



(INCORPORATING VALLEY AND HARESTONE WARDS)

CATERHAM VALLEY PARISH COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of Caterham Valley Parish Council Planning Committee held at Caterham Valley Library, Stafford Road, on Wednesday 15th September 2021 at 6:30pm

Cllr Sakina Bradbury - Chairman
Cllr Jeremy Webster
Mrs Deborah Brent - Co-opted member
Mr Peter Brent - Co-opted member
Mrs Caroline Hollins - Co-opted member

Mrs M Gibbins - Clerk & RFO
Caterham Valley Parish Council

MINUTES

1. **Apologies for absence:**
Cllrs Alun Jones and Annette Evans.
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 11 members of the public in attendance in relation to the application TA/2021/1443. There were 2 members of the public in attendance in relation to application TA/2021/1414
The Chairman thanked all the members of the public for attending and for their contributions which it was confirmed would be taken into account when the committee discussed the application.
The Chairman, with the agreement of the committee brought application TA/2021/1443 to the beginning of the agenda.
4. **To consider and make comment on the following Planning Applications:**
4.1 TA/2021/1475/TPO
T1) - Ash - Fell as close to ground level as possible and poison stump to prevent regrowth. If necessary client will plant a replacement tree. (Please refer to photos provided.)
3 The Clares, Caterham CR3 6RW *Case Officer: Alastair Durkin*
Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to the Arboriculturist

4.2 TA/2021/1418

Erection of single storey side extension, single storey rear extension and internal re-configuration.

1 Tillingdown Hill, Caterham CR3 6QN

Case Officer: Deborah Soulsby

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers

4.3 TA/2021/1370

Demolition of existing utility/garage extension and erection of a single storey side and rear extension. (Amended block plan)

Upwood Gorse Lodge, Tupwood Lane, CR3 6DQ

Case Officer: Hannah Middleton

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers

4.4 TA/2021/585/NC/Cond1

Details pursuant to the discharge of Condition 1 (Internal Noise Levels) of planning permission ref: 2021/585/NC/Cond1 dated 26th May 2021 (Change of use of upper two floors of the building from B1(a) (office use) to C3 (dwelling houses to provide 8 apartments (Prior approval Class O Part 3 Schedule 2.)

70 - 72 London & Thames House, 2nd Floor, Croydon Road, Caterham CR3 6QD

Case Officer: Kim Waite

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers to ensure the condition is adhered to and monitored

4.5 TA/2021/583/NC/Cond1

Details pursuant to the discharge of Condition 1 (Internal Noise Levels) of planning permission ref: 2021/583/NC dated 26th May 2021 (Change of use of upper two floors of the building from B1(a) (office use) to C3 (dwelling houses to provide 6 apartments (Prior approval Class O Part 3 Schedule 2)).

70 - 72 London & Thames House, 2nd Floor, Croydon Road, Caterham CR3 6QD

Case Officer: Kim Waite

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers to ensure the condition is adhered to and monitored

4.6 TA/2021/1449

Erection of two storey rear extension, first floor front extension and single storey side/rear extension.

Harestone Heights, 16 Woodland Way, CR3 6ER

Case Officer: Hannah Middleton

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers

4.7 TA/2020/511/Cond3

Details pursuant to the discharge of Condition 8 (Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat Roost Assessment) of planning permission ref: 2020/511 dated 5th May 2021 (Demolition of office buildings; Erection of 7x two-storey detached dwellings. Construction of access road from Harestone Drive and provision of associated parking and landscaping).

Hut 1, Harestone Drive, Caterham CR3 6YQ

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers to ensure the condition is adhered to and monitored

4.8 TA/2021/1397

Demolition of existing garage. Erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.

54 Tillingdown Hill, Caterham CR3 6QL

Case Officer: Deborah Soulsby

Comment: The Parish Councillors request that consideration is given to the neighbours at No. 52 who have no objection to the side extension however object on the ground of privacy and light which must be a serious consideration when determining this application. Although No.56 has not objected the proposal potentially impacts the neighbouring property - TDC7 and CSP18

4.9 TA/2021/1380

Erection of raised timber decking to rear of existing dwelling

58 Crescent Road, Caterham CR3 6LF

Case Officer: Tracey Williams

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers

4.10TA/2021/1414

The erection of three terraced houses (comprising 2 x 4 bed and 1 x 3 bed), with associated access and parking

Land to the rear of 180 to 188 Croydon Road CR3 6QF

Case Officer: Wayne Spencer

Comment: Comment: Caterham Valley Parish Council objects to this application for the following reasons:

