

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning
Applications Committee held at
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House
on 14 September 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 Paul Ilnicki (In place of Robin Perry) and Cllr Max Nelson (In place of Colin Dougan)

In Attendance: Cllr Paul Deach, Cllr Charlotte Morley, Lee Brewin, Michelle Fielder, Gareth John, Karen Limmer, Jonathan Partington, Emma Pearman and Jenny Rickard

Cllr Paul Deach from min 22/P – 25/P
Cllr Charlotte Morley from min 22/P – 27/P
Karen Limmer from min 22/P – 23/P

22/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 19 August 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

23/P Application Number: 14/0925 - Little Heath Nursery, Little Heath Road, Chobham, Woking GU24 8RJ - Chobham Ward

The application was for the redevelopment of a commercial nursery for residential use - 35 affordable dwellings with associated works with access from Burr Hill Lane; and provision of suitable alternative natural green space (SANGS) with associated works. (Amended plans & info rec'd 23/03/15), (Additional info rec'd 27/05/15), (Amended/additional info rec'd 28/07/15), (Amended plan rec'd 20/08/15).

A site visit took place at the site.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'A response to the submitted Flood Risk Assessment has been received from the Lead Local Flood Authority who concludes that surface water drainage can be provided. However the Council's Drainage Officer has objected to the proposal.

*The basis of this objection is that the information submitted does not adequately demonstrate that the surface water run-off can be accommodated without conflict arising between this and ground water. It is therefore considered that the **Recommendation should be changed** and the application should be **REFUSED** for the following reason:*

In the absence of accurate and robust Flood Risk Assessment and Sustainable Drainage Strategy the applicant has failed to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the proposed development would not result in an increased risk of either ground or surface water flooding; or that a conflict will not arise between these two water sources. The local planning authority cannot therefore reasonably conclude that the proposal would not result in harm or injury to either future (occupiers of the proposed development), or neighbouring occupiers or their property. As such the development fails to comply with Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated guidance in the Planning Practice Guidance and Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012.

Suggested informative

- 1. The applicant is advised that the raising of site levels is not considered to be an appropriate means of addressing the high groundwater table and on-site surface water ponding. This is because the build-up of ground levels will displace standing surface water and is likely to compromise the ability for neighbouring properties to drain effectively. One way this could be addressed (it is accepted there may be others) is by lowering level increases across the site and considering off-set ponding and additional land drainage systems (to the rear of properties (these would need to be shallow and independent from any other drainage system and discharge to the open watercourse at the lowest corner of the site))*
- 2. The applicant is also advised to address the inconsistencies between the FRA and submitted plans (with specific reference to the discrepancies between finished floor level details / attenuation / landscaping / tree retention).*
- 3. The applicant is also advised to ensure the following matters are addressed in any future application submission:*
 - Attenuation systems to cater for a 1:100 year event, +30% climate change, taken for worst case duration scenario and allowing for all impervious hard surface areas*
 - No buildings, fences or other obstructions to be constructed above existing ground levels within 5.0m of any watercourse (top of embankment)*
 - Full details of any offset of surface water ponding areas must be provided*
 - All drainage and attenuation systems to be fully annotated within the proposals. Details to include all pipe sizes and gradients, chamber sizes*

including cover, sump and invert levels where applicable. All connections to properties to be shown.

- *All attenuation systems to be fully detailed with plan sizes, levels and volumes. Details of attenuation tanking and venting systems to be provided.*
- *New access road to be drained independently from any attenuation system serving properties. Plans to detail a separate attenuation system provision to accommodate highway drainage with all gully connections to be shown. All road levels, kerb levels and drainage attributes to be fully annotated.*
- *Details must be provided for the surface water system (highway drainage) present at the site access. Full details of any surface water system likely to drain into or through the development must be provided.*
- *Total flows from the development to be restricted to a maximum of 5.0 litres/second/hectare.*
- *FFL of all proposed buildings to be provided.*
- *Levels for all impermeable hard surface areas to be provided must be provided (to include level information around the curtilage boundary and for any paved or parking areas). All elements of the drainage systems to be indicated upon the drainage layout plan*

A request for the applications deferral from tonight's Agenda has been received from the Applicant via their Planning Agent. This is made on the basis that the applicant considers that the surface and ground water related objection could be resolved in a timely manner. Officers do not share this view.

