(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 23rd October 2024 at 6:30pm

Cllr Jenny Gaffney – Chair
Cllr Annette Evans
Cllr Robin Spencer – arrived at 19:02
Cllr Tony Pearce
Mr Neil Farrance – Co-opted member

In attendance: Cllr Alun Jones

Mrs M Gibbins - Clerk & RFO

M I N U T E S

1. **Apologies for absence:**
Mr Peter Brent

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 13 members of the public in attendance. 1 in respect of application TA/2024/784. The remaining 12 members were in attendance in respect TA/2024/858. The Chairman thanked the residents for attending the meeting and for their input. With the agreement of the Committee application TA/2024/858 was brought to the beginning of the agenda.

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

4.1 TA/2024/874
Proposed garage conversion into habitable room (Certificate of Lawfulness for a Proposed Use or Development)
99 Farningham Road, Caterham CR3 6LN *Case Officer: Adam Halpin*
Comment: The Councillors leave to TDC Officers

4.2 TA/2024/1012
Demolition of existing garage. Erection of single storey side extension.
13 Everard Lane, Caterham CE3 6QS *Case Officer : Cindy Blythe*
Comment: The Councillors leave to TDC Officers

4.3 TA/2024/858
Demolition of Dwellings 79 to 85 Stafford Road. Erection of 4 no 3 bed terraced dwelling houses and 42no 1, 2 and 3 bed flats, comprising of 4 x 1-bed flats, 29 x 2-bed flats and 9 x 3-bed flats together with the provision of 61 car parking spaces .
9 – 85 Stafford Road, Caterham CR4 6JJ *Case Officer: Hannah Middleton*

Comment: Caterham Valley Parish Council strongly objects to this application for the following reasons:

1. POLICY CSP19 – DENSITY

- This proposal is contrary to CSP19 and is gross overdevelopment of the site, with densities significantly higher than the prevailing densities.
- Section 1.4 of the Affordable Housing Statement says:
  'The site area covers approximately circa 0.88 hectares (ha)/ 8900 square metres (sqm) of land spread across the properties of 79-85 Stafford Road and the associated gardens. ***The developable area is only 0.35 ha.'***
- Although the larger area of 0.88ha would allow for the larger density, the applicant admits only 0.35 ha is developable, so is disingenuous to use 0.88ha to put in the larger density.
- 0.35ha at 55 units per hectare equates to 19.25 units and at the higher density of 75 units per hectare this equates to 26.25 units. The site is not in the town centre, but even at a town centre density of 100 units per hectare this would equate to a maximum of 35 units.
- The flats are either bare minimum, or slightly above bare minimum, Government standard. This will result in a cramped living environment for the 152 potential residents.
- The supposed amenity space for the flats is in the form of balconies, which is completely at odds with the amenity space of the surrounding properties.
- With a potential capacity of 152 people in the flats and 20 people in the houses (**total 172 people**), this is a maximum capacity development for maximum gain, with little consideration for the occupants of the properties.

2. AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- With an application for 46 units, the applicant should provide affordable housing at the current requirement to meet the needs of the local population. In an area that is desperate for affordable housing and considering the numbers on the Tandridge Housing Register, it is completely unacceptable that there are no affordable units with this proposal.
- The applicant's Affordable Housing Statement says that Danelise instructed Savills to examine the economic viability of the proposal to support affordable housing. The applicant knew the cost of the land and must have had some indication of the cost of providing the 42 flats and 4 houses they have detailed in their application.
- However, it was no shock to note that Savills have come up with the conclusion that 'the proposed scheme generates a present day viability deficit and is therefore considered unviable in planning viability terms and unable to support additional planning obligations including in the form of affordable housing other than on an ex-gratia basis'.The applicant admits that this proposal 'will not meet the terms of Policy CSP4 in helping to deliver a mix of affordable housing.' Their assertion that
- 'the scheme will provide a range of small residential units, these being the most affordable market dwellings' is still full market housing and does not help those on the TDC Housing Register who need homes in Caterham. An ex-gratia payment, presumably S106 payment, being made to TDC in lieu of affordable housing does not bring housing to Caterham. Tandridge Council does not have to accept a payment to build off site and should insist on affordable units at the site. The developer is also not being magnanimous by paying CIL. This is a legal requirement.

