

BOROUGH OF REIGATE AND BANSTEAD

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held at the New Council Chamber - Town Hall, Reigate on 22 January 2020 at 7.30 pm.

Present: Councillors D. Allcard (Chairman), M. S. Blacker (Vice-Chair), J. S. Bray, H. Brown, P. Harp, J. Hudson, S. A. Kulka, S. McKenna, R. Michalowski, S. Parnall, C. Stevens, R. S. Turner, S. T. Walsh and N. C. Moses (Substitute).

Also present: Councillors C. T. H. Whinney (Substitute).

79. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 18th December 2019 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

80. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors F. Kelly and J. King (substituted for by Councillor N. Moses).

81. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor P. Harp declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 5 - 19/01513/F Walton Heath Golf Club, on the basis that he had led a survey of the heath for Surrey County Council approximately twenty years prior. He however indicated that this would not influence his consideration of the item and therefore remained present to participate in the consideration of the item.

82. ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA

RESOLVED that the addendum be noted.

It was also identified that material circulated directly to members of the Planning Committee by developers or other third parties did not constitute a planning application document, and should therefore be regarded accordingly.

83. 19/01513/F WALTON HEATH GOLF CLUB, DEANS LANE, WALTON ON THE HILL

Councillor P. Harp declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item, as set out under the minute for Declarations of Interest, but indicated that it would not influence his decision making and therefore participated in consideration of the item.

The Committee considered an application at Walton Heath Golf Club, Deans Lane, Walton on the Hill for the erection of a new clubhouse to serve Walton Heath Golf Course comprising a main clubhouse building, ancillary staff accommodation, an 'Artisans' clubhouse, car parking, associated hard and soft landscaping, putting

green and a new access road from Dorking Road, as amended on 07/10/2019, 06/11/2019, and 19/11/2019.

Sean Bashforth, an agent for the application, spoke in support of the application. He stated that the consideration with regard the greenbelt should be if the use is appropriate, rather than if alternatives are available. He stated that the application had taken great care with regard to the openness of the site and the design and screening of the development, and that he disagreed with the report's assessment that it was unacceptable. He drew attention to the wider community benefits of the clubhouse and the Council's policies to support and protect local sports clubs.

Alastair Wells, the Club Chairman, spoke in support of the application. He drew attention to the role of the club in attracting high profile sporting events to the area. He stated that the club needed to adapt to modern circumstance and that the proposed new clubhouse would allow improvements to quality, efficiency and safety. He stated that the club had considered refurbishing or building a new building on the existing site, but that he didn't believe this would address these elements as fully as the proposed development.

Gillian Hein, representing Tadworth & Walton Residents Association, spoke in objection to the application. She stated that she didn't consider the application to meet the requirements for greenbelt development, as per the National Planning Policy Framework. She stated that the new clubhouse was not necessary for the community benefits of the club, and that one of the benefits of the golf course with the current clubhouse is that the course has no neighbouring development.

Richard Harris, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that he was concerned regarding the effects of the development upon the greenbelt, particularly given the proposed scale, and that he did not consider the location to be appropriate. He stated that the development did not reflect the historic nature of the heath and would adversely affect the surrounds.

RESOLVED that planning permission be **REFUSED** as per the recommendation within the report.

84. 19/01514/OUT WALTON HEATH GOLF CLUB, DEANS LANE, WALTON ON THE HILL

The Committee considered an outline planning application with all matters reserved (excluding access) at Walton Heath Golf Club, Deans Lane, Walton on the Hill for the demolition of the existing buildings and provision of up to 13 residential dwellings, residential amenity space, associated car parking, access and associated works.

John McCormack, architect for the proposed development spoke in favour of the application. He stated that the proposed development was similar to surrounding developments, of a lower height and within footprint requirements. He stated that the intended soft landscaping would provide benefits to the local area, that concerns regarding proximity to the nearby historic garden had not previously been raised, and that the proposals were in keeping with requirements.

