

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning
Applications Committee held at
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House
on 9 February 2017**

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr David Mansfield (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Adrian Page
+ Cllr Nick Chambers	- Cllr Robin Perry
+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Ian Sams
- Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Conrad Sturt
- Cllr Surinder Gandhum	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Jonathan Lytle	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
+ Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper	- Cllr Valerie White

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Paul Ilnicki (In place of Cllr Colin Dougan) and Cllr Max Nelson (In place of Cllr Surinder Gandhum)

In Attendance: Cllr Ruth Hutchinson, Duncan Carty, Emma Pearman, Neil Praine, Michelle Fielder, Jonathan Partington, Gareth John, Lee Brewin, Ross Cahalane and Jenny Rickard

(Neil Praine attended from minute 53/P)

48/P Minutes

The open minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

49/P Application Number: 16/0554 - Land south of 24-46 (evens), Kings Road and 6 & 9 Rose Meadow, West End GU24 9LW

The application was the approval of reserved matters (appearance, landscape, scale and layout) pursuant to outline planning permission APP/D3640/W/15/3028247 [SU/14/0532] for the erection of 84 dwellings (including 8 one bedroom flats, 34 two bedroom houses, 28 three bedroom houses and 14 four bedroom houses) with access from Rose Meadow. (Amended Plans and Additional Plan/Info - rec'd 07/12/2016). (Amended Info and Plans recv'd 12/12/16). (Amended and Additional Plans recv'd 13/12/16). (Amended Information recv'd 14/12/16). (Additional & amended plans recv'd 15/12/16). (Additional plans recv'd 16/12/16). (Amended plans recv'd 5/1/17 & 6/1/17).

Members received the following updates:

'Correction:

The last sentence of Paragraph 7.11.3 (on Page 27) should read:

"This contribution has been secured through the legal agreement attached to the appeal decision and, as such, no objections are raised on these grounds."

Education Authority (SCC) has raised no objections subject to the provision of a contribution towards education [Officer comment: See paragraph 7.9.3 of the agenda report whereby this was discounted at outline stage and on appeal]

Six additional representations raising an objection have been received making the following additional comments:

- *Lack of one storey houses (bungalows) for an aging population*
- *Lack of provision for an aging population*
- *No evidence that the travel plan has been implemented which is required prior to permission being granted [Officer comment: These details are required by condition 13 of outline permission to be provided and approved prior to first occupation]*
- *VDS has been overlooked*
- *Council's approach is at odds with other Council's approach to SANG development (e.g. Ashdown Forest SPA)*
- *Lack of recreational facilities in West End – part of reserve site should be used for such purpose*
- *Concerns about the requirements to meet Condition 7 of the outline permission (method of construction)*

LLFA have confirmed no objections subject to the imposition of a condition and informative to explain requirements of Condition 10 of the outline permission.

The Council's Arboricultural Officer raises no objections, subject to conditions.

FURTHER CONDITIONS:

6. Prior to occupation, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the Sustainable Drainage System has been constructed as per the agreed scheme.

Reason: To ensure the Sustainable Drainage System has been constructed as agreed.

7. Before any of the operations which involve the movement of materials in bulk to or from the site are commenced, facilities shall be provided as must be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, in order that the operator can make all reasonable efforts to keep the public highway clean and prevent the creation of a dangerous surface on the public highway. The agreed measures shall thereafter be retained and used whenever the said operations are carried out.

Reason: The condition above is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to

accord with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

8. The approved development shall be implemented in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement by ACD Arboriculture Rev. B dated 07.12.16 unless the prior written approval has been obtained for the Local Planning Authority. In addition, the required pre-commencement meeting must include the Tree Officer and be agreed a minimum of 7 working days in advance of the start of any works on site to allow the all parties to attend. Tree works, tree and ground protection, site supervision of excavation works, and storage etc. will all need to be agreed at that stage.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

AMENDMENT TO CONDITIONS:

Amendment to second sentence of Part 1 of Condition 4 to read:

“The submitted details shall include an indication of all level alterations, hard surfaces, speed restraint devices, street furniture, walls,”

Amendment to Condition 1 to read:

“Except for the requirement to meet Condition 4 below, the proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans...”

