

ADDENDUM

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY 9th MARCH 2022

ITEM NO: 6

PLANNING APPLICATION: 21/02160/F – CULLIGAN INTERNATIONAL UK LTD, PROSPECT WELLS HOUSE, OUTWOOD LANE, CHIPSTEAD, SURREY, CR5 3NA

Amended conditions (any changes underlined)

Condition 2 is amended following the receipt of amended drawings to correct discrepancies between the floor plans and elevations, where windows and doors did not accord with one another. This is corrected in the amended plans, where a door has been added to the plant room at ground floor level, and amendments to balconies have been made to the rear/side elevations, to accord with the floor plans.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Proposed Plans	MBSK220119-02	P1	20.01.2022
Proposed Plans	MBSK220119-01	P1	20.01.2022
Floor Plan	1468-PL1210	<u>B</u>	<u>02.03.2022</u>
Proposed Plans	1468-PL1115	A	20.01.2022
Proposed Plans	MBSK211202-01	P1	20.01.2022
Street Scene	PL1300		01.09.2021
Existing Plans	PL1200		01.09.2021
Location Plan	PL1100		09.08.2021
Block Plan	PL1101		09.08.2021
Site Layout Plan	PL1102		09.08.2021
Site Layout Plan	PL1110		09.08.2021
Elevation Plan	PL1312	<u>B</u>	<u>02.03.2022</u>
Elevation Plan	PL1313		09.08.2021
Elevation Plan	PL1310		09.08.2021
Elevation Plan	PL1311	<u>B</u>	<u>02.03.2022</u>
Floor Plan	PL1212	<u>A</u>	<u>02.03.2022</u>
Roof Plan	PL1213		09.08.2021
Floor Plan	PL1211	<u>A</u>	<u>02.03.2022</u>

Reason: To define the permission and ensure the development is carried out in accord with the approved plans and in accordance with National Planning Practice Guidance.

Following an amendment to the site layout plan, two highways conditions are amended to accord with the amended plan reference.

18. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plan numbered 1468 PL 1115 A for vehicles to enter and leave the site in forward gear and for cars associated with the proposed residential and retail development to be parked. Thereafter the approved turning and parking areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purposes.

Reason: The condition above is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users, and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and Policy TAP1 Parking, access , and Servicing of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan September 2019.

19. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plans numbered 1468 PL 1115 A for a minimum of 20 bicycles to be stored in a secure and entirely covered location for the residential development and for 10 bicycles associated with the retail use to be provided in a sheltered location. Thereafter the approved bike parking areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purpose.

Reason: The condition above is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users, and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and Reigate and Banstead Core Strategy 2014 Policy CS17 (Travel Options and Accessibility).

The Applicant has requested the hours of retail use be amended to 07:00 to 22:00 daily. This would be consistent with other similar retail shops within the borough with residential dwellings above. Accordingly, this is considered reasonable and condition 25 is updated as follows:

25. The retail use hereby permitted shall only be carried out between the following times:

07:00 hours to 22:00 hours (Monday to Sunday)

Reason: To control activity in the interests of neighbouring residential amenities with regard to Reigate & Banstead Borough Council's Development Management Plan 2019 policies DES9 and RET1.

ITEM NO: 6a and 6b

PLANNING APPLICATION: 21/00468/F and 21/00469/LBC – THE OMNIBUS BUILDING LESBOURNE ROAD REIGATE SURREY RH2 7LD

Additional representations

Since the publishing of the report 4 further representations has been received objecting to the application for the following reasons:

- Harm to Conservation Area
- Increase in traffic and congestion
- Noise & disturbance
- Overdevelopment
- Harm to listed building
- Inadequate parking

- Loss of private view

The matters set out above are addressed within the committee report.

The Twentieth Century Society – Following re-consultation on the proposed conservation rooflights, the following comments have been made:

‘The society maintains its objection to the insertion of lights within the roof of the north elevation. This plain tiled steeply pitched roof is a key feature of the ‘barn-like’ building and provides a plain ‘backdrop’ to the Church Fields, making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of these open spaces which are central to the special interest of the conservation area. Inserting lights in to this roof would be visually disruptive and would change the buildings appearance and erode its historic character. We recommend that the north elevation is conserved in its original, uninterrupted form. For these reasons, the Society continues to object to the application and recommends that Listed Building Consent is refused.’

