



(INCORPORATING VALLEY AND HARESTONE WARDS)

Minutes of the meeting of Caterham Valley Parish Council Planning Committee held at Caterham Valley Library, Stafford Road, Caterham CR3 6JG, on Wednesday 31st May 2023 at 6:30pm

Cllr Jeremy Webster - Chairman  
Cllr Alun Jones  
Cllr Victor Emmanuel  
District Cllr Jenny Gaffney - co-opted member  
Mrs Deborah Brent - co-opted member  
Mr Peter Brent - co-opted member  
Mr Neil Farrance - co-opted member

Mrs M Gibbins - Clerk & RFO

---

## MINUTES

1. **Apologies for absence:**  
Cllr Annette Evans.
2. **Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest:** *To receive any disclosure by members of personal pecuniary interests in matters on the agenda, the nature of any interests, and whether the member regards the interest to be prejudicial under the terms of the new Code of Conduct. Anyone with a prejudicial interest must, unless an exception applies, or a dispensation has been issued, withdraw from the meeting.* There were none declared.
3. **Public session:** There were 4 members of the public in attendance in respect of application TA/2023/422. The chairman thanked the residents for attending and for their comments. With the agreement of the committee members application TA/2023/422 was brought to the beginning of the agenda.
4. **To consider and make comment on the following Planning Applications:**
  - 4.1 TA/2023/389  
Erection of conservatory to the rear of the property.  
43 Harestone Valley Road, Caterham CR3 6HN *Case Officer: Cindy Blythe*  
**Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers**
  - 4.2 TA/2023/505  
Removal of Condition 8 and 9 (General Permitted Development) of planning permission ref: 2022/927 (Demolition of existing dwelling. Erection of a replacement dwelling and associated works).  
Harestone Heights, 16 Woodland Way, Caterham CR3 6ER *Case Officer: Hannah Middleton*  
**Comment: The Parish Councillors object to this application and consider the Conditions should remain in place as the property is in the Green Belt and the applicant should apply for planning permission to ensure they meet the requirements of the relevant TDC policies. It is in the candidate area for the change in the AONB.**

#### 4.3 TA/2022/1597

Erection of new building containing 4 x 2 bed and 5 x 1 bed flats together with associated parking. (Additional information and following plans submitted 05.05.23 (Drainage details, Flood Risk Assessment, SuDS design + strategy and long section drawing).

Clearway Court, 139 Croydon Road, Caterham CR3 6PF

*Case Officer: Cindy Blythe*

**Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers**

#### 4.4 TA/2023/405

Erection of a two-and-a-half-storey detached property with a lower ground floor, new vehicle access to Colburn Avenue, associated parking and landscaping.

14a Harestone Hill, Caterham CR3 6SX

*Case Officer: Tracey Williams*

**Comment: The Parish Councillors object to this application for the following reasons:**

- **DP8: Residential Garden Land Development**

This is a back garden development and the proposal is contrary to DP8 in that it is inappropriate to the surrounding area in terms of land use, size and scale. It does not maintain or enhance the character and appearance of the area, reflecting the variety of local dwelling types. It is the inappropriate sub-division of existing curtilages to a size below that prevailing in the area. It does not present a frontage in keeping with the existing street scene or the prevailing layout of streets in the area.

- **DP7: General Policy for New Development**

This proposal does not integrate effectively with its surroundings, reinforcing local distinctiveness and landscape character. It does not respect and contribute to the distinctive character, appearance and amenity of the area in which it is located. The built form is not in keeping with the prevailing landscape/streetscape and it results in overdevelopment or unacceptable intensification by reason of scale, form, bulk, height, spacing, density and design. The proposal harms the amenity of neighbouring properties and harms the amenities and privacy of occupiers of neighbouring properties (including their private amenity space) by reason of overlooking and its overshadowing/overbearing effect.