3. PARKING PROVISION

- The parking provision proposed in the development is insufficient and does not align with the Tandridge Parking Standards 2012, which require 1.5 spaces per 1-2 bedroom flats and 2 spaces for 3-bedroom flats / houses. While the parking provision for the 4 houses at 9 spaces is correct, the parking allocation for the flats should be **68** unallocated or **86** allocated. 51 parking spaces is completely inadequate, particularly as 7 are for visitors and 42 are actually allocated to the potential new residents.
- Should the Officer be minded to approve this application, we request the parking remains unallocated. There is a cumulative deficit in parking across Caterham and this proposal will exacerbate this considerably, blighting current and future residents' lives on Stafford Road by the overflow of parking from current properties.
- Stafford Road is at breaking point with parking stress in excess of 100%, and is a shalom course where drivers have to try and find places to pull in to allow vehicles coming in the opposite direction to pass. They often have to back up as otherwise passing is impossible. The road is often reduced to a single lane due to cars parked on both sides of the road. Pavement parking, blocking passage for pedestrians, buggies and mobility scooters has become the norm.
- The applicant has stated that the site is in a highly accessible location which is supposed to explain the lack of parking. The assumption seems to be that all the potential residents will be physically able to walk to the station and bus stops. With parking at a premium in Caterham, parking continues to be a major concern and this issue was highlighted in applications for 51 Stafford Road, 74 Croydon Road and 64 - 66 Beechwood Road, where officers stated that the adverse impact on on-street parking were major considerations for refusal.
- There are constant assertions that an under-provision of parking will encourage use of alternative modes of transport and 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. Additional cars parked on the local roads will exacerbate existing problems and this is detrimental to the amenity of the local residents. Therefore, it is vitally important that adequate parking as per TDC's Parking Standards 2012 is provided.
- The proposal introduces a parking strategy that reduces parking spaces, relying heavily on sustainable transport modes such as cycling and public transport. Those proposing this concept do not appreciate that Caterham Valley is surrounded by hills. Only the fit can cycle up Church Hill or Waller Lane and only a small percentage of people use bikes for work.
- The reduction in parking spaces, combined with the expectation that residents will rely on public transport or car clubs, underestimates the likely demand for parking in a residential area where car ownership is prevalent. The actual provision of parking does not meet the needs of future residents. This shortfall will exacerbate parking congestion on Stafford Road and surrounding areas, creating a negative impact on local traffic and residents. The introduction of car clubs and reliance on cycle parking will not sufficiently alleviate parking and traffic congestion concerns in this part of Caterham. The idea that 2 car club spaces will be the equivalent of 58 car parking spaces (Planning Statement says 'and 2 Car Club bays with one Car Club vehicle equivalent to up to 29 cars) would be laughable if any additional traffic movements along Stafford Road would not result in an increase in highway safety issues and further stress for the current residents.
- The addition of 46 dwellings will have a material impact on traffic flows on the road, considerably increasing vehicle movement per day into a road that is typically

double parked with limited parking space. It is also likely that some of the new occupants will have work vans etc which will end up parked on Stafford Road which is already saturated, as many of the houses do not have off road parking. This does not include deliveries, services and trades also visiting the site.