PROPOSED INFORMATIVE:

The applicant is advised that to comply with Condition 10 of the appeal decision APP/D3640/W/15/3028247, the applicant will need to supply the following information, Environment Agency consent(s), exceedance flow routes and final construction details.’

Some Members were concerned that there had not been any community engagement between the developer and neighbouring residents. Members were advised that there had been a public exhibition but not on reserved matters. There were also concerns regarding traffic safety. It was noted that the road scheme had been amended to alleviate pinch points and to add in pavements.

Some concern was raised about the cumulative impact of the development, but this had been dealt with at the outline stage. In addition, some Members asked how long it would take to complete the development. This could not be included in a condition however, there was a standard condition which stated that the development should begin no later than two years from the date of approval. There was also a condition limiting the hours of construction.

Resolved that application 16/0554 be approved as amended subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Members declared that they had received letters from residents and the developer and had attended a design meeting.

Note 2

As this application had triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Beulah Kingston and Jason Ing spoke in objection to the application and Andy Stallan representing the agent spoke in support.

Note 3

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Nick Chambers and seconded by Councillor Max Nelson.

Note 4

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Max Nelson, Jonathan Lytle, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page and Conrad Sturt.

50/P Application Number: 16/0679 - Land South East of 4-14 (evens) Kings Road, West End Woking

The application was for the Residential development of 35 dwellings comprising of 8 four bedroom, 10 three bedroom, 10 two bedroom houses and 3 two bedroom and 4 one bedroom flats with associated access, car and cycle parking, refuse/recycling storage and landscaping. (Additional Plan & information recv'd 03/08/2016). (Additional info recv'd 4/8/16). (Additional Info Rec'd 05/08/2016). (Additional Info recv'd 20/10/16). (Additional/Amended Info - Rec'd 09/01/2017). (Additional Information - Rec'd 16/01/2017).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Corrections:

Paragraph 3.4 – A copy of the appeal decision at Annex 1 has been subsequently added.

The last sentence of Paragraph 7.10.4 (on Page 65) should read:

"It has been concluded that the proposal accords with the Development Plan and whilst the implementation and completion of the development will result in a financial benefit this is not a matter that needs to be given significant weight in the determination of this application."

The applicant has requested an extension to complete the required legal agreement for SANG delivery and retention to 28 February 2017, with any required further extensions agreed by the Head of Service.

The Council's Arboricultural Officer raises no objections, subject to conditions. Eleven additional representations raising an objection have been received making the following additional comments:

- It is so rural that it is outside the scope of the VDS [Officer comment: There are parts of the VDS within the defined Countryside (including the Green Belt)]*
- The requirements made by the Surrey Wildlife Trust should be met before development starts*
- The requirements made by Environmental Health (assessment of ground gas) should be submitted to and approved prior to commencement of foundations [Officer comments – See proposed Condition 8]*
- Visibility splays and high friction surfacing to highway, as required by County Highway Authority should be provided [Officer comments – See proposed Conditions 12 and 13]*
- CIL contribution should be obtained for a contribution towards education [Officer comment: The type of contribution falls outside the CIL scheme]*
- Infrastructure should be considered across all approved planning applications (300+ dwellings) in the area*
- Residents have not been consulted on any road improvement to Kings Road [Officer comment: None are proposed]*
- Lack of provision for an aging population*
- Council's approach is at odds with other Council's approach to SANG development elsewhere (e.g. Ashdown Forest SPA)*
- Lack of recreational facilities in West End – part of reserve site should be used for such purpose*

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS:

17. The approved development shall be implemented in accordance with the Tree Report (Tree Survey and Constraint Advice) and Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement by ACD Arboriculture dated 23.03.16 and 01.07.16, respectively, unless the prior written approval has been obtained for the Local Planning Authority. In addition, the required pre-commencement meeting must include the Tree Officer and be agreed a minimum of 7 working days in advance of the start of any works on site to allow the all parties to attend. Tree works, tree and ground protection, site supervision of excavation works, and storage etc. will all need to be agreed at that stage.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

18. No development shall take place until an ecological strategy and management plan for the off-site woodland mitigation has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The offsite woodland should be delivered and managed in accordance with the approved details and commenced prior to occupation of the proposed development. The development shall also be implemented in accordance with the Ecological Impact Assessment dated 7 July 2016 and its Addendum dated 20 October 2016 both by EAD Ecology unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of nature conservation and to comply with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

AMENDMENT TO CONDITIONS:

Amendment to Condition 2 to read:

“Except for the requirement to meet Condition 4 below, the proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans...”