The proposal does not provide appropriate facilities in terms of amenity to match the neighbouring properties, which is also contrary to the Harestone Design Guide.

There is concern that the landscaping is not sufficient to adhere to the Harestone Design Guide as the proposed gardens for the current and proposed property will be very small.

There is a concern that construction works will damage the existing hedge between number 21 Colburn Avenue and the proposed property.

- **Policy CSP 18 Character and Design**

This Policy states that 'design must reflect and respect the character, setting and local context, including those features that contribute to local distinctiveness. Development must also have regard to the topography of the site, important trees or groups of trees and other important features that need to be retained. Development must not significantly harm the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of overlooking, overshadowing, visual intrusion, noise, traffic and any other adverse effect.

This proposal will significantly harm the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of overlooking, overshadowing and visual intrusion.

There is a concern that the construction will cause issues with the boundary wall to number 21 Colburn Avenue.

The Harestone Design Guide states the following:

- **Design Principle L 2:**

Buildings must provide high levels of visual privacy in relation to the character of Harestone Valley and not unduly impact on the amenity of neighbours.

- **Design Principle L 3:**  
The fronts of buildings must relate to other fronts, across roads or other forms of public realm. Backs of dwellings should relate to other backs to create a more private zone.
- **Design Principle L 4:**  
Forms of development must respect their location, the size of the site and the character of the area.
- **Design Principle RT 1:**  
Development must be integrated into the existing topography and bear a positive relationship to the road and the surrounding development. The use of retaining walls should be avoided.

#### **Car parking:**

- There is a concern about the access to the parking spaces as the front garden space is small in comparison to neighbouring properties. There is no space to manoeuvre.
- Design Principle SS 2 of the Harestone Design Guide states that 'Parking should be designed to integrate into the development and be visually unimposing. An appropriate number of spaces should be provided on plot, the parking spaces should be convenient and easy to use so that there is no need for residents to park on the road. Parking and access should not adversely affect the amenities of existing and new residents.'
- A four-bedroom house should have a minimum of 3 parking spaces as per TDC Parking Standards 2012.

#### **SUDS**

- On 22<sup>nd</sup> May, Surrey County Council said they had reviewed the water drainage strategy and that the applicant has not considered the surface water floor risk to and from the site and has not suggested appropriate mitigation measures to inform the planning application. They have suggested the following condition should permission be granted:
- 'The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. The design must satisfy the SuDs Hierarchy and be compliant with the NPPF and the accompanying PPG'.

The Parish Council understands that local residents have serious concerns about this development and also understands the developer met with residents but this was limited to 2 people who we now understand have objections to this development.

#### **4.5 TA/2023/422**

Addition of 2 storeys of residential accommodation to existing residential and commercial building to provide 7 additional flats.

Avante, 71 Croydon Road, Caterham CR3 6EX

*Case Officer: Hannah Middleton*

**Comment: The Parish Councillors object to this application for the following reasons:**  
**Policy CSP 19 Density**

- This Policy states that 'within the framework for the character and design of density as set out in Policy CSP18 the density of new development will be within the following ranges:  
(c) Oxted and Caterham Valley town centres (as defined on the proposals map) 40 to 75 dwellings per hectare, unless the design solution for a higher density scheme is compatible with local character and distinctiveness.'

This proposal is not compatible with local character and distinctiveness and the development of the old Rose & Young site should not be used as precedence for this proposal, so a high density scheme is not appropriate.

- The site is 468 square metres according to the application form. At a density of 55 units per hectare, this equates to 2.574 units, at 75 units per hectare – 3.51 units and at 100 units per hectare – 4.68 units. Therefore this development for 7 units is gross overdevelopment of the site and when the 14 units already there is added in, this is a completely unacceptable and inappropriate density.

