

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning
Applications Committee held at
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House
on 19 October 2017**

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr Nick Chambers (Vice Chairman)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| + Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman | + Cllr Adrian Page |
| - Cllr Colin Dougan | - Cllr Robin Perry |
| - Cllr Surinder Gandhum | + Cllr Ian Sams |
| + Cllr Jonathan Lytle | + Cllr Conrad Sturt |
| + Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper | + Cllr Pat Tedder |
| + Cllr David Mansfield | - Cllr Victoria Wheeler |
| + Cllr Max Nelson | + Cllr Valerie White |
| + Present | |
| - Apologies for absence presented | |

Cllr Ian Sams arrived after min 25/P

Substitutes: Cllr Ruth Hutchinson (In place of Cllr Victoria Wheeler) and Cllr John Winterton (In place of Cllr Robin Perry)

In Attendance: Cllr Richard Brooks, Lee Brewin, Ross Cahalane, Duncan Carty, Gareth John, Jonathan Partington and Emma Pearman

25/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

Chairman's Note

The Chairman reminded Members that if an application was called in to Committee, clear reasons should be provided so that these can be published in the agenda report.

26/P Application Number: 17/0647 - Orchard Cottage, Shepherds Lane, Windelsham GU20 6HL

The application was for the approval of the Reserved Matters (appearance, landscaping, layout, scale) pursuant to condition 1 of planning permission SU15/0272 for the erection of a 65 bed care home, doctors' surgery and detached bungalow following demolition of existing buildings.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'An amended landscaping plan has been provided which has taken into account the Council's Arboricultural Officer's suggestions in terms of species and is now considered to be acceptable, and the Arboricultural Officer has removed his objection.'

Accordingly, the second plan listed in Condition 1 should be amended to read:

- *Hard and soft landscape GA Plan 17158 rev PL03 received 19.10.17'*

Resolved that application 17/0647 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 Councillor Conrad Sturt had been contacted by the applicant.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Jonathan Lytle and seconded by Councillor Conrad Sturt.

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 as amended :

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

27/P Application Number: 17/0500 - St Georges Industrial Estate, Wilton Road, Camberley GU15 2QW

The application was for change of use of Industrial Estate to include Class B8 use (warehousing and distribution) whilst retaining the current Class B1(c) (Light Industrial) and B2 (General Industrial) approved uses. (Additional plan recv'd 15/8/17) (Amended Plan - Rec'd 15/08/2017.)

The application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers, however, as the applicant was the Council it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee for determination.

Resolved that application 17/0500 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared, on behalf of the Committee, that the applicant was the Council.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Katia Malcaus Cooper.

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, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

28/P Application Number: 17/0484 - 26 Portsmouth Road, Camberley GU15 1JX

The application was for the outline application for the erection of a two storey building with accommodation in the roof to provide 8 No. two bedroom and 1 No. one bedroom flats with parking and associated development following the demolition of existing dwelling and surgery (siting, access, scale and appearance to be determined). (Amended information recv'd 27/9/17).

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's scheme of Delegation for officers. However, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Vivienne Chapman.

There had been a site visit at the site.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'A further 8 representations raising an objection have been received raising the following additional issues:

- The justification for the need for the surgery under SU/14/0036 was to improve these facilities for their patients and this need appears to have evaporated [See Paragraph 7.2 of the officer report]*
- Proposal would put pressure on TPO'd trees which provide a substantial amount of privacy to local residential properties, which would be at risk [See Paragraphs 7.3 and 7.4 of the officer report]*

The County Highway Authority has raised no objections to the proposal indicating, in relation to the parking provision, that:

"The level of parking provision to be provided at the site complies with Surrey County Council's recommended guidance for residential parking of 1 car spacer per one and two bedroom flat. It is considered that if there is any occasional parking as a result of the development then this is more likely to occur in the less busy road of Highclere Drive. Highclere Drive has a 5.5 metre wide carriageway, sufficient to accommodate on-street parking on one side of the carriageway without unduly hindering traffic flow or causing a highway safety issue"

The Arboricultural Officer has made further comments confirming no objections to the proposal subject to the amended condition (as below).

An upfront payment of £3,514 has been received for the required SAMM contribution.

CHANGE IN RECOMMENDATION:

To GRANT, subject to conditions

AMENDED CONDITIONS

5. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Report prepared by Crown Consultants [Ivan Button] and dated 12 May 2017. No development shall commence until photographs have been provided by the retained Consultant and forwarded to and approved by the Council's Arboricultural Officer. This should record all aspects of tree and ground protection measures having been implemented in accordance with the Arboricultural Report. The tree protection measures shall be retained until completion of all works hereby permitted.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

8. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved on site details of refuse and cycle storage area(s) and access thereto are to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved the details shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans and thereafter retained.