Also, the list of approved drawings in proposed Condition 2 should also include the following approved drawings:

“HT-28-S2F2 Rev. B, HT-29-S2FOG Rev. C, HT-30-S2H1 Rev. D, HT-31-S2H2 Rev. C, HT-32-S2H2 Rev. C, HT-33-S2H2 Rev. C, HT-34-SG Rev. B and HT-35-SGP Rev. B”

Amendment to second sentence of Part 1 of Condition 4 to read:

“The submitted details shall include an indication of all level alterations, hard surfaces, speed restraint devices, street furniture, walls,”

CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION:

To extend the time period to complete the legal agreement for SANG delivery and retention to 28 February 2017, with any required extensions to be agreed by the Head of Regulatory.’

There was some concern regarding the un-adopted road which led to the site, the design and density of the development. Members were advised that although the road was un-adopted it was still a right of way. In addition no condition could be added to improve the road as it was a private road.

Resolved that application 16/0679 be approved as amended subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory, and to extend the time to complete the legal agreement for SANG delivery and retention to 28 February 2017, with any required extensions to be agreed by the Head of Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Committee Members declared that they had received information from the developer.

Note 2

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Dr Jeff Llewellyn representing the West End Action group spoke in objection to the application and Mr Greg Pitt representing the agent spoke in support.

Note 3

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor Nick Chambers.

Note 4

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Paul Innicki, Max Nelson, Jonathan Lytle and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler.

51/P Application Number: 16/1048 - Land south of Beach House, Woodlands Lane, Windlesham GU20 6AP - WITHDRAWN

The application was for the outline application for the erection of 15 dwellings comprising houses for the over 55s (Class C3) and houses for the Windlesham Trust Community Home (Class C2) with access off Broadley Green. Access only with all other matters reserved.

Members were advised that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant and therefore was not considered by the Committee.

52/P Application Number: 16/0779 - Whitehill Farm, Kings Ride, Camberley GU15 4LZ

The application was for the erection of 4 no. blocks part two storey /part two storey with accommodation in the roof, with balconies and roof gardens, to provide 21 no. two/three bedroom units and 20 no. two storey units of extra care residential accommodation along with car, cycle and buggy parking, access and landscaping including footpaths links.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The applicant has provided further evidence concerning the future occupiers indicating that the average occupier of extra care accommodation is 77 years old and that people in their 70's are unlikely to be able to walk to the SPA due to the distance in-between.

The applicant has also considered that the landscape analysis has been provided for the applicant by a qualified landscape architect and that the scheme has not been assessed by a qualified landscape officer and the development can be provided within the site and is unlikely to give rise to unacceptable landscape or visual effects which cannot be mitigated.

The applicant has provided a sequential assessment to indicate that there are no other available sites for this development.

The applicant has also referred to an RTPI report on dementia care which identifies that good quality housing and well-planned, enabling local environments can have a substantial impact on the quality of life of someone living with dementia, and that town planning has a role to play if health and social policies are to succeed.

The applicant has requested a deferral for this application to allow more time to consider the impact of the proposal on the SPA. However, Natural England considers that there is no need to extend the timeframe to determine this application because they do not consider that an agreement on this issue is possible.

The Surrey Wildlife Trust has raised concerns about the proposal on SPA grounds and that there is insufficient information to be able to confirm the ecological impact of the development.

Four further objections have been received raising the following additional concerns:

- Behaviour of builders on site [Officer comment: This is not a material planning consideration for the current proposal]*
- Noise from generator on site [Officer comment: This relates to the approved development]*
- Security threat for military families [Officer comment: This would not be a reason to refuse the current proposal]*

ADDITIONAL REASON FOR REFUSAL

3. It has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on protected species likely to be present on the site failing to comply with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and advice in the National Planning Policy Framework.'

