

## **BOROUGH OF REIGATE AND BANSTEAD**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held remotely on 28 October 2020 at 7.30 pm.

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

#### **61. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 30 September 2020 be approved as a correct record.

#### **62. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Kelly (substituted by Councillor Neame) and Councillor Turner.

#### **63. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

#### **64. ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA**

**RESOLVED** that the addendum be noted.

#### **65. 20/00789/F - LAND ADJACENT TO 86-100 CHILBERTON DRIVE, MERSTHAM**

The Committee considered an application at Land Adjacent to 86-100 Chilberton Drive, Merstham for the erection of 2 x semi-detached 3 bedroom houses and associated driveways and private gardens. Provision of public open space, repositioning of driveway, replacement car parking and associated landscaping and other works. As amended on 05/06/2020, 11/06/2020, 08/09/2020, 16/09/2020, 29/09/2020 and on 01/10/2020.

Errol Holness, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application on the grounds that the proposals in relation to parking were inadequate. The street parking was already exceeding capacity. The development would lead to the loss of 8 mature trees which would be replaced by 7 sapling trees. The development would destroy what is a lovely area.

Duncan Summers, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application on the grounds that there would be a highly detrimental effect on all the residents. There would be a negative impact on the visual amenity. The application area was used and cared for by local residents. The parking provision was inadequate and the development would result in cars parking unsafely. The development would result in the removal of trees and a visual relief would be lost.

Tom Tanner, the agent, spoke in support of the application on the grounds that the development was small scale and responded well to its surroundings. The

application area was an informal open space which was shown as surplus to requirements in the open spaces plan. The development would use traditional materials which would enhance the public open space. It would provide a high quality living environment which would be in keeping with the locality and would accord with local and national planning policy.

Councillor Mark Brunt, a Visiting Member for the Ward, spoke in objection to the application on the grounds that the development was poorly designed. The properties were oversized and not in keeping with neighbouring properties. The development would be crammed and would create an enclosed space which would have a detrimental impact on existing and future residents. A reduction in parking provision was not acceptable. A principal existed for some form of development on the site but the application as submitted was not suitable.

A motion to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Blacker and seconded by Councillor Walsh, whereupon the Committee voted and **RESOLVED** that the application be **REFUSED** and that the reasons for refusal be drafted by the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman, Councillor Blacker and Ward Members.

**66. 20/01224/F - 12 AND LAND TO THE REAR OF 6 TO 16 CARLTON ROAD, REDHILL, SURREY**

The Committee considered an application at 12 and Land to the Rear of 6 to 16 Carlton Road, Redhill for the demolition of 12 Carlton Road, creation of an access road and new frontage dwelling and construction of 8 additional dwellings with associated parking and landscaping on land to the rear of 6 to 16 Carlton Rad. As amended on 13/7/2020, 17/07/2020, 20/07/2020, 05/08/2020, 11/09/2020 and on 08/10/2020.

Geoff Tothill, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application on the grounds that the proposed number of dwellings on the site would be higher than any other development on the road. The new houses would be overbearing and obtrusive and would result in a loss of privacy. There would be a loss to biodiversity and, as residents' experiences have shown, the area was at risk of flooding which would increase with a greater housing density.

Ray Bell, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application on the grounds that the application was overdevelopment and would be crammed. The development would not improve the local habitat and would result in overbearing and overlooking. The application should be rejected on grounds of overdevelopment.

Billy Clements, the applicant, spoke in favour of the application on the grounds that the development would make efficient use of the site and that it would not result in overdevelopment. There would be a spacious and open character. The scheme had been amended following discussion with officers. The development would result in much needed family housing.

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

1. The proposal, by reason of the number of dwellings proposed, would result in a cramped layout which is not reflective of the typical depth of plots within the immediate area and which is of a density that is out of keeping with the existing site and other development at the eastern end of Carlton Road. Such cramped and higher density development would be out of keeping with and harmful to the character and appearance of the locality 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.

**67. 20/00861/F - LITTLE THORNS, LONDON ROAD, REDHILL, SURREY**

The Committee considered an application at Little Thorns, London Road, Redhill for the demolition of a detached house and garaging, and construction of a block of 8 no. Apartments including parking and landscaping. As amended on 05/06/2020, 30/06/2020, 27/07/2020, 01/10/2020 and on 05/10/2020.

A motion to defer the application was proposed by Councillor Walsh and seconded by Councillor Blacker, whereupon the Committee voted and **RESOLVED** that planning permission be **DEFERRED** for a site visit by the Committee to consider the impact on Holcorn Court.