- 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 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).
- The D & A Part 1 on page 5 and 6 talks about the site being 'sustainably located within half a mile of Caterham town centre with train station, taxi rank and central busstops, providing onward links for commuters to London by rail as well as seven bus services operating into the wider local community'.
- It is evidently thought that the proximity of Caterham Railway Station will encourage people out of their cars. The rail service from Caterham is not much use if one wishes to travel east or west. The station operates as part of the Southern Railway network and provides services to London Bridge via South Croydon and Norwood Junction. 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.
- 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.
- The applicant comments that the Dene Hospital is close by. However, this can only be accessed by either Church Hill or Waller Lane, both steep hills. The Dene is limited in its opening hours and also its remit and, because of this, a number patients are referred on to East Surrey Hospital in Redhill, which is not easy to get to without a car.
- Then the D & A goes on to talk about the facilities in Caterham with the supermarket being a 10 minute walk. You cannot do a large shop without either getting a taxi or using the car to transport goods. The train or buses do not have stops on Stafford Road. This in part illustrates the requirement for a car for most residents.
- 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.
- We also have concerns that as the enclosed undercroft parking will create a haven for illegal behaviour and result in future problems.

4. POLICY DP5 – HIGHWAY SAFETY

- This proposal is contrary to policy DP5: Highway Safety & Design with the adverse effect on the impact on highway safety on Stafford Road, with additional vehicle movements.
- Policy DP5 states that a development should 'not unnecessarily impede the free flow of traffic on the existing network or create hazards to that traffic and other road users.
- Increased volume of traffic entering and exiting the proposed development will increase road safety issues and place additional pressure on Stafford Road. There is **NO** additional parking on the street. The TRICS data with this proposal is really low and there is a need to consider the road out of daytime hours. There are no parking

spaces in the morning and the evening and very limited passing space, so any additional vehicle movements add to existing and known highway issues.

- There is no pavement on much of one side of Stafford Road. Pavement parking on the other side of the road is the norm, and that certainly problematic if you are carrying shopping, coping with a physical disability, walking with children, pushing a child in a pushchair or using a mobility scooter. This will increase considerably with the proposed development. Access and egress will be compromised in this location.
- Stafford Road is a narrow road and it is a struggle for 2 cars to pass. Residents' parking on the street currently means that ambulances, refuse collection or even the large lorries required to facilitate the building of the development struggle to pass on the street if there is parking on the road. The impact on highway safety on Stafford Road with additional vehicle movements will be a major concern.
- Emergency vehicles and refuse vehicles already struggle with access along the road and this will be exacerbated by the additional vehicles from this development, particularly as the parking is insufficient and the proposal removes 12 spaces on Stafford Road to facilitate the new development, thereby causing further issues with residents' parking, both current and the overflow from the development.
- It should also be noted that Junction 6 of the M25 is already over capacity running at 104.1% of capacity on the southbound A22 in the AM peak. With the removal of direct trains from Caterham to Victoria, people will be more likely to travel by car. It should also be noted that the 2nd highest destination of work for residents in Caterham is in Reigate and Banstead. As such, even one vehicle movement from this development through Junction 6 will have a detrimental effect on traffic from 2018 baselines.
- The increased volume of traffic entering and exiting the proposed development will thereby increase road safety issues and place additional pressure on Stafford Road. Stafford Road is currently problematic and was recognised in 2021 as being problematic from a highways safety perspective with an average speed of 28mph and with safety solutions were reviewed by the Highways authority due to the volumes of traffic along the road. https://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=166&MId=8042. Additional vehicle movements from this proposed development will significantly increase highway safety issues for current and any new residents and as such impact on their amenity. As such, it should be refused on grounds of Highway safety and design.
- This part of Stafford Road has had numerous roadworks over the last few years due to overloaded utilities, and this development would increase those issues.

5. POLICY DP7 – DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENT

- This proposal is contrary to policy DP7: General Policy for New Development in that this application does not 'integrate effectively with its surroundings, reinforcing local distinctiveness and landscape character.' in particular:

➢ **Character & layout:** The proposal should respect and contribute to the distinctive character, appearance and amenity of the area in which it is located which is typically detached and semi-detached family homes

➢ **Built form:** The proposal should be in keeping with the prevailing landscape/streetscape, reflecting the variety of local building types by using complementary building materials and designs, and should not result in overdevelopment or unacceptable intensification by reason of scale, form, bulk, height, spacing, density and design.

