



(INCORPORATING VALLEY AND HARESTONE WARDS)

CATERHAM VALLEY PARISH COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of Caterham Valley Parish Council Planning Committee, held at 6pm on Wednesday 14th July 2021 at Caterham Baptist Church, Beechwood Road, Caterham

Cllr Alun Jones
Cllr Sakina Bradbury
Cllr Annette Evans
Mr Peter Brent - Co-opted Member
Mrs Deborah Brent - Co-opted Member

In attendance: Cllr Victor Emmanuel

Mrs M Gibbins
Parish Clerk & RFO

MINUTES

1. **Apologies for absence:**
There was none
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 public present.
4. **To consider and make comment on the following Planning Applications:**
4.1 TA/2021/872
Construction of third floor to create 2 x one bedroom and 4 x two bedroom flats and associated parking.
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 a number on this site. Permitted Development has been granted for 19 units (from the original 16 units) in the current building and the developer has submitted a further application for 6 units in the roof to increase this to 25 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
 - Depending on which application you read, the size of the site varies. The current application says the site is 0.10 hectare. CSP 19 states a residential density of 75 units

per hectare in town centres, which for this site equates to 7.5 units. Even at a density of 100 units per hectare, this would only allow 10 units and not the 25 that is now proposed for this site. The Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe classifies this area as 'medium density' character area and advocates a maximum density of 60 - 75 units per hectare. Therefore, this additional proposal for 6 units adds to the gross over-development of the site. At what point does the density become unacceptable or can the applicant amend again and add more units. We believe this proposal is unacceptable on a site of this size.

- 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. With an additional 6 units of which the occupancy is expected to be 20 people added to the 19 units, the occupancy of the 25 units is expected to exceed 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 major concern in a Covid world.

PARKING

- If application TA/[2021/872](#) 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. With this additional application for the 6 units in the roof, the allocation has been reduced to 25 spaces for 25 units. The developer has 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 (2 spaces per unit).
- The Parish Council and local residents have consistently argued for better parking provision with developments in Caterham. The lack of parking provision in Caterham is also acknowledged in the emerging Tandridge Local Plan and the Caterham, Chaldon & Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan. This application is contrary to Policy CCW5, Design of Development - Point D - of the Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan which states that any development should be 'Providing off-road parking in accordance with the adopted Tandridge Parking Standards (2012).
- 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. 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/2020/970/NC.
- Census data indicated car ownership is increasing and not decreasing. Policy is directed at change of fuel and not modal shift. There are 11,694 dwellings in the CR3 area and the number of registered vehicles in the CR3 area is 17,909 (Q4 2020 - DVLA) giving a vehicle to dwelling ratio of 1.53 vehicles per dwelling. Since the parking standards were published in 2012, there has been a 5.48% increase in car ownership in the CR3 area.
- Should the officer be minded to approve, we request a condition that the parking provision remains unallocated.

DESIGN & CHARACTER

- Policy CCW4 of the Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan states 'Development is expected to preserve and enhance the character area in which it is located. Development proposals in the defined character areas will be supported which:
 - i. exhibit design reflecting local context, character and vernacular of the area;
 - ii. demonstrably enhance the quality of the built form through innovation in design;
 - iii. make a positive contribution to the character area when viewed from the main highway approaches into the settlements;

Developments along streets parallel to the Valley, should ensure views over or between the rooflines from adjacent streets are maintained.

The juxtaposition of the additional height against the 2 storey house to the North will dominate the adjacent property and reduce the available light into the property, plus remove any linkage between 143 and clearway court.

This proposal does not adhere to this policy. The proposed roofline is not in keeping with the neighbouring properties as none have flat roofs, nor are they of a metal type construction. The additional floor is not an attractive addition to the building.

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. This is exacerbated by the potential addition of 6 further units. The sizes of the terraces are not clear (i.e. what size are they and are they included in the internal dimensions of the flats).
- The additional height of the building will dominate the courtyard and make the balconies on the neighbouring flats in Ashton Court even darker. The projecting windows of the development will allow for overlooking of the amenity space of the flats in Ashton Court.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- With this new application for 6 units, in addition to the PD for 19 units and the

rear development of 9 units, the developer should provide affordable housing at 34%, the current Core Strategy requirement. Even at the Emerging Tandridge 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 there will be 34 units with no affordable housing provision. The developer quotes paragraph 63 of the NPPF which states 'Provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer).'

However the developer fails to mention the remainder of that paragraph which states 'To support the re-use of brownfield land, where vacant buildings are being reused or redeveloped, any affordable housing contribution due should be reduced by a proportionate amount'.

Therefore the development should provide a portion of the flats as 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.

Caterham Valley Parish Council objects to this application and strongly requests that it be refused.

Should the officer be minded to approve Cllr Alun Jones and Cllr Jenny Gaffney will take it to Committee.

