

Supplementary Agenda – Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Planning and Regulatory Committee

**Date & time**

Wednesday, 25
January 2023 at
10.30 am

Place

Council Chamber,
Woodhatch Place, 11
Cockshot Hill, Reigate,
Surrey, RH2 8EF

Contact

Joss Butler
joss.butler@surreycc.gov.uk

Chief Executive

Joanna Killian

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

2 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

(Pages 1
- 6)

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2022.

Joanna Killian
Chief Executive
Published: 24 January 2023

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES of the meeting of the **PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 7 December 2022 at Council Chamber, Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 8EF.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

Members

*= present

Tim Hall (Chairman)*
Ernest Mallett MBE*
Penny Rivers*
Jonathan Hulley (Vice-Chairman)*
Victor Lewanski*
Scott Lewis*
Catherine Powell*
Richard Tear*
Jeremy Webster*
Jeffrey Gray
Edward Hawkins
Penny Rivers*

79/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Edward Hawkins and Jeffrey Gray.
David Harmer acted as substitute for Edward Hawkins.

80/22 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]

The Minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the previous meeting.

81/22 PETITIONS [Item 3]

There were none.

82/22 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 4]

There were none.

83/22 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 5]

There were none.

84/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 6]

There were none.

85/22 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL RE22/00775/CON - REIGATE PARISH SCHOOL, 91 BLACKBOROUGH ROAD, REIGATE, SURREY RH2 7DB [Item 7]

Officers:

Caroline Smith (Planning Group Manager)
 Sonia Sharp| (Senior Highways and Planning Solicitor)
 Stephen Jenkins (Planning Development Manager)
 Chris Turner (Senior Planning Officer)

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chairman introduced the item and highlighted that an update sheet had been circulated. Officers provided Members with a brief overview of the proposals. It was noted that the proposal was for the construction of a new artificial grass surfaced Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA), macadam-paved access route, provision of new perimeter gates and fencing and associated works without compliance with Condition 3 of Planning Permission ref: RE15/01766/CON dated 16 October 2015 to extend the hours of use of the MUGA to allow use by the community. Full details of the proposal could be found from page 13 of the agenda.
2. A Member highlighted that the location of the proposal was within their constituency and that previous concerns were based on the potential installation of floodlighting however floodlights had not been included within the proposal before Members at the meeting. Officers confirmed the installation of floodlights were not included within the proposal and that a condition had been included to restrict floodlighting.

Actions / Further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

The Committee unanimously agreed that, pursuant to Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, application no. RE22/00775/CON be PERMITTED subject to the conditions outlined in the report and update sheet.

86/22 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL TA/2021/1213 - ST PETER AND ST PAUL CE INFANT SCHOOL, 93 ROOK LANE, CHALDON, CATERHAM, SURREY CR3 5BN [Item 8]

Officers:

Caroline Smith (Planning Group Manager)
 Sonia Sharp| (Senior Highways and Planning Solicitor)
 Stephen Jenkins (Planning Development Manager)
 Janine Wright (Principal Planning Officer)
 Dawn Horton-Baker (Planning Development Team Leader)
 Tricia Gurney (Principal Transport Development Planning Officer)

Speakers:

Graham Baker made representations in objection to the application. The following key points were made:

1. That he fully supported the proposal to expand the school but opposed the draft transport plan.
2. That the draft transport plan would not work and would cause more congestion, more pollution, that it was more dangerous, expensive and was visually horrible.
3. That the draft plan had proposed to half the number of parking spaces outside the school while the report had acknowledged that the number of cars would double.
4. That vehicles were already parking dangerously on the pavement and that this would only increase with the proposals.
5. That, when parking was unavailable, the draft plan advice parents not to stop and queue but to carry on and loop around the parking laybys using Church Lane and Doctors Lane which were very narrow country lanes.
6. That the consulting engineers should have consulted residents of the village.
7. That a carpark on Rook Lane could be used for parents and minibuses to discharge their children and then walk to school. There were two potential sites for the carpark.
8. That conditions 3 and 4 should be amended to allow a period of consultation of six months with the village on the proposed transport plan provided by residents to provide an alternative, cheaper, safer and more effective solution.
9. That consultation was key to making a successful decision.

