

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 19 May 2021 at 7.30 pm.

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

Also present: Councillor Ritter.

138. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 14 April 2021 be approved as a correct record.

139. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

Councillor Blacker attended the meeting virtually and was therefore unable to vote.

140. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

141. ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA

RESOLVED that the addendum be noted.

142. 19/0986/F - LAND AT THE CROFT, MEATH GREEN LANE HORLEY, RH6 8HZ

The Committee considered an application at Land at The Croft, Meath Green Lane, Horley for the Erection of 10 dwellings with site access, private amenity space, garaging, parking and access to neighbouring development. As amended on 12/07/2019, 21/04/2020, 01/12/2020, 22/12/2020 and on 11/03/2021.

RESOLVED that the application be **GRANTED** with change to condition as set out in the Addendum.

143. 20/00487/F - 25 BRIGHTON ROAD, HOOLEY, CR5 3EJ

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.

RESOLVED that the application be **GRANTED**.

Councillors Stevens, Walsh and Whinney requested that it be noted that they voted against the application.

144. 20/02799/F & 20/02800/LBC - BANSTEAD PLACE, PARK ROAD, BANSTEAD, SM7 3EE

The Committee considered an application at Banstead Place, Park Road, Banstead for:

A - External alterations including partial demolition to Banstead Place for extra care assisted living accommodation (Class C2). Demolition of modern additions within site boundary and construction of part one and part two storey buildings for extra care assisted living accommodation (Class C2), and new car parking layout, and landscaping alterations within site boundary. As amended on 16/02/2021 and on 24/02/2021.

B - The application seeks listed building consent for internal and external alterations to enable conversion and refurbishment of Banstead Place for extra care assisted living accommodation, demolition of modern extensions to Banstead Place and replacement with extra care residential accommodation and new landscaping, internal and external alterations to enable conversion and refurbishment of the Lodge for extra care residential accommodation and ancillary buildings for associated uses, demolition of modern buildings and ancillary structures within the former walled garden and replacement with extra care residential accommodation and new landscaping, and restoration of existing Ha-Ha, reinstatement of woodland path and associated landscape improvements. As amended on 16/02/2021 and on 24/02/2021.

RESOLVED that, subject to completion of a Section 106 legal agreement, planning permission be **GRANTED** with conditions, as per the recommendation and addendum and listed building consent is **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

145. 21/00328/F - 136 BRIGHTON ROAD, HOOLEY, CR5 3EF

The Committee considered an application at 136 Brighton Road, Hooley for the demolition of the existing dwelling and attached garage; erection of a development of six flats in a two-storey building with roof accommodation together with the provision of refuse and recycling stores, seven car parking spaces and new access. As amended on 04/03/2021.

RESOLVED that planning permission be **REFUSED** on the grounds that:

The proposed development, by virtue of the lack of car parking provision, would lead to unacceptable pressure for on-street parking along the Brighton Road (A23) access road and/or Church Lane Avenue which already suffer from pressure for on-street parking and so would cause harm to the amenities of the existing residents wanting to park in these areas. The distance and lack of such on-street parking would also be inconvenient for residents of the proposed development harmful to their amenities. There would also be pressure to park on the verge outside the site, harmful to the visual amenity of the area. The failure to provide sufficient parking to meet the demands of the development would therefore be contrary to Policies TAP1, DES1 and the parking standards contained within Annex 3 of the Development Management Plan 2019 and guidance contained within the Council's Local Distinctiveness Design Guide SPD.

146. 20/01876/F - LAND TO THE REAR OF 1-3 WEST AVENUE, SALFORDS, REDHILL RH1 5BA

The Committee considered an application at land to the rear of 1-3 West Avenue, Salfords, Redhill for the erection of 2x3 bed semi-detached dwellings. As amended on 18/12/2020, 15/01/2021, 22/02/2021, 26/02/2021 and 31/03/2021.

Jaswant Dhandra, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application stating that his house was to the rear of the proposed development. There would be a loss of privacy and loss of light in his garden. There was concern that if permission was granted that this would set a precedent and the developers had contacted other local residents regarding potential further development. There would also be a loss of habitat for wildlife.