Since writing the committee report a further objection has been received from Chobham Parish Council. This reiterates the previous concerns raised and adds that the revised drainage strategy does not address the development's impact off site.

5 further objections have also been received. These reiterate previous comments / objections; in addition specific reference is made to the Windsor Court Development and the contribution this will make to the Affordable Housing provision within Cobham. [Officer note: this development comprises 8x3 bedroom dwelling houses: it is not a rural exception site and because of this there is no requirement for these units to solely accommodate a local need; notwithstanding this, 4 of the units are to be rented to persons with a local connection to Chobham. It is not however considered that these four units will address the local need identified by the Housing Manager and as reported as part of the main Committee Paper's].

Comments have also been received from County Cllr Mike Goodman. '

A note was also circulated to Members from County Councillor Mike Goodman with regard to the application.

Some Members questioned whether the application could be deferred for a month as requested by the applicant. It was advised that the drainage issues could not be resolved in that time period. Some Members were concerned that responses from required authorities had been delayed which had resulted in the recommendation being changed so close to the meeting date.

Some Members also felt that the need for shared ownership units had not been proven.

It was noted by the Committee that the Environment Agency had raised no objection to the application but the agency had provided strategic flood risk advice.

In addition, Members sought clarification on what would be considered on any future applications should this one be refused. It was advised that whatever issues the application was refused on would be a consideration should a further application be brought back to Committee. It was noted that given the County Highways Authority had not objected to the scheme, any reason for refusal on highways grounds would need to have robust evidence to support this.

Resolved that application 14/0925 be refused for the reasons set out in the update report of the Executive Head Regulatory and that sufficient evidence had not been provided to support the need for affordable housing on the site.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that he and Committee Members had received communication regarding this application.

Note 2

As this application triggered the public speaking scheme, Mr Dymott and Mr Rees spoke in objection to the application. Mr Sheppard, the applicant spoke in support.

Note 3

The recommendation to refuse the application as amended was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Pat Tedder.

Note 4

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 refuse the application as amended:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

24/P

Application Number: 15/0175 - Camberley Police Station, Portesbury Road, Camberley GU15 3SZ - Town Ward

The application was for the erection of 35 residential units (comprising 9 apartments in a 3 storey block and a mix of two storey dwelling houses (with rooms in the roof and 3 storey town houses). (Amended plans rec'd 13/07/2015 & 5/8/15).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Housing Mix and Viability (Paragraphs 5.6, 5.7 and 7.7)

To confirm, the overall development would provide the following housing mix: 3 no. 1 bed (9%); 6 no. 2 bed (17%); 9 no. 3 bed (26%); 5 no. 4 bed (14%); and, 12 no. 5 bed (34%)

The applicant provided additional viability information. The Council's Viability Consultant assessed this and on the basis of revised calculations recommended that 8 affordable units (or 22.8%) ought to be provided. However, following further negotiation the provision from 4 to 6 units (or from 11.4% to 17.1%, respectively) was agreed with the following breakdown proposed:

- *Plot 2 Ground Floor 1 Bed Flat (Shared Ownership)*
- *Plot 3 Ground Floor 2 Bed Flat (Shared Ownership)*
- *Plot 24 Three Bed House (Affordable Rented)*
- *Plot 25 Three Bed House (Affordable Rented)*
- *Plot 26 Three Bed House (Affordable Rented)*
- *Plot 27 Three Bed House (Affordable Rented)*

The Council's Viability Consultant and Council's Housing Manager are supportive of this approach.

Consequently, this development would now deliver a total of 29 market housing of which 2 no. would be 1 bed (7%); 5 no. 2 bed (17.3%); 5 no. 3 bed (17.3%); 5 no. 4 bed (17.3%); and, 12 no. 5 bed (41%).

To reiterate paragraph 7.7.2 of the agenda report, whilst this market housing split is not aligned with Policy CP6 which requires a total of 50% of the market housing to be 3 bed or above, Policy TC18 of the AAP supports family housing at this location. Thus, the higher uplift of family housing, equating to approximately 76% of the total market housing, is not unreasonable.

