

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning
Applications Committee held at
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House
on 17 November 2014**

- + Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
- Cllr Glyn Carpenter (Vice Chairman)

- | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| + Cllr David Allen | + Cllr Ken Pedder |
| + Cllr Richard Brooks | + Cllr Audrey Roxburgh |
| + Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman | + Cllr Ian Sams |
| + Cllr Colin Dougan | + Cllr Pat Tedder |
| Cllr Surinder Gandhum | - Cllr Judi Trow |
| Cllr David Hamilton | + Cllr Valerie White |
| + Cllr David Mansfield | + Cllr John Winterton |

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Rodney Bates for Cllr Judi Trow

In Attendance: Cllr Adrian Page, Cllr Bob Paton and Cllr Wynne Price (Cllrs Page and Price from min 72/P to 74/P and Cllr Paton from 72/P to 76/P)

Officers in attendance: Lee Brewin, Michelle Fielder, Gareth John, Jessica Harris-Hooton, Aneta Mantio, Shane O'Donnell, Jonathan Partington, Jenny Rickard, Chenge Taruvinga, Paul Watts.

72/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

73/P Application Number: 14/0249 - 17 Queens Road, (formerly Bisley Office Furniture), Bisley, Woking GU24 9RB - Bisley Ward

This application was for the erection of 113 dwellings with new access from Snowdrop Way and Chatton Row, internal roads, footways, parking, landscaping, open space with other associated works following demolition of the existing factory buildings and areas of hardstanding. (Additional information rec'd 22/09/14), (Amended plans & info rec'd 20/10/14).

There had been a site visit at the proposed site.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Twelve additional letters of objection have been received concerned with the following issues:

1. *Proposed access – the existing access from Queens Road is the preferred option. BPC highlights that an application to the Planning Inspectorate was made to use the existing access for a residential use.*

Officer's comments: The alternative access from Queens Road is not subject to the current application. The applicant seeks planning permission with a single access from Snowdrop Way and this has been considered only.

2. *Housing mix & affordable housing*

Officer's comments: The proposal includes a variety of residential units from 1-bedroom to 5-bedroom. The Housing Manager is satisfied that the proposed mix is acceptable.

3. *Impact on the Thames Basin Heath SPA*

Officer's comments: The development cannot commence until the SANG, the relevant mitigation of the likely impacts on the TBH SPA, is in place, which is secured by condition No. 3. The legal agreement in terms of SAMM is an additional measure to the SANG and relates to the management and monitoring of the SPA.

4. *Representation letters*

Officer's comments: 2 letters of support have been received – on 30/09 and on 09/10.

5. *Site visit*

Officer's comments: Members and officers visited the site.

6. *All the other matters raised have been addressed in the report to the Committee or above.*

7. *Condition 3 – to be reworded as follows:*

No development shall take place until written confirmation has been obtained from the LPA in agreement with Natural England that the applicant has secured a SANG in perpetuity (including its management plan); and no dwelling shall be occupied before written confirmation has been obtained from the LPA that the works required to bring the land up to acceptable SANG standard have been completed.

Reason: To comply with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012; saved Policy NRM6 (Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area) of the South East Plan; and, the Surrey Heath Borough Council's Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

8. *Condition 4 – to be reworded as follows:*

No development works shall commence until the applicant has secured and undertaken relocation of the watercourse to the southern end of the site, on

or off the application site; with full details of the proposed design of the watercourse, timetable for delivery and maintenance agreement submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to manage flood risk and to comply with Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

9. *Condition 9 – A survey has been submitted by the applicant and therefore the amended condition should read:*

The Oak T29, as identified on plan R.0324_03-A received on 20/10/2014, should be replaced with plant 1no of Quercus robur tree within 2m of the tree to be removed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the development. The tree shall have minimum stem size of 20 - 25 cm girth [nominal diameter of 7.2cm] at 1m from ground level, of a minimum overall planted height of 4.0 – 6.0m and having a substantially straight stem and Semi Mature tree as specified in BS 3936. Replacement planting shall conform to the British Standard for Nursery Stock as set out in BS 3936, Parts 1 to 5. Handling, planting and establishment of trees shall be in accordance with BS 8545:2014 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape. If any replacement planting planted in accordance to this condition die or become seriously damaged or diseased within a period of five years of the date of first occupation of the development, it shall be replaced as soon as practicable with another tree of similar size and species.