#### Policy CSP 18 Character and Design

- This Policy states that 'The Council will require that new development, within town centres, built up areas, the villages and the countryside is of a high standard of design that must reflect and respect the character, setting and local context, including those features that contribute to local distinctiveness. Development must also have regard to the topography of the site, important trees or groups of trees and other important features that need to be retained. *Development must not significantly harm the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of overlooking, overshadowing, visual intrusion, noise, traffic and any other adverse effect.* This proposal will significantly harm the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of overlooking, overshadowing, visual intrusion, noise and traffic.
- Because of the angle at which the pictures in the planning statement were taken, they are disingenuous as they make the current Avante building look taller than it is. A site visit by the officer is recommended.

#### In addition to CP7:

The scale of the development will impact the amenity of 64, 66 and 68 Croydon Road with the scale of the property obscuring light from habitable rooms fronting on to Croydon Rd. The location of windows and balconies on the Croydon Road elevation will directly overlook the balconies below, impacting the privacy and enjoyment of the limited outside space which these flats currently enjoy.

The lack of parking will impact the amenity of residents on surrounding roads which already suffer from parking stress in excess of 100%. It was acknowledged by a planning inspector that a development at 74 Croydon Road (across the road from this development) where there was to be displaced parking, would impact the amenity of residents on Farningham Road. The appeal decision can be found here <https://tinyurl.com/4vtrvjx9>

#### The Lambeth parking assessment methodology states:

All roads within 200m walking distance of the site. Note, this is not a circle with a 200m radius, but a 200m walking distance as measured along all roads up to a point 200m from the site.

People searching for a parking space are unlikely to stop halfway along a road at an imaginary 200m line so the survey should be extended to the next junction or shortened to the previous one or taken to a suitable location along the road. Surveys will be assessed on practical driving routes so advanced confirmation that the extent of a survey is acceptable should be sought.

#### the following areas should be excluded from surveys:

- If the site is in a CPZ, any parking bays in an adjoining CPZ
- Any CPZ bays within the survey area where the site does not fall into a CPZ
- Private roads and housing estate roads

There is no reason to exclude Farningham, Commonwealth, Colin or Mount Pleasant roads from this assessment. They are widely used due to the unavailability of on street parking along Croydon Road. They are accessible and are accessed by residents on Croydon Road for parking. The 'steepness' isn't a barrier given we are located in a Valley which necessitates access via hills. The 'narrow' steps described are 2m wide. The exclusion of these roads has in the Parish Councillors view been done to reduce the parking stress measurement within the vicinity. Inclusion of these roads would show a true representation of the local parking stress.

5 of the proposed flats have no accessible outside space and there is no park or outside space accessible within 200m.

A number of the flats have habitable rooms with no windows. Kitchens are classed as habitable space and as such, should have access to sufficient light.

This application has generated many negative observations, including the short length of time for the submission of comments.

Residents who have commented on the proposal also raise the issue of the strain which the extra flats will put on the local sewerage system to which the Lidl development will also have been connected. One resident claimed that there is, on occasion, the smell of sewage wafting through the environs of Avante.

In addition, it is also claimed that the pipes for the mains water supply to Avante leak and cannot meet demand at peak times.

Concerns were also raised about the ability of the local medical practice to cope with the demands of the residents of the Lidl development and the Avante expansion. The Caterham Valley Medical Practice stated that it was already at capacity when the Ropemaker scheme (2021) to redevelop Church Walk was being discussed.

It is also pointed out that the provision of rubbish bins is already insufficient and it is not clear that there will be enough bin capacity if the expansion of Avante were to go ahead contrary to Policy DP 7 (paragraph 9).

### Character and Design

The adjacent Rose and Young development steps down from its high point at its boundary with Avante. The scale of Avante then steps down the the adjacent property at 77 Croydon Road which is 2 storeys to the Croydon Road elevation. The addition of 2 floors on top of Avante with no tapering of massing towards 77 Croydon Road will result in a dominant development, with no relationship to surrounding buildings. The proposal will also result in a step up from the Rose and Young site which is already over dominant in the street scene.

