

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning
Applications Committee held at
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House
on 11 November 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 Adrian Page (In place of Colin Dougan)

In Attendance: Emma Pearman, Neil Praine, Michelle Fielder,
Jonathan Partington, Cllr Alan McClafferty, Lee Brewin and Gareth John

34/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

35/P Application Number: 12/0546/2 - Princess Royal Barracks, Brunswick Road, Deepcut, GU16 6RN

The application was for a Non-Material Minor Amendment to vary conditions 2 and 3 of planning permission 12/0546.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'For information the text of condition 2 and 3 as originally imposed is:

2. Prior to the commencement of any development or the submission of any reserved matters application, a Phasing Scheme for the delivery of the entire development hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Phasing Scheme shall include an Indicative Strategic Masterplan for the development of this site identifying the phases of development and shall include details of the land uses and quantum of development to be delivered by each phase. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved phasing scheme unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

3. Prior to the submission of any reserved matters applications, Design Codes which are in substantial compliance with the approved parameter plans and the

submitted Design and Access Statement shall be submitted for each of the Character Areas. The Design Code shall include the following:

- a) built-form strategies to include density and massing, street grain and permeability, street enclosure and active frontages, type and form of buildings and landmarks and vistas*
- b) design strategies for principal buildings or land uses within the character area, including where appropriate the primary school, the sports hub sites*
- c) a strategy for a hierarchy of streets and spaces*
- d) principles for the alignment, width, lighting and surface materials proposed for all footways, cycleways, roads and vehicular accesses to and within the site*
- e) design of the public realm, including layout and design of squares, areas of public open space, areas for play, street furniture and sustainable urban drainage*
- f) principles for determining quality, colour and texture of external materials and facing materials for roofing and walls of buildings and structures including a consideration of opportunities for using locally sourced and/or recycled construction materials*
- g) principles for hard and soft landscaping including the inclusion of important trees and hedgerows*
- h) on-street and off-street residential and commercial vehicular parking, off-street turning (where required) and/or loading areas cycle parking and storage*

The Reserved Matters applications shall thereafter accord with the approved Design Codes for the site.'

It was noted that legal advice had been sought from external legal representatives.

Some Members felt that more information was required on various planning codes but Members were reminded that planning officers had the expert knowledge to advise Members accordingly.

Resolved that application 12/0546/2 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield 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:

Councillors David Allen, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Councillor Katia Malcaus Cooper arrived after the start of the consideration of applications 12/0546/2 and 15/0676 (these were considered together) and therefore was unable to vote.

36/P Application Number: 15/0676 - Princess Royal Barracks, Brunswick Road, Deepcut GU16 6RN

The application was for a variation of condition 35 pursuant to planning permission 12/0546 (Hybrid planning application for major residential-led development totalling 1,200 new dwellings) to permit the residential units to attain Code 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes (or equivalent national standard) as opposed to attaining level 4 and level 5 for CO2 reduction and water efficiency measures.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'One further letter of objection has been received; however this raises concern over the principle of the site being developed and not the variation of the condition itself.'

It was noted that legal advice had been sought from external legal representatives.

Some Members felt that more information was required on various planning codes but Members were reminded that planning officers had the expert knowledge to advise Members accordingly.

Resolved that application 15/0676 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory and the receipt of a satisfactory legal agreement/deed of variation by 1 December 2015.

In the event that a satisfactory legal agreement to link the planning obligations secured under the S106 Agreement dated 17 April 2014 to both planning permission 12/0546 and the new planning permission (as either permission could be implemented) is not completed by 1 December 2015 then the application shall be refused as it would fail to provide adequate infrastructure mitigation; SANGS and SPA provision and would not provide an inclusive and sustainable form of development (detailed reason for refusal to be delegated to the Executive Head of Regulatory Services).

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Robin Perry and seconded by Councillor David Mansfield.

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, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Councillor Katia Malcaus Cooper arrived after the start of the consideration of applications 12/0546/2 and 15/0676 (these were considered together) and therefore was unable to vote

37/P Application Number: 15/0166 - Land between 4 and 5 School Lane, Windlesham GU20 6EY

The application was for the erection of a detached 4 bedroom, two storey dwelling (with accommodation in the roof space) and integral garage. (Additional plan recv'd 11/6/15), (Amended plan rec'd 23/07/15).

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers; however at the request of a local Ward Councillor it had been called in to be determined at this Committee.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Since writing the report four further objections have been received a number of the objections raised are already considered in the report, however, the following issues as raised in the objection letters are considered below.