Reasons: To maintain the landscape character and profile of the area and to establish a tree which, in time, will replace the loss of amenity which was afforded by the tree, which is to be removed and to maintain the landscape character of the area to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

Additional conditions to be imposed in terms of contamination:

Condition 32:

Unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, development other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation must not commence until conditions 1 to 4 have been complied with. If unexpected contamination is found after development has begun, development must be halted on that part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination to the extent specified by the Local Planning Authority in writing until condition 4 has been complied with in relation to that contamination.

1.1 Site Characterisation

An investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are

subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

(i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;

(ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:

- human health,*
- property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,*
- adjoining land,*
- groundwaters and surface waters,*
- ecological systems,*
- archeological sites and ancient monuments;*

(iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

1.2. Submission of Remediation Scheme

A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

1.3. Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme

The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

1.4. Reporting of Unexpected Contamination

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported

in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of condition 1.1, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of condition 1.2, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with condition 1.3.

1.5. Long Term Monitoring and Maintenance

A monitoring and maintenance scheme to include monitoring the long-term effectiveness of the proposed remediation over a period of 5 years, and the provision of reports on the same must be prepared, both of which are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of the measures identified in that scheme and when the remediation objectives have been achieved, reports that demonstrate the effectiveness of the monitoring and maintenance carried out must be produced, and submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

Reason (common to all): To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework'.

Some Members raised the following:

- i) Traffic congestion from increased number of cars parking in Snowdrop Way;
- ii) Concerns regarding HGVs using Snowdrop Way and space for passing;
- iii) Loss of children's right to play in Snowdrop Way;
- iv) Loss of commercial site;
- v) Consideration to be given to change the access to Queens Road – Members were advised that this land was not currently owned by the applicant and could not be part of the application, although negotiations were being undertaken under section 38 with the Secretary of State;
- vi) Deferral of the application – Members were advised that the application had to be determined at the meeting as any change in the access would mean the application would have to be resubmitted with new plans and another consultation process. The applicant could then hold the Council to account for non-determination within the statutory period.

- i) Paragraph 7.8.12 stated that the Surrey Fire Service recommended that parking enforcement be introduced due to residents' concerns regarding access for emergency vehicles – this contradicted the County Highways Agency's comments at paragraph 7.8.3. Members expressed disappointment that a representative from the County Highways Agency was not present at the meeting particularly as this was for a major application with significant highways implications. It was agreed that a letter be sent by the chief executive of the Council to the chief executive of Surrey County Council expressing this disappointment.

The officers had recommended that the application be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head –Regulatory and the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement. After consideration of the officers' recommendation, the Committee was of the opinion that the application had not provided sufficient evidence on traffic issues in Snowdrop Way and the impact on the residential amenity.

Resolved that application 14/0249 be refused on the grounds that the application had not provided sufficient evidence with regard to the traffic concerns and the impact on the residential amenity, the wording to be finalised after consultation with the Chairman.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor David Mansfield had been an employee of Bisley Office Equipment some years ago. He also attended meetings in relation to the consultation process as an observer and did not take part in any discussion.

It was also noted for the record that councillors had received letters from Bisley Parish Council and residents in relation to this application.

Note 2

As this application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mrs James representing the Snowdrop Residents' Association spoke in objection. Mr Smith and Mr Holden (representing the Bisley Residents' Association) also shared a speaking slot and spoke in objection.

Mr Hutchison, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Note 3

The recommendation to approve was proposed by Councillor Rodney Bates and seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks.

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:
Councillors Rodney Bates and Richard Brooks.

Voting against the recommendation to approve:

Councillors David Allen, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

The vote was lost.

The recommendation to refuse was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Vivienne Chapman.

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve:
Councillors David Allen, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton

Voting against the recommendation to approve:
Councillors Rodney Bates and Richard Brooks.

The vote was carried.

