

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning  
Applications Committee held at  
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House  
on 20 October 2016**

---

+ 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 Dan Adams (In place of Cllr Richard Brooks) and Cllr Ruth Hutchinson (In place of Cllr Victoria Wheeler)

In Attendance: Lee Brewin, Duncan Carty, Joe Fullbrook, Daniel Harrison, Laura James, Jonathan Partington, Emma Pearman and Jenny Rickard

**15/P Minutes**

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

**16/P Application Number: 14/0451 - Land South of Beldam Bridge Road, West End, Woking**

The application was for the erection of 2 no. five bedroom and 1no. four bedroom two storey detached dwellings with detached double garages and accommodation in the roof with landscaping and access. (Amended and additional plans/information recv'd 26/5/16)

This application had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of the Executive Head of Regulatory Services because of its strategic significance.

Members received the following updates:

*Update – At Paragraph 3.7, the hearing for appeal for SU/15/0455 was held in September 2016.*

*An upfront SAMM payment of £2,696 has been received.*

**CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION:**

***TO GRANT, subject to conditions***

Add additional condition:

*The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

*Those details shall include:*

- a) A design that satisfies the Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) Hierarchy and is compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, National Planning Policy Framework and Ministerial Statement on SuDS;*
- b) Evidence that the proposed solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+30% Climate Change allowance for climate change storm events), during all stages of the development (Pre, Post and during), associated discharge rates and storages volumes shall be provided. This shall include evidence if applicable showing that no further storage is viable for this site to provide for restriction to closer to Greenfield runoff rates;*
- c) A finalised drainage layout plan that details impervious areas and the location of each SuDS element, pipe diameters and their respective levels;*
- d) Long and cross sections of each SuDS element;*
- e) Details of how the site drainage will be protected and maintained during the construction of the development; and*
- f) Details of the proposed maintenance regimes for each of the SuDS elements and details of who is responsible for their maintenance.*

*Reason: To ensure the design meets the technical stands for SuDS and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site and to comply with Policies CP2 and Dm10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.'*

Some Members were concerned about any further development around the site. Officers advised that the land south and east of the site was Green Belt land.

**Resolved that application 14/0451 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Cllr Mansfield, in his capacity as Chairman of Bisley Scouts, declared that he had received a donation from the developer.

**Note 2**

As the application had triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mrs Diane Doney spoke in objection and Mr Edmund Bain and Mr Hutchinson, the agent spoke in support.

**Note 3**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan 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 the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Dan Adams, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

**17/P Application Number:16/0526 - Frimhurst Farm, Deepcut Bridge Road, Deepcut, Camberley GU16 6RF**

The application was for the continued use of the existing industrial centre (use classes B1, B2 and B8) and movement between these uses. (Retrospective). (Additional Plan Rec'd 21/09/2016).

Members received the following updates:

*Paragraph 3.8*

*A split decision was issued for application 16/0528 for a Certificate of Lawful Existing Use. This allowed most of the E areas applied for (E2, E3, E4A and E4B) but refused the certificate in respect of E1B as it was not considered that it had been in continuous use for at least 10 years prior to the first Enforcement Notice being served on this area.*

*These areas lie outside the application site of this application and are subject to an Inquiry on 8<sup>th</sup> November.*

*Location Plan*

*This has been updated because it was incorrect on the western boundary. The correct plan will be shown on the presentation.'*

Some Members felt that as the applicant had carried out the changes required that the proposal was acceptable.

It was suggested that should the Committee approve the application, an informative be added to the decision notice stating that the approval represented

the limit of acceptable development on this site and no further applications would be considered favourably.

**Resolved that application 16/0526 be approved subject to conditions, and an informative, stating that the approval represented the limit of acceptable development on this site, the wording to be finalised in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Cllr Colin Dougan declared that he had visited the applicant and the site in his role as Economic Development Officer; and Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper declared that she worked with the applicant's husband on a different site.