- **Parking:** There are insufficient parking spaces because of the scale of the development and the lack of space on the site.
- **Amenity:** The proposal will significantly harm the amenity of neighbouring properties in relation to the additional traffic that this will generate and will also be affected by way of overlooking, noise and impact to privacy for residents of the development and the neighbouring properties. The supposed amenity space is in the form of private terraces and balconies which is completely at odds with the amenity space of the surrounding properties.

The proposal would result in substandard living accommodation for future occupiers by virtue of the layout of accommodation and the relationship with external communal amenity space. The relationship of internal living conditions to external environment for future occupiers is disproportionate with balconies rather than the outdoor space typified by neighbouring properties.

The proposal to remove 4 family homes and replace with to 42 flats and 4 houses for 172 people will have an increase in noise and light pollution and will overlook and be overbearing for neighbouring properties either side.

- **Landscaping:** The proposal should ensure that landscaping is an integral element in layout design, making provision for suitable new planting, trees and boundary treatments to enhance the appearance, character and amenity of the site from the outset. Only 0.35ha is developable by the developers' own statement, so complete over intensification of the site.

The TDC Trees and Soft Landscaping Supplementary Planning Document November 2017 requires gardens proportionate to the development, yet landscaping is minimal and amenity space is almost non-existent which impacts on the mental and physical wellbeing of the residents.

6. POLICY CSP18 – CHARACTER AND DESIGN

- The proposal is contrary to Policy CSP 18 Character and Design in that it does not reflect and respect the character, setting and local context, including those features that contribute to local distinctiveness. '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'. The surrounding area is of residential character and comprises predominantly houses that differ in style and design. However, the drawings give an indication as to the scale of the development and it overly dominates the street scene, and completely dwarfs the neighbouring properties.
- Despite CSP18 stating that developments should have a high standard of design, respecting local character, setting and context, the property in the plans bears no resemblance to the majority of the property in the surrounding area which is predominately 2-storey houses. The design of the development would significantly alter the character of the site. The scale of the building will dominate the site and the landscape, which is in conflict with the prevailing street scene. The scale and proximity will overpower and over shadow the adjacent houses.
- The scale and massing of the property is out of character for the area and will dominate the site. The scale and proximity will overpower and over shadow the adjacent houses and create a significant step in the ridgeline as you progress along this section of road. Considering the total design of the building, it will be overbearing.

- Tandridge policies encourage development that reflects the character and scale of the local area, but the proposal's height and massing is out of place, particularly in an area predominantly characterized by lower-density, smaller-scale housing. The actual residents' housing requirement in Caterham is for 2 and 3 bedroom family homes with gardens, not more flats.
- The part 6-storey development, which also includes undercroft car parking, will impact the rhythm of houses along this section of Stafford Road. Whilst not characterised by similar styles of building, all plots are characterised by their separation and spaciousness. This is as well as all being of similar height, albeit with their settings on the slope differing, creating interest in the frontages.

7. POLICY DP8 – RESIDENTIAL GARDEN LAND DEVELOPMENT

- It's a part back garden development as it takes up much of the useable back garden space of the original houses. The scale of the development does not result in a development in keeping with the existing street scene. The size, scale and massing is not appropriate to the surrounding area in terms of land use, size and scale. It fails to maintain or enhance the character of the area and the frontage is not in keeping with the prevailing street scene.

8. CATERHAM, CHALDON AND WHYTELEAFE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (CCWNP) POLICIES

This proposal is contrary to the following policies in the CCWNP

- **Policy CCW4: Character of Development**

This proposal is contrary to Policy CCW4 in that development is expected to preserve and enhance the character area in which it is located.

Development proposals in the defined character areas will be supported which:

I. exhibit design reflecting local context, character and vernacular of the area;
II. demonstrably enhance the quality of the built form through innovation in design;
III. make a positive contribution to the character area when viewed from the main highway approaches into the settlements;
IV. do not have a significantly detrimental impact on local views as set out in Policy CCW10;
V. contribute to the conservation and enhancement of designated and nondesignated heritage assets and respect their significance and context.

- **CCW5: Design of Development**

This proposal is contrary to Policy CCW5.