This viability resolution took longer than anticipated and so there is concern that the legal process to draft and sign the legal agreement will not be completed by the 30 September 2015. Hence, the applicant is agreeable to an extension of time until Friday 30 October 2015.

Drainage (Paragraph 7.10)

Following comments received from the Council's Drainage Engineer further work is required on the drainage strategy before the application can be approved and any necessary drainage conditions imposed. It is therefore recommended that the

outstanding drainage issues be agreed under delegated powers and the extension of time until 30 October 2015 will also enable this to happen.

Amended RECOMMENDATION

*The Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to **GRANT** planning permission subject to a receipt of a satisfactory legal agreement to secure affordable housing provision and SAMM (£22,742); subject to receipt of an agreed drainage strategy; and, subject to conditions (as detailed on pages 53-56 of the agenda, and any additional conditions required in connection with the drainage strategy).*

In the event that a satisfactory legal agreement and drainage strategy has not been agreed by the 30 October 2015 (with the drainage strategy received for consideration no later than 30 September 2015), the Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to REFUSE the application for the reasons set out on page 57 of the agenda; and, for the following reason:

3. *In the absence of a workable drainage strategy the applicant has failed to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant and provides an appropriate sustainable drainage system for the management of run-off. As such the development fails to comply with Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated guidance in the Planning Practice Guidance and Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012.'*

Resolved that application 15/0175 be approved subject to:

- i) the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head Regulatory;**
- ii) receipt of a satisfactory legal agreement to secure affordable housing provision and SAMM (£22,742);**
- iii) an agreed drainage strategy by 30 October 2015; and**
- iv) any additional conditions required in connection with the drainage strategy.**

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that he and Committee Members had been contacted by the developer and he and Cllr Richard Brooks had attended an exhibition in relation to the application.

Note 2

As this application triggered the public speaking scheme, Ms Green, the applicant spoke in support.

Note 3

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor David Allen.

Note 4

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, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt , Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

25/P Application Number: 15/0272 - Orchard Cottage, Shepherds Lane, Windlesham GU20 6HL - Windlesham Ward

The application was for the outline application for the erection of a 65 bedroom care home, a doctors surgery and a detached bungalow with landscaping and access following demolition of existing buildings (access to be considered), (Additional info rec'd 24/06/15 & 15/7/15).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Consultee comments

We have had comments from the following:

- *Local Lead Flood Authority – Further information provided is not sufficient to meet requirements; there are discrepancies in the information which need to be checked. Therefore a fourth refusal reason is proposed as follows:*

- 3. *In the absence of a workable drainage strategy the applicant has failed to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant and provides an appropriate sustainable drainage system for the management of run-off. As such the development fails to comply with Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated guidance in the Planning Practice Guidance and Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012.*

- *Environment Agency – No comments – low environmental risk*

- *Fisher German Pipelines – Further clarification that they are satisfied that the works will not affect the pipeline. [Officer comment: the pipeline is not considered to be a reason for refusal in any case]*

- *Windlesham Parish Council – This should have read 'Comment' as opposed to 'Objection' - Their response read as follows: Concern expressed by the access from Chertsey Road and highway safety issues, as the local school is only 500 metres away. Council asked if there are any very special circumstances in this case that would allow the Green Belt to be built on*

Very Special Circumstances Statement – received 28th August

The applicant provided an additional statement covering the factors they believe amount to very special circumstances. In the summary they make the following points:

- **Case Law and Planning Policy relating to very special circumstances state that they can be several factors taken together and none of these factors need to be exceptional individually** – Officers do not dispute this. Very special circumstances, however, must outweigh the harm to the Green Belt, and any other harm. Either alone, or in combination opinion the very special circumstances do not amount to outweigh the significant harm to the Green Belt, and other identified harm to the character of the area and the unsustainability of the location.

