(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 8th January 2025 at 6:30pm

Cllr Jenny Gaffney – Chair
Cllr Annette Evans
Cllr Robin Spencer
Cllr Tony Pearce
Mr Neil Farrance – Co-opted member

Mrs Maureen 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 no members of the public in attendance.

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

4.1 TA/2024/1184

Erection of three storey rear extension, insertion of roof lights in front and rear roof planes, conversion of existing building to 5no. flats, and retention of ground floor commercial space.

21 Station Road, Caterham CR3 6YT *Case Officer: James Kidger*

Comment: Caterham Valley Parish Council objects 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.
- **The site is 463sqm which is 0.0463 hectares (463sqm). At a density of 100 units per hectare, this equates to 4.63 units on the site. 5 units, plus the two floors of commercial space, is overdevelopment of the site.**

Parking and Traffic Congestion

- **There is a discrepancy with the parking spaces in the documents. The plans show 4 parking spaces. However the application form states that 2 spaces currently exist**

and will both be lost with the extension of the building. Clarification is needed on parking spaces.

- **There are two car parking spaces for the commercial space at present. However, if these are being removed to make way for 4 parking spaces for the residential units, 4 parking spaces for potentially 14 people in the flats and the removal of parking for the commercial unit would suggest that the proposal is overdevelopment of the site.**
- **The Tandridge Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) outline a requirement for 1.5 unallocated spaces or two allocated spaces to serve each 1 and 2 bedroom flat. This would generate a requirement for 7.5 unallocated spaces or 10 allocated spaces. In an area where parking is at a premium, there are insufficient parking spaces to accommodate cars for potentially 14 people in this development, never mind parking spaces for the vehicles of any visitors or the commercial units.**
  - **Surrey County Council's (SCC) vehicular and cycle parking guidance states that 1 and 2 bedroom properties should have one space per unit in town centre locations.**
  - **Policy DP7 states that proposals should have regard to the adopted parking standards and not result in additional on-street parking where this would cause congestion or harm.**
  - **Policy CCW5 of the Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan states that development should**
    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.
- **The proposal is close to bus stops and the station but does not assess the impact of any additional vehicles on the already saturated roads or the previous history of traffic problems in that part of Caterham. A roundabout was installed between Stafford Road, Harestone Valley Road, Church Hill and Station Avenue to mitigate traffic issues arising from congestion in this area.**
- **Surrounding streets have a lot of parking restrictions (Harestone Valley Road, Croydon Road) and those that do not are already nose to tail with parking (i.e. Stafford Road, Farningham Road, Commonwealth Road – none of these roads local to the proposal can accommodate additional parking). This proposal for 5 flats will exacerbate existing problems.**
- **Parking on the Croydon Road is restricted to one hour during the day and, with the surrounding local roads, at capacity in the evenings. 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.**
- **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.**

<u>Transport – Buses and Trains</u>

- **There is a continued comment that Caterham is in a highly accessible location which is always given as a reason for the lack of parking. It is true that there are a number of buses that service Caterham but two of those only run one an hour. 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.**
- **It is evidently thought that the proximity of Caterham Railway Station will encourage people out of their cars. Caterham Station operates as part of the Southern Railway network and provides services twice an hour to London Bridge via East Croydon. It is necessary to change at Purley or East Croydon to go further South or into London to go to surrounding counties. 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.**
- **It is expected that somehow the parking problem can be solved by putting in bike spaces, and making the assumption that people will get on their bikes. Those proposing this concept do not appreciate Caterham Valley is surrounded by hills!**

<u>Amenity</u>

- **Most of the flats with this proposal are just above the minimum government standard to maximise profits at the development. This is not about providing good quality flats; it's about cramming as many people as possible into the space. If filled to capacity as detailed in the accommodation schedule, there could be 14 people in this space.**
- **The lack of parking will impact the amenity of residents on surrounding roads which already suffer from parking stress in excess of 100%.**

<u>Relevant Planning Application Refusals</u>

- **The recent application TA/2023/422 at 71 Croydon Road, Caterham CR36EX was refused by the Planning Officer, one of the reasons being:**
  The proposal by reason of the additional residential units that would be provided at the site and the associated increased demand for car parking which would not be met on site, would be likely to lead to additional on-street parking within the locality which is an area of substantial parking stress, thereby imposing a restraint on parking that would be detrimental to the amenities of existing residents and other users of the area. The development is, therefore, unacceptable and contrary to Policy CSP12 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008), Policies DP5 and DP7 of the Tandridge District Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014, Policy CCW5 of the Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan 2021 and the Council's adopted Parking Standards SPD 2012.

This application was also refused by the Appeals Officer
https://plandocs.tandridge.gov.uk/civica/Resource/Civica/Handler.ashx/Doc/pagestream?cd=inline&pdf=true&docno=25263412 where the report states in point 9

9. As such, the proposal would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and of the area. It would conflict with Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy 2008 (CS) and Policy DP7 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies 2014-2029 (2014) (LP). These policies support, amongst other things, development of a high-quality design that integrates effectively with its surroundings and reinforces local distinctiveness. Further, the proposal would be contrary to Policies CCW4 and CCW5 of the Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan 2018 to 2033 (2021) (the NP) which support development that integrates well with their surroundings.

Points 11 to 14 of the report state

11. The Transport Statement (TS) provided in support of the proposal found that, due to the limited availability of parking in the area, together with the proposed cycle parking in excess of the current requirements, public transport offers in the vicinity and proximity to various local shops, services, and Appeal Decision APP/M3645/W/24/3341011 https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate 3 amenities, future residents would likely be discouraged from owning cars and therefore the development would be car free.

