

COUNCIL MEETING

4 October 2017

COUNCIL MINUTE BOOK

1. **Council - 26 July 2017** (Pages 3 - 14)
2. **Executive - 1 August 2017** (Pages 15 - 22)
3. **Executive - 5 September 2017** (Pages 23 - 32)
4. **Planning Applications Committee - 20 July 2017** (Pages 33 - 46)
5. **Planning Applications Committee - 24 August 2017** (Pages 47 - 58)
6. **Planning Applications Committee - 21 September 2017
(to follow)**
7. **External Partnerships Select Committee - 19 September
2017 (to follow)**
8. **Joint Staff Consultative Group - 28 September 2017 (to
follow)**

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SURREY
HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL held at
Surrey Heath House, Camberley on
26 July 2017**

+ Cllr Valerie White (Mayor)
+ Cllr Dan Adams (Deputy Mayor)

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| + Cllr David Allen | + Cllr Jonathan Lytle |
| + Cllr Rodney Bates | + Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper |
| + Cllr Richard Brooks | + Cllr Bruce Mansell |
| + Cllr Nick Chambers | - Cllr David Mansfield |
| - Cllr Bill Chapman | + Cllr Charlotte Morley |
| - Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman | + Cllr Alan McClafferty |
| + Cllr Ian Cullen | + Cllr Max Nelson |
| + Cllr Paul Deach | + Cllr Adrian Page |
| - Cllr Colin Dougan | + Cllr Robin Perry |
| + Cllr Craig Fennell | + Cllr Chris Pitt |
| + Cllr Surinder Gandhum | + Cllr Joanne Potter |
| + Cllr Moira Gibson | + Cllr Nic Price |
| + Cllr Edward Hawkins | - Cllr Wynne Price |
| + Cllr Josephine Hawkins | + Cllr Darryl Ratiram |
| + Cllr Ruth Hutchinson | + Cllr Ian Sams |
| + Cllr Paul Ilnicki | - Cllr Conrad Sturt |
| - Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans | + Cllr Pat Tedder |
| + Cllr David Lewis | + Cllr Victoria Wheeler |
| + Cllr Oliver Lewis | + Cllr John Winterton |

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

21/C Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Bill Chapman, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Rebeca Jennings-Evans, David Mansfield, Wynne Price and Conrad Sturt.

22/C Minutes

It was moved by the Mayor, seconded by the Deputy Mayor, and

RESOLVED that the open minutes of the extraordinary meeting of the Council held on 20 June 2017 be approved as a correct record.

23/C Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor reported that the last 2 months had been very busy. She had attended 55 events including the hosting of a visit by German students. Some of the highlights had been a visit to the Alzheimer's Café at St Mary's Church, Camberley

and an event hosted by the Gurkhas. A performance, at the Camberley Theatre, by Surrey Choices Rhythmic Collision Dance Company and pupils from Cordwalles Junior School had been moving and the Mayor encouraged all members to attend any future performances.

The Mayor presented the Mayor's Cadet, Daniel Farrow, with a certificate in recognition of the completion of his year as a Mayor's Cadet. Unfortunately Libby Butler, the other Mayor's Cadet, was on holiday but her certificate would be sent to her.

24/C Leader's Announcements

The Leader announced that, since the last Council meeting, she had attended the Surrey Leaders' meeting, the EM3 Leaders' meeting and the Local Government Conference.

The Surrey Leaders had discussed the County Council's difficult budget situation, which it was felt could only be solved nationally by increased government funding or by removing the council tax cap.

The EM3 Leaders had discussed the Housing Infrastructure Fund which required bids for funds from local government by the end of September. The Leader reported that she had asked the Chief Executive to explore the possibility of submitting bids for grants from both the major and the small scheme funds.

Ann Widecombe had been the guest speaker at the Local Government Conference and had spoken about Brexit. Sajid Javid, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, had also spoken at the Conference. He had delivered a strong message about the delivery of housing and indicated that he held local authorities responsible for the lack of provision. It was likely that more frequent local plan reviews would be required together with changes to the housing needs assessments.

The Leader also reported that the appeal against the Council's decision to refuse planning permission for the development of up to 140 dwellings and communities facilities on land at Heathpark Wood, Heathpark Drive, Windlesham, had been upheld and planning permission granted.

25/C E-Petition - Housing Development at Fairoaks

In accordance with the Petition Scheme at Part 4 of the Constitution, an e-petition was considered. The petition stated:

"We petition SHBC not to promote or support housing development at Fairoaks but to retain it in the Greenbelt This includes committing to not making a second bid for a Fairoaks Garden Village. SHBC should instead encourage airport operations at Fairoaks with their associated local employment opportunities."

The e-petition had opened for signatures on 24 March 2017 and closed on 24 June 2017. It had received 5,348 signatures nationally. Members were advised

that 992 signatories were from addresses in the Borough and included 605 signatories from Chobham.

Mr Darren Rees of the Chobham Society presented the petition and spoke for 5 minutes.

The Mayor advised that the following options were available to the Council in responding to the petition

- take the action the petition requests,
- not to take the action requested for reasons put forward in the debate,
- or to commission further investigation into the matter, for example by a relevant scrutiny committee.

Members considered the request contained in the petition.

It was moved by Councillor Moira Gibson and seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks that the petition and the concerns of local people be noted but that no further action be taken at this time.

Councillor Gibson spoke to her motion. She advised the Council that there were currently no plans to submit a second round Garden Village Bid as there was no information to suggest that there would be further bid rounds available. Certainly no second bid round had been announced and it was understood that the government's thinking had changed. However she stressed it would be wrong to fetter any future decision the Council might make about the submission of a second bid as this would restrict the Council from obtaining available funds. Councillor Gibson reminded Members that garden village bids were essentially bids for infrastructure contributions. In addition, in view of the pressure from government relating to the provision of housing, no Council could afford to rule out any potential housing site without going through the proper process and a detailed examination of all the appropriate issues.

The Council was informed that the relevant issues would be dealt with through the planning process if an application was submitted. A planning application would be considered by the full Council. In addition viability issues would be dealt with as part of the planning process. It would not be for the Council to establish viability but to make a decision once all evidence had been examined. As a result Members were advised of the need to be cautious in their approach so as not to put themselves in a situation where predetermination might apply.

Councillor Victoria Wheeler spoke in support of the action requested by the petitioners. She supported the use of the site as an airport, as provided for in the local plan, as an area of strategic employment. She was of the opinion that the site was unsuitable as a garden village as it failed to meet the criteria of being a free standing settlement due to its close proximity to Chobham and the new development at Longcross.