Development proposals, which integrate well with their surroundings, meet the needs of residents and minimise the impact on the local environment will be supported where they demonstrate a high quality of design, by:

a. Incorporating the principles of Building for Life (12), or successor design principles which would deliver a higher quality of design. Development proposals are encouraged to achieve the 'Built for Life' quality mark.
b. Incorporating as appropriate, the guidance contained within the Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan Design Guidelines, and adopted supplementary planning documents and the Caterham Valley and Hill Town Design Statement.
c. Meeting the requirements of 'Secure by Design' and minimise the likelihood and fear of crime.

d. Providing off-road parking in accordance with the adopted Tandridge Parking Standards (2012).
e. Not adversely affecting vehicular and pedestrian safety due to traffic generation, access and parking design.
f. Providing appropriate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) on site, unless there are clear reasons why this is not possible, or necessary.
g. Ensuring that areas requiring service and maintenance including watercourses are accessible at all times.

9. GREEN BELT BOUNDARY

The proximity of the development to the green belt boundary raises concerns, especially with respect to visual intrusion and ecological disturbance. While the applicant has attempted to limit development near the Green Belt, the scale of the proposed buildings (with large blocks of flats) will affect the landscape and we have concerns that it will breach the intended protection of the Green Belt.

Tandridge Core Strategy's Green Belt policies seek to protect the open character and natural beauty of the Green Belt. The size and scale of the proposed Blocks A and B will lead to visual intrusion and disruption of the landscape. Views from Stafford Road and the surrounding area will be obscured and the proposal's height and mass are out of character with the surrounding built environment and will impose on the Green Belt's visual amenity.

10. FLOODING & SEWERS

- The proposal also adds to the stress on the existing drainage system. Caterham has had extensive flooding issues over the last number of years, much detailed in representations from the Caterham Flood Action Group. Stafford Road is currently subject to flooding. It is time that the cumulative effect of all development is taken into account when an application is considered by the TDC planning department.
- This proposal will have a material impact on the sewer to cope at peak times. The assessment should not just look at the impact of the one property but should consider the aggregate impact of all extensions and developments in the last 5 years

11. POLICY DP21 – SUSTAINABLE WATER MANAGEMENT

- Water Quality, Ecology and Hydromorphology B – Proposals should avoid damage to Groundwater Source Protection Zones, having regard to the Environment Agency's 'Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice' guidance or successor documents.
- The site of the Proposed Development is significantly sloping/ tiered from Stafford Road at the front and to the rear boundary. This represents a significant gradient. Overland flow will naturally flow in the direction of Stafford Road.
- The issues of extreme site excavation, loss of vegetation at the site and disturbance of well-established root systems, increased building foot-print and use of impermeable materials puts further pressure on the land.

12. SITE EXCAVATION

- Considerable excavation is required at the site to accommodate the proposal and that the development lies on chalk.
- Chalk is a relatively soft fissured Cretaceous limestone rock that underlies many areas of the UK and north-western Europe. Excavation of chalk must deal with potential groundwater inflows (Preene and Roberts, 2017)

- Chalk is a very diverse material and presents a wide range of groundwater problems. Highly weathered structureless Chalk often acts like fine grained or coarse-grained geotechnical soils and can suffer from 'running' conditions or 'blows' where uncontrolled groundwater pressures destabilise the base and sides of an excavation.
- Less weathered structured Chalk can act like massive fissured rocks. In structured Chalk groundwater inflow typically occurs only along pre-existing bedding planes, fissures or other geological features, and can vary from minor nuisance seepages to major inflows with associated risks of instability and inundation.
- Chalk, being a limestone, has a significant solubility to water, and fissures can become enlarged as a result of long-term groundwater flow, potentially resulting in the development of zones of enhanced permeability and karst flow systems. The distribution of permeable zones is further complicated by the presence of weathered zones within the Chalk, where the bedding and jointing has been disrupted.
- For most construction projects in the UK, the nature of the Chalk encountered is described against a framework of different grades of Chalk – commonly known as the CIRIA grades, after CIRIA Report C574 Engineering in Chalk (Lord et al, 2002).
- A range of construction dewatering techniques is potentially available to control groundwater for excavations in Chalk. Groundwater control requirements, and the construction dewatering techniques that are applicable, are strongly influenced by permeability, which can be related indirectly to weathering grade of Chalk.

