

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 Caterham Ex Service Men's Club at
1.30pm on Friday 24th June 2022**

Present: Cllr H Bilton, Cllr G Duck, Cllr V Robinson

In attendance: Cllr G Dennis (remotely), Mrs H Broughton (Clerk) and 2 members of the public

Cllr H Bilton in the Chair

PL22/1 Election of the Chair and Vice Chair

It was proposed and seconded that Cllr Dennis be appointed Chair and Cllr Bilton Vice Chair for the 2022/23 council year. There being no other nominations they were appointed unopposed.

PL22/2 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence had been received from Cllr C Botten and Mrs D Brent.

PL22/3 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest arising from the agenda.

PL22/4 Approval of minutes

It was agreed that the Chair sign the minutes of the meeting held on 29th April 2022 as a correct record.

PL22/5 Planning comments submitted under delegated action

Comments submitted between meetings, under delegated action were noted (appendix 1)

PL22/6 Public Forum

Residents spoke regarding application 2022/245 – 5 Queens Park Road. They appreciated Parish Council support and requested advice on the ability to argue scale. It was agreed that Cllr Dennis draft a letter to the Chief Planning Officer for TDC requesting clarification.

PL22/7 Recent decisions

The Parish Council had raised an objection to application 2022/91 for a replacement monopole. The application had been withdrawn.

PL22/8 Planning applications

It was agreed to make the following responses to planning applications:

2022/558: 155 Addison Road: Single storey rear extension, loft conversion inc. hip to gable end, rear dormer and front roof lights. *Application is dated 4th May and was approved by TDC on 17th June so no comment to be made.*

2019/1309/Cond1: Foxacre, Town End Close – two 1 bed bungalows (Council's own development). Discharge of details (drainage strategy).

Objection:

Copy: Tor Peebles SCC/LLFA; Caterham FLAG:

Any storm water shed from the site during storms may migrate towards the nearby high-risk area for surface water flooding around Town End roundabout, where residents were severely affected in 2016. That would be contrary to NPPF and therefore a condition was applied to planning permission requiring submission of a design for sustainable drainage (SUDS) to prevent off-site flows.

The specialist report now submitted consists mainly of technical appendices/data sheets with no overall explanation of what the proposed drainage design consists of and which organisation has approved it. This has impeded the Parish Council's ability to review the scheme and comment, as a statutory consultee.

We understand that the solution may involve deep drainage borehole soakaways. These accelerate surface water percolation into the underlying chalk aquifer. If they become widespread in Caterham Hill, the method could affect drinking water supplies and worsen flood risk along Caterham Valley. The Environment Agency has indicated previously that they do not generally support the method. It is therefore essential that they sign off on the SUDS design, but they are not listed on the application as a consultee.

This confused situation is made worse by the other expert flood risk body (SCC/LLFA) taking the view that they have no need to respond because the site is not at risk from rivers or the sea when the material planning issue is of course the well-known surface water flood risk (as clearly shown on gov.uk mapping). There is a lack of local knowledge and joined up thinking here, between those responsible and therefore the Parish Council is seeking clarification on this key topic. Due to the inadequate supporting flood risk information, we do not consider that the condition can be discharged.

It was agreed to ask that Westway District and Ward councillors request a site visit with officers / contractors.

2019/1310/Cond1: Rochester Gardens, Town End – one 3 bed and two 1 bed houses plus two 2 bed flats (Council's own development). Discharge of details (arboricultural survey, drainage strategy).

Objection:

Copy: Tor Peebles SCC/LLFA; Caterham FLAG

The arboricultural report is informative and well presented. It indicates that seven mature trees will be removed and hedging partially removed. It is therefore important that when the soft landscaping details are submitted (under Condition 5) they include specific reference to how mitigation for these losses can achieve a net environmental gain as per government policy. It is unlikely that a net gain can be achieved within the reduced open space area remaining after development. Therefore, the Parish Council will wish to agree compensatory replanting off-site as part of the discharge of details. This could be within the Council's public open spaces where there is an ongoing unmitigated loss of further mature trees due to disease and structural decay. This

solution has already been agreed in principle by officers for the Council's similar scheme at Windmill Close.

In contrast, the specialist drainage report is mainly technical appendices/data sheets with no overall explanation of what the proposed drainage design consists of, and which organisation has approved it. This has impeded the Parish Council's ability to review the scheme and comment, as a statutory consultee.

Any storm water shed from the site during storms may migrate towards the nearby high-risk area for surface water flooding around Town End roundabout, where residents were severely affected in 2016. That would be contrary to NPPF and therefore a condition was applied to planning permission requiring submission of a design for sustainable drainage (SUDS) to prevent off-site flows.

We understand that the solution may involve deep drainage borehole soakaways. These accelerate surface water percolation into the underlying chalk aquifer. If they become widespread in Caterham Hill, the method could affect drinking water supplies and worsen flood risk along Caterham Valley. The Environment Agency has indicated previously that they do not generally support the method. It is therefore essential that they sign off on the design but neither they nor the SCC/LLFA are listed on the application as consultees. There is a lack of local knowledge and joined up thinking here, between those responsible and therefore the Parish Council is seeking clarification on this key topic. Due to the inadequate supporting information, we do not consider that condition 9 can be discharged.

