

BOROUGH OF REIGATE AND BANSTEAD

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held remotely on 20 January 2021 at 7.30 pm.

Present: Councillors S. Parnall (Chairman), M. S. Blacker (Vice-Chair), P. Harp, J. Hudson, J. P. King, S. A. Kulka, S. McKenna, R. Michalowski, R. Ritter, K. Sachdeva, C. Stevens, R. S. Turner, S. T. Walsh, C. T. H. Whinney (Substitute) and C. M. Neame (Substitute).

95. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 December 2020 be approved as a correct record.

96. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Bray and Kelly. Councillors Whinney and Neame attended as their substitutes respectively.

97. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Blacker declared a pecuniary interest in item 9 of the agenda, Market House, as he was the Structural Engineer on the project and would leave the meeting for this item.

98. ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA

RESOLVED that the addendum be noted.

99. 20/01462/F - CODES HOUSE, YORKE ROAD, REIGATE

The Committee considered an application at Codes House, Yorke Road, Reigate, for the demolition of Codes House and the erection of a 2.5 storey building comprising 7no two bed flats and 1no one bed flat. As amended on 25/11/2020 and on 26/11/2020.

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions as per the recommendation.

100. 20/01212/F - 29 WOODLANDS ROAD, REDHILL

The Committee considered an application at 29 Woodlands Road, Redhill, for the construction of three terraced four bedroom houses including access road and parking/ landscaping. As amended on 20/07/2020, 27/10/2020 and 02/12/2020.

Liam Donoghue, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application, stating that a previous refused application was for 3 bedroomed properties and felt this proposal could not be an improvement. The current application was cramped and over developed, and the gardens proposed were not of similar depth to those in the North of Woodlands Road. In this proposal, all available space would be taken up by the access road and parking bays. There were also concerns regarding surface water and the potential for flooding. The information from the previous planning

appeal cited that soakaways would not be sufficient. Screening was also insufficient and there was no further space in the development for more.

Tim Carter, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application, stating that the proposal was cramped. The current application was of the same mass and scale as the previous application so should be refused. There was further concern regarding water run off and this had been a reason for refusal previously. There was concern regarding highway safety and that residents of the development and their visitors would park on the highway.

Keith Anderson, the agent, spoke in support of the application, stating that the proposal was in line with planning policy. There had been no reference to height, mass and bulking in the previous application. This development would be of high quality in an area where housing was needed. The design had the support of the Planning Department. Any adversity from the construction of the development would be kept to a minimum and it was felt that this proposal was an improvement on the previous application. There was provision for landscaping in the scheme and the conditions would provide for adequate drainage.

Reasons for refusal were proposed by Councillor Ritter and seconded by Councillor McKenna, whereupon the Committee voted and **RESOLVED** that planning permission be **REFUSED** on the grounds that:

1. The proposed development, by reason of the height, bulk, scale and mass of the building, combined with the small plot size of each dwelling and proximity to the side and rear boundaries, would constitute a cramped form of development, inconsistent with the pattern of development in locality, which would be out of keeping with and harmful to the character of the area. This would be contrary to policies DES1 and DES2 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 and advice contained within the Local Distinctiveness Design Guide SPG and the NPPF.

101. 20/00487/F - 25 BRIGHTON ROAD, HOOLEY

The Committee considered an application at 25 Brighton Road, Hooley for the erection of a two-storey detached building consisting of 2 no 1 bedroom maisonettes. As amended on 26/03/2020, 20/07/2020, 28/08/2020 and on 20/10/2020.

Councillor Walsh raised serious and morale concerns regarding safety, in particular with vehicles reversing onto the Brighton Road from the site and into an existing dwelling. In light of the Coroner's report, that cited there had been 39 deaths as a result of Smart Motorways, whose design had been approved by Highways England, he felt that advice given by Highways England could be flawed. It was requested that this be recorded in the minutes. Councillor Blacker supported the points raised.

The Head of Planning stated that Highways England had been consulted eight times regarding this application and they did not raise any objections, therefore it was not possible for Officers to contradict advice from the statutory highway authority.

Upon a vote, the recommendation to grant planning permission with conditions was not agreed. As per the Planning Committee Protocol, the application was therefore **DEFERRED** to consider reasons for refusal.

102. 20/01989/F - WAREHOUSE, REAR OF CORNWALLIS, THE COTTAGE, BRIGHTON ROAD, LOWER KINGSWOOD

The Committee considered an application at Warehouse Rear of Cornwalls, The Cottage Brighton Road, Lower Kingswood for the demolition of existing warehouse and replaced by a new warehouse with an office mezzanine and staff car park.

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED** as per addendum changes plus tightening of condition 6 to restrict delivery times

103. 20/02096/F- MARKET HOUSE, 12A CROSS ROAD, TADWORTH

The Committee considered an application at Market House, 12A Cross Road, Tadworth for carrying out external material changes to the appearance of the building further to 19/00905/PAP3M. As amended on 30/11/2020.

Councillor Blacker left the meeting for this item.

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED** with additional informative requisition for contractors to park considerately off the local highway.

104. PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF THE REIGATE HILL CONSERVATION AREA

The Committee considered a report to consider the designation of the Reigate Hill Conservation Area followed by consultation on the designation.

RESOLVED that the Committee supports the recommendation, with the final detail of designation delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman and Ward Members to consider inclusion of 3 properties west of the Yew Tree pub.

105. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT QUARTER 3 PERFORMANCE

Members noted the Development Management Quarter 3 2020/21 Performance.

It was stated that 1 major appeal had been successfully dismissed; this had been the first major appeal held virtually.

In terms of non-major appeals, there had been less success in this quarter. Although the target had not been met this quarter, this was not indicative of any trend and the Planning Department were broadly, across the year, in line to meet its target.

The enforcement performance statistics for the quarter showed an increase in the number of reported breaches from Q3 in 2019/20 although it was down from Q2. Further work was being undertaken to improve the visibility of enforcement action whilst cases were being dealt with.

106. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There was none.

The Meeting closed at 9.39 pm