

Minutes of a meeting of the **Planning Committee** held at the **New Council Chamber - Town Hall, Reigate** on **Wednesday, 2 November 2022 at 7.30 pm.**

Present: Councillors S. Parnall (Chairman); M. S. Blacker (Vice-Chair), J. S. Bray, P. Chandler, Z. Cooper, P. Harp, A. King, J. P. King, S. A. Kulka, R. Michalowski, C. Stevens, D. Torra, S. T. Walsh, V. Chester (Substitute) and R. S. Turner (Substitute)

Visiting Members present:

55 Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 28 September 2022 be approved as a correct record.

56 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Baker and McKenna, Councillors Turner and Chester were their respective substitutes.

57 Declarations of interest

There was none.

58 Addendum to the agenda

RESOLVED that the addendum be noted.

59 21/02000/F - Land to the rear of 260, 262 and 264 Chipstead Way and the rear of Kita, Sunnyfields and Paddock, Woodmansterne

The Committee considered an application at and to the rear of 260, 262 and 264 Chipstead Way and the rear of Kita, Sunnyfields and Paddock, Woodmansterne for the redevelopment of the site to deliver seven residential units with associated landscaping and private gardens, parking and internal access road. As amended on 18/10/2021, 20/10/2021, 28/10/21, 01/11/2021, 25/11/2021, 13/12/2021, 03/03/2022, 08/03/2022, 17/06/2022, 04/07/2022, 21/07/2022, 30/08/2022, 30/09/2022 and on 19/10/2022.

A reason for refusal was proposed by Councillor Walsh and seconded by Councillor Bray, whereupon the Committee voted and **RESOLVED** that planning permission be **REFUSED** on the grounds that:

The proposal, by reason of its layout and density, siting of dwellings including the relationship of unit 1 with the donor plots and narrow access road with close proximity



Planning Committee, Wednesday, 2nd November, 2022

to buildings either side, limited space for meaningful soft landscaping and impractical tandem parking for the smaller units which include tandem spaces (units 6 and 7) would appear cramped and would harm the character of the surrounding area and would fail to make adequate provision for parking, resulting in potential overspill and impact on local character and residential amenity contrary to policy DES2 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan and Section 9 of the NPPF 2021.

60 22/01232/F - Farm Corner, 15 The Avenue, Tadworth

The Committee considered an application at Farm Corner, 15 The Avenue, Tadworth for the construction of two detached houses with associated garages, parking and turning areas.

A reason for refusal was proposed by Councillor Cooper and seconded by Councillor Turner, whereupon the Committee voted and **RESOLVED** that planning permission be **REFUSED** on the grounds that:

1. The proposed new access road, by virtue of its proximity to the donor property and the number of potential vehicle movements, would result in an unacceptable amount of noise and disturbance which would be harmful to the amenity of 15 The Avenue. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Part 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Plan 2019 and the Householder Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Guidance.
2. The proposed dwellings, by virtue of their height, scale, proximity to the north boundary and higher ground level, would be unacceptably overbearing on 9 Spindlewoods to the north and therefore harmful to the residential amenity of this property. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Part 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Plan 2019 and the Householder Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Guidance.

61 22/00595/F - Redhill and Reigate Golf Club, Clarence Lodge, Pendleton Road, Redhill

The Committee considered an application at Redhill and Reigate Golf Club, Clarence Lodge, Pendleton Road, Redhill for the demolition of existing buildings, erection of 10x dwellings with associated parking and landscaping. As amended on 12/05/2022, 05/08/2022, 26/08/2022, 14/09/2022, 07/10/2022 and on 13/10/2022.

Jonathan White, a local resident, objected to the application on the following grounds:

- lack of parking provision;
- the proposal exceeded the established and historical building line; and
- the loss of amenity, including light, for neighbouring properties due to the scale and density of the proposed development.