4.2 TA/2021/956

Demolition of existing single storey rear extension. Erection of three storey extension to side elevation and raising of roof ridge to provide a third storey to the existing building in association with the conversion of the existing office and workshop building into 3 x terrace 'town house' dwelling houses with amenity areas and parking.

3 Timber Hill Road, Caterham CR3 6LD

Case Officer: Paige Barlow

Comment: The Parish Council has no objection to the conversion of the current property however:

- this is a substantial addition to the current building and the addition of a third floor is out of keeping with the other residential properties on this side of the road which are all two-storey.
- Policy DP7 requires that a "development should integrate effectively with its surroundings" and be "in keeping with the prevailing landscape/streetscape, reflecting the variety of local building types by using complementary building

materials and designs". Policy CSP 18 requires that new development must reflect and respect the character, setting and local and must not significantly harm the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of overlooking or overshadowing.

- The additional 'town house' is not in keeping with the original building and goes against Policy CCW4 of the Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan which states 'Development is expected to preserve and enhance the character area in which it is located. Development proposals in the defined character areas will be supported which:
 - v. exhibit design reflecting local context, character and vernacular of the area;
 - vi. demonstrably enhance the quality of the built form through innovation in design;

This proposal does not adhere to this policy. The proposed additional town house is not in keeping with the neighbouring properties as none have flat roofs, irrespective of the fact that it has a green roof.

- The additional town house is not an attractive addition to the building and does not add to the overall look of the property. If the additional floor to the main building, and the ground floor of the new town house, are to be of the same materials as the existing building, why is the entire additional town house not in the same style? This would make the properties have more character and fit better together. None of the neighbouring properties have cladding so the proposed extension will not fit in or complement the existing style of the current property or neighbouring properties.
- The balcony is above a bin store and faces the bin storage area of the nearby property which will not create an ideal outside space.
- Doesn't meet the TDC Parking Standards of 1 ½ parking spaces per unit unallocated or 2 spaces allocated. It should also be noted that there is a lack of landscaping plan for the site. As such it is not possible to determine the finishes of boundary walls between back gardens. The parking space is only 2.4m wide in house 3. This is insufficiently wide if the boundary is delineated by a wall or a fence.

4.3 TA/2021/611

Erection of a single storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration on north-East, north-west and south-west Elevations.

159 Harestone Valley Road, Caterham CR3 6HT

Case Officer: Deborah Soulsby

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers

4.4 TA/2021/955

Removal of Condition 8 (renewable energy) and Variation of Condition 10 (hard and soft landscaping) attached to permission 2018/1901 for 'Variation of Condition 2 on permission 2017/240 dated 29th November 2017 granted on appeal , seeks permission to allow for changes to the western building including a reconfiguration of the ground floor flats to form larger patios, the replacement of balconies on west elevation with Juliet balconies, internal reconfiguration of duplex units and changes to windows at second floor level on east elevation onto the terraces' to allow building to comply with Part L of Building Regulations and to change the hard landscaping from block paving to permeable/porous tarmac.

Evergreen House, 409 Croydon Road, Caterham CR3 6PP

Case Officer: Wayne Spencer

Comment: The Parish Councillors comment as follows:

- Whilst the energy report details the savings achieved, it does not consider the climate emergency passed by the council and the net zero targets set by the government. Whilst the current targets are met, the developer should be striving to deliver minimal emissions from the building and the operating of the building. The

PV panels would support achieving the government's legislated targets and should be progressed with.

- The development is in flood risk zone 3. The change of surface does not detail how the attenuation originally approved for the site will be maintained with the change of materials. It should also be noted that there are no drainage properties of the proposed material vs the earlier approved block paving plan to assess if the drainage properties are the same or exceed the originally approved specification.

4.5 TA/2021/1017/TPO

3) - Yew - To maintain Shrub by trimming 200mm from existing height of appx 4.5m

4) - Yew - To maintain Shrub by trimming 200mm from existing height of appx 4.5m

5) - Yew - To crown reduce by up to 3m off current height of appx 10m leaving a residual 7m and reduce existing radius of 5m by 1.5m leaving a residual 3.5m radial spread.

8. Holly - To fell

9 The Clares, Caterham CR3 6RW

Case Officer: Alastair Durkin

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to the Arboriculturist

4.6 TA/2021/1096

Conversion of existing garage to habitable accommodation and external alterations. (Certificate of Lawfulness for Proposed Use or Development)

50 Tupwood Lane, Caterham CR3 6DP

Case Officer: Wayne Spencer

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers

4.7 TA/2021/1071

Demolition of existing garage and rear conservatory. Erection of two storey side extension, two storey rear extension with dormer windows above, single storey front extension with internal alterations. Installation of patio to rear of property with retaining wall.

126 Harestone Valley Road, Caterham CR3 6HG

Case Officer: Deborah Soulsby

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers

The meeting closed at 1830

**The next planning meeting will be held on Wednesday 4th August 2021 commencing at 6pm
at Caterham Valley Library, Stafford Road**

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, Tel: 07510 226989