13. ECOLOGY

- Our objections are based on principles laid out in the Tandridge Core Strategy and Tandridge Detailed Policies, including protecting the Wooded Hillside, maintaining the character of residential areas, addressing Green Belt concerns, and ensuring that parking and ecological considerations are adequately addressed.
- While the developers have taken some steps to address biodiversity, the potential impact on local wildlife, especially with the removal of trees and disturbance to the site's natural ecosystem, raises concerns about compliance with environmental policies. The proposed development is partially located in a wooded hillside area which is part of the distinctive character of the area and it will significantly alter the character of the site. CSP18 protects wooded hillsides in the built-up area and seeks to prevent the loss of tree cover and ensure that new development does not adversely affect the character of the area. Despite efforts to mitigate the damage, the proposed removal of mature trees (including Category B and C trees) and the subsequent replanting strategy does not fully align with the policy. Any tree loss, particularly protected trees, would negatively impact the visual and ecological environment, even if replanting is planned.
- Page 22 of the Planning Statement acknowledges the wildlife at the site. Badgers, bats, slow worms, owls and deer are all on the site. This proposal will result in a major loss of biodiversity and green corridors on the site.
- The ecological assessments provided do not sufficiently account for the potential long-term impact on local biodiversity. The removal of mature trees, even with the intention to replant, will disturb local habitats and could lead to a net loss in biodiversity. This contravenes Tandridge's commitment to safeguarding the environment and ensuring development results in a net biodiversity gain.
- The removal of these trees will negatively impact the ecological value and character of the hillside, as well as disrupt views across Caterham Valley. The character of the Wooded Hillside will be irreversibly damaged, particularly in terms of its visual amenity and biodiversity.

- We have concerns about the light pollution at the rear of the building onto the woodland which is host to nocturnal animals.

14. REFUSE COLLECTION & EMERGENCY VEHICLES

- With only 51 spaces for vehicles for the flats, we expect these to be constantly in use, particularly as there is only one space per unit and the overflow will utilise the 7 visitors' spaces. Where are the refuse vehicles anticipated to park to collect the rubbish, and is there sufficient space for them to be able to turn and exit the development? Bin storage on large developments in Caterham has been seen to regularly be inadequate and access and egress is also a concern.
- We would have the same concerns for where emergency vehicles would park on the site should all the parking spaces be utilised. Again access and egress is a concern with the level of on-street parking.

15. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

- What happens with the vehicles delivering materials to the development? Should this proposal be granted approval, these must be parked on the site rather than on the road to allow free movement of resident and other traffic. No deliveries or removal of materials during peak times.
- A fully detailed Construction Management Plan is essential to ensure minimum disruption to those who use Stafford Road.

16. APPEAL DECISIONS

- The applicant has quoted two appeal decisions in support of their application. Decision Ref: APP/M3645/W/19/3243184, https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?Caseid=3243184. The quoted appeal site is for Eugene Bann Indoor Tennis Centre, Crab Hill Lane, South Nutfield, Redhill RH1 5PG. This backs on to the M23, and the site cannot be seen as in any way similar to 79-85 Stafford Road in Caterham.
  The appeal https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?Caseid=3243184 for Land west of Limpsfield Road, Warlingham, CR6 9RF is also not relevant to this application as it is not on a road where the road is at traffic saturation point.

- Caterham Valley Parish Council would suggest the following appeal dismissal is more relevant.
  TA/2022/28 - 51 Stafford Road, Caterham CR3 6JG
  The appeal by the developer for non-determination at 51 Stafford Road Appeal was dismissed by the Appeal's Officer as Tandridge had been minded to refuse the application. The Appeal Officer's report, which is very relevant to the application 2024/858 can be found at https://plandocs.tandridge.gov.uk/civica/Resource/Civica/Handler.ashx/Doc/pagestream?cd=inline&pdf=true&docno=25107703.

