

BOROUGH OF REIGATE AND BANSTEAD

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held remotely on 17 March 2021 at 7.30 pm.

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

Also present: Councillor Harrison .

113. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 17 February 2021 be approved as a correct record.

114. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

115. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Walsh declared a pecuniary interest on item 5, 16 Downs Wood, Epsom Downs, as this was an application belonging to his client. Councillor Walsh was not present at the meeting for the duration of the item.

116. ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA

RESOLVED that the addendum be noted.

117. 20/01369/F - 16 DOWNS WOOD AND REAR OF 37, 39, 41, 43, 45 & 47 YEW TREE BOTTOM ROAD, EPSOM DOWNS, EPSOM, SURREY

The Committee considered an application at 16 Downs Wood and Rear Of 37, 39, 41, 43, 45 & 47 Yew Tree Bottom Road, Epsom Downs, Epsom for the demolition of 16 Downs Wood and the erection of 8 dwellings on land to the rear, with associated landscaping and car parking. As amended on 14/10/2020.

Alex Mosely spoke in objection to the application on behalf his clients at 4 Kenmore Close and 35 Yew Tree Bottom Road. The L shaped development showed that there would be rear facing windows from 4 properties directly into habitable side windows of 4 Kenmore Close. The properties would overlook the garden and the distance from these homes to the shared boundary was 12 metres. The plans did not address the issues of privacy and overlooking, and the layout was not a typical back land development. This could be improved if all the properties were positioned in the same direction.

In respect of the residents of 35 Yew Tree Bottom Road, plot 8 would detract from the enjoyment of their property and plans were inaccurate as they did not show his client's summerhouse. There would be an unacceptable loss of light and sunlight, particularly in peak summertime and the applicant had not prepared a daylight and sunlight assessment. There would be an infringement of privacy from rear facing

windows. The applicant had not considered the Planning Inspector's concerns around character and he urged the Committee to refuse the application.

Sarah Farrar spoke in objection to the application, stating that there had been more than 200 objections submitted against the application, a significantly larger number than the applications in 2016 and 2019 received. It was felt that the application had been rushed through with a total of 6 amendments since July 2020. The proposal did not provide affordable homes and there was no shortage of luxury homes in the area. The application was an overdevelopment, was not in keeping with the surrounding area and affected privacy. There would be a loss of trees with TPOs and the development would cause harm to wildlife. There was not enough room for bins in the designated refuse area and the volume of bins would create issues with odour. The bin lorry would also cause congestion. The development would be at the detriment of local residents.

Peter Rutter, the Architect for the development, spoke in support of the application stating the Planning Inspector's concerns and reasons for refusal the previous year had been considered. The application had been developed in consultation with Planning Officers and comments from neighbouring properties had been taken into account. The properties would be of red brick construction with catslide rooves. The properties were generously separated and were well landscaped. Objections from 3 Kenmore Close and 35 Yew Tree Bottom Road had been addressed. Refuse had been considered with Refuse Officers. If refuse became an issue, a commercial collection of bins could be arranged.

Councillor Harrison, a visiting Member for the ward, spoke on the application, noting that this was the 3rd application on the site in 5 years. The Planning Inspector rejected the previous scheme on 3 counts, some of which had been addressed, however this application was the same size as the application in 2016 and that had been dismissed. The proposal was an overdevelopment. Plot 8 would have a significant impact on 35 Yew Tree Bottom Road. Road access on Downs Wood was narrow and parking would be difficult, as would access. Page 12 of the report highlighted the Planning Inspector's concerns regarding bin collection.

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

1. The proposed development by virtue of the bulk, scale and massing of the dwellings, dominance of hard surfaces and parking areas to the front of the houses, together with the bin collection point on the access road, would appear cramped, overly dense, car dominated and out of character with the pattern of development in the locality, contrary to policies DES1 and DES2 of the Development Management Plan 2019 and the Reigate and Banstead Local Distinctiveness Design Guide SPD.
2. The proposed development by virtue of the mass of the flank wall of plot 8 and its proximity to the boundary, would have an overbearing impact on the southern end of the rear garden of 35 Yew Tree Bottom Road and would overshadow the existing summerhouse during late afternoon hours, harmful to the residential amenities of this dwelling contrary to policies DES1 and DES2 of the Development Management Plan 2019.

