

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning  
Applications Committee held at  
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House  
on 20 July 2015**

---

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)  
+ Cllr David Mansfield (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr David Allen	+ Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper
+ Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Robin Perry
+ Cllr Nick Chambers	- Cllr Ian Sams
+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Conrad Sturt
+ Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Surinder Gandhum	- Cllr Victoria Wheeler
- Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	+ Cllr Valerie White

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Max Nelson (In place of Rebecca Jennings-Evans)

In Attendance: Cllr Adrian Page, Lee Brewin, Duncan Carty, Cllr Paul Deach, Michelle Fielder, Gareth John, Jonathan Partington, Neil Praine, Cllr Nic Price and Jenny Rickard.

Cllr Paul Deach from min 9/P – 13/P  
Cllrs Nic Price and Adrian Page from min 9/P – 14/P

**9/P Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**10/P Application Number: 14/0532 - Land South of 24 - 46 (evens) Kings Road, and 6 and 9 Rose Meadow, West End GU24 9LW**

The application was for the outline application for 84 dwellings (including 8 one bedroom flats, 34 two bedroom houses, 28 three bedroom houses and 14 four bedroom houses) with access from Rose Meadow. Access only to be considered. (Additional info rec'd 11/09/2014). (Additional info rec'd 09/10/2014), (Additional info rec'd 22/10/14), (Additional in rec'd 06/11/14).

The Committee was reminded that the application was the subject of a valid non-determination appeal that has been received by the Planning Inspectorate. The applicant had the right to make a non-determination appeal after the expiry of the statutory time limit or expiry of an extension of time agreement. The Planning Inspectorate became the determining authority. However, it was still necessary for the Council to confirm what it would have determined if it had been the determining authority.

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'SCC (Education) has provided further comment suggesting a contribution of £508,877 towards secondary and primary education is required. However, they confirm that there are currently no projects to fund.*

*As such, the contribution would not comply with the tests set out in Paragraph 204 of the NPPF.*

*Correction: SU/06/0879 relates to 40-46 Kings Road and therefore relates to an adjoining site.'*

It was noted that the speakers agreed with the officer's recommendation to refuse the application but they felt that other reasons for refusal should be included, including harm to the rural area, lack of infrastructure, highways issues, harm to the wildlife habitat and inappropriate access route.

Some Members felt that an additional reason for refusal that the development would be harmful to the rural character of the village should be included. Members were reminded that the site fell within the defined countryside (beyond the Green Belt) but also formed a part of a housing reserve site as previously defined in Policy H8 of the Surrey Heath Local Plan.

**Resolved that application 14/0532, had the Council been the determining authority, be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head - Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Members had received correspondence regarding this application.

**Note 2**

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme Mr Consterdine, Ms Doney and Ms Walters spoke in objection to the reasons for refusal.

**Note 3**

The recommendation to refuse the application, had the Council been the determining authority, was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor David Allen.

**Note 4**

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to this application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application, had the Council been the determining authority:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

11/P

**Application Number: 14/0594 - land north of Beldam Bridge Road, West End GU24 9LP**

The application was for the outline application for the erection of up to 85 dwellings with new access and change of use of land to provide publicly accessible recreation space (SANG), car parking, landscaping and open space (details of access only to be agreed). (Additional info rec'd 15/09/14), (Additional info rec'd 23/09/14).

Some Members felt that the application had been premature as the borough had met the housing requirement.

**Resolved that application 14/0593 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head - Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Members had received correspondence regarding this application.

**Note 2**

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme Ms Kingston, Ms Doney and Mr Bain spoke in objection to the application. Mr Woolf the agent spoke in support.

**Note 3**

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Pat Tedder.

**Note 3**

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to this application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillor Max Nelson.

**Democratic Services Officer's Note:**

A day after the meeting the appellant lodged an appeal on the grounds of non-determination and before the decision had been formally issued. The planning decision cannot therefore be issued by the Authority and the application will now be decided by the Planning Inspectorate.

**12/P Application Number: 14/0869 - 12 Streets Heath, West End, GU24 9QY**

This application was for the erection of a two storey detached building to comprise of a 60 bedroom nursing home (Use Class C2) following demolition of existing dwelling. (Additional info rec'd 29/09/2014) (Amended & additional plans/info rec'd 16/12/14), (Amended info rec'd 19/02/15), (Amended info rec'd 26/02/15), (Amended info/plans rec'd 02/04/15). (Amended and Additional plans & documents rec'd 24/06/2015).