Report

Paragraph 6.11 amended to read as follows to correct the reference to dormer windows (changes underlined):

The nearest residential property would be Linden Court to the east of the Omnibus building which, whilst now residential in use, once formed the offices for the former bus garage. This building features flat roof dormer windows around the roof of the building. Most of these would not be impacted by the proposed rooflights due to the relationship between the two buildings, with the rear elevation of Linden Court angled away facing a north-easterly direction. This would render views between windows difficult and would give rise to minimal overlooking/ loss of privacy. It is noted that the roof plane of Linden Court features two windows in the southern elevation that face the Omnibus building; however there are no windows proposed to face this elevation. In view of this the proposal would not give rise to significant harm to neighbouring amenity and would comply with Development Management Plan Policy DES1 in this regard.

Information from the Applicant

The applicant has provided further marketing information from a commercial agent, which is provided at Appendix A. Overall it is considered that this evidences suitable marketing undertaken to demonstrate that the upper floor offices are unattractive to let in their current form. However that does not alter the balance of harm or the recommendation.

The applicant has also written to Committee members alleging errors within the report to committee. Following the withdrawal of the report from the last meeting and the registration of the amendment to rooflights from dormers (and following the correction made above) it is clear that the report is now concerned with a proposal for rooflights, not dormers and has been assessed as such.

Otherwise the assertions of the applicant that report contains errors are unfounded. The building is a Grade II statutory listed building, designed by Wallis, Gilbert & Partners, notably the same architect as designed the Hoover building in London (though that was not known at the time of its listing). It was listed as an example of a 1930’s bus garage which was built in a barn style with a large, simple, unbroken roof on its northern elevation to provide an appropriate setting and backdrop to the

Church Fields area of open space to the north (now part of the Chart Lane Conservation Area).

Upon the remodelling and conversion of the former bus garage to offices a day nursery, great care was taken to ensure that the northern elevation was relatively unharmed with the southern elevation significantly remodelled. It is not clear whether the roof to the northern elevation was re-built or remains as original as part of this conversion but it exists today in the same form as historically and so its significance is not diminished.

The applicant contends that the report is incorrect in finding harm to the listed building when their appointed consultants consider otherwise. This is not an error or a mischaracterisation, it is a difference of judgement.

It is alleged that the recommendation for refusal is based on the “basis of hypothetical applications that will never come before Committee” given the Officer report considers alternative, less harmful, options may exist to improve daylighting without harm to the important northern elevation. Whilst the potential for less harmful daylighting solutions is a consideration, it is not an over-riding one, and cannot be simply ignored when balancing the harm against cited economic benefits.

Overall Officers remain of the view that the proposals would be harmful to the important northern elevation of the listed building with its southern elevation having been the focus for change in its conversion/re-modelling.

ITEM NO: 7

PLANNING APPLICATION: 21/02145/F - Heysham Church Lane Hooley Coulsdon Surrey CR5 3RD

Additional representations

Since the publishing of the report 1 further representation has been received objecting to the application:

- Hazard to highway safety
- Increase in traffic and congestion
- Loss of/harm to trees
- Overdevelopment
- Poor access to public transport

The matters set out above are addressed within the committee report.

Additional ecology information

The applicant has provided a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated 7 March 2022 ref. C1149.003.

The report results can be summarised as follows:

“The site is located in a residential/rural area. The garden is maintained and dominated by short amenity lawn, areas of ornamental plants and trees. The ornamental fish ponds are not considered to support great crested newts. The larger trees present on site are likely to provide foraging and nesting opportunities for common garden birds.

The dwelling remains in good condition and provides no significant features suitable for roosting bats or nesting birds. The dwelling is assessed to have negligible suitability for roosting bats”.

The following mitigation measures/biodiversity enhancements are recommended:

- Precautionary approach to be taken in relation to bats and hedgehogs.
- Sensitive clearance of vegetation with regard to birds.
- Landscape planting to include plants that have value for local wildlife.
- Install bird boxes on the exterior of the new development.
- Exterior lighting planned sensitive to nocturnal wildlife.

