

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 being held at the Westway Centre, Chaldon Road at 2.00pm on Friday 15th December 2023

Present: Cllr G Duck (Chair), Cllr G Dennis, Cllr M Grasso,

PL23/68

Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Ms H Broughton (Clerk), Cllr V Robinson, Cllr D Carpenter and Cllr L Sowambur.

PL23/69

Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest arising from the agenda.

PL23/70

Public Forum

Email correspondence from residents, dated 12th December and 15th December was read out and points noted. The larger issue concerns the progress at the site 5, Queens Park Road, application 2020/1504 which is in contravention of the Planning permission granted which stated "There shall be no variations from these approved drawings".

The Parish Council Parish committee will write a formal request to the two Queens Park District Councillors (Cllr V Robinson, Cllr M Groves) to arrange a meeting with the TDC Head of Planning. We request a meeting be arranged prior to the next planning committee meeting (Jan 5th, 2024). If it is not, then the matter will be taken further. Such abuses of the planning system bring the system into disrepute and allow developers to proceed with impunity.

PL23/71

Minutes

Notes to minutes held over to next meeting.

PL23/72

Recent decisions

Recent planning decisions were discussed. It was noted that the Planning Committee's objection to application 2023/1103 was upheld, and the planned back garden development at Macaulay Road was refused.

PL23/73

Planning responses

Informal discussions were held at the previous meeting with the architect of 12 Stanstead Road attended by the neighbours as no 12a Stanstead Road. Responses submitted under delegate action were noted (see appendix A)

2020/1504/NMA1: 5 Queens Park Road – non-material amendment to change timber windows from timber frame to UPVC sliding sash.

Objection: The Parish Planning Committee protest at the continued alterations being made to plans despite TDC stating no further changes should be made to the original plans. Our objections dated October 2023 reflect our dismay that our comments relating to the adherence to the Neighbourhood Plan have been ignored. The number of windows has increased significantly from the original proposal, now the materials are being altered. These constant alterations are not acceptable.

2020/1504/NMA1: 8 Money Avenue – details to discharge Condition 4 (carbon emissions).

No comment

2023/1324: Coombe Dingle, 14 Queens Park Road - single storey rear extension to care home to provide additional 15 rooms.

Objection: This substantial proposal represents an unsustainable overdevelopment of the plot in the following respects:

Flood risk – this is a flood prone critical drainage area; the site being located within a medium to high risk zone for surface water flooding (as shown clearly on government mapping at gov.uk). Any off-site flows during the storms that are becoming more intense with climate change will migrate into this flood pathway, heading northwards out of Queens Park. The footprint area of built form would double. As a result, the proposal takes up the majority of the mature rear garden, presently absorbent green space. Therefore such flows are highly likely and will worsen the risk to vulnerable properties downstream that were flooded in 2016. The Parish Council supports the Lead Local Flood Authority's objection.

Loss of biodiversity and green space – the Parish Council supports the government policy directive that development should create a measurable biodiversity net gain. This would be impossible on site, given the green space lost to the proposed built form. Residents reported the recent felling of large mature trees close to the proposed extension. These are not shown in the arboricultural report, so presumably had already been removed. In addition to aiding flood resilience, mature trees and garden planting are of great value to wildlife. Whilst development should in general be focused to previously developed brownfield land, the Parish Council notes that residential gardens in built up areas are not included in that category. All this amounts to an unavoidable and significant net biodiversity loss under the proposal.

Parking – Queens Park Road suffers from congested on-street parking at peak times. Due to the popularity of the park, the southern side of the street can be taken up entirely with parked cars at weekends. This is presumably when visitors might be present at the care home. Other vehicles for staff, service deliveries and transport may be expected. There are no pavements so the traffic creates difficulties for the adults and children accessing their cars. It is therefore essential that the adopted Tandridge

Parking Standards SPD is followed in such locations but it is not addressed in the applicant's Transport Statement. The Standards indicates that care homes (class C2) should provide 1 parking space per two residents.

The evidence submitted with the application states that there are 36 single rooms with a high rate of occupancy within the present building. Therefore 18 parking spaces are recommended. The proposal for an additional 15 rooms would raise that number to 25. In contrast, the existing site frontage provides just 7 off-street parking spaces. Even on the most optimistic travel projections there is already a significant shortfall. In our view this is a clear indication of overdevelopment.

2023/1333: 5 Windmill Close – two storey side extension, single storey front and rear extensions.