Councillor Wheeler considered that, in a climate of fewer local airports, the use of Fair Oaks as an airport provided the opportunity for it to become a destination of

choice for business and leisure. She was of the opinion that the Council should exploit this opportunity for growth and remain open for business. Furthermore she indicated that the proposed garden village was not supported by the community and that the potential developer had failed to overcome the objections of local residents. In addition there was no evidence that the infrastructure needs had been assessed as part of the garden village bid. She also drew attention to issues relating to congestion and air pollution as a result of the development of a garden village.

Councillor Rodney Bates indicated that he did not wish to debate the merits of housing development on this site at the current time. However he did not support an application for a second bid for a garden village and suggested that if a further bid was contemplated it should be considered by the Executive. He agreed with the action in the petition that the Council should encourage airport operations at Fair Oaks and the local business opportunities.

The Leader concluded that the information provided by the petitioners had been extremely helpful. The motion as proposed by Councillor Gibson and seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks was put to the vote and carried.

Resolved the petition, together the concerns of local people, be noted but that no further action be taken at this time.

Note 1

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.4, a roll call vote was taken.

The following Members voted in favour of the motion: Councillor Dan Adams, Richard Brooks, Nick Chambers, Ian Cullen, Paul Deach, Craig Fennell, Surinder Gandhum, Moira Gibson, Edward Hawkins, Josephine Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, David Lewis, Oliver Lewis, Jonathon Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Bruce Mansell, Alan McClafferty, Charlotte Morley, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Chris Pitt, Joanne Potter, Nic Price, Darryl Ratiram, Ian Sams, Valerie White, John Winterton.

The following Members voted in against of the motion: David Allen, Rodney Bates, Ruth Hutchinson, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler.

Note: 2

- The Mayor, on behalf of all Members present, declared for the record, that all Members had been lobbied and had received approaches relating to the issues raised in the above petition.
- Councillor Pat Tedder declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the Chobham Society.
- Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the Chobham Society and as the Council's representative on the Fair Oaks Consultative Committee. She also declared for the record that her partner and son had signed the petition.

- Councillor Paul Ilnicki declared for the record that he had spoken to Mr Mancini.

26/C Executive, Committees and Other Bodies

- (a) Executive – 20 June 2017 and 11 July 2017

It was moved by Councillor Moira Gibson, seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks, and

Resolved that

- (i) **the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 20 June 2017 and 11 July 2017 be received;**
- (ii) **local contributions funding of up to £1,000,000 be agreed for the Public Realm Bid Scheme; and**
- (iii) **contributions be phased over 2017/18 and 2018/19, with payment to be made upon commencement of the works.**

- (b) Planning Applications Committee – 11 May 2017 and 29 June 2017

It was moved by Councillor Edward Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Nick Chambers, and

Resolved that the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Applications Committee held on 11 May 2017 and 29 June 2017 be received.

- (c) External Partnerships Select Committee – 27 June 2017

It was moved by Councillor Robin Perry, seconded by Councillor Darryl Ratiram and

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the External Partnerships Select Committee held on 27 June 2017 be received.

- (d) Licensing Committee – 28 June 2017

It was moved by Councillor Adrian Page, seconded by Councillor Nick Price and

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 28 June 2017 be received.

- (e) Joint Staff Consultative Group – 6 July 2017

It was moved by Councillor Josephine Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Charlotte Morley and

Resolved that the notes of the meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Group held on 6 July 2017 be received.

- (f) Audit and Standards Committee – 10 July 2017

It was moved by Councillor Paul Deach, seconded by Councillor Paul Ilnicki and

Resolved that the minutes of the meetings of the Audit and Standards Committee held on 10 July 2017 be received.

- (g) Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee - 12 July 2017

It was moved by Councillor Jonathan Lytle, seconded by Councillor Katia Malcaus Cooper, and

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Performance and Finance Scrutiny Committee held on 12 July 2017 be received.

27/C Leader's Question Time

The Leader responded to a question from Councillor Rodney Bates relating to the housing of Syrian refugees. She reported that difficulties had been experienced with Surrey County Council and with gaining the cooperation of private landlords. The Leader undertook to ask the Executive Head of Regulatory to provide a fuller update by email.

28/C Exclusion of Press and Public

In accordance with Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public were excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 3 of Schedule 12A of the Act as set out below:

| <u>Minute</u> | <u>Paragraphs</u> |
|---------------|-------------------|
| 29/C | 3 |
| 30/C | 3 |
| 31/C | 3 |

29/C Council, Executive and Committees - Exempt

The exempt minutes of the extraordinary meeting of the Council held on 20 June 2017 were approved. The Council also received the exempt minutes of the Executive of 20 June and 11 July 2017 and adopted the recommendation therein.

30/C Acquisition of Land for use as SANGS

The Council made decisions relating to the acquisition of land for use as SANGS.

31/C Review of Exempt Items

The Council reviewed the minutes which had been considered at the meeting following the exclusion of members of the press and public, as they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information.

Resolved that

- (i) Minute 18/C be made public but the minute and the associated agenda report remain exempt for the present time;
- (ii) Minute 19/C and the associated agenda report remain exempt for the present time, but the decision be made public following completion of lease negotiations;
- (iii) Minute 11/E, and the associated agenda report, remain exempt until further notice;
- (iv) the decision at Minute 12/E be made public, but the minute and associated agenda report remain exempt for the present time;
- (v) the decision at Minute 13/E be made public following the completion of lease negotiations, but the minute and associated agenda report remain;
- (vi) the decision at Minute 25/E be made public but the minute and the associated agenda report remain exempt for the present time;
- (vii) the decision at Minute 26/E be made public but the minute and the associated agenda report remain exempt for the present time; and
- (viii) the decision at Minute 30/C be made public but the minute and the associated agenda report remain exempt until the completion of the acquisition.

Mayor

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held at Surrey Heath House on 1
August 2017**

+ Cllr Moira Gibson (Chairman)

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| + Cllr Richard Brooks | + Cllr Josephine Hawkins |
| + Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman | + Cllr Alan McClafferty |
| + Cllr Colin Dougan | + Cllr Charlotte Morley |
| + Cllr Craig Fennell | |

+ Present

In Attendance: Cllr Chris Pitt

28/E Minutes

The open and exempt minutes of the meeting held on 11 July 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

29/E Questions by Members

No questions were received from Members.

30/E Food Safety Service Plan 2017/18

The Executive considered a report seeking approval of a Food Safety Service Plan for the period 2017 to 2018, which would ensure that the Council was compliant with the requirements of the Food Standards Agency and the Framework Agreement on Local Authority Food Law Enforcement.

It was reported that the number of food businesses in the Borough which were 'Broadly Compliant' with food hygiene law remained high at 95.8%. In 2016/17 85 new businesses had been included in the inspections.

In 2017/18, officers intended to build on the success of the Food Hygiene Rating System and to maintain the proportion of food businesses which were "Broadly Compliant" with food hygiene laws to at or above 95%.

RESOLVED that the Food Safety Service Plan 2017/18 attached at Annex A to this report be approved.