The Local Member, Jeremy Webster, made the following comments:

1. That Caterham Hill was an area of significant population expansion due to new development.
2. That if St Peter and St Paul CE Infant School did not expand then the future of the school would be in doubt and that parents would need to travel to schools beyond Caterham.
3. Provided detail on the current situation at the school in regard to number of pupils.
4. That the school had an excellent reputation locally and had outperformed compared to the Surrey average. It also had an outstanding reputation for caring for its pupils.
5. That if the school was to disappear then there would be a serious impact on the local community.
6. That local people generally supported the expansion.
7. That the travel plan was a disappointing document and that it was regrettable that the school, local councillor and residents were not more involved with its creation.
8. That alteration to the speed limit on the busy through road and adjoining rural lanes were welcomed but insignificant attention had been paid to other aspects. Suggestions made on Mount Avenue, a cul-de-sac, would not work due to parking used by residents.
9. That the school had acknowledged the travel plan should be a living document and capable of adaptation.
10. Proposed that the local Member, the village council and the school should work together to make Condition 6 a reality and that the Local Member was prepared to Chair this process.
11. Thanked the Case Officer for her work on the report.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. Officers introduced the report and update sheet and provided Members with a brief summary. Members noted that the proposal was for the construction of a single storey extension to the existing school to accommodate the expansion of the school from a 1FE Infant School to a 1FE Primary School, including the construction of teaching classrooms with related support accommodation, WC facilities, library, enlargement of the existing hall and associated off-site highway works (AMENDED). Full details of the proposal, including photographs and plans, could be found from Page 37 of the agenda.
2. A Member of the committee had concerns around the travel plan especially due to the comments made by Legrew Memorial Charity of Chaldon Village which raised issues with the design of the carpark and fire exits. The Member went on to state that they felt it was sensible to amend the condition to allow the local Member to chair a series of consultations on the travel plan. The Principal Transport Development Planning Officer explained that it was usual practice for the creation of the travel plan to be the responsibility of the school. The Member went on to state that in her experience a positive outcome was more likely if the school, and other members of the local community, were involved with the creation of the travel plan. The Member asked officers for advice on what could be done to ensure the local village was included within the transport plan creation. Following discussion, officers suggested that an informative be included to encourage the applicant to engage with the school and the local community on the travel plan.
3. In regard to the local highway safety issues, officers explained that a condition was included which was related to highway safety and that a highway safety audit would be undertaken, and also that the detailed travel plan would be submitted to the County Highways Officer.
4. A Member provided comments on travel plans in general and stated they did not believe them to be enforceable. The Senior Highways and Planning Solicitor highlighted that Condition 6 outlined that once the travel plan was approved then the development had to be carried out in accordance with the travel plan. The Solicitor therefore said that her view was that the travel plan would be enforceable.
5. The Senior Highways and Planning Solicitor suggested that Members ask the relevant officer for their thoughts on the quality of the current travel plan. The officer also stated that Members needed to be satisfied with the highway safety aspects of the application and suggested that Members ask questions to better understand the current situation.
6. In regard to the quality of the travel plan, the Principal Transport Development Planning Officer explained that officers were not completely satisfied with some elements of the plan. However it was the responsibility of the school and parents to compile the plan and, once implemented, develop further when they consider it appropriate.
7. The Principal Transport Development Planning Officer explained that a Stage 1 Safety Audit had been complete which was very basic. Following the completion of a survey, a Stage 2 Safety Audit would be completed. The officer highlighted the need to mitigate issues caused by increasing the number of pupils at the school to ensure safety.
8. A Member reiterated the need to ensure that members of the local community were involved in the travel plan creation process.

9. Officers provided detail on the difference between the travel plan and the mitigation process.
10. The Senior Highways and Planning Solicitor suggested that Members ask officers for information related to the parking issues raised by the local Member and public speaker.
11. The Senior Highways and Planning Solicitor advised Members that, if unsatisfied with the detail provided on the travel plan, highway safety and the impact on neighbours, then Members could request more time to make a decision on the application.
12. The Planning Development Team Leader explained that the impact on local residents due to increased traffic and parking had been taking into consideration, and that mitigating actions had been proposed. However it was officers' opinion that the need for school places outweighed the short-term harm caused by traffic at pick up and drop off times.
13. A Member highlighted the Construction Transport Management Plan noted within Condition 5 of the report and asked for detail on the length of time required for the construction. Further to this, the Member asked whether officers were satisfied that the Construction Transport Management Plan would mitigate any impact to residents. Officers said that were not currently aware of the length of time needed to construct the extension however the applicant had undertaken 10 tenders and were close to instructing a provider to provide a quote on the works. In regard to the Construction Transport Management Plan, officers were satisfied that the requirements for the plan would mitigate any harm caused to nearby residential amenities.
14. The Planning Development Manager highlighted that the concerns raised at the meeting were covered by conditions which would need to be submitted to the authority and approved and that it was within the power the committee to call any of these items in for consideration.
15. The Chairman proposed the inclusion of an informative to encourage the applicant to engage with the local county councillor, the village community and neighbouring residents on the creation of the travel plan. The inclusion of such an informative was agreed by the committee.
16. The Chairman moved to a vote on the applicant which received 7 votes For, 0 Against, and 1 abstention.

Actions / Further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

That, pursuant to Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, planning application ref: TA/2021/1213 be permitted subject to the conditions and informatives outlined within the officer report and update sheet, and the informative agreed during the discussion of the item.

87/22 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 9]

The date of the next meeting was noted.

Meeting closed at 11.27 am

Chairman