

Michael Parker  
Development Management, Planning Department  
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council  
Town Hall  
Castlefield Road  
Reigate  
RH2 0SH

[email: Michael.Parker@reigate-banstead.gov.uk]

Dear Michael

**Land at Partridge Mead (ref. 23/OO822/F) and Land to the north of Downland Close (ref. 23/OO823/F)**

Further to our meeting on 10 August to discuss the current planning applications at Partridge Mead and Downland Close submitted on behalf of Raven Housing Trust and EDAROTH, please find enclosed revised plans and commentary which responds to the points raised at the meeting.

This covering letter is accompanied by the following information in associating with the Partridge Mead Application:

- Proposed Site Plan (updated to ref. 5213970-ATK-06-00-DR-AR-021554 P2);
- Proposed Internal Layout Plan (updated to ref. 5213970-ATK-06-ZZ-DR-AR-011551 P2); and
- Proposed Landscaping Plan (updated to ref. 5213970-ATK-06-00-DR-AR-021555 P2).

**Partridge Mead**

Bin collection point

During the meeting on 10 August, it was queried whether the location of the temporary bin store could be moved further to the south, adjacent to the garage at the neighbouring property.

Collection points comprising of painted lines on the floor (not an above ground structure) were suggested by the Waste Officer, Ian Muir during the pre-application process as a solution to aid the sufficient and safe collection of waste. The location of the bin collection point is in accordance with Building Regulations Part H which defines locations for storage and collection of waste, and states the following:

*“Residents should not be required to carry waste more than 30m (excluding any vertical distance) to the storage point*

*Waste collection vehicles should be able to get to within 25m of the storage point”*

The bin collection point can therefore not be relocated to the south as suggested as it results in a greater distance for residents to move the wheelie bins, thereby contravening the maximum distances outlined in Building Regulations Part H. Given that the maximum drag distances for residents have been met, the location cannot be altered.

### Legal access

It is noted that the resident of 6 Park Wood Road raised an objection on the basis that the originally submitted plans affected the right they held to access their garage on the east of the site. The resident has provided a copy of that deed, which grants rights of way for passing with a vehicle of domestic use. Whilst land ownership and access rights are not a material consideration in planning terms, since receiving the deed, the necessary plans have been amended to show the access right is maintained. The vehicle tracking used is for a modern domestic vehicle (as shown below) which is larger than when the deed was written, showing that there is the required space to maintain the access. Raven Housing Trust has written to the resident confirming that the access would be maintained.



### Accuracy of plans

There have been queries raised by members of the public that the base plans used as part of the planning application are not reflective of the surroundings. The plans used for this planning applications come from the Ordnance Survey mapping data. This is the clearest set of maps that are used in planning applications.

Specific ancillary domestic items such as garden sheds are not always uploaded to the OS mapping platform and therefore, whilst specific items do not appear on the plans themselves, any structures neighbouring the site will be taken into consideration during the detailed design period.



### Coordination of boundaries

The OS plans that are used for the application are based on a specific data set, which are then overlaid with a topographical survey, which measures the characteristics of the site. There are instances where these two data sets do not align perfectly, and therefore it is post planning during the detailed design stage, where the coordination of items at the boundary are finalised, in line with title ownership.

Where an objection has been raised based on the removal of trees on the boundary, the Arboricultural Assessment has deduced that the tree is within the application boundary (within Raven's ownership) is a low grade C (self-set tree of little value) and should not act as a limitation on the effective use of the site, or impose any significant constraints on the layout.

Raven has been in touch with the resident and suggested a meeting to discuss this item, post planning.

### **Downland Close**

#### Spatial coordination

As you are aware, the application sites are being proposed for social housing. The sites are previously developed brownfield land which by their very nature come with characteristics that restrict certain design principles that might otherwise be expected on larger less constrained sites.

The constraints and opportunities of the sites have been full assessed by the design team in order to coordinate the most effective use of space and to aid with the delivery of good quality homes that Raven Housing Trust can deliver at an affordable price and maintain in an efficient and cost-effective way for future residents and generations to come.

For example, whilst it was suggested that private driveways may be a more preferable design option over a parking court, in these instances existing constraints on the site dictate the centralisation of parking. The resulting design does not materially affect the quality of homes, the way the elevations are seen, or the use of the external space. Equally, parking and tracking information has been provided and the parking of cars has been fully assessed by Markides which determines the parking courts are safe.

#### Soft landscaping

It was suggested within the meeting that the proposed application should increase soft landscaping. In the applications, where possible, soft landscaping has been included to soften elevations and provide an improved appearance of the site, compared to the existing site which has no attractive landscape features. Local Plan Policy DES1 states that new development should incorporate appropriate landscaping to complement the design of new development.

*“Schemes should:*

*a. protect and enhance natural features by:*

*i. incorporating existing landscaping into scheme design where feasible.*

*ii. integrating new landscaping, both hard and soft, and boundary treatments which use appropriate local materials and/or species.*

*b. Provide details about how future maintenance of existing and new landscape works will be managed. Where necessary, conditions will be used to secure the delivery of landscaping schemes, protection of natural features during the course of development and requirements for replacement planting.”*

At present, the site does not have any existing landscaping. Accordingly, the proposed development provides an overall improvement to the current baseline, which includes providing soft landscaping to the front and rear of the properties.

Communal landscaping (both hard and soft) needs to be maintained by Raven, which is paid for by the social tenants via a service charge. The amount and type of landscaping is a material consideration to Housing Associations (as it is to Local Authorities) when considering the annual maintenance obligations and pass through to residents. Hard landscaping is easier to maintain to a higher standard, keeping the aspiration of the residents high, whilst keeping the cost to them to a minimum. The design has been thought through in detail taking account all relevant factors including planning policy, and also the end user.

### **Summary**

This note provides updated plans and additional commentary in respect of the applications at Partridge Mead and Downland Close, following the discussions with yourself on 10 August. The applications are part of a wider masterplan of sites being brought forward by Raven Housing Trust and EDAROTH to deliver much needed affordable housing in accordance with Reigate and Banstead’s Housing Targets. The applications have been prepared in accordance with the Development Plan, considering the sites constraints and opportunities, surrounding context and Raven’s commitments to housing tenants and financial constraints as a Housing Association.

We trust the above information is helpful to your consideration of the two applications. If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact myself or my colleague, Lauren Manoharan.

Yours sincerely

**Adam Gostling**  
Director