect'.

- It may also be argued that the proposal contravenes Policy DP7 Design and Amenity, particularly with regard to having an overshadowing or overbearing effect.
- Furthermore, the application would potentially be contrary to the requirement of Policy DP8 that a development should present a frontage in keeping with the existing street scene.
- The proposed side and rear extensions render No. 4 more out of keeping with the rest of the development. It already appears visually intrusive and dominant due to its position at the highest point of the close.
- The rest of The Riddings is quite proportionate and well-spaced. Additional enlargement of this particular house would further spoil the rhythm and balance of the development.
- There is an inconsistency between the description of this application on the TDC website (Erection of first floor side and rear extension) and the explanation in the application form (Erection of a first floor flank extension).

**Caterham Valley Parish Council request that this application be refused.**

#### **4.9 TA/2020/1018**

Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of new single storey rear extension (Certificate of Lawfulness for Proposed Use or Development)

313 Stafford Road, Caterham CR3 6NN

*Case Officer: Hannah Middleton*

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

**The meeting closed at 1825**

---

**The next planning committee meeting will be held on Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> July 2020.**

---

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, Tel: 07510 226989