

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 7 July 2021 at 7.30 pm.

Present: Councillors S. Parnall (Chairman), M. S. Blacker (Vice-Chair), G. Adamson, J. Baker, Z. Cooper, A. King, F. Kelly, S. A. Kulka, S. McKenna, R. Ritter, C. Stevens, S. T. Walsh, J. Hudson (Substitute), R. S. Turner (Substitute) and C. T. H. Whinney (Substitute).

10. MINUTES

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2021 be approved as a correct record.

11. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Harper, J King and Michalowski. Councillors Whinney, Hudson and Turner attended as their respective substitutes.

Councillors Blacker and Cooper attended the meeting virtually and were therefore unable to vote.

12. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

13. ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA

RESOLVED that the addendum be noted.

14. 21/00205/OUT - 46- 48 VICTORIA ROAD, HORLEY

The Committee considered an outline planning application at 46- 48 Victoria Road, Horley, for additional floors to accommodate 42 residential dwellings. As amended on 28/04/2021 and on 26/05/2021.

Tom Collingwood, the applicant, spoke in support of the application, stating that the intention was to develop homes and associated infrastructure which complemented the central area of Horley and modernize the existing store. No objections had been received. The revenue was needed from the residential development to secure the future of the store and its many employees. The site has had several extensions over the years. The original main apex top had to be tied back to give stability and remained fragile and if retained would require extensive work to repair which was unviable. The properties in Horley varied greatly and the proposed development would not overshadow neighbouring properties as it would be stepped back on upper levels and located on the corner and to the rear of the building is a car park. The proposal was an investment in the town and the regeneration of a key site within it.

Reasons for approval were proposed by Councillor Stevens and seconded by Councillor Baker, whereupon the Committee voted. The original vote was tied at 6-6 with the Chairman then casting his vote to make it 7-6 against approval and 7-6 in favour of refusal. It was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be **REFUSED**.

15. 21/00413/F - 29 WOODLANDS ROAD, REDHILL

The Committee considered an application at 29, Woodlands Road, Redhill for the construction of two detached four bedroom houses including access road and parking/ landscaping. As amended on 17/06/2021.

Tim Carter, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application stating that previous planning applications at this address had been rejected by the Committee. Previously he had quoted numerous county and borough planning policies that had not been met and highlighted an objection which identified 5 contraventions of planning policy and a further 2 infringements of the National Planning Policy Framework guidelines relating to the current application; some dated back to 2006 and remained unresolved. These included the over massing of the proposed structures relative to the site; insufficient provision for amenity space; and issues relating to surface water run-off and foul water drainage. There was concern regarding safe access onto Woodlands Road. There had been 25 objections logged on the Council's website, illustrating local sentiment. Any development was inappropriate in the mature gardens of No. 29, which had previously been given a "listed" status. Any construction in its grounds would alter the immediate surroundings. It was requested whether an investigation into an extension of the existing preservation order to cover the gardens was possible to end cycle of planning applications here.

Liam Donoghue, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application stating that this was the third time the applicant had attempted to develop the site and there was little improvement since the previous application. Overall massing and the finished height of the roof ridge, reduced marginally on the plan, did not consider the complicated contours of the site. Plan drawings were misleading, and this was explained. Due to its proximity, the 10 metre plus length side wall would be just over two metres from the boundary. The height and bulk of the nearest proposed house would be overbearing. Proposed screening was inadequate. The proximity to the railway line was highlighted and there were concerns regarding the stability of the land and that trees here could be felled. Surface water management had not been addressed adequately and there were concerns of local flooding to the lower lying properties. Soakaways, as a means of storm / surface water disposal must not be constructed within 20 metres of Network Rail's boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail's property. No soil permeability survey had been completed. The roof area of both houses was immense and, when combined with the access road and parking, this would be exacerbated. The properties would be overbearing, and their size, mass, appearance and position/orientation would look out of character with the surrounding neighbourhood.

Oliver Watkins, the Agent, spoke in support of the application, stating that the erection of 2x 4 bedroom properties was in line with feedback. Height and scale had been reduced so that the new proposal had the same ridge height as those properties on St Johns Road and over 4m lower than the donor property. The development was sympathetic to the donor property and properties to the south and was situated in excess of the minimum required distances from rear to flank

elevations. The bulk and mass had been reduced by proposing two separate buildings, this gave greater amenity space to the front of the dwellings. The application was compliant with Reigate and Banstead's current DMP policy guidance. The Conservation Officer raised no objection, subject to conditions. Surrey County Council Highways, Surrey Wildlife Trust, and Reigate and Banstead's Tree officer confirmed their agreement to the proposals.

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

The proposed development, by reason of the height, bulk, scale and mass of the buildings, 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.

16. 21/00501/F - MIDDLETON HOUSE, 43-49 HIGH STREET, HORLEY

The Committee considered an application at Middleton House, 43-49 High Street, Horley for the erection of a three storey rear extension to provide ten flats (Revision of 18/01576/F to provide for an additional unit). As amended on 06/05/2021, 26/05/2021. and on 28/05/2021.

RESOLVED that the application be **APPROVED** as per recommendation and additional condition in addendum.

17. A) 21/00373/HHOLD AND B) 21/00374/LBC - 29 WEST STREET, REIGATE

The Committee considered two applications at 29 West Street, Reigate for the demolition of existing modern wooden conservatory at the rear of the property and replacement with part-single and part-two storey extensions.

Sarah Sullivan, speaking on behalf of a neighbour, spoke in objection to the application stating she was a Conservation Specialist. Concern was raised regarding privacy and scale and that the proposal did not comply with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Householder Extensions and Alterations. The ground floor extension was beyond the 45 Degree Test. However, the proposal needed to fail in the vertical plane as well, to justify refusal. In terms of the Listed Building Consent Application it also failed, as it was the duty of any proposal not to cause 'harm', but to actually enhance the Conservation Area and this proposal did not and should be refused on heritage grounds. This was overdevelopment and would give a negative contribution to the overall environment of the area. The Conservation Officer considered that other examples of flat roof extensions exist further down West Street making this application difficult to resist. All those examples pre-dated the establishment of the Conservation Area in 1973 and would not be approved now.

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

1. The proposed extension would, by reason of its design, scale and form together result in a disproportionate extension to the building that would unacceptably detract from the listed building as the principal structure and would lack subservience in its appearance and be harmful to the historic character and integrity of the building. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies CS1 and CS4 of the Core Strategy 2014; Policies DES1, NHE9 of the Development Management Plan 2019 and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed two storey extension by virtue of its size, juxtaposition and design would contribute to an unacceptable loss of amenity to the occupiers of 31 West Street through reduction of light and an overbearing relationship. It would therefore be contrary to policy CS4 of the Core Strategy, policy DES1 of the Development Management Plan 2019 and Householder Extensions and Alterations SPG 2004.

18. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There was none.

The Meeting closed at 9.54 pm