Philip Truett, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that the separation of the clubhouse and course was a key feature of the course and that the loss of the existing clubhouse and incorporated elements would be a loss to the heritage of the area, at odds with the Core Strategy objectives regarding maintaining heritage elements. He stated that concerns regarding road crossing could be addressed through alternative options.

Richard Sammons, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that he was concerned that the proposed development would be harmful to the surrounding amenity and he considered there to be a risk to the community use elements of the site.

RESOLVED that planning permission be **REFUSED** as per the recommendations within the report.

85. 19/00875/S73 REIGATE COLLEGE, CASTLEFIELD ROAD, REIGATE, SURREY, RH2 0SD

The Committee considered an application at Reigate College, Reigate for the variation of condition 8 of permission 03/00711/F, requiring that no more than 1200 students are permitted on site at any one time, with regard to a 2003 application for extension works to the College, as previously deferred by the Committee on 27 November 2019. It was identified that additional information had been provided on student numbers and proposed management.

Jo Silcock, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that the college had not communicated well with local residents and that increases in student numbers had adverse effects on the surrounding area, including issues relating to parking and littering. He expressed concern regarding the ability to monitor student numbers and enforce the condition.

Chris Whelan, Chief Executive of the college, spoke in support of the application. He stated that the college would be working to better communicate with local residents and that measures would be taken to reduce any negative consequences for local residents of any increase in student numbers. He stated that there was a general increase in need for student places due to a variety of factors.

A correction was noted regarding the date on the covering report on the application.

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

86. 19/00990/F AND 19/00991/LBC BANSTEAD PLACE, PARK ROAD, BANSTEAD, SURREY SM7 3EE: 8A AND 8B

The Committee considered applications for full planning permission and listed building consent at Banstead Place, Park Road, Banstead for Change of use and external alterations including partial demolition to Banstead Place for residential use to create a total of 31 residential units across the site; Demolition of modern additions within site boundary and construction of part one and part two storey buildings for residential use; new car parking layout, and landscaping alterations within site boundary. Internal and external alterations to enable conversion and refurbishment of Banstead Place for residential use; Demolition of modern

extensions to Banstead Place and replacement with residential units and new landscaping; Internal and external alterations to enable conversion and refurbishment of the Lodge for residential use and ancillary buildings for associated uses; Demolition of modern buildings and ancillary structures within the former walled garden and replacement with residential units and new landscaping; and restoration of existing Ha-Ha, reinstatement of woodland path and associated landscape improvements. As amended on 24/06/2019, on 25/09/2019, on 23/10/2019 and on 07/01/2020.

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

RESOLVED that listed building consent be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

87. 19/02012/OUT CHAUCER COURT, 4 COLLEGE CRESCENT, REDHILL, RH1 2LN

The Committee considered an application at Chaucer Court, 4 College Crescent, Redhill for the erection of a two storey block containing 8 x 1 bedroom flats for supported living with car parking (Outline application with all matters, apart from landscaping, to be considered).

Barbara Evans, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application. She stated that the proposed development was closer to the boundary of a neighbouring property than surrounding properties and would overlook the property significantly. She also stated that the boundary treatment should require a solid boundary rather than only a hedge, and that this had previously been agreed, but was not included in the current details.

Vicky Johnson spoke in support of the application on behalf of the applicant. She stated that the proposed development was similar to surround building and located centrally on the site, and that care had been taken regarding positioning of windows and other details to ensure that overlook was reasonable. She stated that disruption from construction would be minimised through use of modular construction and that the proposal would support provision of affordable housing.

The Committee requested to view a section view of the site reflecting the topography of the site and surrounding properties, and confirmation regarding matters relating to the distance to the boundary and overlook. A suitable section view was not available at that time.

A motion to defer the application was proposed and seconded, and upon a vote the Committee **RESOLVED** that determination of the application be **DEFERRED** for consideration of additional information.

The meeting was adjourned between 21:52 and 22:00.

88. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT Q3 PERFORMANCE

RESOLVED that the report be deferred to the following meeting.

89. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There was no other urgent business to consider.

The Meeting closed at 10.26 pm