31/E Review of the Corporate Capital Programme and Capital Prudential Indicators for 2016/17

The Executive received a report detailing the capital outturn for 2016/17 and requesting approval for any carry forward of budgets into the 2017/18 Capital Programme. A breakdown of the actual performance against the 2016/17 prudential indicators was noted.

RECOMMENDED to Full Council that

- (i) the carry forward budget provision of £1.261 million from 2016/17 into 2017/18 be approved;
- (ii) the revised 2017/18 Capital Programme of £44.567 million be noted; and
- (iii) the final capital prudential indicators for 2016/17 be noted.

32/E Exclusion of Press and Public

In accordance with Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public were excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the ground that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act as set out below:

| Minute | Paragraph(s) |
|-------------|--------------|
| 28/E (part) | 3 |
| 33/E | 7 |
| 34/E | 3 |
| 35/E | 3 |
| 36/E | 3&7 |

Note: Minutes 33/E and 35/E are summaries of matters considered in Part II of the agenda, the minutes of which it is considered should remain confidential at the present time.

33/E Request for supplementary funding for Planning Appeals and Enforcement

The Executive made decisions in relation to providing supplementary funding for Planning Appeals and Enforcement.

34/E Executive Working Group notes

The Executive received the notes of the Local Plan Working Group meetings held on 28 February, 19 April and 22 June 2017; the Camberley Town Centre Working Group meeting held on 1 March 2017; and the Camberley Theatre and Arena Working Group meeting held on 16 March 2017.

RESOLVED that the notes of the Local Plan Working Group meetings held on 28 February, 19 April and 22 June 2017, the Camberley Town Centre Working Group meeting held on 1 March 2017, and the Camberley Theatre and Arena Working Group meeting held on 16 March 2017, be noted.

35/E Acquisition of Property

The Executive made decisions in relation to the acquisition of property.

36/E Review of Exempt Items

The Executive reviewed the reports which had been considered at the meeting following the exclusion of members of the press and public, as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information.

RESOLVED that

- (i) minute 24/E and the associated agenda report remain exempt for the present time;**
- (ii) the notes of the Local Plan Working Group held on 28 February, 19 April and 22 June 2017 remain exempt for the present time;**
- (iii) the notes of the Camberley Town Centre Working Group held on 1 March 2017 and the notes of the Camberley Theatre and Arena Leisure Centre Working Group held on 16 March 2017 be made public; and**
- (iv) minute 35/E and the associated agenda report remain exempt for the present time.**

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive
held at Surrey Heath House on 5
September 2017**

+ Cllr Moira Gibson (Chairman)

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| + Cllr Richard Brooks | - Cllr Josephine Hawkins |
| + Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman | + Cllr Alan McClafferty |
| - Cllr Colin Dougan | + Cllr Charlotte Morley |
| - Cllr Craig Fennell | |

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr David Allen, Cllr Rodney Bates, Cllr Chris Pitt, Cllr Valerie White and Cllr John Winterton

37/E Minutes

The open and exempt minutes of the meeting held on 1 August 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

38/E Questions by Members

The Leader received questions from Councillor David Allen in relation to the number of customers parking in the Main Square Car Park in comparison to the previous year, and the use of the Glide App in Council Car Parks.

39/E Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document

The Executive considered a Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The SPD would provide additional guidance to policies in the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document, which had been adopted in 2012.

Members were reminded that, at its meeting in March 2017, the Executive had agreed to a five week consultation on a draft SPD. The consultation had been carried out between 22 March and 28 April 2017, during which time comments had been received from 14 respondents. Minor amendments had been made to the SPD following the consultation.

RESOLVED to adopt the Residential Design Guide, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report, as a Supplementary Planning Document in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

40/E Refurbishment of Windle Valley Centre

The Executive was reminded that the Windle Valley Centre offered a range of activities and services for older residents of the borough. The Centre opened 5-days a week for its core care services. In addition, the Saturday Club operated

every Saturday afternoon, offering older residents, carers and the cared for a chance to relax and enjoy themselves through interaction and entertainment. In 2015 the Centre had been extended to provide a Wellbeing Centre, which provided help and advice to people with dementia and their carers.

Members were informed that the main Centre had not received any major refurbishment for at least 20 years. It was suggested that the carpet, furniture and furnishings were in need of replacement and, importantly, the colour and fabric of the walls, floors and furnishings did not render the centre dementia friendly. It was also noted that providing a modern, safe and comfortable centre for users was important for the financial viability of the Centre.

The estimated cost of the work was £35,000, which included the cost of a designer to ensure that the decoration, flooring, furniture and furnishings were suitable for users who were living with dementia. The work would be funded from the Personalisation Prevention and Partnership Fund, which had been received from Surrey County Council as part of a 5 year programme between 2012 and 2017.

RESOLVED that the proposal to refurbish the Windle Valley Day Centre be agreed.

RECOMMENDED to Council that the Capital Programme be amended by the total sum of £35,000 based on the estimated costs for refurbishing the Windle Valley Day Centre, the costs to be funded from the Personalisation, Prevention and Partnership Fund.

41/E Response to the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy

The Executive considered a response to the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy consultation, which closed on 2 October 2017.

RESOLVED to agree the response to the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy, as set out at Annex A to the agenda report.

42/E Business Rates Relief Schemes

The Executive was informed that, in his Spring Budget, the Chancellor had announced 3 new Business Rates Reliefs for businesses most affected by the April 2017 revaluation. These were:

- Supporting Small Business – ensuring that no business losing small business rates relief or rural rates relief as a result of the revaluation would face an excessive increase in bills;
- Local Discretionary Fund – a £300m fund to be distributed to the hardest hit businesses under locally designated criteria; and
- Relief for Pubs – a £1,000 rebate for all pubs with a rateable value of under £100,000.

The Small Business Rates Relief scheme and the Pubs Business Rates Relief scheme would be fully funded by the Government provided the relief was awarded

in line with the criteria. Each local authority would set its own Local Discretionary Fund scheme, which would be reimbursed by way of a section 31 grant or as a deduction on the NNDR 3 return. Members noted the grants the Council would receive, as follows:

- 2017/18 £219,000
- 2018/19 £106,000
- 2019/20 £44,000
- 2020/21 £6,000

The Government had set some broad eligibility criteria for the Local Discretionary Business Rates Relief scheme, but the level of relief had been left to individual Councils to determine; if the level of relief awarded was greater than the level of grant, that additional cost would fall on the Council. In order to prevent this, the proposed scheme had been designed so that the whole grant, less a 2.5% top slice for contingencies, would be divided equally amongst all eligible ratepayers. Guidance on whether underspends from one year could be carried forward was awaited.

