

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning
Applications Committee held at
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House
on 7 April 2016**

+ 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 Cllr Colin Dougan)

In Attendance: Michelle Fielder, Jonathan Partington, Andrew Crawford and Gareth John.

52/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

53/P Application Number: 15/1043 - 34 Curley Hill Road, Lightwater GU18 5YH

This application was for conversion of garage to habitable space, erection of a two storey rear extension following demolition of existing extension and conversion of roof space to provide habitable space. (Amended Plans Rec'd 11/02/2016), (Additional information received 17/2/16)

This application would normally have been 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.

The Committee noted that a letter of objection had been sent to all Members prior to the meeting and were advised of the following update:

1. *The letter of complaint referred to has been dealt with as a stage one complaint and a response issued on 15 March 2016.*
2. *The matter of the missing consultee response from Windlesham Parish has been investigated by the Technical Services Team Leader who advises that only one response has been received (dated 4/3/2016) and this is publically available.*
3. *There are 9 letters of objection to the proposal and two letters of support. The Parish Council comments are reported as an objection at paragraph 5.2 of the committee report in line with Council procedures.*

4. *The summary of objections in the committee report at 6.3 should include a reference to the proposal's impact on the privacy of No.32 as this was raised in a letter of objection rec'd 24/2/2016. This omission does not, however, affect the validity of the officer assessment as the proposal's impact on the privacy of the occupiers of No.32 is considered in full in the committee report.*
5. *Appendix 2 – repeats a list of applications the author considers comparable to the current application. However, as Members are aware, each application has to be assessed on its own merits. Moreover, amenity considerations are site specific and as such just because an extension was considered to be harmful in one location does not mean that the same extension would be harmful in another. In addition, officers are of the opinion that none of the applications listed as being 'comparable' are materially similar to the current application.*
6. *The comments made in respect of para 7.3.7 are noted, however the officer's assessment is considered appropriate.*
7. *The comments made in respect of para 7.4.3 are noted – for the avoidance of doubt this para refers to the side elevation facing the shared boundary with No.32. With regards to Appendix 3 – the diagrams and details provided are noted, however the two storey element of the extension is set a minimum of 4.3m from the shared boundary with No.32 and this, as set out in the officer's report, is considered acceptable.*
8. *The comments made in respect of para 7.4.4 and Appendix 5 are noted. It should be noted that while a document titled 'sun survey' was submitted with the previous application this was not a full survey or report, however*
9. *With regards to concerns about the impact of the proposal on a bedroom window, the reports cite existing windows on the rear elevation. In addition, the visibility of a proposal is not indicative that it would be harmful.*
10. *With regards to the comments about Para 7.5.3 – the impact on an un-adopted road is not a material consideration and is a private matter.*
11. *The format of the committee report and the citation and reference of national and local policies is in accordance with Council procedures and follows that of all other reports prepared for consideration by the Planning Applications Committee. The Committee Report is considered to address all material considerations and policy constraints.*

*It is noted that the wording of proposed **condition 6** could be more specific and as such it is recommended that this is **amended** as detailed below:*

6. *Other than for the first floor terrace shown to front elevation of the development hereby approved (above the ground floor cloak, hallway, re-treat/media room), the roof areas of the dwelling hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.*

Reason: To ensure that the development does not affect the amenity of existing properties by overlooking in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

*It is also recommended that permitted development rights for further extension or alterations to the property be removed. An **additional condition (10)** is proposed below:*

10. *Notwithstanding the provisions of Class A, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any subsequent Order updating or re-enacting) there shall be no further extensions or alterations to the dwelling.*

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in the interests of character and amenity and to comply with Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Management Policies 2012, the Lightwater Village Design Statement and the NPPF.

Members expressed concerns in relation to the proposed development in that it was considered an overdevelopment, overbearing, out of character with surrounding properties, loss of amenities to neighbouring properties, including loss of sunlight and the size/bulk of the proposed building.