  Tandridge Planning Department's report with reasons for refusal can be found at https://plandocs.tandridge.gov.uk/civica/Resource/Civica/Handler.ashx/Doc/pagestream?cd=inline&pdf=true&docno=25042204.

17. RESIDENT COMMENTS

At Caterham Valley Parish Council's Planning meeting on 23rd October, residents' expressed serious concerns relating to:

- **The need for family homes**

- **Scale, massing, character - proposal not in keeping with the local area**
- **Highways and Parking stress issues / Lack of sufficient parking spaces / no passing space for pedestrians walking / speeding along the road / cannot see how current problem on the road will be resolved**
- **Drainage issues and infrastructure / flooding and skidding cars**
- **Emergency services can't get through and appears to be a one way road**
- **Environmental health and refuse collections**
- **Ecology and the destruction of the wooded hillside with the impact on views with 40 trees being removed – canopy size will not be the same as those being removed even if species are similar.**

18. CONCLUSION

Caterham Valley Parish Council believe this proposal is gross overdevelopment of the site and it will adversely impact the lives of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of overlooking, over shadowing, visual intrusion, noise, light pollution, increased traffic and stress of finding a parking space.

It is detrimental to the quality of the environment, by way of increased traffic and pollution, increased light pollution, increased usage of utilities, increased water run-off and the removal of trees.

We believe the actual housing requirement in Caterham is for 2 and 3 bedroom houses with gardens to meet the needs of families, not more flats.

A site visit by the Planning Officer is essential.

Caterham Valley Parish Council request that this application be refused.

Cllrs Alun Jones and Jenny Gaffney will take the application to Committee should the Officer be minded to approve.

4.4 TA/2024/976

Erection of part one/part two storey rear extension together with elevational alterations.

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

Comment: Caterham Valley Parish Council makes the following comments:

- **The proposal is directly on the boundary of the adjacent properties, so excavation for the extension could be an issue.**

- **The proposal will remove considerable light from the neighbours at 83 and 79. Any windows on either side of the upper floor of the extension should have obscure glazing.**

- **There are no dimensions with the proposal. It is important that the size of the proposal is clear and the applicant should not exceed the dimensions should permission be granted.**

- **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. A Construction Management Plan is required so that the proposal does impact road safety.**

4.5 TA/2024/784

Installation of 1 no static internally illuminated fascia sign , 1 no. static internally illuminated yellow "Golden Arch" on plinth, 1 no. non illuminated yellow vinyl "Golden Arch" applied externally to glazing, 1 no. static internally illuminated double sided. projecting sign, 3 no. non illuminated parking signs fitted to railing and 1non illuminated fascia sign wall mounted sign. Amended plan received 09.10.24.

35 – 41 Croydon Road, Caterham CR3 6QF *Case Officer: Cyndy Blythe*

Comment: Caterham Valley Parish Council believe that this application cannot be determined prior to the Change of Use application 2024/697. To approve this application before 2024/697 would give the impression to this Council that the decision for the Change of Use was a fait accompli. All the issues raised by this Council to 2024/697 need to be addressed before any consideration is given to 2024/784.

The proposal 2024/784 is very dominant on the two units at Quadrant House, and it should be less obtrusive in line with advertising on other units in the town.

Only signage that is attached directly the unit, on either window or wall, should be permitted. There should be no illumination that is brighter than the surrounding shops, offices and residential properties. Any illumination at height should not cause light pollution for residential properties in the hours of darkness and any illumination on the building must not be outside of trading hours.

The signage at the back should also remind delivery drivers that they are in a mixed area that includes residential and as such all noise must be kept to a minimum. It is unacceptable to use the fire escape as an access route for the delivery drivers.