RECOMMENDED to Full Council that

- (i) the Supporting Small Businesses Business Rates Relief Scheme, Local Discretionary Business Rates Relief scheme and the Pubs Business Rates Relief Scheme as set out in Annexes A to C of the agenda report be approved;**
- (ii) the Executive Head of Finance in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance be authorised to make changes to the scheme arising out of the consultation with major preceptors; and**
- (iii) the Executive Head of Finance, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance, be authorised to make changes to the schemes to ensure that the costs remain fully funded by Government and do not fall on the Council.**

43/E Council Finances as at the 30th June 2017

The Executive received a report detailing the Council's financial position at 30 June 2017.

Members considered the revenue position for the first quarter of 2017/18 and were advised that there were no areas of concern at present. In that quarter £840k had been spent on capital projects, the largest element of which had been £512k on the purchase of a property in Doman road and a final payment of £279k as final settlement on the Mall. The remainder had been spent on renovation grants and smaller projects.

The Executive noted that sundry debts amounted to £1,146,000, although £292,000 related to car park season tickets and help line fees being paid by instalments; £481,000 related to invoices raised at the end of June for rent and recycling.

RESOLVED to note the Revenue, Treasury and Capital Position as at 30 June 2017.

44/E Exclusion of Press and Public

In accordance with Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public were excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the ground that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act as set out below:

| Minute | Paragraph(s) |
|-------------|--------------|
| 37/E (part) | 3&7 |
| 45/E | 3 |
| 46/E | 3 |
| 47/E | 3 |
| 48/E | 3 |

Note: Minutes 45/E, 46/E and 47/E are summaries of matters considered in Part II of the agenda, the minutes of which it is considered should remain confidential at the present time.

45/E Acquisition of Land for use as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) at north of Station Road Chobham

The Executive made decisions in relation to the acquisition of land north of Station Road, Chobham for use as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace.

46/E Lease of the Briars Centre, Briar Avenue, Lightwater, Surrey

The Executive made decisions concerning the awarding of a lease for the Briars Centre, Briar Avenue, Lightwater.

47/E Christmas Events in Camberley

The Executive made decisions in relation to Christmas events to be held in Camberley in 2017.

48/E Review of Exempt Items

The Executive reviewed the reports which had been considered at the meeting following the exclusion of members of the press and public, as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information.

RESOLVED that

- (i) **minute 45/E and the associated agenda report remain exempt until the completion of necessary legal procedures;**

- (ii) minute 46/E and the associated agenda report remain exempt until the completion of necessary legal procedures; and**
- (iii) the decision at minute 47/E be made public following a Press Release but any financial and contractual information remain exempt for the present time.**

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 20 July 2017

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr Nick Chambers (Vice Chairman)

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| - Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman | + Cllr Adrian Page |
| + Cllr Colin Dougan | + Cllr Robin Perry |
| + Cllr Surinder Gandhum | + Cllr Ian Sams |
| - Cllr Jonathan Lytle | + Cllr Conrad Sturt |
| + Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper | + Cllr Pat Tedder |
| + Cllr David Mansfield | + Cllr Victoria Wheeler |
| + Cllr Max Nelson | + Cllr Valerie White |

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper in attendance from partway through minute 6/P
Cllr Nic Price in attendance up to minute 7/P
Cllr Charlotte Morley in attendance from minute 7/P
Cllr David Mansfield in attendance up to minute 7/P

Substitutes: Cllr John Winterton (In place of Cllr Jonathan Lytle)

In Attendance: Cllr David Lewis, Cllr Charlotte Morley, Cllr Nic Price, Lee Brewin, Ross Cahalane, Duncan Carty, Michelle Fielder, Gareth John, Emma Pearman and Jonathan Partington

5/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 June were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

6/P Application Number: 17/0399 - 42 Kings Road and land to rear of 40-46, West End, Woking GU24 9LW

The application was for the outline application for residential development to provide 2 x one bedroom flats, 4 x two bedroom houses, 17 x three bedroom houses with access from Kings Road, following the demolition of existing dwelling and associated buildings, (access, appearance, layout and scale to be determined). (Additional information recv'd 1/6/17).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The LLFA has confirmed that they raise no objections to the proposal, subject to additional conditions (see below).

The Surrey Wildlife Trust has raised no objections subject to the provision of ecological compensatory measures to ensure that there is no net loss in the ecological value of the site.

The Council's Drainage Engineer has raised no objections to the proposal indicating:

"Any surface water flows generated within the site, or passing through, are directed towards the main-river (southern) [wider] site boundary. The drainage proposal has allowed for surface water attenuation within the development and for any failure or overload of systems to follow various exceedance routes through additional storage areas within the development before discharging into main-river at the [wider] site boundary.

To conclude, the drainage system design that has been approved by SCC LLFA should limit flows to a value that does not exceed the original green field run-off rate. Any exceedance or failure of surface water drainage systems will follow overland flood routes through the development and will be contained before discharge. The flows within main-river downstream of the development should therefore not exceed the current flows."

Further to their previous comments, raising no objections to the proposal, the County Highway Authority has advised:

"The proposed development of 23 dwellings served from Kings Road is likely to generate approximately 12 two way traffic movements in the morning and afternoon peak hours. The 2014 application [SU/14/0532] for residential development off Rose Meadow included a full assessment of the suitability and capacity of the junction of Kings Road and Beldam Bridge Road and this was found to be adequate to serve the additional vehicular movements generated by that development. Taking into consideration the small number of additional peak hour movements generated by this proposed development and the 2016 development [SU/16/0679] for 35 dwellings, it is not considered they would materially affect the capacity or operation of this junction. It is likely that the majority of traffic from the proposed development would be likely to use the Kings Road/Beldam Bridge Road junction due to the very poor condition of the section of Kings Road between the proposed site access and the junction of Kings Road with Guildford Road. The junction of Guildford Road is considered adequate to serve the minimal peak hour traffic movements generated by the proposed development. An assessment of this junction was carried out for planning application 16/0679 and an extension to the high friction surfacing on the southbound A322 Guildford Road approach to the Kings Road junction was requested to help maintain safety. There are no records of any personal injury accidents at either junction within at least the last 5 years."

One further objection received making these further objections:

- Density appears excessively high in this semi-rural location and existing residential development in Kings Road and Rose Meadow [See Paragraph 7.5 of the officer report];*
- Proposed parking appears inadequate and not reflective of real-world scenarios due to high levels of car ownership in the village and lack of local industry [See Paragraph 7.7 of the officer report];*

- *There is no legal right for access for this development from Rose Meadow (and the management company (for this road) has no intention of allowing such legal right of way) [Officer comment: this matter relates to property law and would not be a reason to refuse this application. However, no such access is proposed with the sole access for the development to come from Kings Road]; and*
- *Further destruction of wildlife habitats [See Paragraph 7.8 of the officer report].*

CORRECTIONS

The title of the development has been amended to delete “and 1 four bedroom house”

For clarification, the proposal relates to 23 dwellings, as indicated in the officer report

Paragraph 2.2 should confirm that the application site “wholly falls within an area of low flood risk (Zone 1 as defined by the Environment Agency).”

