(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 13th November 2024 at 6:30pm

Cllr Jenny Gaffney - Chair
Cllr Annette Evans
Cllr Tony Pearce
Mr Peter Brent – Co-opted member

Mrs M Gibbins - Clerk & RFO

M I NU T E S

1. **Apologies for absence:**
Cllr Robin Spencer and Mr Neil Farrance

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 two members of the public in attendance regarding applications TA/2024/1133, TA/2024/697 and Appeal TA/2024/174.

4. **To consider and make comment on the following Planning Applications:**

4.1 TA/2024/1081
Erection of Proposed outbuilding
173 Stanstead Road, Caterham CR3 6AJ *Case Officer: Cindy Blythe*
Comment: The Councillors leave to TDC Officers.

4.2 TA/2024/1089
Single storey rear extension, changes to windows / doors, internal alterations plus new flue for log burning stove (Listed Building)
High Beeches, Tupwood Scrubbs Road, Caterham CR3 6TH *Case Officer: Tianjiao Ma*
Comment: Leave to Officer but note this is a site of historical interest. Consideration must be given to this, plus the fact the site is listed. Also should be determined with reference to application 2024/1053.

4.3 TA/2024/1053
Erection of single storey rear extension and changes to windows/doors.
High Beeches, Tupwood Scrubbs Road, Caterham CR3 6TH *Case Officer: Tianjiao Ma*
Comment: Leave to Officer but note this is a site of historical interest. Consideration must be given to this, plus the fact the site is listed. Also should be determined with reference to application 2024/1089.

4.4 TA/2024/1042

Replacement of existing retaining garden walls to the rear and side of the property and garden level adjustments.

St Benets, 5 Elgin Crescent, Caterham CR3 6ND *Case Officer: Samuel Odell*

Comment: The Councillors leave to TDC Officers.

4.5 TA/2024/977

Excavation works to convert front garden into hardstanding for car parking area together with the erection of (1.2m high) front boundary railing.

81 Beechwood Road, Caterham CR3 6NF *Case Officer: Adam Halpin*

Comment: The Councillors request this application should be determined with reference to application 2024/976 because of the space required to store materials for both the house extension and the conversion of the front garden to parking.

There is nowhere to store materials at the site and materials delivery will have to be carefully managed so as not to impede traffic on the road. It is essential that the applicant does not exceed the permitted working hours. Both applications for house and parking space should be considered together so that the proposal does not impact road safety. As the extension works to the property are likely to take longer than those to the front garden, we would suggest the garden should be converted first to allow storage space for the building materials for the extension. There should be no storage of materials on the road as this removes parking spaces on a road that is generally at capacity for parking.

4.6 TA/2024/1133

Certificate of Lawfulness for existing use of side and rear extensions to the dwelling house, roof extension and 2 dormer windows within the front roof slope and 5 dormer windows within the rear roof slope which were substantially completed more than 4 years ago.

130 Harestone Valley Road, Caterham CR3 6HG *Case Officer: Joss Miller*

Comment: The Councillors do not support retrospective applications and certainly not on this scale.

We reiterate the comments to application TA/2024/748 and 2021/749.

2024/99 was refused and the reasons are still relevant.

2021/1726 was refused and reasons 1 and 2 are still relevant.

We do not believe the Appeals Officer's reason for dismissing the appeal to 2021/1726 or the Planning Officer's reasons for refusal to this application have been mitigated.

Passage of time should not permit the application to go through as this runs roughshod over the planning system.

Leave to Officer with all necessary action to be taken to remedy the planning breaches that have taken place.

4.7 TA/2024/697

Change of use of Class E (retail units) to a mixed Class E (Restaurant) and Sui Generis takeaway use and associated external works (including, shop front alterations, plant and provision of motorcycle parking.)(Amended Supporting Statement and Noise Assessment received 01.08.24) - Updated Transport Statement and Updated Delivery Management Plan received 31.10.24.