- This is a back garden development and is not appropriate to the surrounding area in terms of its size and scale (TLP DP8, 1 & 5) These are 3, 3-storey dwellings. Attic spaces are in fact bedrooms.
- The development is contrary to DP7. It is on the North Eastern side of Beechwood Gardens. All of the properties on this side were built in the late 1890's and are similar in size and scale. They are either small detached or semi-detached properties with two stories on the street side elevation. The proposal for a block of 3 town houses does not fit with the rhythm of the design of the street. This would be out of character with the rest of the developments on the road. The development does not reflect the local character, context or vernacular of the street scene. This is against policy DP7 and CCW4 of the neighbourhood plan.
- It should also be noted that the development ,stepped back from the prevailing building line of Beechwood Gardens, creates an uncharacteristic break in the building line. This is inappropriate given the heritage of the existing buildings dating back to 1896.
- With regard to the external design, the application form states that the lighting will be solar powered (which is to be welcomed) but none of the plans appear to show any solar panels on any of the roofs.

Parking

- The Application does not conform with Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan Policy CCW5 , because it does not provide off-road parking in accordance with the adopted Tandridge Parking Standards (2012).
- The development has no regard for the parking standards SPD. This development would require 8 allocated parking spaces based on the Tandridge SPD. The CCW NP passed in 2021 also references in policy CCW5 that developments should adhere to these standards. Whilst the under provision will impact on highway safety, it will also impact the amenity of nearby

residents. There will be increased parking stress in this area which already exceeds 100%.

- It is contrary to Policy DP7: General Policy for New Development in relation to Design of Development Parking. This states that planning proposals must have regard to the adopted Parking Standards SPD (2012) or successor documents; maintain existing off-street parking spaces (including garages) where they are considered necessary to serve the existing buildings or use; and should not result in additional on-street parking where this would cause congestion or harm to amenity or highway safety.
- With only 3 parking spaces allocated, the proposal fails to meet TDC's Parking Standards 2012 which state that a parking standard of 1.5 spaces unallocated or 2 spaces allocated. An additional issue is that the proposal removes 4 parking spaces from Beechwood Gardens. Parking is at a premium in this area on Beechwood Road, Beechwood Gardens and Croydon Road and the displacement of these 4 parking spaces with the potential addition of additional parking required for the 3 new properties will have detrimental impact on the amenity of the current residents, particularly those that currently have no off-road parking who park on Beechwood Gardens, Beechwood Road and Croydon Road.
- While the applicant comments on the fact that many of the current properties in the vicinity have only one parking space, these houses were built before the TDC Parking Standards 2012 were implemented. The design and access statement does not show an accurate reflection of the parking situation on Beechwood Gardens. All the pictures are taken during the day. Parking is at a premium and while there may be some spaces during the day when people go to work, the evenings are very different with maximum parking.
- Developments at both Beechwood Road and Farningham Road have been refused in the past because of a lack of parking as these roads are at capacity.
- The proposal does not include sufficient parking provision as set out in the Tandridge Parking Standards SPD. These standards would require the properties to have 8 allocated parking spaces. This is 5 greater than is currently planned.
- Car ownership in Caterham Valley is 1.3 vehicles per dwelling (2011 census). Car ownership in GB has increased from 29.6m in 2015 to 31.89m in 2019 (2016 and 2020 DfT statistical release). This supports the requirement of parking given the prevailing car ownership in the Caterham Valley area and the general increase in car ownership across the country. At best it would be irresponsible to disregard these numbers and accept 1 space per dwelling which would be completely inadequate.
- As well as having an under provision, the development would also result in the loss of 3 on-street parking spaces on Beechwood Gardens. The surrounding roads are characterised by properties with no off-street parking. The loss of 3 spaces will result in increased parking stress on adjacent roads. An assessment of those roads already shows illegal and dangerous parking taking place during weekday evenings. This includes parking on double yellow lines on Beechwood Gardens and Beechwood Road, parking on Grass verges on Beechwood Gardens, parking across dropped kerbs and even in bus stops. Parking stress within this area exceeds the standard acceptable of 85% and exceeds 100% when considering residents forced to park on grass verges, across dropped kerbs and on double yellow lines. As such a parking stress

survey should be completed to assess the impact illegal parking as a result of this development will have on the adjacent highways.

- This development will create a hazard to other road users as a result of the under provision of parking and displaced parking. This is also contrary to the neighbourhood plans policy CCW5.

