

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 30 October 2024 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)

Ernest Mallett MBE\*  
Victor Lewanski\*  
Scott Lewis\*  
Catherine Powell\*  
Jeremy Webster\*  
Edward Hawkins (Chairman) \*  
John Robini\*  
Richard Tear (Vice-Chairman) \*  
Jonathan Hulley\*  
Jeffrey Gray  
Chris Farr

**50/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies have been received from Jeffrey Gray and Chris Farr.

**51/22 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]**

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

**52/22 PETITIONS [Item 3]**

There were none.

**53/22 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 4]**

In regard to the Horse Hill site, Officers made a statement in addition to the responses to the public questions.

*Following discussions between the council's Planning Enforcement and Monitoring Team and the operator, oil production has ceased at the site at Horse Hill which we are pleased to note. However, discussions remain ongoing between the council and the operator and the investigation remains live in the sense of working towards full suspension and demobilisation at the site.*

Further to this, officers read aloud a public statement from the operator of the site.

Five Public Questions were submitted. The questions and responses were published within a supplementary agenda on 29 October 2024.

1. Deborah Elliott asked the following supplementary question:

In UK Oil & Gas PLC's (UKOG) recent statements, they say there have been in talks with Surrey County Council since June. Could you confirm and provide evidence of this? If this is true, why has drilling been permitted by the Council in the interim without any planning permission in place?

In response, officers stated that they could not provide evidence while in the meeting but confirmed that there had been an ongoing dialogue with the operator. As per the published public question responses, the council had not permitted drilling and that it was the council's position that the extraction of oil at the site is unlawful. Officers agreed to provide a full written response outside the meeting.

2. Jackie Macey asked the following supplementary question:

The delayed action from Surrey County Council has led Chris Coghlan MP to say Surrey County Council owe residents of a full explanation of their conduct over the last four months. You state in your response that you UKOG has been put on notice. When did this happen and exactly what does this mean?

Officers stated that, as mentioned in the previous response, 'put on notice' meant that UKOG had been informed the extraction was considered unlawful and that there had been ongoing dialogue over the past four months. Officers agreed to provide a detailed written response outside the meeting.

3. Sarah Freeman did not ask a supplementary question.

4. Jacqueline Phillips asked the following supplementary question:

Can Surrey County Council please confirm that they will require an Environmental Impact Assessment which takes full account of direct and indirect emissions from all extracted, to be submitted by Horse Hill Developments Limited or UKOG for any future or redetermination of the planning application at Horse Hill?

Officers stated that, in respect of the application where the permission was quashed, it was now back with the county for redetermination. This would require consideration of the environmental impact assessment threshold, along with an environmental statement, before any redetermination could take place. Officers could not confirm anything regarding other planning applications, as they did not yet know the content of any forthcoming applications. However, it was noted that any permission or application submitted would have needed to be mindful of the Supreme Court's decision.

5. Neville Kemp asked the following supplementary question:

On 2 October 2024, thanks to the dedicated journalism of Ruth Hayhurst of Drill or drop, it was revealed that, until last week, when, curiously, the company announced a suspension of their operations, Horse Hill Development Limited were continuing to extract oil in flagrant disregard of the Supreme Court judgement in June, which had found against the Council's

decision allowing continued production. In its failure to uphold this judgement over the past four months, and moreover, to honour its declaration of a climate emergency in 2019, are we to infer a Council bias in favour of the oil and gas industry?

In response, the Chairman acknowledged that part of the question was outside the remit of the Planning and Regulatory Committee. The Chairman agreed to provide a written response outside the meeting.

#### **54/22 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 5]**

1. One Member Question was submitted by Cllr Jonathan Essex. The question and response was published in a supplementary agenda on 29 October 2024. Cllr Essex asked the following supplementary question:

As this relates to a decision of the Supreme Court and the activities pursuant have continued for the past five years, it would seem unreasonable to think the courts would anyway not support such immediate enforcement, so it's unclear why prior investigation appears to have been undertaken first rather than first taking immediate formal enforcement action. The supplementary question is to ask whether the Surrey County Council will now, if not already, formally issue and publish a stop notice to ensure that continued operations at the Horse Hill site do now cease and immediately instead commence clearance and full restoration of the site.

Officers stated that the investigation was ongoing and agreed to provide a written response outside the meeting.

#### **55/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 6]**

There were none.