Officers therefore remain of the view that the proposal is acceptable in relation to ecology. A condition is recommended to secure the recommended mitigation measures.

Amended/additional conditions (any changes underlined)

5. No development, other than demolition and site clearance, shall commence until a strategy for the disposal of surface and foul water (surface water drainage scheme) is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The design must satisfy the SuDS Hierarchy and be compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDs, NPPF and Ministerial Statement on SuDs. Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system must also be included. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the site is satisfactorily drained and in order to protect water and environmental quality with regard to Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy 2014, Policy CCF2 of the Development Management Plan 2019 and the NPPF.

6. No development No development shall take place above slab level until written details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces, including fenestration and roof, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and on development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory external appearance is achieved of the development with regard to Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 policy DES1.

11. No The development shall not be commenced until the proposed vehicular access to Church Lane has been provided with a sight line of 28.3 metres to the west in accordance with the approved plan MBSK220222-01 Rev P1, all to be permanently retained with no obstructions to sight lines between 2.0 metres and 1.00 metres high above the level of the carriageway.

Reason: The condition above is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users, and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and Policy TAP1 Access, Parking, and Servicing of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan September 2019.

20. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures set out within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated 7 March 2022 ref. C1149.003 by Crossman Associates.

Reason: To ensure that any potential impact to protected species is adequately mitigated in accordance with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy NHE2 of the Development Management Plan 2019.

ITEM NO: 8

**PLANNING APPLICATION: 21/02090/F - The Childrens Trust Tadworth Court 2
Tadworth Street Tadworth Surrey KT20 5RU**

Additional information from applicant regarding parking/construction

“This [statement] demonstrates that the bigger concerns around parking are being addressed.

We appreciate that parking remains a concern for some of our neighbours, and the community around us. However, it is important to confirm that our application does not exacerbate the demand for parking on our site.

The landscape that we operate in has understandably changed dramatically in the last two years, impacting working practices that have resulted in many staff hybrid working. Whilst there is potential for some growth in staff numbers to support an increase in children attending the school, the projected increase in staff to a maximum of 7 frontline staff is vastly offset by more than 100 staff now hybrid working and limiting their time on site to 40-60% of their working week. It is also worth noting that we operate our site 24/7 with many of our staff working early shifts, late shifts and weekends, thus staggering the demand. The full-time staff number is therefore greater than the number of staff coming to site each day.

We would also like to share with the planning committee that we are committed to being a responsible organisation and are continually looking for ways to improve our carbon footprint. The following actions we have taken also respond to previously-raised concerns from councillors. Over the last three months we have implemented a shuttle service staff from Epsom, Sutton and Coulsdon stations. Uptake is gradually increasing and we are also developing a parking management strategy which will incorporate incentives for staff to use other modes of transport to get to our site. We are entering discussions with Liftshare to promote car sharing to work. It has not been possible to implement this sooner due to the risk of infection during Covid and our priority to protect the children and young people we are responsible for.

At the point of completion, we won't be operating our new building at full capacity, whilst we continue to reduce demand for parking on site through hybrid working and incentives to reduce cars coming to site. These continually evolving developments along with our commitment as a responsible organisation will only positively contribute to easing parking demand on our site, resulting in a net improvement.

Working alongside our design and project management team, we have evaluated options for the management of construction traffic during the build and concluded that with an appropriate management strategy, the main entrance is the viable point to access the site for this project. Access to the site for construction traffic would be managed with access to site limited to agreed times of the day, e.g. to allow our staff to park safely on site first. Given the location of the build construction, traffic would

not be required to access the residential perimeter road at the rear of the site (where the road is at its most narrow).”