The rear of the building has the aesthetic of a container ship. It is a flat elevation with no tiering of scale or bulk. It will dominate the landscape and the nature of the design will result in it towering over and dominating buildings on the other side of the railway line such is its scale. It is poor design.

### DP7 - Tandridge Local Plan Detailed Policies

- This proposal contravenes policy DP7 in that it does not respect the character and layout of the nearby properties 9 Rose & Young site excluded). The built form is domineering on the street scene and parking provision is inadequate which would

suggest that the proposal is overdevelopment of the site. It will harm neighbouring properties in terms of amenity (of which there is none), privacy and lack of facilities, with no landscaping at all. The environment for the residents in the immediate vicinity, and on the opposite side of the road, will be impacted by the overshadowing.

#### **Car Parking**

- The Design and Access Statement states that the current development of 14 apartments has 17 parking spaces. Of these
  - 3 are for the retail units
  - 3 of the spaces are little more than 3.9m in length and are not satisfactory to serve the development – acknowledged in the transport statement point 1.9).
  - 1 is vacant as it cannot be used by modern cars because it is too small to be of use (acknowledged in the applicant’s Transport Statement in point 1.6). In fact it has a pillar in front of it that makes it extremely difficult to park a regular sized vehicle.
  - 1 is for the use of DPS, the owners of the freehold. While they allow one of the apartments to use this space, it still belongs to DPS so could be removed at any time.
  - The disability space is included in the ‘17’ spaces, so is not an additional space.
  - There are no visitor spaces for the 14 units, never mind the proposed additional 7 units.
  - The statement also says there is the potential for an additional 19 people over the 7 units. Up to 19 people with no additional parking to accommodate their vehicles is completely unacceptable in an area where parking stress is at 100%.
  - One of the apartments has 3 vehicles and one parking space.
- Surrey County Council’s (SCC) vehicular and cycle parking guidance state that 1 and two bedroom apartments in town centres should have at least 1 parking space per unit. TDC Parking Standards 2012 states 1 and 2 bedroom flats should have 1.5 spaces unallocated (preferred) OR 2 spaces allocated. Therefore a minimum of one parking space per unit is required.
- There are no additional car parking spaces for the potential 7 new units and there is already insufficient parking allocation for the approved development of 14 flats. Parking on the Croydon Road is restricted to one hour during the day and, with the surrounding local roads, at capacity in the evenings. Additional cars parked on the local roads will exacerbate existing problems and this is detrimental to the amenity of the local residents. It will not encourage the use of alternative modes of transport. This has consistently been proven to be false in an area where car ownership continues to increase. It is time that the cumulative effect of all developments in Caterham is taken into account when an application is considered. Exacerbating the current situation is not acceptable.
- The Parish Council and local residents have consistently argued for better parking provision with developments in Caterham. The lack of parking provision in Caterham is also acknowledged in the emerging Tandridge Local Plan and the adopted Caterham, Chaldon & Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan (CCWNP). This application is contrary to Policy CCW5, Design of Development – Point D – of the CCWNP which states that any development should be ‘Providing off-road parking in accordance with the adopted Tandridge Parking Standards (2012).
- Croydon Road already has parking stress in excess of 100% and has become a dangerous slalom course for buses and traffic trying to get in and out of Caterham. Existing parking restrictions are already ignored and pavement parking, blocking passage for pedestrians, has become the norm. People park on the single yellow lines on Croydon Road in the evening when they are not penalised by parking tickets. However, these cars have to be moved from 8.30am when one hour

restrictions come in force, meaning it is not possible to park there during the day on 6 days of the week (acknowledged by the applicant's transport statement in point 1.5) .