3. The proposed development, by virtue of the location of the refuse and recycling presentation point, would result a harmful impact upon the residential amenities of 14 and 18 Downs Wood by way of noise and disturbance. The proposal is thereby contrary to policies DES1 and DES2 of the Development Management Plan 2019.

118. 20/01430/F - REDHILL AERODROME, KINGS MILL LANE, REDHILL, SURREY

The Committee considered an application at Redhill Aerodrome, Kings Mill Lane, Redhill, for the retention of widened hard standing on Taxiway C/D, 14m width across the entire 490m stretch. As amended on 11/02/2021.

Wayne Clark, Chairman of Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application stating that the application was materially worse for residents than the application refused in 2017. This application proposed a substantial number of flights over homes that were previously unaffected. Noise nuisance should be minimised to an appropriate level. There had been unrestricted use of the unofficial runway (taxiway), however the number of flights from this runway should be capped at 45 per day and this would suit year-round business continuity. If the application was approved, the Parish Council requested a condition on the daily average rolling figure of 45 movements per day.

David Brown, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application, stating that he had no previous issues with the aerodrome until the taxiway redevelopment. Flights now flew over new properties and in closer proximity to others. 70% of aircraft departed from the taxiway. The noise and disturbance were monotonous, and this had been raised with the aerodrome. The taxiway was essentially a runway in winter. This application was similar to the application in 2017 and that was refused, in part to the detrimental effect on the community due to the loss of winter respite. The report showed an increase to the allowance of movements from 45 to 85 per day and this was an 88% increase. Members were asked to recognise the increase in noise disturbance already being experienced from the development and consider a cap in the number of movements in line with that proposed in 2017.

Michael Wood, a Planning Consultant for the Aerodrome, spoke in support of the application. He thanked the Enforcement and Development Management Teams at the Council for the positive attitude and time in order to resolve the matter of the taxiway. All had worked hard to arrive at a workable situation, with restrictions in place that were previously not a requirement. These would not assist the long-term viability of the Aerodrome, however the Aerodrome would make these work. There was open invitation to all, to visit the Aerodrome and an overview of the Consultative Committee was given. Minutes of these meetings were available on the Aerodrome's website.

A motion to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor McKenna and seconded by Councillor Whinney whereupon the Committee voted and the motion was not carried.

RESOLVED that, subject to completion of a Section 106 legal agreement, planning permission be **GRANTED** with conditions, as per the recommendation and addendum.

119. 20/02824/F - LITTLE THORNS, LONDON ROAD, REDHILL, SURREY, RH1 2JU

The Committee considered an application at Little Thorns, London Road, Redhill, for the Demolition of a detached house and garage and construction of three terraced houses with associated parking and landscaping. As amended on 16/02/2021.

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

120. 20/00315/F - 34 BRIGHTON ROAD, BANSTEAD, SURREY, SM7 1BS

The Committee considered an application at 34 Brighton Road, Banstead for the demolition of existing surgery with the erection of 4 x 4 bedroom 3 storey houses. As amended on 20/04/2020, 05/02/2021, 10/02/2021 and on 15/02/2021.

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

1. The proposed development would be located in an area of low accessibility and would provide insufficient off street parking to meet the parking standards as set out in Annex 4 of the Development Management plan 2019 This would result in additional pressures for on street parking in the local area to the detriment of the amenities of existing residents, 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 Development Management Plan 2019.

In view of the time, the Committee **RESOLVED** to consider item 9 of the agenda only. The meeting was adjourned at 10.14PM and resumed at 10.17PM.

121. 20/01846/F - BENTING MEAD, LONESOME LANE, REIGATE, SURREY, RH2 7QT

The Committee considered an at application at Benting Mead, Lonesome Lane, Reigate, for the removal of existing industrial and stable buildings, construction of 3 detached dwellings. As amended on 13/10/2020, 26/10/2020, 11/12/2020 and on 11/02/2021.

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

122. 20/02581/F - 94 BRIGHTON ROAD, HORLEY

This item was **DEFERRED** to next meeting due to lack of time.

123. 20/02840/HHOLD - 9 GARDEN CLOSE, BANSTEAD, SM7 2QB

This item was **DEFERRED** to next meeting due to lack of time.

124. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There was none.

The Meeting closed at 10.35 pm