74/P Application Number: 14/0605 - Frimhurst Farm, Deepcut Bridge Road, Deepcut GU16 6RF - Mytchett and Deepcut Ward

The application was for the application relating to the continued use of the existing Industrial Centre for use classes B1, B2 and B8 and movement between these uses as well as a revised vehicular access onto Deepcut Bridge Road.

Some Members felt that the proposal catered for a variety of employment types in the area and refusal of the application would cause a loss of local jobs and have a detrimental impact on the local economy. Officers reminded Members that while the reuse of buildings within the historic core of the site may be acceptable, the proliferation of compound areas and the creation of a new access in the countryside would harm its intrinsic character, beauty, and landscape quality.

Resolved that application 14/0605 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

As this application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Andrews, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Ken Pedder.

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 refuse:
Councillors Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse:
Councillors David Allen, Colin Dougan and Pat Tedder.

75/P Application Number: 14/0675 - The Brickmakers Arms, Chertsey Road, Windlesham GU20 6HT - Windlesham Ward

The application was for the erection of a detached building and ancillary storage shed to provide additional accommodation to the existing public house and the extension of the car park with associated landscape alterations (retrospective).

This application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, at the request of a local ward councillor it had been called in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The committee report contains two errors;

- 1. It states that Windlesham Parish Council has no objection, this is incorrect, an objection has been raised on the basis there are no very special circumstances to justify the retention of the buildings in the Green Belt. The Parish Council also raise concerns as to whether the parking facilities are sufficient to meet the demand of the public house and the new facility.*
- 2. Para 7.1 the word 'locally' is omitted from the first sentence.*

Officers have had sight of the material circulated to members (by the agent) in advance of this meeting).'

In addition the Committee was advised that there was an error in the report and Windlesham Parish Council had raised an objection to the proposal.

Some concerns were raised with regard to the planning permission of the previous out buildings and the mobile home still on the site. In addition the traffic and car parking issues were discussed.

It was noted that the erected detached building used as a function room, catered for the local community by providing a venue for various groups. This improved the vitality of the business and the village. It was suggested a condition could be added to limit the function room to community use only.

It was suggested that the application be deferred so that further discussions could take place with the applicant with regard to the use of the function room.

Resolved that application 14/0675 be deferred to allow for further discussions to take place with the applicant, with regard to the use of the function room.

Note 1

As this application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Sapstead spoke in objection; he also spoke in objection on behalf of Lord Russell who was unable to attend at short notice. Mr Andrews, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Note 2

The recommendation to defer the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Vivienne Chapman.

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 defer the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to defer:

Councillor Rodney Bates.

76/P

Application Number: 14/0609 - Brook Green, Waverley Close, Camberley GU15 1JH - Parkside Ward

The application was for the outline application for the erection of two detached buildings, each to contain 9 two bedroom flats following the demolition of the existing buildings (Matters of access, layout and scale to be considered.) (Additional info rec'd 21/10/2014).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'One additional representation of objection and one representation of support have been received.'

The objection raised the following concerns:

- *increased traffic and potential parking issues*
- *loss of trees and vegetation which is harmful to the character of the area'*

In addition the sentence in paragraph 7.5.2 starting with 'moreover' should read:

'Moreover the scale and siting of the buildings, with the access drive running between the buildings and formal parking arrangement, would give rise to a form of development which would appear significantly at odds with the existing development in Waverley Close.'

Resolved that application 14/0609 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Audrey Roxburgh.

Note 2

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 David Allen, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

77/P Application Number: 14/0794 - Alenia Marconi, Lyon Way, Frimley, GU16 7EX - Frimley Ward

The application was for the erection of a gas fuelled, Short Term Operating Reserve electricity generation plant.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The LPA has been notified of a change in the planning agent acting for the applicant.

4 representations of objection have been received which raise the following matters:

- Increase in noise, dirt, pollution and vibrations already experienced by residential properties in the area; (Officer note: the proposal's impact on residential amenities is considered in section 7.5 of the committee report)*
- The proposal is too close to residential properties (Officer note: this would be a matter for the Health and Safety Executive)*
- Object to the principle of any development on the site on flooding grounds (Officer note: the site is part of an allocated employment site and benefits from planning permission for redevelopment, in addition the EA has not raised any flood related objection to the proposal which is supported by an up to date flood risk assessment)*

Point of clarification – The Environmental Health Officer has considered the proposals impact in terms of noise, contamination and air pollution.