It is also worth setting out the overall figures for the site to help put this proposal in context:

- Across The Children’s Trust site there are currently a total of 617(Transport Assessment says 649 but this has reduced since submission of application)* staff who work on-site within the various facilities provided. Typical working hours are between 7:00am to 7:00pm shift patterns with some staff working outside of these hours to support the 24 hour care requirements
- The Children’s Trust grounds provide a total of 300 car parking spaces of which 276 are formalised spaces and the remaining 24 provided informally.
- The school has a total of 39 pupils of which 30 are residential (stay on-site) and 9 are day visitors and live off-campus and are brought to the daily. There is capacity for the existing school to accommodate an additional 5 pupils (raising the total pupils to 44) if demand increases. There is a total of 75 staff associated with the school facility.

It is noted that there has been mention of a different figure from a Financial statement from March 2021 which states 713 staff. The Children’s Trust has advised that this is the number of **staff paid in March 2021. This includes all staff based onsite at Tadworth as well as retail, brain injury community service and bank staff. This therefore is **not** the number of staff who work onsite.*

The Children’s Trust has also provided some additional information on this.

Transport Assessment states – 649ppl. This is a total headcount of people onsite from June 2021, and not solely for staff on site. This includes bank, retail, brain injury community service as well as staff on site.

Onsite headcount – 610ppl. This is the headcount of Full time Employees onsite from June 2021

The below table breaks down the Total Head count and Onsite head count of people onsite - from when the transport assessment was carried out (June-21) and compares this to now (Feb-22)

	Total Headcount	Total FTE	Onsite Headcount	Onsite FTE	% headcount onsite
Jun-21	649	559.9	610	528.5	94%
Feb-22	617	536.8	582	509.1	94%

The numbers in the table above exclude Bank staff. It is estimated that 20 bank staff are working on site at any one time.

To summarise:

- *The Transport assessment was correct in describing the number of people onsite (Fulltime staff + bank, retail, brain injury and community service) – 649ppl.*
- *This number is now lower – Feb 2022*

The applicant as per the committee report and above additional information has advised that the new school gives the potential for a further 10-15% increase in pupil numbers, equating to 7 additional Children at the school.

This is likely to generate a maximum of 7 additional staff at the very worst case, or 0.5

staff members per child, so most likely 3 or 4 staff.

The potential increase in student and staff numbers at the school site is therefore by no means guaranteed but even if this did such an increase will be a negligible in the context as set out above. As per the committee report Surrey County Council has raised no objection to the school subject to a condition to secure details of a Parking Management Plan.

The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable with regard to parking and highway safety matters.

Travel Plan Condition advice: As set out in the Surrey County Council Highway Authority (CHA) response it is not considered to be necessary in this case;

“While the CHA is supportive of the Travel Plan objectives to promote and encourage sustainable travel, and to reduce single occupancy car trips to and from the site, the development does not actually warrant a Travel Plan due to the very limited increase in pupil and staff numbers proposed. The issue to be addressed is more to do with managing the on-site parking in order to reduce congestion, delays, and to facilitate vehicle movement through the site, rather than reducing single occupancy vehicle use. This can be achieved through the implementation of the Parking Management Plan. For this reason, it is not considered necessary to impose a condition to secure the implementation of the Travel Plan, particularly as there would be no requirement for the CHA to audit the Travel Plan. Condition 2(b) above, however, requires the applicant to promote and encourage sustainable travel by providing information to staff, parents and visitors, regarding home working and the availability and whereabouts of local public transport services/facilities, walking/cycling routes, cycle facilities, and car sharing clubs, rather than through a formal Travel Plan.”

Based on the CHA comments officers remain of the view that a Travel Plan condition would not be necessary or reasonable in this case. It is also of note that the approved 2016 application for a new school, 16/02369/F, was also considered acceptable in terms of parking and highway safety and that no Travel Plan condition was required by the County Council in that case either.

The CHA has recommended an additional informative to clarify what is expected from the Parking Management Plan condition. This is recommended to be added as informative 8:

8. In order to discharge the Parking Management Plan condition the developer should explain existing parking demand and how this demand can be reduced. This could include measures such as home working, car sharing, shuttle bus for those travelling by public transport and a parking permit scheme.