Paragraph 6.1: Additional text for Second bullet point officer comment as italicised below:

“The proposal would be compliant with the SPA avoidance strategy and under such circumstances an appropriate assessment is not required”

Paragraph 7.7.3 – 44 car spaces to be provided (not 75)

Paragraph 7.8.4 - The SAMM contribution is £13,120

Paragraph 7.10.4 - The last part of the last sentence should indicate:

“...it has been concluded that this proposal does accord with the development plan as it would not give rise to significant harm.”

Paragraph 7.11.1 – The first line of the paragraph should confirm the requirement for 9 affordable housing units (not 14)

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS:

9. No development shall take place until a Method of Construction Statement, to include details of:

- (a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors*
- (b) loading and unloading of plant and materials*
- (c) storage of plant and materials*
- (d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management)*
- (e) provision of boundary hoarding*
- (f) hours of construction*
- (g) confirmation of no on-site burning of material during the site clearance, demolition and construction phases has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction period.

Reason: The condition above is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety or residential amenity, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to accord with Policies CP11, DM9 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. No development shall take place until details of all of the SuDS/drainage elements and layouts, construction phasing (i.e. how drainage will be dealt with during construction works including pollution prevention), and full drainage calculations indicating all storm events up to 1 in 30 year storm event are contained within the drainage system and that the 1 in 100 year (+climate change) storm event is suitably managed on site and details of the proposed maintenance regimes for each of the SuDS elements shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the drainage system does not result in increasing the risk of flood risk on or off the site, to ensure that the drainage system is maintained throughout its lifetime and to comply with Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

11. Prior to the occupation of the approved development, a verification report carried out by a suitably qualified engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the sustainable drainage system has been constructed in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the sustainable drainage system has been constructed in accordance with Condition 10 above and to comply with Policy DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

AMENDED CONDITION:

6. In addition to the requirements set in the Section 106 legal agreement attached to this decision, the development hereby approved shall be implemented in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement by ACD Environmental dated 24/04/2017 (Ref: SH20983ala-ams) and the Ecological Impact Assessment by ACD Environmental dated July 2017 (Ref: SH20983) unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

AMENDMENT TO RECOMMENDATION:

GRANT subject to a receipt of a satisfactory legal agreement to secure agreement for the proposed ecological compensatory measures and for the affordable housing provision and SAMM by 4 August 2017, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Executive Head of Regulatory, and subject to the following conditions:

With a further reason for refusal if the legal agreement, as amended, is not secured under the above terms:

In the absence of the a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to ecological compensatory measures, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.'

Some Members sought clarification regarding the vehicular access through to the adjoining land south of Rose Meadow development (ref 16/0554) as there were concerns that this could be opened as part of the proposal and be used as a rat run. It was confirmed that there was no legal right to access via Rose Meadow and that there was a ransom strip in place. Some Members requested that a condition be added to prevent any future opening of a vehicular access. Officers advised that a condition would be superfluous as creating this vehicular access would be a change from the approved plans and require planning permission. However, an informative would be added reminding the applicant that planning permission would be required for a vehicular access.

There had also been concerns regarding drainage issues on the site but the drainage consultant had raised no objections. It was confirmed that the roads would be privately maintained.

In addition, some Members felt that the proposal would be overdevelopment.

Some Members asked about the planting of trees and other landscaping across the end of the cul-de-sac adjacent to Rose Meadow. The Committee was informed that these matters would be dealt with separately as reserved matters.

Resolved that application 17/0399 be approved as amended subject to:

- i) the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory;**
- ii) an additional informative to verify that there was no right of access through Rose Meadow; and**
- iii) receipt of a satisfactory legal agreement to secure agreement for the proposed ecological compensatory measures and for the affordable housing provision and SAMM by 4 August 2017, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Executive Head of Regulatory.**

In the event that a satisfactory legal agreement has not been received by the 4 August 2017 to secure affordable housing provision and a contribution towards SAMM and in the absence of a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to ecological compensatory measures, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework, the Executive Head - Regulatory be authorised to refuse the application for the reasons as amended.

Note 1

As this application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mrs Margaret Willis, Mr Bain and Mrs Charlie Walters and Mr Swallow spoke in objection and Mr Mark Hendy spoke in support.

Note 2

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

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 Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Surinder Gandhum, Robin Perry, Ian Sams and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

The Chairman had the casting vote; the recommendation to approve the application as amended was carried.

7/P Application Number: 16/0752 - 325 Guildford Road, Bisley, GU24 9BD

The application was for erection of 12 no. three bedroom dwellings in the form of 3 no. terraced in the form of two storey houses with accommodation in the roof with parking, landscaping and access for Foxleigh Grange following the demolition of existing building. (Additional information recv'd 23/6/17)

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Surrey Wildlife Trust has raised no objections.

CORRECTIONS

*The title of the development has been amended to add the italicised text:
"Erection of 12 no. three bedroom dwellings in the form of 3 no. terraces in the form of two storey houses with accommodation in the roof with parking, landscaping and access from Foxleigh Grange following the demolition of existing building"*

Paragraph 7.7.3 - The last part of the last sentence should indicate:

"...it has been concluded that this proposal does accord with the development plan as it would not give rise to significant harm."

Clarification was sought regarding the 'fastigate' trees. Officers advised that it referred to trees which were narrow and not wide spreading.

It was noted that there had been some local concern regarding the access; however, this had been approved on a previous application on this site.

Resolved that application 16/0752 be approved subject to:

- i) the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory; and**
- ii) a satisfactory legal agreement has not been received by the 26 July 2017 to secure a contribution towards SMM**

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor David Mansfield had received emails from residents from Foxleigh Grange but had not entered into further correspondence.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Adrian Page and seconded by Councillor Max Nelson.

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:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler, Valerie White and John Winterton.

8/P Application Number: 17/0286 - Land to the East of Bellew Road, Deepcut

The application was for the application for outline planning permission, access to be considered (appearance, landscape, layout and scale reserved) for up to 12 residential dwellings. (Additional information recv'd 12/6/17). (Additional & amended information recv'd 23/6/17). (Additional information rec'd 03/07/2017).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Representations and petition

Since the Committee report was written, a petition has been received with 60 signatures from the Deepcut Neighbourhood Forum. In summary, the reasons for objection listed on the petition are as follows:

- *Application undermines and conflicts with Deepcut SPD which seeks to maintain gaps between Deepcut and Frimley Green, and Deepcut and Heatherside*
- *Will destroy many trees which adds to rural aspect of Deepcut and is home to wildlife, and has amenity value*
- *Proposed access on a bend is not appropriate*
- *Contradicts the traffic proposals for Bellew Road being closed, but applicant's plans are at odds with this and throw future configuration of the road into confusion*
- *Development would result in a loss of privacy and amenity for residents of neighbouring properties*

Officers consider that these issues have been addressed within the Committee report.