The application is supported by a noise assessment, air quality assessment and contaminated land assessment.

In respect of noise, the assessment considers the impact of the proposal on the nearest properties located in Station Road. In his assessment of the robustness of the Noise Assessment, the EHO notes:

- No sound is produced when the plant is not on line;*
- Experience of this type of plant indicates that operating times are likely to be 1900-2100 (season and demand dependant);*
- Plant will be online typically 83mins a day (subject to caveat above);*

- *On the basis of the 35Db(A) silencers proposed by the applicant complaints are unlikely (increase in noise over background levels being 1Db(A)), however this can be improved by the use of 45Db(A). The use of these improved silencers will reduce the difference between sound produced and background noise levels to Zero. This is conditioned, condition 5 of the report*

In summary the EHO concludes:

1. *Noise levels from the plant will not cause the standards detailed within BS8233:14 to be exceeded within bed, dining and living rooms of the nearest residential properties.*
2. *Noise levels from the plant will be below day, evening and night time background levels within bed, dining and living rooms for the nearest residential property. Allowing for the same to have a partially open window for ventilation purposes.*
3. *Noise levels from this power plant are less than was predicted to arise from the same unit in the distribution, trading or warehouse scheme.*

No objection is raised on land contamination grounds and a standard condition is proposed (condition 6).

In terms of air quality, the submitted air quality assessment predictions are based on a worst case scenario of the plant being on line for 1500hrs per year (not the predicted 800hrs). The EHO concludes that air quality issues can be controlled by condition and are not a constraint to the proposed development.

An additional condition (detailed below) is however proposed to deal with dust generation during the construction phase:

8. Prior to the development hereby approved commencing a Dust Management Plan (DMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The details to be submitted should include:

- *measures for the mitigation and control of dust from the site construction operations and include details of any monitoring scheme,*
- *measures to ensure contact details for appropriate persons are displayed on the site boundary,*
- *means of observing wind speed and direction prior to conducting any dust generating operations during periods of high or gusty wind*
- *establishment and enforcement of appropriate speed limits on site during the construction period to prevent dust being whipped up*
- *Water assisted dust sweepers to be used on access roads and local roads to remove any material tracked out of the site*
- *Measures to avoid the dry sweeping or large areas*
- *All loads to be covered entering and leaving the site*
- *Water to be used as a dust suppressant*

Reason: To comply with the guidance produced by the Institute of Air Quality Management, Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 212 and the NPPF.'

Some Members sought clarification on the noise levels but were advised that Environmental Services had raised no objection as the noise levels could be compared to that of talking in a library.

In addition clarification was sought on the phrase 'short term' in the description 'short term operative reserve'. The Committee was advised that short term related to the operation during the day. Some Members requested that a definition of 'short term' could be included in the resolution.

Resolved that application 14/0794 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 Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks.

Note 2

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 Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to approve:

Councillors David Allen and Ian Sams.

78/P

Application Number: 14/0799 - Burwood House Hotel, 15 London Road, Camberley GU15 3UQ - St Pauls Ward

The application was for the erection of side and rear extensions with associated internal alterations following conversion of hotel into 10 residential flats (one 3 bedroom, eight 2 bedroom and one 1 bedroom). (Amended plans rec'd 24/10/14).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Further viability information has been submitted and the levels of contributions have yet to be agreed as a result; however the recommendation in respect of this application remains to defer and delegate subject to the satisfactory negotiation and completion of an agreement in respect of infrastructure, SPA and affordable housing by the 27th of November.'

Some Members were concerned about traffic issues and the low provision of affordable housing.

Resolved that application 14/0799 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 David Allen.

Note 2

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 David Allen, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

79/P Application Number: 14/0735 - Pembroke House, Pembroke Broadway, Camberley - Town Ward

The application was for the erection of a 92 bedroom residential carehome following the demolition of existing office building. (Amended plans rec'd 09/10/2014)

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Point of clarification: parking provision for this development. Para. 1.1 and 4.4 should read 31 car spaces in the basement, 10 cycle spaces and 2 disabled bays on the ground floor as well as one minibus bay. A revised consultation response from the Highway Authority to reflect this has been also received.'

