

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning
Applications Committee held at
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House
on 25 August 2016**

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

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| - Cllr David Allen | + Cllr Adrian Page |
| - 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 Katia Malcaus Cooper(arrived
part way through min 10/P) | + Cllr Valerie White |
- + Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Paul Ilnicki (In place of Cllr Colin Dougan) and Cllr Max Nelson (In place of Cllr David Allen)

In Attendance: Lee Brewin, Michelle Fielder, Gareth John, Jonathan Partington and Cllr Jonathan Lytle

8/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

9/P Hook Meadow Appeal Decision

The Committee was advised that this item was for information only and was not for discussion at the meeting.

10/P Application Number: 16/0353 - Land to the Rear of 31 Windsor Road, Chobham, Woking, GU24 8LA

The application was for the provision of gated access to field and gravel apron. (Amended & additional plans rec'd 06/07/16). (Additional Information rec'd 19/07/2016).

The application would normally be determined under the Scheme of Delegation for Officers, however, it was reported to Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllrs Tedder and Wheeler.

A Member site visit took place on the site.

The Committee was advised that the application was classed as a major application as the site area exceeded one hectare.

Members received the following updates:

'Reference to Cllr Wheeler having called the application in to Committee is incorrect.

Evidence concerning the maintenance equipment used (tractor) at the site has been received indicating the cutting blades pulled up as the tractor passes through the gate access.

The applicant has responded by letter to indicate that this manoeuvre is not best practice and the wider access point proposed under this application will improve access and allow other maintenance vehicles to access the site.

A response to this letter has been provided by an objector (Chobham Poor Allotments Charity who own the shared access) which confirms that the existing access has not impeded any access by a contractor in the last 30 years, the maintenance/upkeep of the watercourse is undertaken by the Environment Agency who would still be able to use this access and that whilst an independent access is required under this application, this cannot be obtained because the access crosses third party land (i.e. owned by Persimmon Homes).

The objection includes other comments/objections previously indicated in the officer report.

Correspondence has been received from Surrey County Council who has fielded concerns from a local resident about access to The Grange being restricted by cars parked on this highway (i.e. in the vicinity of the proposed access point).

A previous objector, Persimmon Homes, confirms that the formal notice has now been correctly served (as part owner of the site with the new access proposed across their verge) and confirms that there has been no prior agreement to this proposal.

Correspondence has been received from Surrey County Council who has been (email) copied an email to Persimmon Homes from a local objector to resist this proposal (as part landowner).'

Some councillors felt that the development was unneighbourly, too big and there would be a loss in residential amenity. Further views included that the development would cause visual harm, there would be a loss of boundary and landscaping and there would be safety issues for pedestrians. The width of the new access had not been demonstrated.

Officers had recommended approval of the application but some Members felt that the development would be harmful to the area and to residents.

Resolved that application 16/0353 be refused for the reasons set out below:

- **Impact on residential amenity;**
- **Visual harm;**
- **Loss of boundary and landscaping;**

- **Pedestrian safety**
- **No demonstration of the width of new access.**

The wording would be finalised after consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman and Ward Members.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Cllr Tedder was a Trustee on the Chobham Poor Allotments charity.

Note 2

As the application had triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Ms Pauline Isle spoke in objection.

Note 3

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman 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 the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Max Nelson, Robin Perry and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

The recommendation was lost.

Note 5

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Pat Tedder.

Note 6

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Max Nelson, Robin Perry and Ian Sams.

11/P Application Number: 16/0575 - 8 Turpins Rise, Windleham, GU20 6NG

The application was for a single storey front extension.

This application would normally be determined under the Scheme of Delegation for officers; however, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Sturt.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'A further letter of objection on behalf of the objector at No.10 has been received from a firm of solicitors. This 4 page A4 document contains 18 bullet points and raises a number of concerns regarding perceived inaccuracies or omissions within the committee report.

The points raised, fall into 3 areas, namely: character, amenity and parking.

In respect of character, the further letter of objection notes an area of lawn between the border referenced at para 2.2 of the report and the hardstanding has not been referenced; submits there is an established building line in the spur, but then also submits that the dwellings are staggered to one another and further adds that the report overly relies on the presence of vegetative features as visual mitigation to the proposal, a further area of concern raised is that the case officer has not understood the nature of previous works undertaken at the application property. Substantive detail is provided on each of the points raised; however officers note that the consideration of the proposal's impact on character is largely subjective and it is not considered the matters raised in this letter of objection materially alter the assessment undertaken in the committee report.

In terms of amenity, the objection cites a failure to have regard to the cumulative impact of the proposed works and those previously undertaken on the objector's amenity, claims the case officer assessment in terms of loss of privacy is flawed and cites, by reference to a photograph that direct views into the front facing windows already exists. In respect of this latter point, if this is accepted by the Committee it becomes a question of whether the proposal could be said to significantly and detrimentally alter the existing relationship.

The final concern is the loss of available parking spaces to serve the property. In this regard there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal would impede the applications property ability to provide 2 on-site parking spaces. It is also noted that there is no County Highways objection to the application.

In summary while the content of this letter of objection is noted this does not materially alter the assessment undertaken on the merits of the application and it remains that officers recommend that the application be approved.'

The Ward Member advised Members that there were strict deeds related to the property therefore the development would be out of character and there would be a parking and amenity issue.

Other Members felt the proposal would constitute overdevelopment, when all the houses were meant to be set back. There would also be a loss of a parking space and trees and shrubs.

Resolved that application 16/0575 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Committee Members had received a letter from the applicant.

Councillor Conrad Sturt also declared that he had been contacted by the resident at number 10 in relation to the application.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Max Nelson and seconded by Councillor Nick Chambers.

Note 3

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Malcaus Cooper, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors, Surinder Gandhum, Paul Ilnicki, David Mansfield, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

Chairman