There was some concern regarding the visibility of the development from the road, development in SPA and the felling of many trees.
It was noted that the borough was required to have 255 private extra care units by 2018. Members were advised that the units were designed to give 'extra care' residents independent living and the choice to live in larger homes so family members could stay. In addition residents would not be permitted to have any pets.

Resolved that applications 16/0779 be refused as amended 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 declared that had been contacted by residents and the developer.

Note 2

It was noted for the record that Councillor Richard Brooks declared that he had attended an exhibition by the developer and left the room during the consideration of the application.

Note 3

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Jenny Garner spoke in objection to the application and Guy Wakefield, the agent and Rob Andrews (the applicant) spoke in support.

Note 4

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

Note 5

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 as amended:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Max Nelson, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler.

53/P Application Number: 16/0947 - Orchard Cottage, Shepherds Lane, Windlesham GU20 6HL

The application was for the erection of an 88 bedroom care home with associated landscaping and planning, following demolition of existing dwelling and builders yard. Access from Chertsey Road. (Additional information recv'd 1/11/16). (Additional information rec'd 09/12/2016). (Additional Information - Rec'd 10/01/2017). (Amended Plan - Rec'd 16/01/2017).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The applicant has circulated an 11 page information document to some Members in support of the scheme. The applicant explains that this information can be found within the submitted planning documents.

Officer comment: This summary document does not contain new information, although some elements are only mentioned briefly in the draft S106 rather than the submitted planning documents. This summary states that the openness of the Green Belt will be maintained with screening from the road and landscaping, and views through the buildings and heights; and, that the scheme will have a reduced impact on openness than the previous scheme. As explained at paragraph 7.10 of the agenda report the applicant has assessed openness against visual impact rather than the quantum of built form, which is significantly greater than the extant scheme. The applicant also references the lack of alternative sites, however, the applicant did not carry out an alternative site assessment with this or the previous application so this is an unknown factor.

Two additional letters of representation (one with no name/address) in support of the application have been received. The issues raised are that it is an intelligent and thoughtful care home, will enhance the attractive residential community, allow individual needs to be addressed in a sensitive way, will provide a higher level of care than other homes.'

It was noted that some Members felt that the proposal was harmful to the Green Belt, was a large increase in scale, would have potential traffic and parking issues and was an isolating location for the residents of the care home.

Members were advised that the proposal was designed to move away from the institutional look and provision for care homes. More car parking spaces were being offered contrary to the standard requirement. This was as a result of the developer listening to neighbouring residents' concerns about parking.

Some Members felt that there was a serious need for dementia care in the borough and this need outweighed the Green Belt issues.

Members were reminded that should they vote against the officers' recommendation, the very special circumstances to support this decision would have to be robust and clear.

Resolved that application 16/0947 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 declared that he had been contacted by residents and the developer.

Note 2

It was noted for the record that:

- Councillors Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler declared that the applicant had met with them and handed them a document. There was no discussion;

- Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that he had attended an exhibition and was contacted by several parties in support and in objection to the application;
- Councillor Jonathan Lytle declared that he had also attended an exhibition.

Note 3

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Victoria Muir spoke in objection to the application and David Driscoll, representing the agent spoke in support.

Note 4

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler.

Note 5

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, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Max Nelson, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman Jonathan Lytle, Ian Sams Conrad Sturt.

54/P Application Number: 16/1041 - Unit 2, adjacent to Waitrose, 150-152 London Road, Bagshot

The application was for the subdivision of existing retail unit to provide 3 No. retail units to be used for the following: one unit for the sale of bulky goods and goods relating to outdoor pursuits with ancillary travel clinic (Class A1); one unit for the sale of bulky goods with ancillary pet care, treatment and grooming facilities and installation of mezzanine floor (Class A1); and one used as a cafe/restaurant (Class A3).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The applicant has provided further evidence of the impact of the proposal on local/town centres, particularly in relation to the proposed Cotswold Outdoor (Unit 2A) outlet. The unit would be seen as a flagship store which, whilst providing a similar range of products to other Cotswold Outdoor stores, would extend the range to include a library and travel clinic. The clinic would provide travel advice together with associated products including travel guides, maps, dietary

suggestions, insect guards, creams, etc. Cotswold Outdoor has specialist brands (Runnersneed, CycleSurgery and Snow + Rock) which would be provided under one roof. All of this differentiates the proposed Cotswold Outdoor outlet from its rivals.

