Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 29 June 2023

+ Cllr Cliff Betton (Chair)
+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler (Vice Chair)

+	Cllr Shaun Garrett	+	Cllr John Skipper
+	Cllr Mary Glauert	+	Cllr Kevin Thompson
+	Cllr Nirmal Kang	-	Cllr David Whitcroft
+	Cllr Liz Noble	-	Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+	Cllr David O'Mahoney	+	Cllr Valerie White
	Cllr Ying Perrett	+	Cllr Richard Wilson
+	Cllr Murray Rowlands		

\+ Present
\- Apologies for absence presented

Members in Attendance: Cllr Leanne Macintyre
Cllr Sarbie Kang

Officers Present: Gavin Chinniah, Head of Planning
William Hinde, Principal Solicitor
Jonathan Partington, Development Manager
Rowan Speed, Senior Planning Officer
Iain Williams, Development Management Team Leader

8/P Minutes of Previous Meeting

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held on 2nd June 2023 be approved as being a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

9/P *Application Number: 23/0074/FFU 29, 30 and 30a Brackendale Close, Camberley, Surrey, GU15 1HP

The application was for the erection of 25 affordable apartments with associated access, hardstanding, car parking, landscaping, bin and cycle stores following the demolition of 29 and 30 Brackendale Close and associated outbuildings. The Committee noted the updates provided in the supplementary agenda papers.

As the application had triggered the Council's public speaking scheme Mr Akhil Vyas spoke in opposition to the application. In his representation, Mr Vyas referenced the lack of parking proposed and the impacts this could have on neighbouring streets as well as the scale of the development which was considered to be at odds with the surrounding area.

Whilst the representation from the Urban Design Consultant made reference to the fact that the scale and mass of the development was considered to be appropriate for the area it was considered that the development's design was materially similar to a previous application for the site which had been refused on the grounds of scale and over development.

It was noted that the ecological appraisal was out of date and consequently the proposals did not adequately demonstrate an appropriate level of protection for any that any protected species onsite.

The officer recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Kang, seconded by Councillor Skipper, put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that application number 23/0047/FFU be refused for the following reasons:

i. The proposed development by reason of its overall quantum, scale, size, design and density, would represent an overdevelopment of the site, failing to integrate positively within the surrounding area resulting in a dominant, urbanising and incongruous form of development that would fail to respect the verdant, semi-rural character and form of the area, including the Wooded Hill Character Area. The proposed building results in an overly bulky, large span of development without sufficient break, whilst the parking forecourt would result in a large area of hardstanding without relief. The proposal therefore would be contrary to Policy CP2 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy & Development Management Policies 2012, Principles 6.4, 6.7, 6.8, 6.9, and 7.3 of the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017, Principles WH1 and WH3 of the Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012.

ii. Insufficient information has been submitted by way of an up to date ecological appraisal, to demonstrate whether protected species and their habitats are present on site, whether the proposal would be likely harm these and whether any mitigation is required. The proposal therefore fails to safely ensure the protection of any protected species and their habitats on site, failing to demonstrate that the proposal would conserve and enhance biodiversity the application is contrary to policy CP14A of adopted Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the adopted NPPF (2021).

iii. In the absence of a payment or a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP14B (vi) (European Sites) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and Policy NRM6 (Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area) of the South East Plan 2009 (as saved) in relation to the provision of contributions towards Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANGs) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) measures, in accordance with the requirements of the Surrey Heath Borough Council's Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted January 2019).

iv. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure the required provision of affordable housing, the proposal is contrary to Policy CP5 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

NOTE 1
It was noted that the Brackendale Close Residents' Association had written to some of the Committee members outlining their concerns about the application.

NOTE 2
In accordance with Part 4, Section D, Paragraph 18 of the Constitution the voting in favour of the motion to refuse the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the motion to refuse:

Councillors Betton, Garrett, Glauert, Kang, Rowlands, Skipper, White and Wilson
Voting against the motion to refuse:
Councillors O'Mahoney, Thompson and Wheeler

Having arrived part way through consideration of the application Councillor Noble did not participate in the discussion or voting.

10/P Application Number: 23/0217/FFU 5 Cedar Gardens, Chobham, Woking, Surrey, GU24 8PG

The application was for the erection of a single storey rear extension with roof light. The Committee noted the updates provided in the supplementary agenda papers.

It was noted that the application had been called in by Councillor Wheeler at the behest of Chobham Parish Council due to concerns about the impact that the proposal would have on residential amenity.

It was clarified that there was one tree subject to a Tree Preservation Oder at the front of the site; proposed Condition 4 would enable the safeguarding of trees on the site.

The Committee was informed that it was considered that the proposed extension would not cause adverse harm to the character of the area and would not result in any adverse highways impacts. Concern about the reduction in size of the private garden space was noted however the remaining space was considered to be of an adequate size for the dwelling concerned. It was noted that the Design Guide standards for amenity space only applied to new developments. Moreover, it was considered unreasonable to apply new Design Guide Standards to an existing development that pre-dated the guidance. However, section 10 of the Design Guide specifically dealt with residential extensions and this proposal complied with that section.

The officer's recommendation to approve the application subject to the conditions set out in the report and the update sheet, was proposed by Councillor Wilson, seconded by Councillor Kang put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that application number 23/0217/FFU be approved subject to the conditions in the officer's report and the planning update sheet.

NOTE 1
In accordance with Part 4, Section D, Paragraph 18 of the Constitution the voting in favour of the motion to approve the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the motion to approve:
Councillors Betton, Glauert, Kang, Noble, O'Mahoney, Rowlands, Skipper, Thompson and Wilson
Voting against the motion to approve:
Councillors Garrett, Wheeler and White.

Chair