Policy DES1 of Reigate and Banstead's Development Management Plan was referred to and it was stated that Clause 5 required that the development provided an appropriate environment for future occupants whilst not adversely impacting upon the amenity of occupants of existing nearby buildings, including by way of overbearing, obtrusiveness, overshadowing, overlooking and loss of privacy. It was felt that this

Planning Committee, Wednesday, 2nd November, 2022

proposal did not satisfy that requirement. As the development included a number of family properties, it was likely that parking provision would be insufficient and there was limited on-street parking in the locality. Additionally, access to Clarence Walk by emergency and the Council's refuse services was already a concern amongst residents and concern was raised over pedestrian safety. In terms of the established and Historical Building Line an overview of the local properties was given, and the most southerly elements of the proposed development overstepped this line and were closer to the common land opposite, than they would otherwise be. Although the site was not on Green Belt land, concern was raised over the impact of the development on nearby Green Belt land. The scale and density of the proposed development would have the effect of limiting the amenity, including light of neighbouring properties. It was acknowledged that the site needed development however a proposal was required that fitted the site.

David Smith, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application, stating that the proposal was an overdevelopment of the site and the houses would tower above neighbouring properties. Concern was raised regarding the loss of light, privacy and views. There were too few parking spaces, and this would put pressure on local roads. In respect of 60, 62 and 64 Clarence Walk, it was felt that the historic relationship between these three buildings and the proposed development site had not been given enough thought in terms of impact, including access for the maintenance of these properties. The proposed planting of trees and shrubs could damage neighbouring buildings and one proposed tree would block the light to a habitable room at 62 Clarence Walk. Drainage issues had also not been properly considered. There had been insufficient time to respond to the application and it was felt that objections had not been given enough credence by officers.

Adem Mehmet, the Agent, spoke in support of the application, stating that it was critical that a strong housing land supply was maintained, in order to resist speculative development on greenfield and green belt land. Houses must continue to be delivered on brownfield sites, which should be used as efficiently as possible, to avoid the need for greenfield development in the future. This site was an unattractive brownfield site in a sustainable residential area. National and local policy placed a strong emphasis on using this type of land as efficiently as possible for the delivery of much needed new homes. Local concerns were recognised, however just 19% of the site would be covered by houses. The density of development would be just 22dph, consistent with adjacent development patterns and was clear evidence that the scheme would not represent overdevelopment. Significant changes had been made to address local concerns and these were outlined. Concern over parking and local traffic was considered and Surrey County highways authority did not object; the scheme provided a policy compliant level of parking. The layout had carefully balanced the efficient use of the site with the need to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring properties; good levels of separation were maintained from all adjacent dwellings, particularly given the suburban location. It was felt that the change in appearance would not be harmful. The scheme would deliver 10 new family homes, strengthening local supply. Landscaping would bring biodiversity net gain.

A reason for refusal was proposed by Councillor Kulka and seconded by Councillor J King, whereupon the Committee voted and **RESOLVED** that planning permission be **REFUSED** on the grounds that:

1. The proposal, by reason of the quantum, scale and bulk of the proposed dwellings, the forward position of plots 1,2, 9 and 10, the limited plot sizes and

Planning Committee, Wednesday, 2nd November, 2022

lack of adequate spacing to the site boundaries, would result in an overly dense, incongruous and cramped overdevelopment of the site, out of keeping with and harmful to the character and appearance of the locality contrary to policies DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 and chapter 12 of the NPPF.

2. The proposal, by reason of the proximity of plots 5 and 6 to the northern boundary, would appear as a dominant and overbearing to the neighbouring properties directly to the north of the site (no. 60, 62 and 64 Clarence Walk), harmful to the residential amenities of their occupants. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 and chapter 12 of the NPPF.

62 Development Management Quarter 2 2022-23 Performance

The Development Manager explained that the addendum reflected a change to the table shown within the report. The Committee was given an overview of Development Management in quarter 2. It was explained that 100% of major applications and 80% of non-major applications were determined within the targeted timeframe and these were above the targets set.

There had been no major appeals lodged in quarter 2 and 100% of non-major appeals were dismissed. This was well in excess of the target of 70%.

It was noted that the Great Tattenhams appeal which was allowed but was subsequently quashed, had now been dismissed upon appeal.

The enforcement service continued to see a high volume of work with numbers of reported breaches remaining high. The number of cases over 6 months old had increased, however work had begun to reduce these, and this should be positively reflected in quarter 3.

RESOLVED that:

1. The Committee thanked officers for their continued work; and
2. The report be noted.

63 Any other urgent business

There was none.

The meeting finished at 9.37 pm