35-41 Croydon Road, Caterham CR3 6PB *Case Officer: Cindy Blythe*

Comment: Caterham Valley Parish Council reiterates all of its previous comments at https://plandocs.tandridge.gov.uk/civica/Resource/Civica/Handler.ashx/Doc/pagestream?cd=inline&pdf=true&docno=25212755. These revised documents vary very little

from the previous ones and in no way go to alleviating or mitigating any concerns we have raised.

We would make the following additional comments:

- **The Delivery Management plan says that there would be '***5 motorcycle parking spaces and 4 cycle parking spaces at the rear of the unit which would be used by couriers'* **with '***six additional on street motorcycle parking spaces and one additional car parking space. The total motorcycle parking provision proposed for the rear of Croydon Road would be 11 spaces'***.**
  Is the applicant planning to remove the some of the parking bays on the service road that are currently used for the train station pick-ups? This would not be acceptable. We would also point out that the service road is dark at night with limited lighting so could be dangerous for cyclists.

- **The restaurant is to '***provide facility primarily to serve visitors to the town'***. With the number of courier spaces the application is providing, we believe the anticipated use of couriers is being misrepresented and will actually be far greater than acknowledged.**

- **The Transport Statement says that delivery drivers will not be allowed to use the front door. How will this be enforced? Will they have someone at the door permanently? How will courier access to the rear be governed?**

- **The Delivery Management plan also says '***the delivery vehicle would use the parking bays outside the unit on Croydon Road outside of the car parking restrictions 18:00 hours to 08:30 hours. Access to the corral is provided from Croydon Road'***.**
  How exactly are they going to manage that – residents cannot be prohibited from parking in those bays.

- *Deliveries would be scheduled to occur between 18:00-00:00 and 06:00-08:30 hours outside of the parking control.*
  8.30 is rush hour in Caterham. If this proposal is approved, the drivers must have left the area well before then.

- *Deliveries would be expected to occur 3-5 times per week. The vehicle is expected to be parked for between 15 minutes and 1 hour within an allocated 4 hour delivery slot* **(2.2.2).**
  This contradicts the servicing plan (3.1.2) which says 2-hour delivery slot. Large McDonalds' vehicles parking in these spaces will inhibit the evening economy of the town. These bays are there for customers of the other establishments. It's also a minimum of 6 large vehicles a week on a busy road where parking will be challenging.

- *Through this process of prior assessment and notification, Martin Brower and McDonald's are able to notify the restaurant of an accurate arrival time and ensure that measures required to accommodate the delivery vehicles are employed in good time prior to the delivery arrival.*
  How exactly is this supposed to work? Cars could already be in parking bays and they should not be able to block off parking bays in anticipating of a delivery particularly when spaces are already needed for residents and existing restaurants' customers.

- **To park the vehicles in the bay by the new Lidl store means heavy deliveries will have to be pushed in roll cages quite a distance and this also involves crossing the entrance to the service road.**

- *'McDonald's staff are also on hand to manage customer vehicles and pedestrians during the delivery'*.
  What does the applicant mean regarding customer vehicles? This is clearly designed for a drive through facility.

- **Removal of the crash barrier on the service road is a concern and likely to have dangerous consequences, specifically in relation to Waitrose delivery lorries, but also for the moped drivers.**

- **The Transport Statement has completed ignores the bus times of last buses going up to Caterham Hill, Also walking up Church Hill, and certainly cycling up Waller Lane is only for the very fit.**

- **Noise Abatement Society quote is 7 years old. If soundscape principles are being quoted, can they be applied to the application?**

- **Have Waitrose and neighbouring business been consulted with regard to the speed cushion?**

- **The examples provided from other areas by the applicant to try and find some acceptable arguments on their 'expected use' are not relevant to this proposal, as they are completely irrelevant to our town centre location.**

- **Surrey Highways in response to the Church Walk development used the point of 'unsuitable sharing' in a service area as one of their objections. CVPC believe the proposed service area design and layout for this proposal is unworkable, giving way to conditions prejudicial to highway safety and interference with the safe and free flow of traffic on the service road resulting in conflicting movements. To consider the proposal in isolation, without consideration for the other traffic on the service road will result in safety concerns.**