A schematic layout has been provided which indicates that clothing and footwear would be provided on 56% of the floorspace provided for retail sales but it is noted that product ranges will change, influencing changes to the retail floor layout, because of the seasonality of the product demands. As such, it is recommended to adjust the maximum floorspace for the sale of clothing and footwear, as outlined in Condition 1, to 70%, and this has been agreed as the maximum that should be provided by the Council's Retail Adviser.

The applicant has confirmed that they do not want any restriction and formally requests that the application is deferred to allow further negotiations.

Three further objections have been received raising the following additional concerns:

- *John Lewis should extend their Waitrose development into this store*
- *Café will not be productive (profitable) with other nearby cafes*
- *Highway safety impact, with other developments in the area*
- *Impact from air quality (dust and fumes) - a new report is required*
- *Impact on Bagshot centre*
- *Impact on infrastructure, community and other services*
- *Provision of vet facilities*
- *Development is marketed as the "Bagshot Retail Park" and suggests that the developer's vision is complete*
- *Lack of parking provision*

CHANGE TO CONDITION 1:

Unit 2a, as defined on the approved plan 13001/96, with a total net sales area of 1,201 square metres shall only be used under Class A1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order) for the sale of goods, as listed below:

- (a) outdoor and leisure clothing, accessories, equipment, footwear and services for walking running, camping, trekking, climbing, canoeing, water sports, cycling and winter sports with ancillary travel clinic;*
- (b) home improvement products and materials including hardware and DIY;*
- (c) garden centre goods including garden furniture, plants, BBQ and associated equipment;*
- (d) furniture, lighting, carpets and floor coverings;*

- (e) household textiles, housewares and haberdashery including furnishing, fabrics, cushions and curtains; bedding and linen; blinds and poles; clocks, pictures and mirrors and related accessories;*
- (f) pets, pet foods and related products and services, including ancillary pet care, treatment and grooming facilities;*
- (g) bulky electrical and gas kitchen items;*
- (h) motor goods, cycles, cycle products and accessories; and*
- (i) bulky leisure goods e.g. kayaks, tents, boats.*

Under part 'a' of this condition no more than 70% of the net retail sales floorspace within the unit shall be used for the sale of outdoor clothing and footwear and should not include any fashion clothing or footwear. The goods listed under part 'a' of this condition shall only enure for the benefit of the first occupier.

Reason: In the interest of the vitality and viability of Bagshot centre and Camberley Town Centre and to comply with Policies CP1, CP10 and DM12 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.'

Members were advised of a further update stating that the applicant had agreed the 70% limitation on outdoor clothing and footwear and would not be seeking a deferral.

Some Members were concerned that the extra retail units on this site would detract from Camberley Town Centre and Bagshot Village Town Centre. Other Members felt that the proposal would provide what Notcutts had previously supplied.

There was concern regarding staff parking in the residential areas around the site but Members were informed that the County Highways Agency had raised no objections.

Resolved that application 16/1041 be approved as amended subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Committee Members declared that they had been contacted by residents, the applicant and the developer.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve the application as amended was proposed by Councillor Jonathan Lytle 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 the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillor Paul Ilnicki.

55/P Application Number: 16/1087 - Land between 4 and 5 School Lane, Windlesham GU20 6EY

The application was for the erection of a detached three bedroom, two storey dwelling and detached garage. (Amended Plan - Rec'd 10/01/2017).

The application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers, however, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr. White.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Since writing the committee report a further 9 letters of objection have been received (taking the total number of objections to 17). These letters of objection primarily raise concern about the vehicle access / highway safety and this matter is covered at paragraph 7.2 of the committee report. The 9 representations of objection also raise the following concerns:

- *Size of the proposed dwelling out of character with the surrounding area [This matter is covered at paragraph 7.4 of the committee report]*
- *The proposed dwelling will negatively impact upon the amenity of surrounding residential properties [This matter is covered at paragraph 7.5 of the committee report]*
- *The proposed dwelling will negatively impact upon biodiversity [This matter is covered at paragraph 7.7 of the committee report]*