#### **56/22 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL GU24/CON/00010 - LAND AT ST PAUL'S C OF E INFANT SCHOOL, THE CARDINALS, TONGHAM, SURREY GU10 1EF [Item 7]**

##### **Officers:**

Lok Chee Leonie Chan, Planning Officer  
Dawn Horton-Baker, Planning Development Team Leader

##### **Officer introduction:**

Officers introduced the report and update sheet and informed Members that the application was for the construction and use of double-height extension to rear of school hall, enlarged car park and two new multi-use games areas; and reinstatement of grass playing field. The full details were provided within the published report.

##### **Speakers:**

The Local Member, Cllr Matt Furniss, made the following points:

1. That the proposal had his full support.

2. There was a significant shortage of school spaces in the area, which needed addressing.
3. This was the only school in the area that did not have a junior school attached.
4. A key issue was that the school had to transport students to other junior schools, which was not a sustainable form of travel.
5. The area has seen 2,000 houses built, resulting in a shortage of necessary infrastructure.
6. The Member urged the committee to approve the application in order to keep school children local and reduce unnecessary travel.
7. A 20mph speed limit and other school safety measures would be included before the application advanced further.

A Member of the Committee asked whether the local Member felt the proposal would meet the local need in the area. The Local Member confirmed that the additional school spaces would help address the overall need in the area.

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. In regard to the three metre high mesh fence, a Member inquired if acoustic fencing had been considered as an alternative. Additionally, the Member suggested that if the space were to be rented out in the evening, it could be beneficial. Officers confirmed that there was a condition to limit the hours of use, which would be until 7:30 pm. Additionally, a noise assessment had been carried out, and it was determined that the noise levels were within acceptable limits.
2. A Member inquired whether plans were in place for safety measures such as 20mph speed limits and parking wardens. Officers confirmed that a comprehensive scheme of road safety improvements had been secured by condition, as outlined in the report. These improvements include one-way systems, upgrades to footways, the provision of additional zebra crossings, and more.
3. A Member thanked officers for addressing the concerns raised by Members during the site visit. The Member stated that she fully supported the application.
4. A Member stated that they fully supported the proposal as there was a need for it in the area.
5. Members noted that the on-site pond would be protected during construction.

**Actions / further information to be provided:**

None.

**Resolved:**

That pursuant to Regulation 3 of The Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, the Committee grants planning permission for application ref: GU24/CON/00010, subject to the recommended planning conditions outlined in the report and update sheet.

**57/22 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL RE24/00028/CON - SITE OF FORMER COLEBROOK AND SPECTRUM NOKE DAY CENTRES, NOKE DRIVE, REDHILL, SURREY RH1 1PT [Item 8]**

**Officers:**

Charlotte Parker, Planning Development Team Leader

**Officer introduction:**

The Committee was provided with an overview of the report and update sheet. Members noted that the outline application was for the erection of part 1, 4, 5 and 6 storey building for extra care accommodation, comprising self-contained apartments, staff and communal facilities, and associated parking with access from St Annes Drive and Noke Drive. Appearance and landscaping reserved. The full details were outlined within the published report and update sheet.

**Speakers:**

Carol Bell spoke on behalf of the applicant and made the following points:

1. It was explained that the application was part of a programme of extra care projects being delivered by the council to address the critical gap in the provision of affordable housing for older people who require accommodation with care and support.
2. The development would be set in a community environment where residents' support needs could be met.
3. The applicant's agent confirmed that the facility would provide a higher level of care than traditional supported housing.
4. Communal facilities were designed to promote social activities for residents.
5. The Colebrook site had been specifically selected for extra care housing as it met key sustainability criteria, including close proximity to the town centre, availability of public transport links, and health infrastructure. The design would meet the requirements for affordable specialist housing, including being wheelchair accessible throughout, with adaptable accommodation that could address the current and future needs of its residents.
6. Extra care housing was designed to promote the independence of residents by providing flexible care when required.
7. A manager would be on-site at all times and available in case of emergencies.
8. The latest suitable energy measures would be installed to reduce heat loss and lower energy bills for residents. Electric vehicle chargers would be installed throughout, and homes would be equipped to meet the future needs of residents, including the latest in telecare technology.
9. The Colebrook development would contribute towards the council's ambitious target, set in 2020, to deliver 725 new homes for older adults in need of care and support by 2030.

A Member expressed concerns regarding the layout and flood risk from a planning perspective. The Member inquired whether the overlay of Zone 3

flooding on the layout had been considered to ensure that no ground floor residential accommodation was located in this area. The applicant's agent confirmed that the flood risk assessment document had been updated since the final submission, and additional plans were included to show that residential accommodation on the ground floor was elevated higher than the flood risk zone. The Member asked whether the applicant was aware that current government guidance recommends floor levels to be at least 600 millimetres above the estimated flood level, whereas the design put forward in the plans indicates a floor level of only 300 millimetres. Officers agreed to respond during the item's discussion.