Note from applicant

Officers are aware that the applicant has circulated a note to Members. This note does not change the recommendation and with regard to the 'substantial deficit' in housing land supply mentioned, the current supply is around 3.9 years as stated in paragraph 7.3.1 of the Officer's Report. It is also noted that the applicant states that two of the dwellings are proposed to be affordable. This is different from their planning statement which suggests up to four would be affordable. Two affordable dwellings would not comply with policy, which requires 35% of dwellings in Deepcut to be affordable.

Ecology

Since the Committee report was written, the applicant has provided further information in respect of ecology, which has included amending their Phase 1 Ecology Report, a response from the applicant to the points raised by Surrey Wildlife Trust, a badger survey and a bat emergence survey. West Surrey Badger Group have been to the site and have now removed their objection, provided that the methodology for works as set out in the badger survey is followed should permission be granted. Surrey Wildlife Trust have also removed their objection, and recommended a condition for a detailed Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, should permission be granted. As such it is considered that the ecology refusal reason should be removed.

Trees

Officers wish to point out that the visibility splays on the proposed access seem to conflict with the applicant's tree retention plan and as such it seems that more trees will have to be removed along the front than is currently proposed. The Tree Officer has commented that he expects more would be removed than is currently proposed, and has not objected, however does state that a significant increase in the numbers to be removed would not be appropriate. Landscaping is a reserved matter however and would be considered further at that stage.

Recommendation

The recommendation is still to REFUSE, but the second (ecological) reason for refusal should be removed, as discussed above.'

It was noted that the communication from the applicant should read four units and not two as mentioned in the update above.

Members were concerned about the loss of trees and suggested an informative to prevent the applicant from felling these trees. Officers referred Members back to paragraph 7.4.3 of the report and the Council's Tree Officers conclusions on the trees. Officers further advised that there were currently no Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) on the woodland. Any further loss of trees on the site would be reserved matters. Members were advised that the Arboricultural Officer would consider TPOs for the remainder of the trees on the site.

It was clarified that the site was classified as the countryside and not Green Belt.

Resolved that application 17/0286 be refused as amended for the reasons (excluding the second ecological reason) as set out on the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

As this application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Peter Bowden spoke in objection and Mr James Armitage-Hobbs spoke in support.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Valerie White.

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 as amended:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler, Valerie White and John Winterton.

9/P Application Number: 16/0877 - Garages, Greenlands Road, Camberley

The application was for the erection of a pair of semi detached three bedroom dwelling houses with associated parking and access following demolition of existing garages. (Additional Plan Rec'd 11/10/2016). (Amended Info - Rec'd 21/03/2017). (Amended plans recv'd 13/6/17).

This 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 Lewis.

A site visit took place at the site.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Report correction

The site contains 19 and not 20 garages. The proposal requires these to be demolished to facilitate the development.

Point of clarification

The submitted block plan retains a footpath / access to the side of No.36 Greenlands Road such that access to the side of this property and to the rear of its neighbour's is retained.'

There was local concern regarding a loss of parking and the loss of an area for turning at the location of the garages. Large vehicles and emergency vehicles would have to reverse back down the road if the proposal was approved.

The Committee was advised that of the 19 garages on the site, which were now in disrepair, only two were being rented. In addition the site was private land and was not currently a public car parking area. On questioning the applicant confirmed that land could be fenced off the land to prevent public access.

Some Members were concerned about parking and safety issues and the loss of amenity ground. There were currently serious issues with parking in the area and the loss of the garage area would exacerbate this problem.

Although some Members questioned whether the applicant's parking report had been verified, officers reminded Members that there had been no objection from the County Highways Authority. However, it was noted that during the site visit Members had witnessed the parking issues around the site.

The committee was advised that when considering the application they would have to balance the limited parking area against the need for social housing.

Resolved that application 16/0877 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

As this application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mrs Pamela Hickman spoke in objection and Mr Richard Summers spoke in support. Mr Easterling, was unable to attend but his objections were read to the committee by Cllr Nick Chambers.

Note 2

It was noted for the record that Councillor Colin Dougan declared that he had been a councillor representative on the Accent Board.

Note 3

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Nick Chambers and seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan.

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 Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder,

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Katia Malcaus Cooper, Victoria Wheeler, Valerie White and John Winterton.

10/P Application Number: 17/0167 - 41 Bosman Drive, Windlesham GU20 6JN

The application was for the division of existing 4 bedroom dwelling to form 2 two bedroom dwellings with associated parking and garden space.

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 the Executive Head – Regulatory and not Councillor Conrad Sturt as reported in the agenda.

Resolved that application 17/0167 be approved subject to:

- i) conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory; and**
- ii) a SANGs and SAMM liability being secured.**

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Conrad Sturt declared that he had received communication from residents in relation to the application and Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that she had a close friend in Bosman Drive.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Nick Chambers.

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:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Katia Malcaus Cooper, Conrad Sturt and Valerie White.

11/P Application Number: 17/0293 - Magnolia House, Westwood Road, Windlesham, GU20 6LP

The application was for a detached two storey dwelling with associated landscaping following demolition of existing dwelling and annexe building. (Additional information recv'd 19/5/17) (Additional information recv'd 1/6/17).

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 Conrad Sturt.

A site visit took place at the site.

Members were advised of the following updates:

Three additional letters of support have been received, commenting that the proposal would be in keeping with the surroundings, would enhance the site and would be more compact than the existing dwelling.

An additional letter with photos and indicative streetscene plan was sent from the applicant to the case officer and committee members.

An additional email has been sent from the applicant to the case officer advising that should the committee decided to grant planning permission, the applicant would accept a planning condition that would withdraw any unimplemented permitted development rights i.e not applicable to the part-implemented lawful garage or leisure buildings and rear and side dwelling extensions.

The officer response is as follows:

The quoted figures for the lawful part-implemented extensions 13/0520 and 0555 have been double checked and there is indeed an error in the given figure in Section 7.2.4 of the Committee Report, which has been corrected as highlighted overleaf:

Floorspace

| Existing | 16/1046 approved dwelling | Lawful extensions (13/0520 + 0555) | Current proposed dwelling |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 333 sq. m | 527 sq. m (+ 58.3%) | 527 sq. m (+ 58.3%) | 685 sq. m (+ 105.7%) |

Footprint

| Existing | 16/1046 approved dwelling | Lawful extensions (13/0520 + 0555) | Current proposed dwelling |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 237 sq. m | 293 sq. m | 400 sq. m | 407 sq. m |

| | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|----------|
| | (+ 23.6%) | (+ 68.8%) | (+71.7%) |
|--|-----------|-----------|----------|

Although the footprint of the current proposed dwelling would only be 7 sq m greater than the permitted development fallback afforded by the part-implemented 13/0520 + 0555 extensions to the existing dwelling, as outlined in Para 7.2.5 the proposed dwelling would have an approx. 47% greater floorspace than the existing dwelling and part-implemented extensions and would also involve an approx. 0.5m maximum height increase. The proposed dwelling by reason of its additional bulk arising from the floorspace, volume and height increase would remain significantly larger than the existing dwelling and these part-implemented extensions. Furthermore, the proposal would nullify the consolidated built form benefits which contributed to very special circumstances to allow approval of the 16/1046 replacement dwelling.