Comment:

Windmill Close and the adjoining frontage of Coulsdon Road already have congested on-street parking, such that two way traffic within the Close is not generally possible. That situation will worsen once the new TDC housing at the end of the Close is occupied. Therefore it is important that off-street parking is provided where possible. The proposal approximately doubles the footprint of the house, including 4/5 bedrooms. The adopted Tandridge Parking Standards indicate that this would normally require the provision of three off-street parking spaces. The existing house has one. Whilst the Standards apply principally to new build homes, they provide a framework for enlargements that should be followed if it is feasible to do so. The proposed front elevation suggests that the side extension would have an integral garage. However, the floor plans indicate that this would be a dummy door with a potential fifth bedroom and en suite behind.

The Parish Council requests that the parking provision is considered, for example by the reinstatement of a garage to create a second parking space. In order to qualify as a parking space, the TDC Standards indicate that the minimum internal garage dimensions should be either 3.0 m x 7.0 m or 3.6 m x 5.5 m. Please clarify whether this can be achieved.

2023/1359: 89 Spencer Road – single storey rear and first floor side extensions. Loft conversion inc. hip to gable extension and rear dormer. Pitched roof to existing garage and porch.

No comment

2023/226/Cond1: Kenley Aerodrome, Officers' Mess – building recording and window details (Listed Building Consent).

No comment

List w/e 03.12.23:

2023/1396: 25 Heath Road – single storey side extension and new garage

Comment:

The simplified plans submitted do not include dimensions or even a scale. It is therefore impossible to check whether the room sizes or garage size comply with

policy requirements. This prevents us, as the planning committee, from submitting comment - or objections. It will also be difficult for officers to check compliance during the building stage. We must register our concerns that such plans are validated by TDC.

2023/1407/TPO: 3 Alders Grove – reduce sycamore.

No comment

2023/1418/TPO: 25 Gwynne Road –crown reduce and thin wild cherry.

No comment

2023/226/Cond2: Kenley Aerodrome Officers’ Mess– details to discharge Condition 3 (demolition and temporary stabilisation). The SCC historic buildings officer has been consulted.

No comment

List w/e 10.12.23:

2023/1360: 4 Cedar Park – single storey side/rear extension, partial garage conversion.

No comment

2023/1377: 35 Town End – 12 solar panels on flat roof of existing attached garage

No comment

2023/1417: 26 Livingstone Road – loft conversion with twin dormers, single storey rear extension, porch and external alterations.

Comment

The simplified plans submitted do not include dimensions, although they do show a scale. However, the general drawing style makes it impossible to check whether the room sizes or garage size comply with policy requirements with any accuracy. This prevents us as the planning committee from submitting comment - or objections. It will also be difficult for officers to check compliance during the building stage. We must register our concerns that such plans are validated by TDC.

The meeting closed at 2.45pm

Delegated planning comments and objections

2019/1310/Cond4: Rochester Gardens, Town End – details to discharge conditions 7 (ground contamination) and 13 (electric vehicle charge sockets). *No comment*

2023/1229: 18 Westway – alterations to first floor flat (loft conversion plus new access from ground level) and enlargement of ground floor studio flat. Creation of additional rear parking. *No comment*

2023/1290/NH: 127 Whyteleafe Road - single storey rear extension
No comment

2023/1299: 15 Macaulay Road – conversion of existing attached garage to habitable (for a kitchen extension)
No comment

2023/1304/NH: 93 Addison Road – single-storey rear extension, c. 4m x 4m footprint. *No comment*

2023/1306: 14 Stanstead Road – replace existing detached house with two pairs of semi-detached.

Caterham on the Hill Parish Council makes the following objection to application 2023/1306: 14 Stanstead Road – replace existing detached house with two pairs of semi-detached.

The previous application (2023/121) was refused on two grounds – overdevelopment adversely affecting character and appearance (in terms of amount, scale and form), and inadequate parking. In the view of the Parish Council, this second application still represents an overcrowded and overdeveloped plot. It also does not conclusively address the issue of inadequate parking.

Character and Appearance – overdevelopment is most apparent in the ground footprint area of the two buildings (including depth, front to rear), bulk and height and the narrow separation distances. The separation between buildings has been increased from 1 m. to 2m. The ground floor's internal footprint per building was 104 sq. m; now it is 102 sq. m., representing little change, so the objection of the TDC planning committee has not been effectively addressed. The height remains the same, reflected in the same roof-storey floor level, for both schemes.

The main alteration is the apparent loss of the fourth bedroom, which has reduced the width of the hipped roofs across the frontage. While the bulk and massing is slightly reduced, the overall impression is still overbearing within the plot. The overall internal footprint (all floors) changes from 248 sq. m per building to 222 sq. m., only a 10% reduction.

Because changes to the amount, scale and form of development are relatively minor, the quality of materials and finishes will be paramount to offsetting an increased density within the street scene. The two near-identical buildings have been differentiated by one being set back and by appearance. The right-hand one has traditional tile hanging and looks quite distinctive. However, the left-hand building (more visually prominent because it is set forward) has a lower quality white render on all elevations. This presents a more dominant appearance (see proposed 3D visuals 1, 2 and 3 in the DAS), thus increasing the visual effect of bulk in the development which is already a problem due to the size. These details should be added to the appropriate numbered drawing.