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'Following the submission of an amended drainage strategy and illustrative landscaping masterplan a revised public consultation has been undertaken. This has resulted in 8 letters of objection (confirming the original objections remain) being received. A letter of support has also been received.'*

*Comments have been received from the Drainage Officer and no objection is raised, subject to the condition below **(additional condition)**:*

*Prior to the commencement of any development associated with the permission hereby granted a revised drainage strategy expanding upon the outline drainage submitted 24 June 2015 shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing. The details to be submitted shall make provision for:*

- Surface water drainage connections to the front of building (around car park) to be completed. Layout details to show connection of all downpipes into perforated carrier pipe, not directly into cellular attenuation.*
- Pipe detail around south west corner patio areas corrected (the use of a shallow slot drain is inappropriate in light of the landscaping details provided). The plan(s) must be revised to move the drain away from the landscaping or detailed to accommodate the larger slot drain (Aco Qmax 550) for conveying flows around the building.*
- The overflow channel (under the decking) to be a minimum section of 150x600mm, and discharging through a slot orifice within the retaining wall structure.*
- Level detail to be added to 'Outlet Flow Control' to clarify discharge and sump level details at the attenuation outfall.*
- All surface water and attenuation systems to be maintained to their full design capacity in perpetuity.*

*Reason: to ensure a satisfactory surface water drainage strategy and to comply with the aims and objectives of the NPPF and Policy DM10 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.*

**Amendments**

**The reason for imposing condition 2 to be amended to:**

*To ensure that sufficient foul drainage capacity is made available to cope with the new development; and in order to avoid adverse environmental impact upon the community and to accord with the NPPF and Policies DM10 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.*

**The wording of condition 12 amended:**

*The development hereby approved shall only be used as a Class C2 care home and be occupied solely by persons who are mentally and/or physically frail; have mobility problems; suffer from paralysis or partial paralysis; or are in the need for assistance with the normal activities of life. The building shall not be used for any other purpose within Class C2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) or any other statutory instrument and notwithstanding any provisions either in force or enacted at a later date there shall be no permitted change of use.*

*In addition:*

- there shall be no self-contained or staff accommodation within the approved development;*
- there shall be no dogs or cats at the premises at any time (other than assisted living dogs);*

*Reason: To ensure the integrity of the SPA is not harmed by the proposal in accordance with Policy CP14B of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the NPPF.*

*Correction to the second sentence of para 7.3.4 to read:*

*However, in itself this does not mean that the proposal will be harmful to the character of the area. Indeed in plan form it can be seen that the residential development flanking three sides of the site has tighter urban grain than the application site.'*

The speakers in objection felt that there was not enough parking and there were highways issues. In addition the development would be a strain on the infrastructure, particularly schools, doctors, sewage system and increase the risk of flooding.

The speakers in support commented that the County Highways Agency had raised no objection to the parking allocation and that due to staff shift patterns the amount of parking would be sufficient. A footpath had been considered by the applicant but residents felt that it would urbanise Meadow Way.

Some Members felt that there were not enough parking spaces and this would cause more congestion on the roads. In addition it was felt that the scale of the development was too large.

Officers advised that the applicant was asked to submit more detail about the drainage. There had been several meetings with the Council's Drainage Engineer to ensure that drainage conditions could be finalised.

Members were also reminded that if the application was refused on highways grounds and as the County Highways Agency had raised no objections, there could be cost implications for the Council.

**Resolved that application 14/0869 be approved as amended subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Members had received correspondence from the applicant.

**Note 2**

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme Mr Phillips and Mr Allard spoke in objection and Mr Johnson and Mr Street spoke in support.

**Note 3**

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor Max Nelson.

**Note 4**

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to this application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Max Nelson and Robin Perry.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application as amended:

Councillors Colin Dougan, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

**13/P Application Number: 15/0141 - Weston Paddocks, (land adjacent to 1) Whitmoor Road, Bagshot GU19 5QE**

The application was for the outline application for the erection of 10 dwelling houses following the demolition of existing dwelling house and outbuildings (access and layout to be considered). (Amended plan recv'd 22/6/15).

A site visit had taken place at the site.

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'SAMM payment has now been received, therefore the recommendation is changed to approve'*

Some Members felt that the application was acceptable, in principle, but the access on to Whitmoor Road caused concerns. There had been a number of accidents, many unrecorded, on the road near the proposed access point onto the site and it was felt that this would be made worse and a traffic calming scheme would ease these issues.

Officers advised that a speed management scheme could be required by condition, which would need to be in place before any development. There would be a consultation on the scheme and Surrey County Council would need to agree as previously they had raised no objections to the application. Ward councillors would be kept informed of any progress with the management scheme.

**Resolved that application 15/0141 be approved as amended subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Valerie White and seconded by Councillor Vivienne Chapman.

**Note 2**

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to this application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

**14/P Application Number: 15/0216 - Unigate Dairies Ltd., 7-11 Updown Hill and 2 Wentworth Cottages, Windlesham GU20 6AF**

The application was for the erection of 2 commercial (retail/office) units, 2 two bedroom houses, 4 three bedroom houses, 4 one bedroom flats and two storey side extension (to 2 Wentworth Cottages) following the demolition of existing buildings with access and parking/garaging. (Amended & additional plans rec'd 04/06/15).