**Note 2**

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

**Note 3**

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman 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 refuse the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, David Mansfield and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Dan Adams, Colin Dougan, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White

The recommendation was lost.

**Note 5**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Pat Tedder.

**Note 6**

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 Dan Adams, Colin Dougan, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Ian Sams, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson and David Mansfield.

The recommendation was carried.

**18/P Application Number: 16/0814 - London Road Recreation Ground, (Camberley on Ice), Grand Avenue, Camberley**

The application was for the Installation and operation of a temporary ice rink and associated structures for a Christmas Market on the tennis court and old putting green areas to be held annually for a 5 year period (2016 to January 2021) between November to January (including construction and dismantling periods) and open daily to the public until 9pm, excluding Christmas Day. To include a skate lodge/café/bar marquee, chalets/trader huts, children funfair rides, a bandstand, toilet trailers and ancillary floodlighting and festoon lighting, and perimeter fencing with pedestrian access off Grand Avenue and event traffic management measures. (Amended Plan - Rec'd 28/09/2016). (Additional information rec'd 06/10/2016).

This application had been reported to Committee because it is a Council sponsored event and it has also been called in by Cllr E Hawkins and Cllr Dougan.

A site visit took place at the site.

Members received the following updates:

Paragraph 6.1

- *A total of 15 objections (i.e. from different households) have now been received. One objector comments the number of weeks the event is on is too long, otherwise these letters reiterate the concerns reported on pages 60 and 61 of the agenda.*

- Paragraph 7.7.2 (see also paragraphs 5.2 and 5.8)

- *The applicant has now provided a Waste Management Plan. The Environment Health Officer (EHO) supports this plan provided that the bins adhere to the Council colour scheme for collections, the skip for general waste are covered and location of the waste to be taken is provided. The EHO has agreed that this can be secured by informative.*

*Further details have also been provided on the freezing process and ice disposal, summarised below:*

- The antifreeze (glycol) is contained entirely within the pump system. At least 5 days before the rink is ready to open the system would be filled and the process to create ice would happen
- The glycol is watered down and not a neat chemical. With the rink being bunded the likelihood of large quantities pouring away are next to nil.
- During use of the rink the ice dump volumes would not be more than 1,000L per day in snow scraped off the ice. The dump is located on the east side of the rink and water run off can be to this point.
- The only water would be from an on-site hosepipe and as none of the water/ice would be contaminated no containment is required for the small quantities of run-off and there would be no requirement to discharge into the foul system
- When the rink is de-rigged the ice can be melted quickly within 24 hours by heating the glycol or melted slowly by just turning the system off and allowing melting over several days.

*The EHO and Council's Drainage Engineer support these details. The Drainage Engineer advises that in the event that the melting process is unmanned then the longer melt process ought to be employed to minimise risk. The applicant has confirmed that the melting process would be manned.*

#### Amended conditions

*10. The footprint produced by artificial lighting of the application site shall not extend into the curtilage of any adjacent residential property; and, no lighting associated with the development, other than security lighting (the specifics of which shall be agreed with the Council's Environmental Health Department at least 14 days prior to the setting up of each annual event), shall operate outside the hours of 09:00 and 21:30, unless required for emergency purposes.*

*Reason: as per agenda*

*11. Delete the word 'broadly'*

*13. The applicant shall arrange a site meeting with the Council's Tree Officer at least 7 days prior to the setting up of each annual event for the Officer to confirm and agree the correct positioning of tree protection fencing which shall be chestnut pale fencing supported by tree stakes. Thereafter the protection shall be retained throughout the period of operation.*

*Reason: as per agenda.*

#### Amended informatives

1. Insert additional final sentence to state, '...The applicant will need to provide details to [angela.goddard@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:angela.goddard@surreycc.gov.uk) at least 21 days prior to implementation.'
2. Amend last sentence to state '...The local background levels will need to be agreed with the Council's Environment Health Department at least 28 days prior to the premises being opened to the public.'