- **The use and design is contrary to various paragraphs in the last December NPPF which reference in our original response.**

Also regarding the ADL revised Transport Statement

- **At 2.1.2 the applicant says they are replacing Pedricks Waste Shop. Is this why the applicant is thinking that it is permissible to use one of the four retail frontages as a refuse area? Pedricks was all about recycling and zero waste, not creating waste!**

- **At 2.1.5 and 2.1.6 the applicant acknowledges the Caterham Masterplan Highway recommendations and the recent improvement works to reduce vehicle movement. This application for a large aggressive delivery service is against these design principles. It also works against the intended Public Realm improvements.**

- **At 2.4.1 the applicant says** *'it is expected that the proposed restaurant would provide a facility primarily to serve visitors to the Town Centre'*. **If this is correct, then creating four combined units in a small town is a massive overdevelopment. The design also suggests it is being geared up to a takeout and delivery as we know.**

- **At 2.4.3 the applicant says 'there are already existing courier drivers (from 22 outlets) operating in and around Caterham town centre. It is expected that these drivers would simply transfer to the proposed restaurant.' This is nonsense. It would create**

considerable additional vehicle activity in the heart of the town as their food offer is different and undeniably very popular in the right location. If this were true then we would be accepting 22 existing business will lose considerable trade, possibly losing many local businesses and creating more than 4 vacant shops as a result.

- **At 4.1.5 the proposed highway improvements do not make much sense. On their online plans we could not see exactly where the Copenhagen Pedestrian crossings would go. However, as this design is to 'blend pavement into road' it seems a ridiculous and desperate suggestion. The idea of introducing bicycles (introducing specified parking) as well as mopeds to the rear access road, (the commercial road bypass for the town and used by Waitrose), is a bad mix.**

Caterham Valley Parish Council continue to assert that this proposal is unsuitable for the town, and request again that this application be refused.

5. **Appeal**
   TA/2024/174
   Land Adjacent To Pilgrims Corner, Gravelly Hill, Caterham, Surrey, CR3 6ES
   Erection of new four bedroom detached residential dwelling
   Appeal Reference APP/M3645/W/24/3353738
   Appeal Start Date Development 29 October 2024
   Comment: Caterham Valley Parish Council object to this application for the following reasons:
   - **This application is totally inappropriate at this site and we do not believe that the Planning Officer's reasons for refusal to 2023/232 have been mitigated https://plandocs.tandridge.gov.uk/civica/Resource/Civica/Handler.ashx/Doc/pagestream?cd=inline&pdf=true&docno=25056797.**
   - **The Caterham Valley Planning Committee request that the AONB Planning Advisor should be consulted.**
   - **This is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and this application contravenes Policies DP10 and DP13. Given the site position in the AONB, the proposed dwelling looks cramped so it would fail to conserve and enhance the landscape.**
   - **On the previous application 2023/232, the AONB Officer commented https://plandocs.tandridge.gov.uk/civica/Resource/Civica/Handler.ashx/Doc/pagestream?cd=inline&pdf=true&docno=25040287 and we do not believe all the issues raised have been mitigated.**
   - **The proposal does not contribute to the distinctive character, appearance and amenity of the area in which it is located and there are no indications as to how landscaping will enhance the appearance, character and amenity of the site – Policy DP7. A clear landscaping plan and planting plan is required.**
   - **An Environmental Impact Statement has not been provided and needs to be submitted.**
   - **It is unclear how and where materials will be disposed of or how the construction traffic will be managed as it cannot impede traffic on the dangerous narrow road.**
   - **Surrey Highways have expressed concerns and we concur with them.**
   - **The Lead Recycling and Waste Officer, Waste Management and Enforcement had comments which need to be addressed.**
   - **Neighbours' comments need to be given significant consideration.**

This response had not been uploaded to the TDC website when originally submitted.

Meeting closed at 19:10

The next planning meeting will be held at 6:30pm on Wednesday 4th December 2024