Neil Wright, a local resident, spoke on the behalf of other local residents in objection to the application, stating that there had been 149 objections to the application from 55 households with submissions of support from 3 households that would financially benefit. There was concern regarding precedent. It was stated that the design and access statement referred to a similar scheme located on Woodside Way, where there were dwellings on both sides of the road, however the road layout there was very different to Hillford Place. A similar development, whose frontage would have laid on Hillford Place was rejected previously. There were concerns for highway safety as this was a narrow road, with limited sight lines and a lack of pavements. There was never an intention to build on the south side of Hillford Place and the proposal was out of character. This development would be harmful to neighbouring properties and the character of the locality would be changed for perpetuity.

Emily Hall, the Agent, spoke in support of the application stating that the application site was in the urban area and which was predominantly residential in character. The proposal sought to provide two high-quality homes which would make the best of use of the land whilst respecting the character and appearance of the local area. The site was within a sustainable location and the proposal adhered to relevant national and local planning policy. The NPPF recognised the important contribution to be made by small and medium sites to meet housing requirements. The dwellings would be of traditional design which would accord with the character and pattern of residential development in the locality. The parking layout had been amended during the course of the application and therefore would not contravene highway safety. The level of car parking proposed was appropriate, and the development would not impact the existing parking situation on surrounding roads. The scheme incorporated sufficient separation distances to local properties, and the scale of the dwellings would be consistent with those along Hillford Place. The proposal would not result in a loss of privacy and would not be overbearing. Existing trees would be appropriately protected throughout the construction process.

Councillor Ritter, a visiting Member for the ward, spoke in objection to the application on the grounds of Local distinctiveness. There were currently no houses on the South side of Hillford Place. There was instead a unique wildlife corridor in the form of a wide verge, trees and shrubs. An application in 2011, at the other end of this part of the road, was rejected and was upheld on appeal. There was concern that this could set a precedent for development along this side of the road and this would have an adverse impact on wildlife and trees as well as the loss of this very distinctive local feature. Hillford Place was narrow road and was not designed to

host development on both sides. There was concern regarding highway safety and the developer's efforts to address some of this made the development less in keeping with the street scene and frontages of the North side of the road and totally out of keeping with the verge and wildlife corridor that currently existed. There had also been many objections from local residents.

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

1. The proposed development and the extensive hard landscaped frontages, would spoil the undeveloped character of this side of the road and lead to further development pressures upon it and erosion of its verdant character. This would be contrary to DES1 & DES3 of the Development Management Plan (DMP) 2019 and advice contained within the Local Distinctiveness Design Guide SPD.
2. The proposed dwellings by virtue of their design, scale and massing would appear an overdevelopment of the site, incongruous and out of keeping with the low-density form of development and the design and form of the link-detached houses opposite. This would be contrary to DES1 & DES3 of the Development Management Plan (DMP) 2019 and advice contained within the Local Distinctiveness Design Guide SPD.

147. 21/00569/HHOLD - HORLEY MILL, 83 LEE STREET, HORLEY

The Committee considered an application at Horley Mill, 83 Lee Street, Horley for a first-floor extension with balcony over existing ground floor and new single storey plant room.

RESOLVED that the application be **GRANTED** as per report and the additional informative in addendum.

148. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT Q4 2020-21 PERFORMANCE

Members noted the Development Management Quarter 4 2020/21 Performance.

The Head of Planning explained the tables within the report and it was noted that 1417 applications had been received in 2020/21 when compared with 1063 the previous year, demonstrating the current workload. Applications were dominated by house holder applications for several reasons that were outlined. The volume of applications had an effect on processing these. The aim was to register applications within 5 working days however this was not always being achieved. The department was intending to employ an additional member of staff.

Additionally, the number of alleged enforcement breaches being reported also increased and this was partly as a result of residents spending more time at home. These figures were consistent with other local authorities.

In the last year, 3 major appeals had been determined and were dismissed.

A member asked a question regarding an anomaly in the figures regarding applications withdrawn within one of the tables; it was explained that this was due to a glitch in the system that was currently being investigated.

It was stated that the composition of lawful developments was approximately 15% and prior approval applications equated to 20%.

The Planning Team was thanked for their continuing work.

149. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There was none.

The Meeting closed at 10.30pm