Parking - By reducing the perceived number of bedrooms, TDC parking standards can now apparently be met in terms of numbers (8 allocated spaces + 1 unallocated). However, two of the spaces are garages. The garages that 'fit' the buildings do not comply with TDC sizing, and will not fit most modern cars. However, were the garages to comply with TDC sizing, they will necessarily dominate the space available with the consequence that there will not be sufficient room for pathways, door openings, or even the second car. TDC Parking SPD 2012 sets a minimum garage size if it is to count towards the parking space quota. The proposed garages do not meet this standard. The drawings are not dimensioned but the proposed floor plan (22-240-PO58) gives the garage internal size as 14.5 sq. m. This is larger than the outdoor spaces (2.4 x 4.8 m. = 11.5 sq. m.) but smaller than the required TDC minimum garage size (7.0 x 3.0 m internal = 21 sq. m, or 5.5 x 3.6 m = 19.8 sq. m).

The possibility also exists that whatever the size, the garages may be converted to storage or an extra bedroom, leading to the second car being parked on the street. This will increase the parking nuisance on the already overcrowded Stanstead Road. We also note that an additional room designated as a 'study' has been introduced on the ground floor. Building and contents insurers will consider this to be a bedroom, thereby making the property a four-bedroom dwelling, with the garage a potential fifth bedroom. Using the garage for other than parking a car and/or using the 'study' as a bedroom, both of which are not only possible but likely, means that the parking places designated for the application are inadequate and do not meet TDC requirements.

Flood risk – the extensive front hard-standing area slopes down towards the street. In order to ensure no storm water run-off onto the highway (worsening local surface water flood risk) it will be important to specify porous pavements, with underlying channelling to the soakaway currently shown on the drainage strategy drawing. An Acco strip along the rear pavement edge will not be adequate. This detail should be added to the appropriate numbered drawing.

2023/1320/NH: 25 Annes Walk – single storey rear extension *No comment*

2015/1746/Cond1: Officers Mess, RAF Kenley – details to discharge conditions 9 (remediation strategy, 27 (Written Scheme of Investigation) and 29 (bat survey)).

Comment:

The Parish Council is satisfied with the geotechnical report and bat survey. Regarding condition 27, the archaeology Written Scheme of Investigation has been reviewed by a Member of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists on our behalf. The Parish Council comments as follows:

The character of Caterham has been shaped by our role as a garrison and military town from the 19th century. It includes an important role in the history of military aviation. RAF Kenley is a key part of public appreciation of that heritage. Collectively the Conservation Area with its listed buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and many undesignated military assets is of national significance. It is one of the best surviving historic airfields nationally, was operational during both World Wars and played a pivotal role in the Battle of Britain. The Parish Council seeks to ensure that our cultural heritage is recognised, conserved and enhanced within the development process.

A range of undesignated military assets may be present within the site (above and below ground) such as boundary markers, air raid shelters and disused structures. It may therefore be appropriate to future management of the site to augment the trial trenches with a walkover survey and localised geophysical prospecting. There may be an opportunity to include an element of community archaeology. The Inspector of Ancient Monuments at Historic England has previously organised such participation in conjunction with the Lottery funded Kenley Revival Project. It is based within the site (at the Portcullis Club) and aims to preserve and protect the most intact fighter airfield of WW2.

Therefore 20th century military remains are a principal research objective. Any buried heritage assets may include brick and concrete structures at relatively shallow depth. On other sites these might be removed as modern clearance. Here, care should be taken to establish the extent and function of any such remains. If military structures are identified, it may be appropriate to leave them in situ at the field evaluation stage.

RAF Kenley was attacked many times during WW2 including the Officers Mess. Therefore under section 4.6 of the WSI (Access and Safety) it may be prudent to ensure a risk assessment for the possibility of live ordnance. Remedial measures might include metal detector scans of the evaluation areas before and during excavation.

Condition 27 indicates that no development shall commence until the developer has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with an approved Written Scheme of Investigation. The District Council should consult the SCC archaeological planning advisory service regarding approval. This WSI defines the initial fieldwork phase of that programme (evaluation trial trenches). As it makes clear, there might be a need for further archaeological investigation and reporting (mitigation) depending on the evaluation findings.”

2020/1504/Cond1: 5 Queens Park Road – details to discharge conditions 6 (electric vehicle charging) and 7 (cycle storage).