*Councillor Kulka left the meeting on the conclusion of this item at 9:26pm.*

**68. 20/01611/F - 24 EPSOM LANE NORTH, EPSOM DOWNS, SURREY**

The Committee considered an application at 24 Epsom Lane North, Epsom Downs, Surrey for the re-development of the former industrial site to provide four detached houses along with associate vehicular accesses, car parking and landscaping. As amended on 01/09/2020.

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

**69. 20/01071/F - ASDA, REIGATE ROAD, BURGH HEATH, SURREY**

The Committee considered an application at Asda, Reigate Road, Burgh Heath, Surrey for improvements to the home shopping facilities including a side extension, van loading capacity and amendment to site layout. As amended on 05/08/2020 and on 12/10/2020.

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

**70. 20/01008/F - EAST SURREY HOSPITAL, CANADA AVENUE, REDHILL, SURREY**

The Committee considered an application at East Surrey Hospital, Canada Avenue, Redhill for the demolition of an existing building enclosure and construction of a replacement two storey building and enclosure to house the new energy facilities and facilitate the relocation of ground floor storage/office to first floor. The energy facilities will include the removal of existing steam boilers and installation of 2x 3,000kg/h steam boiler, the installation of a new CHP plant comprising 1.5 MWe natural gas plant and 1x 2,400kg/h composite boiler, the installation of 2x standby

oil tanks and a new Transformer Enclosure and associated works. As amended on 27/08/2020 and on 11/09/2020.

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

**71. 20/00829/F - 8 BRIGHTON ROAD, HOOLEY, SURREY**

The Committee considered an application at 8 Brighton Road, Hooley for the demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two buildings comprising 10 new homes with associated access, parking and landscaping. As amended on 24/06/2020 and on 30/06/2020.

Councillor Mark Brunt, a Visiting Member for the Ward, spoke in objection to the application on the grounds that there was insufficient parking. This would result in problems for residents of the development.

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

1. The proposed development, by virtue of the height, bulk, depth and mass of the frontage building, with additional building to the rear of the site and parking in between, would result in a cramped overdevelopment of the site which is out of keeping with the character of the area. Such cramped and higher density development would be out of keeping with and harmful to the character and appearance of the locality 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.
2. The proposed development, by virtue of the height, bulk, depth and mass of the frontage building, coupled with its' close proximity to 10A-10D Brighton Road, would result in a dominant and unacceptably overbearing relationship with the neighbouring property, harmful to its' amenity and thereby contrary to policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 and the NPPF.
3. The proposed development would be located in an area of low accessibility and would provide insufficient off street parking, as set out in the Development Management plan 2019, resulting in additional on street parking in the local area to the detriment of the amenities of the local area, and highway safety, contrary to the provisions of Policies CS1 and CS10 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan Core Strategy and Policies DES1, TAP1 and Annexe 4 of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan 2019.

**72. 20/01805/F AND 20/01806/LBC - WESTON ACRES, BELVEDERE HOUSE, WOODMANSTERNE LANE, WOODMANSTERNE, SURREY**

The Committee considered an application at Weston Acres, Belvedere House, Woodmansterne Lane, Woodmansterne, Surrey for the extension and

refurbishment of The Royal Alfred Seafarers' Society; to reorganise and enlarge the first floor bedroom suits by extending two areas of the first floor over existing single storey ground floor areas. Small additional garden room at ground floor of 14m<sup>2</sup>. All existing and proposed use class to remain as C2 and there will be no change to total bedroom rooms.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission and listed building consent be **GRANTED** subject to conditions as per the recommendation and addendum.

**73. 20/01732/F - 2 PARKHURST ROAD, HORLEY, SURREY**

The Committee considered an application at 2 Parkhurst Road, Horley for the construction of two new dwellings and alteration addition of rear dormer to existing dwelling.

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

**74. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT QUARTER 2 PERFORMANCE**

Members noted the Development Management Quarter 2 2020/21 Performance.

There had been an increase in the number of reported enforcement breaches. This is thought to have been as a result of residents spending more time at home. All potential breaches would continue to be investigated and a temporary member of staff had been employed to assist with the backlog. A member expressed thanks to the enforcement team for their responsiveness and speed to queries raised by him.

There had also been an increase in planning applications during the quarter, a large majority of which had been household extensions or applications for home studios. This was primarily due to the need of residents to create home working space. This was the case across the whole of Surrey.

**75. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

There was none.

The Meeting closed at 10.44 pm