Reason: To ensure visual and residential amenities are not prejudiced and to promote the use of other modes of transport than the car and to accord with Policies CP11, DM9 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS

9. No development shall take place until a Method of Construction Statement, to include details of:

- (a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors*
- (b) loading and unloading of plant and materials*
- (c) storage of plant and materials*
- (d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management)*
- (e) provision of boundary hoarding*
- (f) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway*
- (g) hours of construction*
- (h) confirmation of no on-site burning of material during site clearance, demolition or construction phases*

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction period.

Reason: The condition above is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to accord with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the proposed modified access to Portsmouth Road has been constructed in accordance with the layout shown on approved drawing BX21-S3-101.

Reason: The condition above is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to accord with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATIVES

5. In respect of landscaping, it will be expected as a minimum that the scheme required for the reserved matters application pursuant to this outline planning permission, should include tree replacement of semi-mature stock using a fastigate form of trees and hedge replacement using semi-mature hedging material, particularly at the flank boundary between 26 and 28 Portsmouth Road.

6. In respect of Condition 8 above, it would be expected that provision is made for secure and covered cycle parking facilities to accommodate a minimum of 18 bicycles.'

Some Members felt that 9 flats on the site would be overdevelopment and the mass would be overbearing and un-neighbourly, which was contrary to policy DM9. There was concern regarding the number of car parking spaces and the potential for parking overspill into Highclere and Portsmouth Road. It was noted that the car parking standards were for guidance.

The Chairman advised the Committee that he had requested a review of the car parking standards for Surrey Heath but until that had been carried out the application needed to be considered taking into account the standards set by the County Council.

Members were referred to the 2014 approved scheme, which was considered against policy DM9. There had been no change in policy. The officers also referred Members to p72 of the report paragraph 7, outlining the Planning Inspector's view on mass and bulk.

Officers had recommended that the application be approved; however, some Members felt that the proposal should be refused on the grounds that it would be an unduly intensive development in the area. It would constitute overdevelopment by size and design and would have an impact on neighbouring properties. There was concern regarding the parking and highway safety.

Resolved that application 17/0484 be refused subject to the reasons outlined above, the wording to be finalised in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman.

Note 1

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme Dr Peter Broughton and Ms Annabele Scott spoke in objection and Mr Jeff Sadler, the agent spoke in support.

Note 2

It was noted for the record that:

- Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that Committee Members had received emails and pictures from residents.
- Councillor Nick Chambers declared that he knew one of the speakers

Note 3

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Max Nelson and seconded by Councillor Jonathan Lytle.

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 as amended:

Councillors Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Ian Sams and Pat Tedder.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Conrad Sturt, Valerie White and John Winterton

Councillor Surinder Gandhum abstained.

The recommendation was lost.

Note 5

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Edward Hawkins.

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, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Conrad Sturt, Valerie White and John Winterton

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Ian Sams and Pat Tedder.

Councillor Surinder Gandhum abstained.

The recommendation was won.

29/P Application Number: 17/0332 - Development Site at Home Farm, Church Road, Windlesham

The application was for the creation of a pond with associated landscape works. (Amended & Additional Plans - Rec'd 22/06/2017) (Amended plans rec'd 18/7/17) (Amended Plans - Rec'd 02/08/2017.) (Amended Plan - Rec'd 10/08/2017.) (Amended Plan - Rec'd 03/10/2017.)

The application would normally have been determined under the Scheme of Delegation for Officers; however, it was reported to Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Conrad Sturt.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Windlesham Parish Council has raised no objections.

One representation in support has been received indicating that proposed change would not have any impact on the Green Belt and should improve overall drainage of the area.

An amended landscape drawing has been received, deleting a reference to a bridge over the ditch.

AMENDED CONDITION:

2. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans: 16-P1389-102 Rev. B received on 18 July 2017 and 1332-L90-501 Rev. J received on 19 October 2017, unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning and as advised in ID.17a of the Planning Practice Guidance.'

The application had been called in because of concerns regarding flooding. Members were advised that the pond would 'hold up' water and would act as a balancing pond. It was also noted that the soil removed to make the pond would

be disposed of off- site. The construction of the pond would be monitored by the Council's Drainage Engineer.

Resolved that application 17/0332 be approved as amended subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared on behalf of the Conservative Group that the Conservative Constituency Office was detailed on the site map.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve application as amended was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Adrian Page.

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 as amended:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton

Chairman