Objection:

Copy to District Councillors, LLFA and Caterham Flood Action Group

It is inappropriate to discharge these matters of detail whilst the developer remains fundamentally in breach of Condition 4. Surface water flood risk is well recognised in Queens Park Road and to properties further downstream along the main flow path northwards from Queens Park. The Lead Local Flood Authority is currently designing flood alleviation works to reduce outflows from the park. These efforts will be undermined if developers in the area do not play their part.

Accordingly, planning consent requires approval of a detailed sustainable drainage design prior to commencement of development. This will require consultation by TDC with the LLFA and possibly the Environment Agency (if deep drainage borehole soakaways into the chalk aquifer are proposed). The first phase of development (demolition) has been completed with no information forthcoming. Despite being advised of this the District Council has not taken enforcement action.

2022/245/Cond1: 5 Queens Park Road – details to discharge condition 4 (soft landscaping).

Objection:

Copy to District Councillors, LLFA and Caterham Flood Action Group

The Garden Installation Management Plan (section 4) is not to the normal professional standard for care of new trees until they are established. January to June 2022 saw the lowest rainfall in 50 years. During that drought period, new trees planted by the Parish Council required watering twice a week. Our normal annual maintenance schedule averages weekly watering (May to September inc.) for the first 2 years for Standard and Heavy Standard plantings.

Whilst the inclusion in the landscaping plan of Extra Heavy Standards is welcome, larger trees would require additional watering. The Management Plan allows for only 1 year and does not specify frequency. These details are crucial to the survival of new trees. The Arboricultural Association recommends summer watering of 50 L per tree per week for the first 3 years. The Management Plan also needs to include a commitment for like for like replacement if these recommendations are not followed and the trees perish as a result. The TDC Tree Officer should be consulted about discharge of this condition.

It is also inappropriate to discharge such matters of detail whilst the developer remains fundamentally in breach of Condition 4 of the original Outline consent (2020/1504). Because of local surface water flood risk, this requires approval of a detailed sustainable drainage design before development commences. The first phase of development (demolition) has been completed with no information forthcoming. Despite being advised of this the District Council has not taken enforcement action.

2023/1294: 26 Dunedin Drive – first floor extension over garage. Side extension with stairs to new lower ground level playroom. Landscaping alterations.

2023/878: Kenley Aerodrome, Victor Beamish Avenue

Objection:

A Member of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists has reviewed the recently submitted Archaeology Desk-based Assessment on our behalf. The Parish Council comments as follows: The character of Caterham has been shaped by our role as a garrison and military town for the army and air force from the 19th century. It includes an important role in the history of military aviation. RAF Kenley is a key part of public appreciation of that heritage. Collectively the Conservation Area with its listed buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and many undesignated military assets is of national significance. It is one of the best surviving historic airfields nationally, was operational during both World Wars and played a pivotal role in the Battle of Britain.

The Parish Council seeks to ensure that our cultural heritage is recognised, conserved and enhanced within the development process. There is clear evidence from maps and aerial photographs that a range of undesignated 20th century military assets are likely to be survive within the site, above and below ground. They may include boundary markers, air raid shelters and disused workshops. A possible fighter aircraft crash site has also been identified. Collectively, these undesignated assets contribute to the overall national significance of the airfield.

Therefore we do not understand the report conclusion that the archaeological potential of the site is negligible. It appears to be based on a view that 20th century military remains, rather than being significant archaeologically are modern obstructions that have probably truncated anything earlier in date. Instead the Parish Council regards them as a principal research objective.

The process for identifying, ranking and mitigating any potential archaeological impact of development is well established. It is set out in the standards and guidance of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. The Parish Council is recommending an archaeological field evaluation that should include walkover and geophysical survey to inform selective trial trenches (if required). Given that the applicant is a school, there may be an opportunity for an element of community archaeology. It has previously been organised via the Inspector of Ancient Monuments at Historic England under the Lottery funded Kenley Revival Project. This aims to preserve and protect the most intact fighter airfield of WW2.

We draw the District Council's attention to our previous comments about the need for a joined-up strategic approach to conserving and enhancing the Conservation Area, rather than piecemeal fragmented planning applications. This is a case in point. The history and archaeology of this site and the adjoining Officers Mess development are a single contiguous whole. A Written Scheme of Investigation for an archaeological field evaluation has already been submitted for the latter (application 2015/1746/Cond1). The District Council should consult the SCC archaeological planning advisory service for guidance.

Our comments concerning archaeology are without prejudice to the Parish Council's previous statutory submission. We do not believe that the principle of development has been established. Under an Outline application for access only, matters of technical detail such as this report are premature. The Parish Council seeks in particular to understand what the Very Special Circumstances justifying an otherwise inappropriate development in the Green Belt are. That includes the effect on the openness of the Green Belt (NPPF 2023 paras 148 and 149). We would welcome a dialogue with the applicant and draw the District Council's attention to para 132 of NPPF 2023 in that regard.

