

## **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 1 September 2021 at 7.30 pm.

Present: Councillors S. Parnall (Chairman), M. S. Blacker (Vice-Chair), J. Baker, R. Harper, A. King, F. Kelly, J. P. King, S. A. Kulka, S. McKenna, R. Michalowski, R. Ritter, C. Stevens, S. T. Walsh and C. T. H. Whinney (Substitute).

Also present: Councillors Z. Cooper.

#### **19. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on 7 July 2021 be approved as a correct record.

#### **20. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Adamson, with Councillor Whinney attending as substitute.

Councillor Cooper attended the meeting remotely and was therefore unable to vote.

#### **21. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

#### **22. ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA**

**RESOLVED** to note the addendum tabled at the meeting.

#### **23. 20/02826/F - 19 GATTON PARK ROAD, REDHILL**

The Committee considered an application at 19 Gratton Park Road, Redhill for the demolition of the existing house and garages and construction of a two-storey residential development to provide four two-bedroom and two one-bedroom flats, along with associated car and cycle parking, waste storage and landscaped communal garden. As amended on 12/02/2021, on 22/06/2021 and on 28/07/2021.

**RESOLVED** that the application be **APPROVED** subject to conditions as per the recommendation.

#### **24. 21/00546/F - 38 ALMA ROAD, REIGATE**

The Committee considered an application at 38 Alma Road, Reigate for the erection of a pair of semi-detached dwellings with associated parking and landscaping following the demolition of the existing garage. As amended on 06/05/2021.

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

The proposed development by virtue of the closure of the visual gap that exists through to the rear of the site, together with the lack of spaciousness to the boundaries, shallow rear gardens, height and mass and extent of the site developed would be at odds with and harmful to the spacious, low density character of the Residential Area of Special Character, contrary to policies DES1 and DES3 of the Development Management plan 2019 and guidance contained within the Local Distinctiveness Design Guide SPD.

**25. 21/01012/F - 42 - 44 HOLMETHORPE AVENUE, REDHILL**

The Committee considered an application at 42-44 Holmethorpe Avenue, Redhill for the demolition of existing building and the redevelopment comprising 5 units within a single building and change of use from B2 general industrial use to light industrial (use class e), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8 use class) uses, together with ancillary offices, and associated parking and landscaping. As amended on 18.6.21 and 29.6.21.

**RESOLVED** that the application be **APPROVED** subject to conditions as per the recommendation plus an additional condition relating to enhanced biodiversity.

**26. 21/00527/F - 17 CHURCH ROAD, HORLEY**

The Committee considered an application at 17 Church Road, Horley for the demolition of the existing dwelling; erection of a development of six flats in a two storey building with roof accommodation together with the provision of refuse and recycling stores, 8 car parking spaces and new access. As amended on 06/08/2021.

**RESOLVED** that the application be **APPROVED** subject to conditions as per the recommendation.

**27. 21/00924/HHOLD - 46 RAGLAN ROAD, REIGATE**

The Committee considered an application at 46 Raglan Road, Reigate for a proposed first floor extension.

Roger Walker, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application on the grounds that the current plans needed further clarification as the size of the proposed extension would be overbearing with loss of light to neighbouring properties. The proposed extension did not meet the Council's Development Management Plan 2019 and the Household Extensions and Alternations SPG 2004. Residents believed it to be contrary to Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy. In addition, clarifications had been requested to amend inaccuracies in the planning applicant's drawings, but these had not been addressed.

Lorraine Vassou, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application on the grounds that the proposed development was overbearing due to its scale and design, and would result in loss of amenity to adjacent properties. Key details of the proposed extension could not be determined from the application. The single storey living accommodation adjacent to the property drawn in the application was not a garage. It was raised on the four occasions that drawings had been submitted to the resident, but the applicant had not made these changes in the drawings. The eaves of the existing bungalow were already above the eaves of the single storey, and the gap between the two properties was overstated in the drawings. If the application

was to be approved, the two rear windows proposed needed to be obscured glass and non-opening, to avoid overlooking.

A motion to refuse planning permission was proposed by Councillor Whinney and seconded by Councillor Blacker, whereupon the Committee voted, and the motion was not carried.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be **GRANTED** with conditions as per the recommendation and addendum.

**28. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT QUARTER 1 2021-2022 PERFORMANCE**

Members noted the Development Management Quarter 1 2021-2022 Performance.

The number of major applications determined during the quarter exceeded the target, with average days to decision consistent with the previous year. During the quarter, 1 major appeal had been decided in the Council's favour, and 9 out of 10 non-major appeals, both of which exceeded the target. There remained a very high application workload. It was noted that case officers are working hard to process them. Employment of temporary staff, which are in high demand across local authorities, and a reduction of discretionary services had not yet been considered but may need to be if workloads became unmanageable.

In response to a question on the percentage of householder applications in the total number of applications received, the Head of Planning confirmed that there is a higher proportion of householder applications relative to other applications, and further detail would be provided in an email to members of the Committee.

**29. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

There was none.

The Meeting closed at 9.46 pm