

Helen Broughton Clerk to the Council
65 Court Road
Caterham Surrey CR3 5RH

Tel: 01883 708310

Email: clerk@caterhamhillparishcouncil.co.uk

Website: www.caterhamhillparishcouncil.co.uk



**Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee
held at the Westway Centre, Chaldon Road at
2.00 pm on Friday 21st July 2023**

Present: Cllr G Duck, Cllr G Dennis, Cllr D Carpenter, Cllr M Grasso.
Minutes taken by Cllr M Grasso

In attendance: None

PL23/13 Apologies for absence
None received.

PL23/14 Declarations of interest
There were no declarations of interest arising from the agenda.

PL23/15 Public Forum
There were no members of the public.

PL23/16 Minutes
To be circulated and signed at the next planning meeting, 11th August.

PL23/17 Recent decisions
To note recent decisions.
2023/197. Cllr Carpenter explained that planning permission is not required for a drop-down kerb. It is only needed if the front garden is being changed to a parking area ie change of use. This is set out under Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980.

PL23/18 Planning applications

2023/550: 1 Garland Way – vehicle crossover. *No comment.*

2021/33/Cond3: 170 Whyteleafe Road – details to discharge condition 9 (vehicular access). Despite having been validated on 28th June, no supporting documents are available on the TDC website. The Clerk would contact the District Council regarding the lack of plans on the website and request an extension of the deadline. It was considered that this access may require a bell-mouth entrance under Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980.

2023/270: Flat 2, 109 Eldon Road – garden shed (3.6 m x 2.4 m x 2.4 m max. height).
No comment.

2023/538: 102 Ninehams Road – replace detached garage with 4 bedroom detached house inc. widened crossover and additional hard standing.

Objection:

This is a challenging site and the Parish Council is concerned that important planning considerations have not been addressed:

Scale and massing – the host property sits at a higher level than the properties to the rear, on Campbell Road. Adding a substantial three storey dwelling in the garden would result in an over-dominant built form (approximately a roof- storey higher than the Campbell Road houses). Although the minimum 14 m separation distance can be achieved, there would still be an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours. Opening up by removing the garden trees makes this worse. The applicant states that the remaining tall boundary hedge would provide sufficient screening but these are deciduous sycamores, so the effect would be absent for about half the year. They have in any case been previously cut down by coppicing and there is nothing to prevent this happening again.

Traffic - the site is on a steep bend with limited visibility, adjoining the junction with Milton Road. We note the neighbour comments about accidents that have happened here. It is therefore important that the Highway Authority carries out a proper road safety assessment before the proposal proceeds further.

Flooding – The applicant makes the elementary mistake of quoting low flood risk (Zone 1 = rivers and the sea) whereas Caterham Hill is well recognised for surface water flash flooding during the storm events that are becoming more common with climate change. The main medium to high-risk flow path proceeds north from Banstead Road and Milton Road to Stites Hill Road and Coulsdon Common and is clearly shown on government surface water mapping. Many lives and properties along this route were badly affected by flooding in 2016. The site sits adjacent to and above it. Due to the topography, any excess storm water flowing off site (due to the increased built form and hard standing) would migrate down-slope towards adjacent properties on Campbell Road, Milton Road and Stites Hill Road.

As a result of not recognising this risk, the applicant proposes merely to connect the waste and storm water from an additional 8 person dwelling into existing drains on site (plus a water butt for the roof).

Instead, a sustainable drainage design is essential. It should demonstrate that the predicted volume of water generated during storms can be absorbed on site without threatening neighbouring properties or further overloading the local drainage system. This matter is too important locally to be left as an afterthought via planning condition. If it subsequently proved not feasible to achieve such a design, it would be too late. The environmental impact could not be mitigated. Due to the level of risk, the LLFA must be asked to comment on the proposed drainage strategy.

Parking – surrounding streets suffer badly from congested on-street parking. It is therefore essential that the adopted TDC parking standards are adhered to. The host and proposed dwelling are each 4 bedroom, requiring a total of 6 off-site parking spaces (3 each). Given the road safety aspects, the proposal also needs to show adequate turning space so that vehicles can exit in forward gear. However the drawings show only 3 parking spaces are provided (1 for the host and 2 for the proposal). This is wholly inadequate.

Biodiversity net loss – there were previously two substantial oak trees within the proposal area. The recently cut stumps can be seen in the site photographs accompanying the application. The adjoining neighbour states that the mature garden tree cover was used regularly by nesting birds including protected red kites. There has already been a significant habitat and biodiversity loss and the proposed clearance of further trees would worsen it. This is contrary to government policy that development should be able to demonstrate a measurable net gain. So little green space would remain on the site that the meagre replanting suggested could never offset the loss of substantial trees, mature oaks being the most biodiverse tree species in Britain.

Policy DP7 indicates that where existing trees are felled prior to permission for development being sought, the Council may require replacement planting. Both the Environment Act (2021) and NPPF (2021 – para 179 b) make provision for biodiversity net gain to be incorporated into planning permissions. NPPF (180 a) indicates that planning permission should be refused if significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided or mitigated. The only possible mitigation in this case would be biodiversity offset, where the applicants funds suitable net gain restoration elsewhere, such as at one of our public open spaces.

Conclusion – taken together, these material planning considerations demonstrate an unacceptable overdevelopment of the plot. The proposal should be reduced significantly in scale, preferably to a bungalow for which there is demand locally (eg allowing older residents to downsize, freeing up much needed family homes)."

2023/750: 37 Auckland Road (semi-detached bungalow) - single storey side and rear extension, plus loft conversion inc. hip to gable end, rear dormers and front roof lights.

No comment.

2023/780/NH: 1 Campbell Road - single storey rear extension. *No comment.*

2023/818/TPO: 10 Foxon Close – 4 x sycamore, reduce back to previous points and reshape. *No comment.*

List w/e 16.07.23:

2023/722: 2 St Michaels Road – two storey side and rear extension and ground floor rear extension.

A previous application (2022/886) was refused for overbearing scale, form and bulk; effect on amenity of neighbours and inadequate parking. The applicant has amended the scheme, reducing to 3 beds (ie 2 parking spaces instead of 3) and reducing depth of

single storey rear extension from 8.6 m to 4.0 m. TDC now consider the proposal acceptable. No comment.

AOB: Cllr Duck led the discussion on the time the planning meeting is currently held (2.00 pm). This follows from concerns regarding forming a quorum, particularly since Cllr Botten and Cllr Bilton are both on the TDC Planning committee and therefore unavailable.

The decision was taken to maintain the meetings as advertised, ie 2.00 pm; however, the committee can review this should future circumstances dictate it.

Meeting terminated at 14.35.