Summary of factors put forward by the applicant that they considered amount to very special circumstances:

1. **A pressing need for specialist residential accommodation in SHBC for older persons** - Officer comment: This is not disputed in the report, however there is no information to suggest that at the present time there is a critical shortage of places in the borough, and the issue remains as to whether this is the appropriate location. Surrey Heath is meeting its housing targets and in any case paragraph 034 of the Housing and Economic Land Availability within the Planning Practice Guidance it makes clear that in decision making, unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the very special circumstances justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.
2. **No objections from either Parish Council and 210 letters of support** – Officer comment: While neither Parish Council has objected, Windlesham PC has raised concern over some issues as stated above.
3. **Priority rights to the care home proposed for Windlesham and Chobham residents** – Officer comment: the applicant has explained further in this document that this could be done by moving residents of Chobham or Windlesham to the top of any waiting list.
4. **By providing alternate accommodation, the proposed care home will release residential dwellings onto the wider housing market, reducing pressure on other greenfield sites in the Borough** – Officer comment: this may be the case, however this site causes harm to a greenfield site itself
5. **Local demand for a doctors surgery in Windlesham parish** – Officer comment: no further evidence of need has been provided to support this within the statement and additionally the County Highway Authority have objected due to the unsustainable location for such a facility

6. No alternative non-Green Belt sites are available or suitable in Windlesham or Chobham parishes so if a scheme is to come forward it would have to be in a Green Belt location – Officer comment: the applicant did not provide an Alternative Site Assessment with this application which would be expected to justify a development on this Green Belt site. Further information has been provided at a late stage within this statement which is taken from the Surrey Heath Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and the applicant shows the sites identified within the SHLAA as potentially suitable for development within Chobham and Windlesham and states that there are none outside the Green Belt. However, the important difference between these sites and the application site is that they are likely to be previously developed land; as in paragraph 3.9 of the SHLAA it states that in choosing the sites to include, undeveloped sites within the Green Belt were excluded at the first stage, unless they were capable of being treated as a rural exception site for 100% affordable housing. None of these sites the applicant has shown therefore would be undeveloped sites in the Green Belt, as the majority of this site is. In order to discount these other sites the applicant should have provided information as to why none of these other sites would be more suitable. Therefore the fact remains that it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that there are no suitable alternative sites – and there may well be other sites which would be preferable to this one in terms of sustainability of location and a larger amount of previously developed land.

7. Site lies adjacent to former BOC complex which was approved on the grounds of very special circumstances earlier this year. This scheme was objected to by the community and Parish Councils and represents far greater levels of built development in the Green Belt. Officer comment - The BOC development is significantly harmful to the Green Belt but was only allowed due to the very special circumstances pertaining to the merits of that specific proposal. Hence, the quantum of development allowed under BOC permission does not provide a greenlight for other neighbouring sites. The case officer in summing up the acceptability of BOC stated the following:

'...in the officer's opinion the combined weight of these very special circumstances marginally outweigh the significant harm to the Green Belt and other harm. It is considered that the applicant's contribution to the local, regional and national economy, particularly in a growth worldwide industry that will become increasingly important in the future, tips the balance in favour of support. In coming to this difficult conclusion regard has been had to whether permitting this development would set a precedent in the Green Belt, or in the event that the applicant vacated the site result in future development that would be even more harmful.

However, it is considered that the proposal is genuinely unique and so other developments elsewhere in the Green Belt would still have to be considered on their own merits being subject to the same stringent Green Belt control.'

8. The site is located in an existing developed setting. Further it is well related to the strategic road network and will be supported by a

sustainable Travel Plan including a minibus for staff and visitors.

Officer comment – in this document the applicant has suggested a Travel Plan including the provision of a minibus amongst other factors. This has been put to the County Highway Authority who has confirmed that it does not overcome their previous objection, and they are still concerned about the unsustainable location of the development, particularly the doctor's surgery. The surrounding development has been discussed in the report under section 7.3. However, this is a semi-rural area where built development is interspersed with rural open land, and this application would result in a band of continuous development which is not currently seen anywhere else along this part of the road outside the settlement area.

9. **The proposal offers a large site whereby a high quality landscaped environment can be created for residents of the care home and plentiful car parking can be provided.** *Officer comment – do not dispute this, however car parking would have to be controlled by intercom because of the site's proximity to the SPA as discussed in paragraphs 7.4.3 and 7.8.1 of the Officer's Report, and the County Highway Authority have raised concern that such an intercom would cause queuing on the Chertsey Road.*

10. **The scheme would provide approximately 70 full time equivalent employment opportunities in a variety of low skilled and high skilled professions. On SHBC's own figures, this could generate £3,570,000 towards the local economy.** *Officer comment: this is discussed in paragraph 7.10.6 of the report.*

11. **A high quality design can be achieved and existing utilitarian buildings removed, such that the standard of design generally in the area can be raised.** *Officer comment: this is discussed in paragraph 7.10.8 of the report.*

Officers do not consider therefore that this further information has overcome any of the previous reasons for refusal.'