- The applicant has stated that the site is in a highly accessible location which is another of their reasons for the lack of parking. Parking continues to be a major concern and this issue was highlighted in applications for both 74 Croydon Road and 64 - 66 Beechwood Road, where officers stated that the adverse impact on on-street parking were major considerations for refusal.
- The transport statement says the 'survey area has been split into individual streets or sections of streets comprising only Croydon Road and Highfield Road'. The applicant's parking survey has not taken into account the parking issues in Farningham Road and Commonwealth Road, both of which are at breaking point for oversubscribed parking. Point 4.6 of the transport statement says 'It should be noted that there are roads within a 200-metre catchment of the site (Farningham Road, Commonwealth Road and Mount Pleasant Road) that have been excluded as they are deemed to be too remote due to access only being available via a steep and narrow set of stairs. Colin Road is also steep and undesirable for parking.' The parking survey did not include these roads which is a serious omission and therefore not an accurate representation of the parking situation locally.
- Points 5.8 & 6.8 state 'From the parking survey inventory, it was found that Croydon Road and Highfield Road, only consisted of time-restricted parking bays which would not be a suitable location for future residents to park as residents would have to move their vehicles every day during the hours of operation for these bays. Additionally, these roads did not include any unrestricted parking opportunities within the survey area.' Highfield Road is the road that leads to the Waitrose Carpark. It is not a reasonable example for parking stress levels either during the day or in the evening.
- There is to be provision for 30 bicycles for the 21 flats. This will be by removing one of the current inaccessible parking spaces (acknowledge in the applicant's transport statement point 1.7). Because of the terrain, and the fact that Caterham Valley is surrounded by hills, cycling is restricted and only a small percentage of people use bikes for work.
- Parking is arguably the most significant issue raised. Residents say that there is already too little parking, not just for residents but for visitors as well. Furthermore, the access road to what parking currently exists is regularly blocked by cars parked illegally on the Croydon Road. It is claimed that the 17 parking spaces proposed are not enough for the flats and the shops. Furthermore, the one disabled bay is allocated to a resident, there is therefore no provision for disabled visitors. Policy DP7 (paragraph 3) requires that new developments must "maintain the existing off-street parking spaces where they are considered necessary to serve the existing buildings". This is not currently being done.
- It is expected that somehow the parking problem can be solved by putting in many more bike spaces, and making the assumption that people will get on their bikes. Those proposing this concept do not appreciate Caterham Valley surrounded by hills! The clue is in the name.
- The Croydon Road Census (Area E00 157306) showed 61.8% of residents have one or more cars. It is likely that many of the residents of the Lidl flats and the potential residents of the Avante expansion will also have cars, thus adding to the parking problem in this part of the Valley.
- It is evidently thought that the proximity of Caterham Railway Station will encourage people out of their cars. However, the service to East Croydon has been cut to two trains per hour (from four). In addition, the rail service from Caterham is not much use if one wishes to travel east or west.

- Were the Avante expansion to go ahead, parking of subbies' cars and general construction traffic would add to the parking problem in this part of the Croydon Road.

#### Transport - Buses and Trains

- The transport statement states in point 2.3 that 'the application site is near six local bus services. The closest bus stops to the site are located approximately 50 metres south of the site on the B2208 Croydon Road and provide access to bus services 407 and 658. The other set of bus stops near the site are located approximately 300 metres south on Station Avenue and provide access to bus services 400, 409, 411 and 603. It is true that there are a number of buses that service Caterham. However, you cannot get to or from East Surrey Hospital in the evening from Caterham and other services are also restricted / scaled down later in the day.
- Point 2.5 says that the nearest railway station is Caterham Railway Station which is around 300 metres to the south of the site. The station operates as part of the Southern Railway network and provides services to London Bridge via South Croydon and Norwood Junction. These trains depart approximately twice an hour during weekdays.  
Trains do run twice an hour but only directly to London Bridge. It is necessary to change at Purley or East Croydon to go further South or into London to go to surrounding counties.
- Point 2.7 states 'in summary the application site has excellent access to local amenities and is very well-served by public transport. This will help to reduce the need for future residents to travel by private car.  
With a considerable percentage of the population using cars to get to work, it is essential that this proposal has adequate parking so that the local residents and roads are not inconvenienced further.