- *The development will lead to a loss of on street parking which will have a negative impact on the flow of traffic and highway safety,*
- *There is limited visibility at the School Road / Chertsey Road junction for pedestrians,*
- *There will be an increase in speed of vehicles using Chertsey Road as a result of this proposal,*
- *If the pedestrian barrier outside Chertsey Road Hall is removed this will raise health and safety concerns,*
- *School Lane is a single width track and vehicles meeting each other will have to reverse onto Chertsey Road causing a highway safety concern,*
- *The loss of on street parking and associated traffic flow disruption will negatively impact on the use of the Chertsey Road Hall as a community asset,*

- *The proposal will prejudice planned future County Council public consultation regarding traffic flow improvement measures, and*
- *There has not been any consultation with Chertsey Road Hall.*

The County Highway's Authority have considered the issues raised in these three objections and have provided the following response:

the existing on street parking pressures on Chertsey Road,

The proposed works will be amended to shorten the length of the road narrowing to be broadly consistent with the extent of the existing double yellow lines [See condition 8 on page 59 of the agenda]. On this side of the road [northern side], the scheme will have no impact upon existing on street parking levels. On the southern side, the presence of the existing vehicle driveways means that there is very little opportunity to park on street, with just one opportunity to park outside number 46. The general tendency along this part of Chertsey Road is for people to park on the northern side which can't legally take place along the frontage of the hall. When parking does occur on both sides it can cause an obstruction to passing traffic, to pedestrians or to the existing driveways, as evidenced by one of the objectors' photos. The proposed scheme will reduce the likelihood of that occurring in the future, due to less room for drivers to try and straddle the carriageway and footway. Where achievable (because of existing driveways), the position of posts on the footway, will further prevent vehicles mounting the footway throughout the extent of the works.

the existing usage of School Lane and lack of pedestrian visibility

This is an acknowledged issue, the widening footway outside the hall will mean that pedestrians do not have to walk immediately adjacent to the vehicle exit from School Lane. The works offer a small gain on the existing situation

the existing and likely increase in speeds of traffic using Chertsey road

The existing speeds on Chertsey Road is not something that we can expect the development to address. The introduction of the narrowing point is unlikely to lead to increased speeds, to the contrary a visible change in environment, could to a limited extent aid speed reduction.

the existing pedestrian barrier outside the Hall

The retention, deletion or replacement of the barrier is an issue than can be considered at the detailed design stage. Whilst a wider footway may in theory allow for it to be removed, the reason for it being there is obvious, so if the need remains, it may either be retained/relocated/replaced as part of the proposed works.

Vehicles reversing onto School Road

Typically a single dwelling would generate 4-6 vehicular movements per day. Taking a mid point of 5 trips per day, this might equate to 1 trip between the hours of 7-10am and 1 trip between 4-6pm. The remaining trips would fall outside of these hours. These are typical/average figures, so in reality the actual numbers may be higher or lower. Typically, the trips would also be in favour of outbound trips in the morning and inbound in the evening, mirroring existing patterns in the lane. Whilst the additional trips increase the likelihood of opposing vehicles meeting in the lane, it would be difficult to argue that the level of intensification would be severe, even if the trips were higher than the above 'average' figures. In combination with the improved visibility proposed as part of this scheme, it is not considered that a case exists to raise an objection on these grounds.

Turning to the objection from a Surrey County Councillor Cabinet Member, the County Councillor objects as there is a traffic calming consultation due at the end of November and the application before Borough Members tonight is not part of the wider County Council scheme. On this basis the County Council consultation could not be implemented due to this change. Again The County Highway Authority have considered the issues raised and consider that the size and position of the highway improvement works the subject of this application would not prejudice the County Council's future consultation process or layout / design and any final surface treatments and signage are to controlled under the s278 agreement.

Finally, it is noted that consultation letters were sent to the Chertsey Road Hall on the 18th September 2015.'

Some Members were concerned about the changes proposed on the road and pavement at the location of the access to the site. It was noted that the County Highways Authority had raised no objections.

Clarification was sought with regard to the ridge height of the proposal and it was noted that the ridge height sat comfortably in the street scene taking into account the distance between the properties and the incline of School Lane.

Some Members noted that a barrier would be removed but requested assurances that it would be replaced or upgraded after the work was completed. It was advised that a clause and condition could be added to this effect.

Members felt that a site visit would be beneficial to view the road and access site. There was concern about the loss of parking spaces on the road and congestion along School Lane causing safety issues. It was also asked that the results of a County Highway Authority consultation on 25 November be taken into consideration with regard to this application.

The Chairman reminded Members that if they were minded to defer the application for a site visit, only those Members who attended the site visit would be able to vote at the meeting when the application was considered. Members were concerned about when the visit would take place, taking into account the time of year and Members who work.

Resolved that application 15/0166 be deferred to allow a site visit to take place.

Note 1

It was noted that Councillor Pat Tedder declared she had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest as her property was sited opposite the development and she left the Chamber during the consideration of the application.

It was noted for the record that Councillors Hawkins, Sturt, Wheeler and White declared that they knew one of the speakers and were also contacted by various residents.

It was noted for the record that Councillor Chambers declared that he owned a property about 10 houses down from the development in Chertsey Road.

It was also noted that Committee Members had received documentation from residents.

Note 2

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr S Pilgrim and Mr Thody spoke in objection to the application and Mr Griffin, the agent spoke in support.

Note 3

The recommendation to defer the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Valerie White.

Note 4

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to defer the application:

Councillors David Allen, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to defer the application:

Councillor Nick Chambers

38/P Application Number: 15/0769 - 39 Hamesmoor Road, Mytchett, GU16 6JB

The application was for the conversion of three bedroom dwelling into two one-bedroom flats (part retrospective).

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers; however at the request of a local Ward Councillor it had been called in to be determined at this Committee.

A site visit took place at the site.

Some Members asked why the application was called in; it was believed due to resident's concerns.

Resolved that application 15/0769 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 David Allen and seconded by Councillor Nick Chambers.

Note 2

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Chairman