It was noted that just before the Committee meeting officer's received notification from the Local Flood Authority that the proposed fourth reason for refusal detailed in the update, should be withdrawn.

Some Members supported the views of the speakers in objection with regard to the Green Belt harm, the lack of public transport in the village, and a charitable or community trust would be preferable to a commercial concern. In addition they supported the County Highways Authority's comments that the location was unsustainable.

Some Members commented that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that there were very special circumstances.

Other Members felt that the scheme addressed the need for a care home in the village and there had been no objection to the application from neighbouring properties.

Members discussed the adjoining site at BOC and why given this development, the proposed scheme should also be supported. Members were reminded of the officer comment at point 7 above.

The officer's recommendation was to refuse the application because of the remote location of the site and lack of public transport, inappropriate and harmful development in the Green Belt and associated harm to the countryside; and because the very special circumstances provided by the applicant did not outweigh the harm.

In the event that the Members did not agree with the officer's recommendations, they were advised that they would need to consider whether there were any very special circumstances which outweighed the identified harm.

Some Members stated that they supported the very special circumstances given by the applicant. Members were then pressed by officers to state what specific very special circumstances they considered outweighed the harm. To guide, Members in being specific, they were directed to paragraph 7.10.2 of the agenda report and the update which lists the applicant's very special circumstances.

It was mentioned that this type of proposal was part of the Windlesham Neighbourhood Plan but it was advised by officers that there was no such plan in existence.

Some Members stated that from the update (listed above) it was points 1 (a pressing need for the community); 6 (No alternative site); and, 10 (provision of employment) which were relevant very special circumstances.

It was also reiterated that the scheme was a provision of employment and there was a shortage of provision in the local area for a care home and doctor's surgery.

The exploration of an in and out access was suggested to help in addressing County Highways Authority's concerns, however, the objection was in regard of the inaccessibility of the access and any change to the access would not alleviate this.

Resolved that application 15/0272 be approved for the very special circumstances pertaining to need, lack of alternatives and provision of employment and subject to, conditions, the wording to be finalised in consultation with Chairman and Vice Chairman and referral to the Secretary of State for consideration.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- i) Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that he knew the applicant but had not met him regarding this application. He had also received documents from the applicant and correspondence from the Chobham Society;
- ii) Councillor Conrad Sturt declared that he knew the applicant and had also received the correspondence mentioned above;

- iii) Councillor Pat Tedder declared that she had been sent presentations and the applicant had attended an independent surgery;
- iv) Councillor Paul Ilnicki declared that he had been acquainted with the applicant; and
- v) Councillor Valerie White declared that she had also been acquainted with the applicant.

Note 2

As this application triggered the public speaking scheme, Mr Rees and Ms Muir spoke in objection and Miss Jackson spoke in support. Mr Rumble, the agent and Mr Gunby, the applicant also spoke in support.

Note 3

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Victoria Wheeler and seconded by Councillor David Mansfield.

Note 4

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 refuse the application:

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield and Victoria Wheeler.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors David Allen, Nick Chambers, Surinder Gandhum, Paul Ilnicki, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, Max Nelson, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

Councillor Richard Brooks abstained.

The motion was lost.

Note 5

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor David Allen and seconded by Councillor Valerie White.

Note 6

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, Surinder Gandhum, Paul Ilnicki, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, Max Nelson, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield and Victoria Wheeler.

Councillor Richard Brooks abstained.

The motion was carried.