2021/636/Cond1: Auckland Road garages – three 2 storey terraced houses (Council's own development). Discharge of details (drainage strategy and Construction Management Plan).

Objection:

Copy: Tor Peebles LLFA; Caterham FLAG

The drainage report is mainly of a set of technical appendices/data sheets with no clear explanation of what the proposed drainage design consists of, and which organisation has approved it. This has impeded the Parish Council's ability to review the scheme and comment, as a statutory consultee.

The external consultants display a lack of local knowledge that results in serious errors. The NPPF makes clear that flood risk from a development site towards downstream neighbours is just as material for planning as risk to the site, but the consultants seem unaware of that. This site sits above a topographic slope down towards the well-known surface water flow path through Caterham Hill, from Town End to Money Road and Banstead Road. Many properties and families along this route were devastated during the 2016 Caterham Hill floods. That route is also subject to sewer overload and discharge, the drain covers lifting regularly during storms, resulting in sanitary debris in the streets. It is therefore critical that the sustainable drainage design can demonstrate no off-site surface water storm flows into either adjoining streets or the public sewer network.

The medium to high surface water flood risk zone here is clearly shown on gov.uk mapping but the consultants seem unaware of it. Instead they simply state that the area is at low risk from rivers or the sea. At 200m above sea level that is hardly surprising.

The consultants have also used the wrong geology source map, stating that it is free draining chalk. Whilst that is true for the solid geology at depth, the surface water flood problems in Caterham Hill are caused by the surface geology, a substantial capping of impermeable clay with flints. It is not therefore possible to have confidence in the proposed drainage solution. Will proposed re-use of the existing soakaway prove adequate for the additional surface water flow generated by the development? Will the proposed cellular crate storage overflow directly into the foul sewer during storms, thus worsening its existing overload? It is not possible to

say due to the lack of clear explanation of the design and confusion about the underlying geology (no geotechnical site investigation appears to have been undertaken).

Neither the SCC/LLFA nor the Environment Agency are shown as having been consulted, therefore the proposed design has not been signed off. There is a lack of local knowledge and joined up thinking here, between those responsible. The Parish Council is therefore seeking clarification on this key topic. Due to the inadequate supporting flood risk information we do not consider that conditions 5 and 9 can be discharged.

In contrast the Construction Management Logistics Plan from Arkay Building Services is commendably well written and site specific covering all potential effects on the health, safety and welfare of neighbours. The Parish Council therefore has no objection to the discharge of Condition 15, subject to a programme and contact details for the site manager being provided to the Parish Clerk once available.

2021/637/Cond1: Windmill Close garages – two 2 storey and one single storey dwellings (Council's own development). Discharge of details (drainage strategy and Construction Management Plan).

Objection:

Copy: Tor Peebles LLFA; Caterham FLAG

The drainage report consists of mainly of technical appendices/data sheets with no overall explanation of what the proposed drainage design actually consists of and which organisation has approved it. This has impeded the Parish Council's ability to review the scheme and comment, as a statutory consultee.

The external consultants display a lack of local knowledge that results in serious errors. The NPPF makes clear that flood risk from a development site towards downstream neighbours is just as material for planning as risk to the site, but the consultants seem unaware of that. This site sits above a steep topographic slope down towards the well known surface water flow path through Caterham Hill, along Banstead Road and Milton Road. Many properties and families along this route were devastated during the 2016 Caterham Hill floods. That route is also subject to sewer overload and discharge, the drain covers lifting regularly during storms, resulting in sanitary debris in the streets. It is therefore critical that the sustainable drainage design can demonstrate no off-site surface water storm flows into either adjoining streets or the public sewer network.

The medium to high surface water flood risk zone here is clearly shown on gov.uk mapping, but the consultants seem unaware of it. Instead they simply state that the area is at low risk from rivers or the sea. At 200m above sea level that is hardly surprising.

The consultants have also used the wrong geology source map, stating that it is free draining chalk. Whilst that is true for the solid geology at depth, the surface water flood problems in Caterham Hill are caused by the surface geology, a substantial capping of impermeable clay with flints. It is not therefore possible to have confidence in the proposed drainage solution. Will proposed re-use of the existing soakaway prove adequate for the additional surface water flow generated by the development? Will the proposed cellular crate storage overflow directly into the foul sewer during storms, thus worsening its existing overload? It is not possible to say due to a lack of clear explanation of the design and confusion about the underlying geology (no geotechnical site investigation appears to have been undertaken).

There has been no response from SCC/LLFA and the Environment Agency are not shown as having been consulted, therefore the proposed design has not been signed off. There is a lack of local knowledge and joined up thinking here, between those

responsible. The Parish Council is therefore seeking clarification on this key topic. Due to the inadequate supporting flood risk information we do not consider that conditions 8 and 10 can be discharged.