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'The Environment Agency has revised their comments, raising no objections subject to a proposed condition to protect the Windlesham Ditch and its 5 metre wide buffer.*

*The applicant has confirmed that this area of land (at the south boundary of the site) is to be retained as a parking area, and that the existing tarmac surfacing is to remain (and is not to be replaced). Landscaping details are proposed to be*

*agreed under Condition 4. Also, details of protection of the Ditch and its buffer, during the demolition, site clearance and construction phases, are proposed under part of proposed Condition 9(i), as set on Page 92 of the officer report.*

*However, an amendment to Condition 9 is suggested as below:  
Replace “No development shall take place...” with “No demolition, site clearance or construction...”*

*Further details for sustainable drainage have been received and the comments of the Drainage Engineer are awaited.*

***CHANGE IN RECOMMENDATION: for the Executive Head of Regulatory Services to GRANT following the consultation period with the Drainage Engineer subject to the following conditions [including the amendments above] and any other condition requirements of the Drainage Engineer’.***

Some Members had concerns about traffic issues due to overdevelopment on the site. It was also confirmed that condition 11 ensured that the retail unit could only be used for retail. However, officers would add ‘retail class A1’ to the condition to be clear.

**Resolved that application 15/0216 be approved as amended following the consultation period with the Drainage Engineer subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory and any other condition requirements of the Drainage Engineer.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Nick Chambers declared that he owned a property in Chertsey Road but it was not close to the development site.

**Note 2**

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor David Mansfield.

**Note 3**

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to this application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson and Robin Perry.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.



15/P

**Application Number: 15/0427 - Chobham Meadows Land between Station Road and Chertsey Road, Chobham GU24 8AN**

The application was for the change of use of land from Agriculture to Site of Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and associated works.

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'One further letter of support and one raising an objection have been received, neither making any specific comments.'*

**Natural England** raises no objections subject to the undertaking of ecological surveys, visitor surveys, (to assist with calculating SANG capacity), and circular walk proposals and areas to remain for grazing (which need to be discounted from SANG capacity).

**Surrey Wildlife Trust** raises no objections subject to the provision of an appropriate suite of ecological surveys and current visitor level surveys (to assist with calculating SANG capacity). Although not formally requested, the advice would appear to suggest that these are provided prior to determination.

The **Environment Agency** raises no objections subject to the provision of an ecological survey (particularly for water voles), with any required mitigation measures, and a landscape management plan. The EA have also noted the flood alleviation scheme separately proposed for the site.

The **County Highway Authority** have commented that they "have undertaken an assessment in terms of the likely net additional traffic generation, access arrangements and parking provision and are satisfied that the application would not have a material impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining public highway. The County Highway Authority therefore has no highway requirements."

*It is considered that in relation to the SWT comments, with the Council as landowner and local planning authority there is sufficient control over the land to not require surveys at this stage but require them at condition stage. In this respect the following condition is proposed:*

*3. No development shall take place until on-site ecological surveys, along with a strategy to consider any required mitigation, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The proposal shall be implemented in accordance with the mitigation strategy.*

*Reason: To ensure that the proposal does not have an adverse effect on on-site ecology and to comply with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

*Further neighbour notifications have been sent with an expiry date for comments on 4 August 2015.*

***CHANGE IN RECOMMENDATION: for the Executive Head of Regulatory Services to GRANT following the expiry of the neighbour notification period, subject to no substantive new objections being raised.'***

Some Members requested a car park survey and officers advised this could be added to condition 2.

**Resolved that application 15/0427 be approved as amended subject to:**

- i) conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory;**
- ii) the expiry of the neighbour notification period, subject to no substantive new objections being raised; and**
- iii) the amending of Condition 2 to include car park surveys (as a part of the management plan) at the request of Members.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that the applicant to this application was Surrey Heath Borough Council.

**Note 2**

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor David Allen and seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks.

**Note 3**

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to this application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson and Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Valerie White

**16/P Application Number: 15/0033 - Unit 2, Trafalgar Way, Camberley GU15 3BN**

The application was for the erection of a trade warehouse with ancillary offices (Class B8) and associated service yard, loading bay and parking following demolition of existing storage warehouse (Class B8).

Some Members felt that the site would benefit from landscaping along the boundary. Officers advised that paragraphs 7.4.8 and 7.4.9 and condition 3 covered this issue.

**Resolved that application 15/0427 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan.

**Note 2**

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to this application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson and Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

**17/P Application Number:15/0504 - 87 Park Road, Camberley GU15 2SW**

The application was for the erection of a single storey rear extension.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers but it was reported to this Committee as the applicant was an employee of the Council.

Members were advised of the following updates:

*'It has been noted that the Recommendation is missing from the report and should read Grant.'*

**Resolved that application 15/0504 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor Conrad Sturt.

**Note 2**

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to this application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson and Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

Chairman