#### Additional informative

3. *The applicant is advised that the bins ought to adhere to the Council's colour scheme for collections and that the skip for general waste be covered. The applicant is requested to advise the Council's Environmental Health Department of the destination as to where the waste will be transported to, at least 28 days prior to the premises being opened to the public.'*

There was some concern regarding the noise that would be generated by live music, fairground rides and plant equipment and the responsibility for monitoring this. There were also concerns regarding whether the traffic management plan would be ready in time for the opening of the event, particularly with the proposed changes in traffic movement on Southwell Park Road.

Members were advised that an independent company would be used to monitor noise and the County Highways Authority had raised no objection to the changes to the traffic movement. The traffic management plan had already been submitted in draft form and there were minor changes to be made.

Some Members felt that the retail units at the site would take custom from the High Street whereas others felt the event would attract more customers into Camberley.

Some Members were concerned that the application was for a five year period and should the event cause problems for residents, it may be difficult to address this. Officers advised that the premises licence could be reviewed to address any concerns.

Condition 9 of the report stated that there would be no delivery and service vehicles in operation between 23.00 hours and 7.30 hours on any day. Members felt that the times in this condition should be amended to 21.00 hours to 7.30 hours.

**Resolved that application 16/0814 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory and the amendment condition 9 to 'there would be no delivery and service vehicles in operation between 21.00 hours and 7.30 hours on any day.'**

**Note 1**

Councillor Colin Dougan declared an interest as he lived close to the site and he left the Chamber during the consideration of the application.

It was noted for the record that Cllrs Valerie White and Ruth Hutchinson declared that they had been members of the Licensing Sub Committee which had considered the premises licence application for this site.

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that he had been present at part of the Licensing Sub Committee meeting where the applicant's premises licence had been considered.

**Note 2**

As the application had triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Alan Kirkland and Mr Chris MacDonald, representing the Southwell

Park Residents' Association, spoke in objection. Mr James Hitchens, the agent spoke in support.

**Note 3**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Vivienne Chapman.

**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 Dan Adams, Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams. Conrad Sturt, and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:  
Councillor Pat Tedder

**19/P Application Number: 16/0759 - 49 Bosman Drive, Windlesham GU20 6JN**

The application was for the division of existing 6 bedroom dwelling to form 2 two bedroom dwellings with associated parking and garden space.

The application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Sturt.

Officers had recommended that the proposal be approved as they felt that the development would be acceptable in terms of the principle of development, in character terms and impact on residential amenity, highways and impact on infrastructure.

However, some Members felt that the proposal would not be in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood and there would be a large increase in the density of the dwelling. Parking was also a concern. It was suggested that the reason for refusal given at a previous Planning Applications Committee meeting for the same proposal should be considered:

*'The sub-division of the site to create a separate additional dwelling would result in a density of use that would be inappropriate development, not in keeping with the established neighbourhood and harmful to the character of the area, contrary to Policies CP2 and DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.'*

Some Members felt that as the dwelling would not change externally, the proposal was reasonable and there would be enough parking for two properties on the



existing site. The proposal would provide extra housing which was needed in accordance with the need in the five year housing supply.

**Resolved that application 16/0759 be refused due to the inappropriate density in the area and being out of character with the established neighbourhood, the wording to be finalised in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that all Members had received documentation from the applicant, and Councillor Sturt had been contacted by residents in his ward.

**Note 2**

As the application had triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Roger Chatfield and Mr Andrew Barette spoke in objection and Mr Gareth Bertram, the applicant spoke in support.

**Note 3**

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan 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:

Councillors Dan Adams, Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, David Mansfield, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

The recommendation was lost.

**Note 5**

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Conrad Sturt and seconded by Councillor Pat Tedder.

**Note 6**

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 Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Ruth Hutchinson, David Mansfield, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Dan Adams, Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan and Ian Sams.

The recommendation was carried.

Chairman