In contrast the Construction Management Logistics Plan from Arkay Building Services is commendably well written and site specific covering all potential effects on the health, safety and welfare of neighbours. The Parish Council therefore has no objection to the discharge of Condition 18, subject to a programme and contact details for the site manager being provided to the Parish Clerk when available. We also draw attention to the need to implement the tree protection measures set out in Condition 6 of planning consent.

2019/1310/Cond2: Rochester Gardens, Town End – one 3 bed and two 1 bed houses plus two 2 bed flats (Council's own development). Discharge of details (land contamination).

Objection:

Copy: Tor Peebles, SCC/LLFA; Caterham FLAG

The Parish Council notes the elevated levels of lead and polyaromatic hydrocarbons in the site investigation and that a remediation strategy of removing c. 450mm depth of made ground and replacing it with clean soil is proposed.

The reason for this condition (6) as set out in the planning consent relates specifically to the sustainable drainage design and ensuring that groundwater is protected from pollution. However the specialist contamination report makes no reference to this - eg is there any risk during storms of mobile contaminants from the made ground entering the proposed deep drainage boreholes into the underlying chalk aquifer, a Groundwater Source Protection Zone? This matter is not addressed in the SUDS and drainage report either (see application 2019/1310/Cond1).

It may not be a problem at all but there is no information. There appears to be a lack of joined up thinking on the project, with each specialist unaware of the others report. Also groundwater protection is a matter on which the Environment Agency should be consulted but they are not listed as having been. Surely they should sign off on the remediation strategy? Due to the inadequate supporting information we do not consider that condition 6 can be discharged.

The proposed ground remediation could also have implications for the existing residents on site especially in hot, dry or windy weather conditions. We assume that it will be undertaken by the construction contractor. The Parish Council will therefore wish to see details of how the health, safety and welfare of adjoining residents will be safeguarded when the contractor's Construction Management Logistics Plan is submitted.

2022/568: 88 Chaldon Road – joint driveway and pavement crossover for nos. 88 and 90

Comment: In Caterham Hill any shedding of storm water onto the highway from paved over front gardens adds to the general flood risk for vulnerable properties elsewhere. We therefore request that consideration is given to using gravel or porous pavements, in addition to underlying soakaways and an Acco strip.

The front gardens here are quite narrow in depth and so one car for each property would be parked parallel to the house and pavement. The vehicle arrangement is not shown on the drawings, so will it allow sufficient space for each car to enter and exit when the other is present?

2022/616: 19 Birch Avenue – loft conversion inc. hip to gable end, rear dormer and front roof lights (PD certificate). *No comment*

2022/583: 1 Money Avenue – change single ground floor entrance to approved flats to create separate front doors serving each flat. *No comment*

2022/634: 66 Eldon Road – single storey side extension. *No comment*

2022/656: 61 Eldon Road – single storey side extension. *No comment*

The meeting closed at 2.26pm

Appendix 1

2022/236: 39 Birch Avenue – single storey porch extension

No comment

2022/429: 101 Whyteleafe Road – single storey side and rear extensions, two storey rear extension, mansard roof extension with dormer windows, basement extension (amended plans, description and arboricultural report)

Request that the District ward councillors to refer the application for consideration by Tandridge Planning Committee.

2022/266: 67 Park Road – single storey side and rear extension, and loft conversion with front and rear roof lights

No comment

2022/402: 136 Banstead Road – vehicle front parking, crossover and dropped kerb

Comment:

This is an area where any shedding of rainwater from hard standing onto the highway adds to the flood risk of vulnerable properties elsewhere. We are therefore pleased to see that the proposed front parking area specifies porous pavements and an underlying soakaway. We hope that the District Council will now ensure that this sensible measure becomes standard practice in areas bordering the main surface water flow path through Caterham Hill.

Surface water flood risk is a material planning consideration in this locality. Therefore, we ask that a planning condition is applied if consent is granted. Banstead Road is a busy, congested through route used by lorries and buses. Therefore, we also ask that the Highway Authority is consulted about the road safety aspects of the proposal e.g. visibility.

2022/589/NH: 37 Essendene Road – single storey rear extension (notification of larger home extension)

No comment

2022/503: 113 Buxton Lane – single storey garage and part rear extension

No comment

2022/635/TPO: 1 Foxon Close – reduce height of mixed species group to create hedge

No comment

2022/497: 69 Ninehams Road – mobile unit (log cabin) in rear garden for ancillary purposes (PD certificate under Caravans Act)

Comment:

This would be a substantial free-standing unit (7.65 x 6.00 m) forming self-contained one-bedroom residential accommodation in the rear garden. Therefore, please ensure by planning condition that its use is restricted to domestic purposes, as extra accommodation ancillary to the host dwelling and its occupants, and that renting out or other commercial use is precluded.

The unit would also be located on the boundary with open Green Belt land forming part of Coulsdon Common, where there is presently open visibility into the garden. Therefore, we also ask that it is screened from view in that direction (by hedging or other planting) so as not to be visually intrusive in a way that may affect public appreciation of the openness of the adjoining Green Belt and National Nature Reserve.

It may be that these objectives could be better secured if this proposal is submitted as a planning application rather than as Permitted Development