

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 3 November 2021 at 7.30 pm.

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

Also present: Councillor Sachdeva .

40. MINUTES

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on 29 September 2021 be approved as a correct record.

41. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Michalowski and Walsh, Councillors Hudson and Absalom attended at their respective substitutes.

42. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

43. ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA

RESOLVED that the addendum be noted.

44. 21/00823/F - 85, 87 AND 89, BRIGHTON ROAD, REDHILL

The Committee considered an application at 85, 87 and 89, Brighton Road, Redhill for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of an apartment building comprising 19 flats with commercial use at ground floor plus associated car parking.

Jeremy Woolley, a member of the public, spoke in objection to the application stating he lived in a property to the south of the site. The report stated that the element facing the cottages was only 2 storeys tall and thus there would be no adverse impact. However, the main view from the living spaces was of the 4-storey part of the plans, resulting in a significant loss of outlook and daylight compared to the existing building. There would be loss of privacy as the main living spaces would be overlooked by 8 balconies and 6 windows across 8 different flats. It was felt that there had been a lack of consultation and public notice of the proposals. The site should be improved however the Committee was urged to consider whether this development was appropriate.

Phillip Russell, the agent, spoke in support of the application, explaining that work had been carried out with officers on the scheme for 3 years, having listened to objections. Much had been done to address the issues of overlooking and the development was in accordance with Planning Policy. There was a duty to maximise potential of all sites, particularly brownfield town centre sites, to protect the greenfield and greenbelt sites and to meet the demand for housing. The

proposal struck a good balance of maximising the site which would give a mix of high quality private and affordable homes and contributing towards the rejuvenation of the local area. Particular aspects of this scheme were that it was compliant with the policy requirements for Affordable Housing and residential parking spaces; the dwellings per hectare were greater than two recently adjacent approved flatted schemes; and the existing premises were in a dilapidated state.

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

1. The proposal, by reason of the significant height, width, depth of the proposed building, which extends across the entire width and depth of the site and sits above the neighbouring buildings, the bulky roof design, and the unsympathetic design which fails to reflect the form and character of the neighbouring buildings, would be 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 its height, depth, bulk, massing and proximity to the dwellings located to the west (Cleveland Cottage and 99A Garlands Road) and north (1-3 Stile Cottages) would appear as a dominant and overbearing structure when viewed from these neighbouring properties as well as result in overlooking and loss of privacy to these dwellings. The proposal would therefore adversely impact the residential amenities of their occupants contrary to policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019.

45. 20/01791/F - 40 HOLMETHORPE AVENUE, REDHILL

The Committee considered an application at 40 Holmethorpe Avenue, Redhill, for the demolition of existing office, new build of 3-storey office building with car parking at ground level with external landscaping. As amended on 12/02/2021 and on 10/08/2021.

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

46. 21/00679/OUT - SUBUD HALL, ALLINGHAM ROAD, REIGATE

The Committee considered an outline application at Subud Hall, Allingham Road, Reigate, for the use of the site for two residential dwellings.

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

1. The proposed loss of the existing community facility would result in a shortfall of such facilities in the local area which, without sufficient marketing evidence to demonstrate that its continued community use is unviable, would be contrary to Policy CS12 of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Council Core

Strategy 2014 and Policy INF2 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019.

47. 21/ 00525/RET - BATTLEBRIDGE SPORTS GROUND, BATTLEBRIDGE LANE, MERSTHAM

The Committee considered an application at Battlebridge Sports Ground, Battlebridge Lane, Merstham for retrospective consent for the installation of a container for storage on land associated to Battlebridge Athletics Track, Battlebridge Lane. Container previously granted temporary consent in 2015.

RESOLVED that retrospective planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions and as per addendum changes.

48. 21/02358/HHOLD - 31 ASHDOWN ROAD, REIGATE

The Committee considered an application at 31 Ashdown Road, Reigate for a two storey and single storey extensions.

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

49. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT QUARTER 2 - 2021-22 PERFORMANCE

The Head of Planning explained that the number of applications received and determined had been the focus of the previous quarterly report as these had been at record levels. There were concerns regarding sustainability, however it was stated that the number of applications had reduced to a more manageable level and if levels remained the same as in quarter 2 concerns over sustainability within the Planning Team could be allayed.

There had been 344 house holder applications in quarter 2, this did not include lawful development applications. A large number of applications had been determined and currently there was no backlog. Overall, performance within the department had held up well in quarter 2 and this was explained. It was noted that it was currently taking 3.3 days to register an application and the Committee concurred this was exceptional.

One major appeal had been dismissed in quarter 2 and all major appeals had been dismissed in the last 4 quarters. For non-major appeals the department was on target for this year.

In terms of enforcement, there had been a large number of potential breaches reported. The Enforcement Team had been temporarily reduced from 4 members of staff to 3, however once the Team was back to full capacity this would ease the pressure.

The Planning Team was thanked for their continuing work.

50. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There was none.

51. EXEMPT BUSINESS

RESOLVED that members of the Press and public be excluded from the meeting for part of agenda item 13 (Confidential address in Redhill) under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that:

- i. it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 6a) and 6b) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act;
- ii. 1. Information relating to any individual.
- iii. 6. Information which reveals that the authority proposes –
 - (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person: or
 - (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment.

52. CONFIDENTIAL ADDRESS IN REDHILL

RESOLVED that the Committee considered the information in the exempt report.

The Meeting closed at 10.10 pm