This overall additional bulk and spread of development would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt that has a significantly greater impact upon the openness of the Green Belt than the existing buildings. The restricted view from Westwood Road does not remove this unacceptable harm upon Green Belt openness as there will still be a significant additional presence of buildings.

As outlined in Section 7.8 any design or other merits of the proposal would not outweigh the inappropriateness and harm of the development in the Green Belt. The removal of permitted development rights for the proposed dwelling, if approved, is not considered to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt arising from its increased bulk. Additionally, it is noted that the 16/1046 replacement dwelling was approved on the basis that permitted development rights would be removed and therefore, future control of further development in the Green Belt would still be achieved should this be implemented.

The Ecology Appraisal was exhibited on the Council's website upon receipt under the 'General Correspondence' tab.'

It was clarified that the outbuildings which included the pool and gym etc, would remain on the site. The application was for a larger replacement dwelling with a 47% floorspace increase from the extant building planning permission.

Some Members felt that the proposal was in keeping with the street scene, was a large plot, not harmful to visual amenities and residents had not objected. However, officers advised the committee that these reasons did not constitute very special circumstances to outweigh the identified inappropriateness and harm to the Green Belt.

Resolved that application 17/0293 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 the Chairman declared that Members had received correspondence from the applicant.

Note 2

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler.

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 Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Surinder Gandhum, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry and Colin Sturt.

The Chairman had the casting vote; the recommendation to refuse the application was carried.

12/P Application Number: 16/0942 - Land adjacent to 1 Whitmoor Road, Bagshot , GU19 5DQ

This application was withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

Chairman

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House on 24 August 2017

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr Nick Chambers (Vice Chairman)

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman | - Cllr Adrian Page |
| + Cllr Colin Dougan | + Cllr Robin Perry |
| + Cllr Surinder Gandhum | - Cllr Ian Sams |
| + Cllr Jonathan Lytle | + Cllr Conrad Sturt |
| + Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper | + Cllr Pat Tedder |
| + Cllr David Mansfield | + Cllr Victoria Wheeler |
| + Cllr Max Nelson | + Cllr Valerie White |

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Paul Ilnicki (In place of Cllr Ian Sams) and Cllr John Winterton (In place of Cllr Adrian Page)

In Attendance: Lee Brewin, Michelle Fielder, Laura James, Jonathan Partington and Emma Pearman

Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman reminded Members regarding the Tour of Sites scheduled in the morning on 8 September 2017.

The Chairman wished Cllr Wheeler a happy birthday.

13/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

14/P Application Number: 16/1207 - Windlemere Golf Club, Windlesham Road, West End, Woking, GU24 9QL

The application was for three detached two storey dwellings with detached double garages, entrance gates and associated accesses and landscaping following demolition of golf club and driving range buildings and use of remainder of land as suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANGS). (Additional info recv'd 25/1/17). (Additional information rec'd 09/02/2017). (Amended and Additional Information Rec'd 31/03/2017) (Amended plans and information, and additional information recv'd 21/7/17).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'An email has been received from the applicant querying the footprint figures quoted in Paragraph 7.4.3 of the committee report. The case officer can confirm

that the figures are correct. The existing building footprint figure of 523 sq. m omits the existing storage buildings of 172 sq. now to be retained, so that a direct comparison can be made against the proposed dwellings which will replace them to assess if they have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

The applicant also expressed concern that insufficient weight and consideration has been given to the removal of the driving range and high powered lighting system. The case officer considers that this has been addressed in Para 7.14.9 of the committee report.'

Members had concerns about the location of the SANGS car park and access, particularly the lack of footpaths along the narrow road, which also supported two-way traffic. In addition some Members felt that the proposed dwellings were too large and there was concern regarding the impact the SANGS car park would have on the immediate neighbours' amenities.

With regard to the SANGS car park entrance there was some concern in relation to the materials which would be used to secure the entrance to the SANG car park. Members felt that they would have to be in keeping with the street scene and complement the listed buildings opposite the site. Some Members asked whether the Heritage Officer was aware of the materials suggested which would be in contrast to the listed buildings. Officers advised that the Heritage Officer had raised no objection.

Councillor White felt that a site visit would be appropriate and that the County Highways Authority (CHA) should also be present. Officers advised that the CHA could be invited but as they had already considered the proposal and had raised no objection, they would not be obliged to attend. Councillor White requested that it be recorded that she did not respect their views on this proposal.

Some Members were not against the development but it was the access which caused concern.

The Chairman reminded the Committee that if they decided to defer the application for a site visit, only Members who attended the site would be able to vote on the application when it was next considered at Committee. In addition, all the speakers who had made a presentation at this meeting would be able to return and address the Members when the application was considered at Committee again.

In addition, should the application be deferred, more information would be obtained from the Heritage Officer in relation to the entrance and proposed materials.

Resolved that application 16/1207 be deferred in order to:

- i) carry out a site visit to inspect the SANGS car park access;**
- ii) invite the County Highway Authority to attend the site; and**
- iii) obtain further information from the Heritage Officer regarding the access to the site.**

Note 1

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme Mr P Weinberger and Mr J Brennen spoke in objection and Mr C Smith, the applicant and Mr I Bell spoke in support.

Note 2

It was noted for the record that:

- i) the Chairman declared that one of the speakers, Mr Bell was known to various Members of the Committee as he had been a Surrey Heath Borough Councillor;
- ii) the Chairman declared that Committee Members had received emails regarding the application;
- iii) the Chairman declared that the land designated by the SANG in the application would be acquired by the Council if approved;
- iv) Councillor Paul Ilnicki declared that he had worked with the applicant some time ago;
- v) Councillor Conrad Sturt declared that the applicant was known to him.

Note 3

The recommendation to defer the application for the reasons set out above was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Katia Malcaus Cooper.

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 revised recommendation to defer the application for the reasons set out above:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Jonathan Lytle, Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler, Valerie White and John Winterton.