Resolved that application 14/0735 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 David Allen.

Note 2

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 David Allen, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

80/P Application Number: 14/0870 - 45 Deepcut Bridge Road, Deepcut, GU16 6QT - Mytchett and Deepcut Ward

The application was for the erection of 3 detached two storey dwellings following demolition of existing bungalow.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'A satisfactory legal agreement was received and therefore the recommendation is Grant subject to conditions.'

Resolved that application 14/0870 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 Audrey Roxburgh.

Note 2

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 David Allen, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

81/P Application Number: 14/0837 - 29 - 29a Portesbury Road, Camberley GU15 3TA - Town Ward

The application was for the change of use from garage/workshop/office to residential, together with the erection of two storey side and single storey rear extensions following the demolition of detached garage to the rear to provide a single dwelling.

Members were advised that a consultation response had been received from Environmental Services regarding contamination issues; no objection had been raised subject to a standard contamination condition being included.

'Additional conditions to be imposed in terms of contamination:

Condition 32:

Unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, development other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation must not commence until conditions 1 to 4 have been complied with. If unexpected contamination is found after development has begun, development must be halted on that part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination to the extent specified by the Local Planning Authority in writing until condition 4 has been complied with in relation to that contamination.

1.1 Site Characterisation

An investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The

investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

(i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;

(ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:

- human health,*
- property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,*
- adjoining land,*
- groundwaters and surface waters,*
- ecological systems,*
- archeological sites and ancient monuments;*

(iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

1.2. Submission of Remediation Scheme

A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

1.3. Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme

The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

1.4. Reporting of Unexpected Contamination

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported

in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of condition 1.1, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of condition 1.2, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with condition 1.3.

1.5. Long Term Monitoring and Maintenance

A monitoring and maintenance scheme to include monitoring the long-term effectiveness of the proposed remediation over a period of 5 years, and the provision of reports on the same must be prepared, both of which are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of the measures identified in that scheme and when the remediation objectives have been achieved, reports that demonstrate the effectiveness of the monitoring and maintenance carried out must be produced, and submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

Reason (common to all): To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. '

Resolved that application 14/0837 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 the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

82/P Application Number: 14/0710 - 22 Worsley Road, Frimley, GU16 9AU - Frimley Green Ward

The application was for the erection of a two storey side extension to comprise 2 one bedroom flats with the retention of the existing property on a reduced curtilage.

Members were advised of the following update:

'Thames Valley Water – No objection'.

In addition the Committee was advised that an email had been received by officers from the applicant outlining the proposal would provide a needed variety of units in the area.

Resolved that application 14/0710 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Rodney Bates and seconded by Councillor Ken Pedder.

Note 2

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 David Allen, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

83/P

Application Number: 14/0887 - The Sun, 45 High Street, Chobham GU24 8AF - Chobham Ward

The application was for the application for Advertisement Consent for 2 illuminated fascia signs, 1 illuminated hanging sign, 1 illuminated title sign, 2 non-illuminated other signs and 1 illuminated menu sign all replacing existing signage.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Chobham Parish Council – Objection 'All external Lighting to be heritage in keeping with the High Street''

Some Members were concerned about the bulkhead lighting and felt signs should be lit from outside and not within the light units. It was agreed that this would be covered by the inclusion of an additional informative.

Resolved that application 14/0887 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 Ian Sams and seconded by Councillor Pat Tedder.

Note 2

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 David Allen, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

84/P Application Number: 14/0876 - The Sun, 45 High Street, Chobham, GU24 8AF - Chobham Ward

The application was for the Listed Building Consent for the advertisement for 2 illuminated fascia signs, 1 illuminated hanging sign, 1 illuminated title sign, 2 non-illuminated other signs and 1 illuminated menu sign all replacing existing signs.

Some Members were concerned about the bulkhead lighting and felt signs should be lit from outside and not within the light units. It was agreed that this would be covered by the inclusion of an additional informative.

Resolved that application 14/0876 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 Pat Tedder.

Note 2

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 David Allen, Rodney Bates, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Chairman