There is not enough detail regarding the signs and location for this Council to make an informed decision. Parking signs for this proposal should not be installed on a public highway. Surrey Council have responded to say '*Any parking signage approved as part of this application (2024/784) may therefore be required to change depending on the outcome of application 2024/697.*'

4.6 TA/2024/982

Erection of ground floor side extension, new front porch extension. Demolition of an existing outbuilding and the construction of a new garage

South Lodge, 4 Dome Hill Peak, Caterham CR3 6EH *Case Officer: Cindy Blythe*

Comment: The Councillors leave to TDC Officers

4.7 TA/2024/916

Variation of Condition 3 (Drawings) of planning permission ref: 2021/2045 (Demolition of existing buildings and erection of two replacement dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping (Outline for access only). Adjustment to site layout plan.

1 Loxford Road, Caterham CR3 6BH *Case Officer: Hannah Middleton*

Comment: Caterham Valley Parish makes the following comments:

It is always important to ensure that local guidelines are fully observed and the views of the residents are taken into consideration.

There is also no information on the separation distance between the proposal and the current properties on either side of the development. We therefore cannot ascertain the distance from the boundary fences.

The highways assessment needs to be undertaken during school term time to obtain a proper assessment of road usage when roads are in use by parents picking up from Caterham School.

The Harestone Design Guide principles should be followed in relation to gaps between the current and future properties and adequate parking provision.

There are no dimensions of the car parking space at the front of the property.

Design Principle P 1 of the Harestone Design Guide states
'All proposals must provide evidence of how the special characteristics of the character area in which they are located or adjacent to have been considered and appropriately addressed in the design proposals. This evidence needs to demonstrate how the proposals will meet the principles set out in this guidance and conserve and enhance the character of the area

All development proposals should normally be accompanied by a Design and access Statement. The level of detail required will depend on the scale of development and is to be agreed with the local planning authority.

It is the Council's intention to not validate applications for new development, except for householder development, unless they include detailed landscape proposals. also it will normally be the Council's intention to resolve principles of the landscaping, for example overall structure and space for planting (above and below ground) at the planning application stage and not leave such matters to be dealt with by way of condition.'

It is disappointing that planning processes have not been followed as per the Harestone Design Guide. This should be consideration in all Harestone applications as it is an SPD adopted by Tandridge. We consider this proposal to be a significant development and are disappointed that the application does not reference these Guidelines.

There are slightly altered plans, but the volume of the properties is considerably larger than that currently on the site. We do not feel that there is adequate information provided for the proposal.

Should the Officer be minded to approve, we would request conditions relating to the following:

- **Glazing to be frosted on overlooking properties by way of restricted openings.**
- **Adequate replacement of boundary hedges for those removed.**
- **Construction traffic and where vehicle will park for delivering and collection materials to minimise disruption to nearby residents. A Construction Management Plan is required.**

The application is lacking in detail making it difficult to make a proper judgement based on the information provided.

4.8 TA/2024/880
Erection of single storey side extension
11 Newstead Rise, Caterham CR3 6RS *Case Officer: Adam Halpin*

Comment: The Councillors leave to TDC Officers although have reservations whether the proposal is practical and functional – the scale is not of practical relevance for future use and we have concerns as to whether it complies with building regulations.

4.9 TA/2024/26/Cond1

Details pursuant to the discharge of condition 8 (Ecology Survey) and condition 10 (Construction Environmental Management Plan) of planning permission ref: 2024/26 dated 20 March 2024 (variation of Condition 2 (drawings) of planning permission ref: 2022/1489 (erection of a single building containing 2 x 2-bedroom apartments) - rationalisation of design following working drawing package resulting in minor reposition and slightly reduced massing)

The Gardens, Caterham Hill, Caterham CR3 6FR *Case Officer: Hannah Middleton*

Comment: The Councillors leave to TDC Officers

The meeting closed at 19:48

The next planning meeting will be held at 6:30pm on Wednesday 13th November 2024

Copies of Parish Council minutes are held by the Clerk and are available on the Parish Council web-site: www.caterhamvalleypc.org.uk Mrs M Gibbins, Parish Clerk, Tel: 07510 226989