Safeguarding Amenity

- The proposal would significantly harm the amenities and privacy of neighbouring properties particularly those along the rear boundary of 182 Croydon Road and adjacent boundary with 1 Beechwood Gardens. The close relationship of the buildings to the site boundaries, the scale, mass and bulk of the dwellings and overlooking contrary to Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) Policy CSP18 of the TDLP Policy DP7 Safeguarding Amenity; 6 Amenity; 7 Privacy; 8 Environment
- It would impact on light and privacy with regards to the neighbours at 182 Croydon Road which backs onto the development and No 1 Beechwood Gardens which is adjacent to the proposed development. The new development is overbearing for 182 Croydon Road which backs on to the development and 1 Beechwood Gardens which is adjacent. In most circumstances, where habitable rooms of properties would be in direct alignment, a minimum privacy distance of 22 metres will be required. This distance may need to be increased to protect those parts of gardens which immediately adjoin dwellings or where sites are sloping. In most circumstances, a minimum distance of 14 metres will be required between principal windows of existing dwellings and the walls of new buildings without windows
- Light - 180,182 and 184 Croydon Road all have the rear of their properties facing East. This development will block out light from the properties, given the topography of the site and the slope downwards from the development to these properties. It will impact the availability of light into habitable rooms and will obliterate light into the rear garden of 180 Croydon Road.
- Privacy - the rear of the properties will overlook the rear of 186 Croydon Road and impact on the privacy of the current and future resident of that property.
- Amenity - The gardens to the rear of 180, 182 and 184 Croydon Road are small gardens in comparison to the rest of Croydon Road and Beechwood Gardens. The development will dominate the gardens, be overbearing and result in the loss in enjoyment of this outside space. Rather than an open outlook, these gardens would enjoy an outlook onto the side of a townhouse.
- The Developer has cited that total sqm meets minimum gross internal floor areas and storage (m²) for 4 bed and 3 bed houses, however it is not clear from the drawings whether: i) in the Attic bedroom space the floor to ceiling height meets the minimum requirement of 2.3m for at least 75% of the Gross Internal Area. ii) That any area with a headroom of less than 1.5m is not counted within the Gross Internal Area unless used solely for storage iii) Any other area that is used solely for storage and has a headroom of 900- 1500mm (such as under eaves) is counted at 50% of its floor area, and any area lower than 900mm is not counted at all. Technical housing standards - national described space standard March 2015

Biodiversity

- Surrey Wildlife Trust is concerned about the lack of any ecological survey information in support of the application.

- We understand there are slow worms on the site and these are a protected species. There is no mitigation measure to protect these and no details in the documentation provided. It has not been demonstrated that wildlife and protected species would not be negatively impacted by the development and, therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy CSP17 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) Policy DP19 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (2014).
- Trees - The developer has removed a number of trees from the site in advance of this application. These trees seen below in April 2018 have been cut down in advance of this application. The tree plan makes no attempt to indicate these trees that were located on the site and the plans have made no attempt to retain them.
- The Tandridge tree and soft landscaping SPD sets out: *"When submitting a planning application for development, the Council will expect to see evidence that tree retention, planting, landscaping and the design of green infrastructure has been clearly considered as part of the design process. The appointment of a suitably qualified Arboricultural Consultant is considered to be vital in assisting this process."* It appears from the submitted tree report that the Arboricultural consultant has either been misleading in their submission, or was appointed following the removal of established trees from the site by the applicant. Either way, this appears to have been done to maximise the development of the site at the expense of trees that brought character and other benefits such as enhancing biodiversity, to a built up area.

The parish council is recommending refusal and should the Planning Officer be minded to approve Cllr Jenny Gaffney will take to committee.

4.11 TA/2021/1477

Erection of two pitched roof dormers to rear roof slope and installation of two roof lights to front roof slope in connection with conversion of loft to habitable accommodation.

20 Eothen Close, Caterham CR3 6JU

Case Officer: Tracey Williams

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers

4.12 TA/2021/1568

Erection of two storey front extension and internal alterations.

6 Harestone Lane, Caterham CR3 6BD

Case Officer: James Amos

Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers

4.13 TA/2021/1443

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of between 4 and 7 replacement dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping (Outline for access).

1 Loxford Road, Caterham CR3 6BH

Case Officer: Paige Barlow

Comment: Caterham Valley Parish Council objects to this application for the following reasons:

- Application is lacking detail about intended development and it is not possible to make an informed decision from the information that has been provided.
- This application is for outline planning permission for between 4 and 7 units. Whereas at a density of 4 units on 0.10 of a hectare in principle would adhere to CSP19 of the TDC Core Strategy, 7 units would be overdevelopment of the site.