A Member asked for details of any additional parking spaces in the local area. The applicant's agent confirmed that the council was aware of the parking restrictions near the site and that officers had worked with the Highways department to consider the local provision of public transport to make the site as sustainable as possible. It was further noted that the majority of residents were not expected to own cars, and officers were working to include a 'car club' provision to support alternative means of transport.

The Local Member, Jonathan Essex, made the following points:

1. The Local Member expressed general support for the proposed extra care homes at this location, noting its proximity to Redhill town centre. They welcomed the scheme being genuinely affordable, particularly at social rent levels. The Member requested that the affordability aspect, specifically social rents, be acknowledged in the recommendations, possibly through an informative.
2. While the development was generally supported, nearby residents were concerned about overlooking. The speaker welcomed the inclusion of obscure glazing on balconies.
3. The Local Member acknowledged the height of the development but did not consider it excessive. They noted the visibility from the neighbouring conservation area, but the harm was not deemed significant. They suggested using a passive house design to reduce energy demands, particularly as the homes might require more heating, and requested that this be covered under reserved matters.
4. The speaker highlighted the need for a construction transport condition that required close liaison with the nearby school, Carrington School, which operated from 8:30 AM to 3:00 PM. They requested that condition 10 be strengthened to ensure this coordination.
5. The speaker raised concerns regarding the wider use of the site, particularly the old Youth and Community Centre site. They noted that youth work had been provided intermittently at faith sites in Redhill and suggested that access through the site to the northern part of the site for future youth facilities be considered, potentially as a condition or informative.

In regard to design, officers stated that it may be difficult to require any additional design to meet passive house design criteria. The officers added that it may be possible to include an informative, but that it could not be conditioned.

In regard to liaison with the local school, it was confirmed that the condition did take into account the movements of the school children. However, it was noted that it was unclear whether further action could be taken at this stage. It was suggested that an additional provision could be included, ensuring that, during the construction phase, there would be a dialogue with the school to facilitate a smooth and safe process for the children.

It was noted that the development of the other part of the site was the responsibility of the landowner and applicant. While there had been some discussion regarding community use, particularly for young people, the officer expressed hesitation in suggesting specific plans or a route through the relevant part of the site. However, it was mentioned that, if the wider site's plans progressed, there could be an opportunity to integrate plans with the current application during the reserved matters phase.

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. In regard to concerns raised regarding Flood Zone 3, officers stated that the guidance suggested a finished floor level of up to 600 millimetres in areas of high uncertainty regarding flood risks. However, detailed modelling had been conducted for this application, as outlined in the flood risk assessment, providing a reasonable degree of certainty about the potential extent of flooding. Under these circumstances, the 300 millimetre level was considered acceptable. The Member stated that she still had concerns with the flood risk on the ground floor.
2. A Member stated that he supported the proposal and stressed the need for applications to make the best use of the land.
3. A Member raised concerns with accommodation being built on the ground floor due to the risk of flooding.
4. A concern was raised regarding Condition 7, which stated that details of a flood warning and evacuation plan were to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to occupation of the building, with implementation thereafter. The Member expressed that, based on the discussions, they would feel significantly more comfortable if the condition required submission before commencement of the development rather than prior to occupation. In response, officers stated that the guidance on pre-commencement conditions strongly recommended avoiding them unless absolutely necessary. The officer explained that a flood evacuation plan could be submitted prior to occupation, as the trigger for the plan was the presence of people on the site, rather than the commencement of physical works. In response to concerns raised by Members, it was emphasised that the evacuation plan would need to address the 24/7 residential use of the site, ensuring pre-emptive actions were included and that safe egress during a flood event was accounted for. The managed nature of the facility was highlighted as beneficial, as it allowed for better oversight of the evacuation plan compared to private residential settings. The officer expressed that, in their professional view, it was acceptable for the condition to be prior to occupation.
5. The Chairman moved the recommendation, with agreement that reserve matters would return to the committee for consideration, which received 7 votes for, 1 against, and 1 abstention.

**Actions / further information to be provided:**

None.

**Resolved:**

That, subject to Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 1992, outline planning consent is granted for application reference: RE24/00028/CON, subject to the conditions outlined within the report and update sheet.

**58/22 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 9]**

The date of the next meeting was noted.

Meeting closed at 12.05 pm

---

**Chairman**