The officers had recommended that the application be approved. However, after consideration, the Members felt that the application should be refused due to the size and bulk of the property proposed and it being out of character with surrounding properties.

Resolved that application 15/1043 be refused on the grounds of size, bulk and character.

Note 1

It was noted, for the record, that Councillors Rebecca Jennings-Evans and Valerie White had received written and e-mailed correspondence on the application and had been present at a presentation given to Windlesham Parish Council.

Note 2

As the application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Michael Dornan spoke in objection.

Note 3

There was no proposer or seconder on the officer's recommendation to approve the application with conditions, as amended.

Note 4

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillor Richard Brooks.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, David Mansfield, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Note 5

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Rebecca Jennings-Evans 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 refuse the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, David Mansfield, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

54/P Application Number: 15/1100 - Hawk Farm, Church Lane, Bisley, Woking, GU24 9EA

This application was for the retention of two storey rear extension, single storey rear extension to garage and alterations to the garage roof; and, installation of a flue to the main roof at the rear.

The application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, at the request of Councillor Mansfield it had been called in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee.

Members were advised of the following update:

Correction to paragraph 7.6.1 – The development is not CIL liable. Therefore, delete informative 1 on page 40.

Resolved that application 15/1100 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Richard Brooks had been lobbied by the applicants and that Councillor David Mansfield had attended a number of meetings of the Parish Council at which the application had been addressed, but had observed only.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks 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 this application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Mansfield and Victoria Wheeler.

55/P Application Number: 77/0405/3 - Hawk Farm, Church Lane, Bisley, Woking GU24 9EA

This application was for the Non Material Amendment to planning permission SU/77/0405 (erection of a nursery manager's dwelling and garage) to allow the repositioning of windows, altered location for the front door and canopy.

This application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, at the request of Councillor Mansfield it has been called in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee.

Resolved that application 77/0405/3 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Richard Brooks had been lobbied by the applicants and that Councillor David Mansfield had attended a number of meetings of the Parish Council at which the application had been addressed, but had observed only.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Conrad Sturt and seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks.

Note 3

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, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Paul Innicki, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Mansfield and Victoria Wheeler.

56/P Application Number: 16/0055 - 7 Tekels Way, Camberley GU15 1HX

This application was for erection of a single storey detached building with flat roof in rear garden to be used as an annexe to main dwelling. (Amended plans rec'd 03/03/16).

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

Members were advised of the following update:

It has been brought to officers' attention that the GIS map on page 59 of the committee papers incorrectly defines the application site and does not extend to its full depth.

*A proposed **amendment to condition 4** is detailed below:*

4. *The development hereby approved shall be occupied only as residential accommodation ancillary to the use of the dwelling currently known as 7 Tekels Way and shall not be used as an independent residential unit or business premises (other than as a home office for the sole use of the occupiers of 7 Tekels Way).*

Reason: To ensure that the dwelling remains in single family occupation and does not give rise to harmful impacts upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, infrastructure, character, amenity or parking provision in accordance with Policies DM9, CP11, CP12 and CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Members expressed concern that the permissions proposed would not sufficiently prevent subletting or subdivision in the future. To further strengthen the conditions recommended by the officers, it was proposed that the following additional conditions be incorporated:

- (i) No subletting or subdivision, with usage limited to those ancillary purposes for 7 Tekels Way only; and
- (ii) Further Class E permitted development rights be removed.

Resolved that application 16/0055 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory, with the inclusion of the following additional conditions:

- (i) No subletting or subdivision, with usage limited to those ancillary purposes for 7 Tekels Way only; and**
- (ii) Further Class E permitted development rights be removed.**

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins had been approached concerning the application by residents of adjoining streets.

Note 2

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

Note 3

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, Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Paul Ilnicki, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, and Victoria Wheeler.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Edward Hawkins, Rebecca Jennings-Evans, David Mansfield, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

Chairman