26/P Application Number: 15/0433 - 4 Frimley Road, Camberley GU15 3BA - St Michaels Ward

This application was for the erection of 1 residential building to provide 16 two bedroom apartments with associated parking following the demolition of the existing two houses and flats. (Amended plans recv'd 14/8/15)

Members were advised of the following update:

'Further consultation responses have been received as follows:

- *Head of Environmental Services – No objection*
- *SCC Lead Local Flood Authority – Have objected, because of the lack of information on which to assess surface water drainage. Further works are necessary before the application can be approved and any drainage conditions imposed. It is therefore considered that the outstanding drainage issues be agreed under delegated powers and an extension of time has been agreed with the applicant until 30th October 2015 to allow this to happen.*

In addition, a signed Unilateral Undertaking has now been received in respect of the SAMM payment, therefore the requirement to provide this is no longer necessary.

Because of these two issues the recommendation is proposed to be changed as follows:

Amended RECOMMENDATION

*The Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to **GRANT** planning permission subject to receipt of a revised drainage strategy; and, subject to conditions (as detailed on pages 92-94 of the agenda, and any additional conditions required in connection with the drainage strategy).*

In the event that a drainage strategy has not been agreed by the 30 October 2015 (with the revised drainage strategy received for consideration no later than 30 September 2015), the Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to REFUSE the application for the following reason:

1. *In the absence of a workable drainage strategy the applicant has failed to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant and provides an appropriate sustainable drainage system for the management of run-off. As such the development fails to comply with Schedule 3 of the Flood*

and Water Management Act 2010, paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated guidance in the Planning Practice Guidance and Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012.'

In addition it was noted that the local flood authority had withdrawn their objection and therefore the recommendation had been amended to approve subject to conditions.

It was noted by some members that there was a lack of affordable housing within the scheme.

Resolved that application 15/0433 be approved subject to conditions as sset 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 Conrad Sturt.

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 as amended:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

27/P Application Number: 15/0455 - 80 Verran Road, Camberley GU15 2LJ - Watchetts Ward

This application was for the erection of a two storey side and rear extension and single storey front extension including integral garage following demolition of existing garage.

This application was deferred from the 10 August 2015 Committee to enable Members to undertake a site visit. In accordance with Part 5, Section D, Appendix B, paragraph 10, only those Members who attended the site visit would be able to vote on this application.

Following the Committee, officers invited the applicant to amend the plans in order to reduce the depth of the two storey rear extension and the impact upon the neighbour. However, the applicant had decided not to amend the plans.

The 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:

'A site visit was held at 5pm on Monday 7th September 2015. The following councillors attended and can therefore vote on the application:

- *Cllr Hawkins; Cllr Mansfield; Cllr Allen; Cllr Brooks; Cllr Gandhum; Cllr Perry; Cllr Sams; Cllr Wheeler; Cllr White.'*

Clarification was sought regarding the measurement between the application site and the neighbouring house. It was noted as being 0.75m.

Resolved that application 15/0455 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins had been contacted by the applicant and revised plans were circulated to Committee Members.

Note 2

As the application triggered the public speaking scheme, Mr Keenan the applicant spoke in support of the application.

Note 3

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler.

Note 4

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 refuse the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Edward Hawkins David Mansfield, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Ian Sams and Surinder Gandhum

28/P Application Number: 15/0532 - 34 Curley Hill Road, Lightwater GU18 5YH - Lightwater Ward

This application was for the conversion of garage to habitable space, the erection of a two storey rear extension following demolition of existing extension and conversion of roof space to provide habitable space. (Amended & additional plans rec'd 12/08/15), (Additional plans rec'd 13/08/15), (Additional info rec'd 17/08/15).

Members were advised that the applicant had withdrawn the application.

29/P Application Number: 15/0568 - Former Cheswycks School, Guildford Road, Frimley Green, Camberlery GU16 6PB - Frimley Green Ward

This application was for the outline application for the erection of a two storey building with accommodation in the roof to provide a 62 bedroom care home

including car parking, landscaping, access and associated works. (Access, layout, appearance and scale to be determined). (Amended info recv'd 7/9/15 and 9/7/15). (Amended plan rec'd 17/08/2015).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The appeal decision referenced in the Committee Report has been dismissed. In dismissing the appeal the Inspector raised no objection to the principle of the development and like the Council was simply concerned about the lack of a legal agreement and ecological survey's. As detailed in the Committee Report these concerns have been overcome in the revised application and the recommendation remains to approve.'

Resolved that application 15/0568 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve 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 this application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Rebecca Jennings - Evans, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Chairman