This would be contrary to the Harestone Design Guide, the Caterham Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan and TDC's own Core Strategy Policies.

- The TDC Parking Standards 2012 will be met for 4 units but not for 7 units at 2 spaces per unit allocated as it would be 4 spaces short. Unallocated is not applicable as all the houses in this area have ample parking. Also, unallocated parking is always changed to allocated without any notification
- The Planning Statement says there are illustrative plans for the properties with the application. These are very basic and do not provide nearly enough information.
- The planning statement says that ' the site lies within a built up area where there is no objection in principle to the flats'. The site is in a special character area of Harestone, and as such there would be an objection to flats or any building that goes against the sylvan nature of the area. The Harestone Design Guide gives explicit guidelines as to what should be built in the area and how the prevalent sylvan landscapes and areas should be respected. This must be respected, particularly when there is recognition of the importance of these areas
- This site lies within the Special Residential Character Area of Harestone Valley and buildings are predominately individually designed detached houses within substantial plots.
- The proposal would result in the progressive and unacceptable sub-division of the curtilage to a size below that prevailing in the area. This would introduce an intensive form of development in depth which is out of keeping with the locality and harmful to the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings, contrary to Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) Policies DP7 and DP8 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (2014) Design principles L1, L3 and L4 of the Harestone Valley Design Guidance SPD (2011).
- The proposal, by reason of the cramped layout, relationship of the dwellings to the site boundaries and dwellings within the development and their scale, bulk, mass would constitute an overdevelopment of the site. This fails to reflect or respect the character, setting and local context and results in unacceptable intensification, contrary to Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) Policy DP7 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (2014), Policy CCW4.
- The proposal would significantly harm the amenities and privacy of neighbouring properties particularly those along the western boundary (Harestone Valley Road) due to the close relationship of the buildings to the site boundaries. The scale, mass and bulk of the dwellings and overlooking contrary to Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) Policy DP7 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed policies (2014).
- Surrey Wildlife Trust have raised concerns regarding a lack of information in relation to a number of reports:
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement, the Tree Protection Plan, Ecological Report and Ecological Enhancement Plan along with issues regarding to Biodiversity.
- It has not been demonstrated that wildlife and protected species would not be negatively impacted by the development and, therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy CSP17 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008) Policy DP19 of the Tandridge District Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (2014).

- The Environment Agency, while having no issue in principle with the proposal, are unable to provide a full report as there is not enough information in the outline application so any permission would need further consultation with them.
- Not all neighbours, as of the 13/09, have received notice of the application. Of those that have, one has already objected because they are concerned that such overdevelopment will mean a loss of character, there will be an increase in parking problems and an increase in traffic congestion caused by delivery vehicles on the relatively narrow Loxford Rd. There are also concerns that although the plot is level, Loxford Rd and surrounding plots are not, so there would be dangers of overlooking depending on what is built.
- Other neighbours are planning to object on character loss, particularly if the higher density alternative is allowed as there will be major damage to the sylvan nature of the area. They will also dispute the supporting planning statement assertion that there would be no detriment to neighbours amenity.
- Neighbours have also brought to our attention that during the winter Loxford Road becomes dangerously icy, so cars often park on Harestone Valley Rd to avoid having to risk driving: a development that could add 14 more cars to the area will surely make the area more dangerous.
- The Parish Council is concerned that increasing this proposal to build on the garden land that forms such an important part of the Harestone Special character area is back garden development and should be objected to on those grounds.
- The Parish has concerns that there is an intention to access Loxford Close via the proposed development, thus creating a crescent accessed via Loxford Road & Loxford Way?
- This is piecemeal development
- This will create further intensification of the area
- While we appreciate that this is an outline request, as there is so little detail in the application, it is very difficult to make an informed decision. We request this application is refused, certainly at the larger density.

The Parish Council is recommending refusal and should the Officer be minded to approve Cllr Michael Cooper will take to committee

5. Appeal

TA/2021/73 - 83 Harestone Hill, Caterham CR3 6DL see additional comments

This appeal is about the non-determination rather than the planning merits of the appeal and thus there is nothing to add.

The meeting closed at 1920

The next planning meeting will be held on Wednesday 6th October 2021

Copies of Parish Council minutes are held by the Clerk and are available on the Parish Council web-site: www.caterhamvalleypc.org.uk Mrs M Gibbins, Parish Clerk, Tel: 07510 226989