A number of concerned parties have also queried why the planning report does not go into significant discussion regarding the proposed highway works. The reasons for this are covered at paragraphs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 3.4, 3.5, 7.2 and 7.3 of the committee report. To summarise, the highway works are identical to the previous scheme SU/15/0166 which were found to be acceptable by the Surrey County Council Road Safety Team, the Surrey County Council Highway Authority and at the previous planning appeal [Appendix 3 of your committee papers] by the

Planning Inspectorate. The highway works are identical to the previous proposal and given the findings of Surrey County Council Road Safety Team, the Surrey County Council Highway Authority and the Planning Inspector, it is not considered an objection on highways grounds can be sustained.'

Members were advised that officers had been contacted by residents with concerns that the report had not covered highways issues. This was because the previous application had been considered by the SCC Road Safety Team, the County Highways Agency and the Planning Inspectorate. There had been no objections to the highways scheme.

Some Members had concerns about the loss of parking spaces in the vicinity and the highways issues due to the narrow line of sight out of School Lane. Officers advised that the Planning Inspector had been satisfied that the proposal would not cause highways issues. Some Members were still concerned about public safety particularly regarding the lack of a footpath. A deferral was requested in order for the highways study to be completed. However, officers advised that the County Highways Agency had taken the forthcoming review into account when making the decision about the application.

Resolved that application 16/1087 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 Pat Tedder declared that she lived close to the site and left the Chamber during the consideration of the application;
- Councillor Conrad Sturt declared that he had been in contact with some of the neighbours.

Note 2

As this application had triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Nick Griffin, the agent spoke in support of the application.

Note 3

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Max Nelson and seconded by Councillor Edward Hawkins.

Note 4

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Conrad Sturt and Victoria Wheeler.

Councillor Jonathan Lytle did not vote as he left the room during the consideration of the application.

56/P Application Number: 16/1063 - 1, 1A & 3 Guildford Road, Frimley Green, Camberley GU16 6NL

The application was for the change of use of first floor from C3 (residential) to B1 (offices) and use of land to rear for parking in connection with the first floor offices and ground floor estate agency.

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers, however, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Paul Deach.

Members received the following update:

'Kevin Cantlon, the Economic Development Officer, has written the following in support of the application:

Luff and Wilkin is a local company owned and run by local people who have made a commitment to the borough over a number of years. They provide employment to local people and will add additional staff numbers should their application prove successful. Each local job filled in the borough contributes in excess of £51,000 to the UK economy.

It is likely that any future employees of Luff & Wilkin will use the amenities in Frimley Green for things such as shopping and lunchtime activities, thereby helping to support the village economy.

Over the course of the next few years significant housing expansion of Deepcut, one mile away, is planned. As a property and estate agent Luff and Wilkin would be well placed to handle some of the new residential sales and lettings business for the new development, which could potentially bring about expansion of the company thus creating more jobs.'

The Ward Councillor addressed the Committee and praised the work of the planning officers. However, it was noted that with regard to this application, the applicant had contributed to the business in the area and this proposal would provide much needed part time positions. This was particularly relevant to the large military community nearby. There was some concern about parking but it was felt that the benefit to the economy outweighed the loss of the residential unit.

Resolved that application 16/1063 be approved subject to conditions, the final wording to be finalised after consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- Councillor Vivienne Chapman declared that the applicant was a close friend and left the Chamber during the consideration of the application;
- Councillor Paul Ilnicki declared that he knew the applicant.

Note 2

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Victoria Wheeler and seconded by Councillor Pat Tedder.

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 the application:

Councillors Paul Ilnicki, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Ian Sams and Conrad Sturt.

The motion was lost.

Note 4

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

Note 5

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 Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Ian Sams and Conrad Sturt.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Paul Ilnicki, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler.

The motion was carried.

57/P Exclusion of Press and Public

The Committee resolved, that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for minute 59/P and

60/P, on the ground that it would involve a likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

58/P Exempt Minutes

The exempt minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

59/P PRB Deepcut

The Committee received an update report in relation to the PRB site at Deepcut.

60/P Review of Exempt Items

The Committee resolved that the information at minute 59/P remain exempt.

Chairman