

BOROUGH OF REIGATE AND BANSTEAD

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held at the New Council Chamber - Town Hall on 20 February 2019 at 7.30 pm.

Present: Councillors S. Parnall (Chairman), M. S. Blacker (Vice-Chair), Mrs. R. Absalom, R. Biggs, Mrs. J. S. Bray, G. P. Crome, V. H. Lewanski, S. McKenna, R. Michalowski, J. Paul, M. J. Selby, J. M. Stephenson, C. Stevens, Ms. B. J. Thomson, Mrs. R. S. Turner, S. T. Walsh, C. T. H. Whinney and J. F. White (Substitute).

103. MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 23rd January 2019 were approved.

104. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor J. M. Ellacott (substituted by Councillor J. F. White).

105. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mrs. R. Absalom declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 5 for the application at 13 Beverley Heights as she had co-founded the Alma Area Residents' Association (AARA) before subsequently resigning following her election as a Ward Councillor. Mr Michael Keep, a local resident who had registered to speak in objection to the application, was also a member of the AARA prior to its closure. Councillor Mrs. R. Absalom participated in the debate and vote.

106. ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA

RESOLVED that the addendum be noted.

107. 18/01947/F - THE ORCHARD, 13 BEVERLEY HEIGHTS, REIGATE, SURREY, RH2 0DL

The Committee considered an application at The Orchard, 13 Beverley Heights in Reigate for the demolition of the existing dwelling and construction of three new dwellings.

Mr Michael Keep, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application on the grounds that:

- a) the bulk, mass and proximity of the proposed development in relation to the southern boundary would cause an unacceptable loss of privacy and harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties in Beverley Heights by virtue of overlooking;
- b) the spacing and density of the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character of the area, contrary to policy Ho15 in

- respect of the Alma Road and Raglan Road Area of Special Character (RASC); and
- c) the design of the proposed development was considered to be unattractive and therefore contrary to Statement 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Mr Derek Dawson, the agent on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application on the grounds that the proposals included sufficient screening on the southern boundary to mitigate potential overlooking for the neighbouring properties on Beverley Heights.

The Committee discussed the criteria within policy Ho15 in respect of the RASC; topography; elevation; landscaping; separation distances; loss of privacy; highways access; waste collection; and the impact on the character and amenity of the area.

Reasons for refusal were proposed and seconded and upon a vote it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be **REFUSED** on the grounds that:

1. The proposed development would, by virtue of the proposed layout, outlook (with each property having two primary first floor bedroom windows on their front elevation) and elevated position of Plots 1 and 2, result in overlooking and loss of privacy to the garden and swimming pool of 2 Beverley Heights, as well as appearing overbearing and dominant when viewed from it. The proposal would therefore cause significant harm to the residential amenities of this property contrary to policies Ho9, Ho13 and Ho14 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan 2005 and the provisions of the Reigate and Banstead Local Distinctiveness Design Guide.
2. The proposed development would, by virtue of the multiple access arrangements, loss of hedging and amount of hard landscaping at the end of the cul-de-sac cause a harmful interruption of the street frontage which combined with the elevated position, height and scale of the dwellings beyond would cause significant harm to the verdant, open and spacious character of the area including the Alma Road & Alders Road Residential Area of Special Character contrary to policies Ho9, Ho13, Ho14 and Ho15 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan 2005, Policy CS4 of the Reigate and Banstead Core Strategy 2014 and the provisions of the Reigate and Banstead Local Distinctiveness Design Guide.

108. 19/00063/F - GLOUCESTER ROAD CAR PARK, GLOUCESTER ROAD, REDHILL, SURREY, RH1 1BS

The Committee considered an application at Gloucester Road Car Park in Redhill for the deployment of 2 x 14sqm and 1 x 8sqm shipping containers within the car park, to be utilised as storage for the Town Centre Market operation. It was proposed that the containers be sited there for 3 years.

The proposals would increase the number of parking bays from 274 to 293 by reconfiguring the layout of the car park.

In the interests of transparency, the Chairman explained that the applicant was Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED** as per the recommendation, plus an additional condition requiring the containers to be painted prior to installation.

109. 18/02696/HHOLD - SOUTH WEST WING, WALTON MANOR, WALTON STREET, WALTON ON THE HILL, TADWORTH, SURREY, KT20 7SA

The Committee considered an application at the South West Wing of Walton Manor, Walton Street in Walton on the Hill, Tadworth for the installation of a ground mounted solar photovoltaic array of panels in the gardens.

Reasons for refusal were proposed and seconded on the grounds that:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its scale and spread within an undeveloped and otherwise open part of the site, would cause significant harm to the openness of the green belt and was inappropriate development. The benefits of the development, including the benefit of the renewable energy provision, was not considered to outweigh this harm such that no very special circumstances were considered to exist and the proposal was therefore contrary to Policies Co1 and Ho24a of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan 2005 and Policy CS3 of the Reigate and Banstead Core Strategy 2014; and
 - upon a vote the motion to refuse the application on those grounds was not carried.

A motion to approve the application as per the officer recommendation was subsequently put to the Committee and it was:

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

110. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business to consider.

The Meeting closed at 8.46 pm