12. However, there is no mechanism before me that would secure and retain the scheme as car free development. In the absence of such, and while on-street parking in the area may be unattractive, there is no guarantee that the development would be car free. On this basis, there remains a possibility that the lack of on-site car parking spaces would lead to the displacement of vehicles onto the public highway, even when considering the appellant's assertion that the units provided would generate a parking requirement of six vehicles only.

13. While the extent of any such displacement may be limited and unlikely to affect the safe operation of the highway, it would likely increase the on-street parking pressure in the area. This in turn would likely result in the displacement of parking to other streets, with the residents of such streets having to park further afield, to the detriment of their living conditions.

14. Thus, the proposal would have a significant harmful effect on the availability of on-street parking for residents of the area, in conflict with CS Policies CSP12 and CSP18, LP Policy DP7 and NP Policy CCW5. These policies support, amongst other things, development with a high standard of design that meets the need of residents by providing off-street parking in accordance with the adopted standards and does not significantly harm the amenity of neighbouring properties.

- **It was acknowledged by a planning inspector that a development at 74 Croydon Road, Caterham, CR3 6QD where there was to be displaced parking, would impact the amenity of residents on Farningham Road. The appeal decision can be found at https://plandocs.tandridge.gov.uk/civica/Resource/Civica/Handler.ashx/Doc/pagestream?cd=inline&pdf=true&docno=24149862.**
- **Officers stated that the adverse impact on on-street parking were major considerations for refusal to application TA/2020/776 at 64-66 Beechwood Road, Caterham CR3 6NB.**

<u>Policy DP7</u>

- **Policy DP7 of the Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies requires development to, inter alia, respect and contribute to the distinctive character, appearance and amenity of the area in which it is located, have a complementary building design and not result in overdevelopment or unacceptable intensification by reason of scale, form, bulk, height, spacing, density and design.**
- **One of the reasons TA/2020/776 at 64-66 Beechwood Road, Caterham CR3 6NB was refused is also applicable with this proposal.**

The proposed development, by reason of its bulk, scale, siting, design, layout, intensity of use and inadequate outdoor amenity space, would fail to provide a satisfactory living environment for future occupants, contrary to Policy DP7 of the Tandridge District Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies (2014).

<u>Light Pollution</u>

- **Whilst most buildings in the area are commercial, there are also some residential. Roof lighting could cause nuisance to neighbours.**

Commercial Space

- **The loss of further office space in Caterham is regrettable. Much of the town's retail / commercial space has been given over to residential. This does not help the economy of the town.**

Construction Traffic

- **Considering the limitations of the site, there is no Construction Management Plan document with this proposal. Should this application be approved, consideration needs to be given to where the construction and delivery vehicles will park. There is no space to unload on Station Avenue and they cannot block access to the neighbouring properties or the parking for other businesses at the back of the development. Conditions must be put in place to minimise disruption to the local businesses and residents. Loading and unloading of vehicles will be disruptive to the local businesses.**

Flooding

- **The proposed units will tie in to the existing drainage provisions. Drains are the old Victorian type and there is regular flooding at the bottom of the mini roundabout at Station Avenue / Stafford Road / Harestone Valley Road.**

Bin Storage

- **To application 2024/776, the Lead Recycling and Waste Manager, Waste Management and Enforcement, has expressed concerns regarding bin storage, size of bins and refuse vehicles. Should this application be approved, consideration needs to be given to how and where the refuse vehicles will park to collect. Conditions must be put in place to minimise disruption to the local businesses and residents.**

This proposal is overdevelopment of the site and Caterham Valley Parish Council request it be refused.

4.2 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: Latest comments with photographs submitted to TDC 30th December 2024

4.3 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. Amended rear elevation plan received 20.12.24.

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

Comment: The Councillors leave to TDC Officers with attention to:

- **the lighting on the service road needs to be improved with the additional traffic from the mopeds and cars. The road is dark and there are certainly potential highway safety issues with the lack of visibility for pedestrians. We suggest the moped drivers should wear high viz vests to improve their visibility.**
- **Contrary to the applicant's view, we would suggest that the enforcement of the parking area at the rear of the proposal is necessary to ensure the couriers do not**

park anywhere else on the service road. The problems they currently cause are well articulated by local people.

- **We reiterate our concerns regarding the removal of the barrier.**

4.4 TA/2024/1176

Proposed dormer to south west elevation and installation of rooflight.
Squirrels Leap, 20b Loxford Road, Caterham CR3 6B *Case Officer: Cindy Blythe*
Comment: The Councillors leave to TDC Officers.

4.5 TA/2024/977

Excavation works to convert front garden into hard standing for car parking area together with the erection of dwarf wall. Annotated plans with dimensions received 18.12.24
81 Beechwood Road, Caterham CR3 6NF *Case Officer: Cindy Blythe*
Comment: Caterham Valley Parish Council requests this application should be determined with reference to the permission granted 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 or impact road safety. It is essential that the applicant does not exceed the permitted working hours. 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/2024/1220

Retention of 3No non illuminated signs on front elevation (upper ground floor level).
14 Timber Hill Road, Caterham CR3 6LD *Case Officer: Samuel Odell*
Comment: Leave to Officer

Meeting closed at 18:55

The next planning meeting will be held at 6:30pm on Wednesday 29th January 2025