The following points from the Transport Statement are of major concern as they have not been mitigated by this proposal.

4.17 As there are no available unrestricted parking opportunities within the survey area, the results of the unrestricted parking stress is 100% which indicates that there is nowhere for future residents to parking within the survey area.

4.20 The average overnight parking stress of unrestricted kerb side within the identified survey area is therefore too high and paring on-street parking is not possible.

5.6 Therefore, an additional six cars from the projected demand cannot be accommodated within the adjoining road network due to there being no opportunities to park within the survey area.

6.7 From the parking survey, it was found that there were no unrestricted parking opportunities within the survey area, which meant that resident parking cannot be accommodated on the adjacent road network

#### Affordable Housing

- The site already is currently 14 units. The addition of 7 units would be 21 units with no affordable housing. Piecemeal development is unacceptable in an area that has such a need for affordable housing.

#### Bin storage

- The bin store is to be extended to accommodate the rubbish for the additional 7 units. To do this, the doors of the store will open and will impede the current entrance gates from opening, also restricting the room for vehicles to enter and exit the development. The current bin store is inadequate for the 14 flats and we would be concerned that additional capacity would not meet the demands of an additional 7 units.



## Fire Safety

- Residents are not aware of a sprinkler system having been installed in the current premises.
- Fire alarm in the building is already faulty.
- Regular fire alarm tests do not appear to be being performed

## Construction Traffic

- Should this application be approved, consideration needs to be given to where the construction and delivery vehicles will park. There is no space in the development area and they cannot block access to the neighbouring properties. They should also not be permitted to further block the Croydon Road which had suffered the build at the old Rose and Young site for a considerable period of time. Measures must be put in place to minimise disruption to the local businesses and residents. The residents of the current flats cannot be expected to find alternate parking in already saturated roads.

## Site Security

- Security for the current residents must also be a consideration while construction works are going on should this proposal be granted permission.

## Flooding

- The proposed units are said to tie in with the existing drainage provisions. Drains are the old Victorian type and there is regular flooding at the bottom of Colin Road, opposite the Avanti building.
- The lift to the building is likely to be out of action for the duration of the build while the additional two floors are added and the lift extended to reach those floors. It is often out of order and will cause additional difficulties for those currently residing in the building if this is a longer term problem.
- There are a number of resident comments which need to be given serious consideration in light of this application.

The application contravenes the Equalities Act 2010 with regards the provision of equal treatment of all regardless of ability. If this application is approved there are residents in the building who will be confined to their dwelling when the lift is out of order due to the inability of them to use the stairs.

Caterham Valley Parish Council request this application is refused. Should the Planning Officer be minded to approve, Cllr Jenny Gaffney will take it to Committee.

### 4.6 TA/2023/437

Erection of brick built enclosed front porch with monopitch roof over (Certificate of Lawfulness for a Proposed Use or Development)

6 Abbots Walk, Caterham CR3 6QU

*Case Officer: Lydia Hemsley*

**Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers**

### 4.7 TA/2023/509

Conversion of garage to habitable accommodation (Certificate of Lawfulness for a Proposed Use or Development).

12 Harestone Hill, Caterham CR3 6SX

*Case Officer: Lydia Hemsley*

**Comment: The Parish Councillors leave to TDC Officers**

## 5. CIL/IL Consultation

Cllrs Webster and Gaffney will draft an initial response. The final deadline is 9<sup>th</sup> June 2023

Meeting closed at 19:25

---

**The next planning meeting will be held on Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> June 2023**  
Copies of Parish Council minutes are held by the Clerk and are available on the Parish Council  
web-site: [www.caterhamvalleypc.org.uk](http://www.caterhamvalleypc.org.uk) Mrs M Gibbins, Parish Clerk, Tel: 07510 226989