ITEM NO: 10
REIGATE HILL CONSERVATION AREA

The recommendation be amended as follows:

RECOMMENDATION:

1. It is recommended that there is no change to the Conservation Area designated on 20th January 2021 for Reigate Hill Conservation Area as delineated on the plan in Appendix 1, under sections 69 and 70 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Date	Applicant	Requirement Sq Ft	Location	Comments
NEW				
February 2022	Tesco c/o Savills	5,000	Reigate	Viewed both ground and second floor suites. Found the second floor space too dark with only light from the atrium and no views from the office floor plate. We gave them a proposal on both suites offering more competitive terms on the second floor and they said ground floor front is preference due to better natural light and views, and for 2 nd floor to be considered further it would be conditional on rear roof lights installed. Currently reviewing options.
January 2022	Confidential	3,500 – 5,000	Reigate	Reigate occupier based in the High Street. Their current office is full and they need to expand. Viewed both ground and second floor suites. Thought the second floor suite with vaulted ceiling could suit their type of business, but only if rear windows installed due to poor natural light and no outlook.
January 2022	Apsida Life Sciences	3,000 -5,000	Reigate	Viewed ground floor and second floor. Only interested in the ground floor due to the lack of natural lights and outlook for the second floor. If rooflights are installed they would reinspect. Requirement on hold
December 2021	Osborne c/o Vail Williams	4,000-5000	Redhill, Reigate	Viewed both floors, preference for a split of the ground floor space as the 2 nd floor was too dark. Offered them a competitive proposal £6 per sq ft less than market rent but they didn't engage. They are now negotiating on another building instead.
November 2021	Confidential	3,000 – 4,000	Reigate	Confidential Reigate business located in the town centre. Have an upcoming lease event and reviewing their options as keen to upgrade quality. Viewed both floors. Thought second floor suite could be great space but concerned about natural light and requested a proposal on a split of the ground floor only. Commented lack of natural light a big negative for them. Have now decided to stay in current building.

Date	Applicant	Requirement Sq Ft	Location	Comments
March 2021	Redrow Homes	4,000 – 5,000	Surrey / Sussex	Viewed both suites and indicated ground floor was preferred due to better natural light and configuration. Did not progress at Omnibus as decided Crawley was their preferred location.
February 2021	Countryside Properties	5,000	South M25	Viewed both floors and asked for terms on the ground floor only. Are now looking at office options outside of Reigate.
January 2021	AIG	14,000	Reigate	Viewed, deal agreed on front section of space as wanted access to the full glazed windows and natural light.

Daniel Chapman
Managing Director
Skelton Group Investments Limited
104 Park Street
London
W1K 6NF

**PRIVATE &
CONFIDENTIAL**

1 March 2022

Dear Daniel,

OMNIBUS – LESBOURNE ROAD, REIGATE, RH2 7JA

In our last letter dated January 2021 we provided an overview of difficult market conditions due to COVID-19 and the need to create the best quality office space possible, in order to attract tenants. Since that letter we have seen all occupiers put more importance into staff well being and an increasing amount of demand for the best quality buildings in order to attract tenants back to work.

The 'flight to quality' with most employers recognising that having a good quality building environment is necessary to create a place where employees want to go to work, and therefore only relocating for betterment. This is now a necessity for any business move as employers want an office space that'll attract and retain staff. For example, Skelton Group as a Landlord have recognised this by investing a significant amount of expenditure into the atrium of the building to create a breakout space for existing tenants. The windows in the rear of the second floor office space are also an important part of this investment into the building and a necessity to adapt to current demand trends to have the best quality Grade A office space.

Now that occupiers are finally feeling more confident about risks associated with COVID-19, we have seen the amount of viewings increase drastically. We have shown many occupiers the rear second floor space (list separately attached) which have all dismissed the space due to a lack of natural light. To overcome this problem, we have tried to offer the space at a discount, but again have received no engagement for this. The feedback we have continuously received has been that the cost of space is less important, and they'd rather pay more to have external facing windows, which bring in natural light and views which they believe will help staff well-being and therefore productivity.

We have also shown the tenants the proposed plans for the windows which we have had positive feedback on, and most of which said if they were installed, they would then consider the space. However, whilst there is planning risk, none of the interested parties are willing to consider occupying the space any further.

DTRE

Yours sincerely,



Hannah Davies
Senior Surveyor

Hannah.davies@dtre.com
07501323734