15/P Application Number: 17/0317 - Camberley Heath Golf Club, Golf Drive, Camberley GU15 1JG

The application was for the erection of split-level 2/3 storey building comprising 12 apartments including rooms in roofspace following demolition of bungalow including additional residential and golf club parking, cycle store, bin store, entrance gates and associated landscaping. (Additional plan recv'd 5/6/17). (Additional Information recv'd 30/06/17 & 03/07/2017) (Additional plans recv'd 27/7/17).

Members received the following updates:

'The Council's Viability Consultant has confirmed that in order to ascertain whether the total sales value of £8,395,000 of the proposed apartments arrived at by the applicant within Section 10 the submitted viability appraisal (and c.21% higher

than the valuation from Knight Frank LLP within the Appendix F of the appraisal) were reasonable value assumptions, a desktop research of property values using property search engines Rightmove, Zoopla and similar sources to review local market indications for properties (both re-sale and new build as available) was undertaken.

This considered current / recent asking prices and where available sold prices in the locality within a 1/2-mile radius of the site and included the four new-build properties on Heathlands Drive (formally ancillary buildings within the golf club grounds) approved under 13/0100, which sold in June 2015 for between £1,195,000 - £1,269,000. These properties are five bedroom detached dwellings of circa 320m², considerably larger than the subject scheme which proposes 2 & 3 bedroom apartments of between c. 102m² - 151m².

Notwithstanding this, the Council's Viability Consultant has calculated the £/m² values of these properties which shows that the achieved sales values of the Heathland Drive properties equated to approximately £3,700/m², which is considerably lower than the assumed values for the proposed apartments at c.£5,650/m². Therefore, the assumed sales values are considered by the Council's Viability Consultant to be well placed and representative of the unique site characteristics.'

The case officer confirmed that the required SAMM contribution had been paid by the applicant.

Some Members were concerned by the lack of affordable housing provision in the proposal but the viability study in the agenda report outlined the reasons for this. It was advised that the club provided facilities for non-members and therefore provided amenities for the community.

The Committee was advised that there would be no loss of parking spaces with regard to the development.

Some Members were concerned that the applicant would return to the committee in the future to develop the site further, if the financial situation of the club became poor again. The Chairman of the Golf Club advised the Committee that the Club's Constitution was being amended to ensure that any future owners would not develop the site any further.

There was some concern from the Golf Drive Residents' Association regarding the increase in events at the Golf Club and increased traffic movements.

In addition some Members felt that the design of the apartments was not in keeping with the area and there were concerns that the gated area could cause queues at peak times. Members were advised that the development only comprised 12 units and this would not cause any congestion.

Some Members supported the proposal as it allowed the club to continue to trade, providing community facilities and local employment opportunities, but there was concern that applications for this site be submitted in the future. Members were advised that the application was made in accordance with an 'open book' policy,

which required the applicant to provide unrestricted information on the club and its finances. An open book policy would be used for any future applications.

Resolved that application 17/0317 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

As this application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr B Heselwood, representing the Golf Drive Residents' Association spoke in objection and Mr R Broderick and Mr J Knevett spoke in support.

Note 2

It was noted for the record that:

- i) Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that he had, as Ward Councillor met with the Senior Management Team regarding the application but had made no comments;
- ii) Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that he had known one of the speakers, Mr Heselwood for many years;
- iii) Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that she had known the applicant many years ago;
- iv) Cllr Robin Perry declared that his partner was a member of the club;
- v) Cllr John Winterton declared that he used the club;
- vi) Councillor Conrad Sturt declared that he had been contacted by the applicant;
- vii) Councillor Nick Chambers declared that the applicant had shown him the application plans.

Note 3

The recommendation to approve was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Jonathan Lytle.

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 Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Surinder Gandhum, Edward Hawkins, Paul Innicki, Jonathan Lytle, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Conrad Sturt, and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

16/P Application Number: 17/0367 - Chobham Club, 50 Windsor Road, Chobham, Woking GU24 8LD

The application was for the erection of a part single storey, part two storey building to form social club on ground floor and 1 x 1 bed and 1 x 2 bed units above, with associated parking and landscaping, following partial demolition of existing club premises and flat. (Additional information recv'd 28/7/17) (Additional plan recv'd 1/8/17) (Amended plan recv'd 2/8/17).

This 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 Tedder because of her concern regarding the parking at the site.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The Environmental Health Officer has confirmed that the details of the sound proof barrier are acceptable, stating that the barrier proposed achieves Category B3 performance which is normally required for roads and motorways so will be good at reducing sound levels. Condition 6 proposed requires the sound proof barrier to be installed in accordance with these details.'

The SAMM payment in respect of the two residential flats has also been received.

One additional letter of objection has been received which raises the following issues:

- *The clubhouse would be invasive to the street scene if the hedge was removed [Officer comment: The hedge is not proposed to be removed and this is discussed further in section 7.4 of the report]*
- *Building will dominate the street scene in Windsor Road close to Grade II listed building [Officer comment: The Heritage Officer has not raised concern with regard to the impact on the listed building. Character is discussed in section 7.4 of the report]*
- *Parking in the area is a constant problem particularly with the rugby club, and cadet facility which has no parking, and there is insufficient parking proposed [Officer comment: Discussed in section 7.6 of the report]*
- *Car park is full with overspill at times and additional street parking would be a hazard [Officer comment: Discussed in Section 7.6 of the report]*
- *Is it not possible for the entrance to be off the main road [Officer comment: The Committee must consider the application as proposed]*
- *Site is neglected and in a state of disrepair [Officer comment: Noted however redevelopment is likely to improve the situation in this respect]'*

Members were advised that a landscaping condition was recommended should the application be approved.

Some Members were concerned about the location of the entrance close to a listed building, where it was narrow, close to a bend and had a lack of pavements. There was concern as to where any displaced parking would go and why a traffic survey had not been carried out.

Members were reminded that the County Highway Authority (CHA) had not raised any objection to the proposal and a parking management plan had been recommended by officers. Some Members felt the application should be deferred for a site visit and a CHA representative should also be present. Members were reminded that CHA had looked at the proposal several times and the view would

be unlikely to change. It was also noted that on page 99 of the report, a condition regarding the Parking Management Plan was included which would look at measures to prevent overspill of parking.

Resolved that application 17/0367 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory and an additional landscaping condition as advised at the meeting.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Nick Chambers and seconded by Councillor Jonathan Lytle.

Note 2

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 Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Max Nelson, Robin Perry and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors Paul Ilnicki, David Mansfield, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White

The Chairman had the casting vote; the recommendation to approve the application was carried.

Councillor Surinder Gandhum did not vote as he left the room for part of the consideration of the application.

17/P Application Number: 17/0504 - Land at former Sparks Garage, 2 London Road, Camberley GU15 3UZ

The application was for the variation of condition 11 of Planning Permission 16/0536 so as to allow change to location of proposed access.

This application should be read in-conjunction with application 17/0503 reported elsewhere on this agenda.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The applicant has provided a further plan to show the visibility splays can be suitably achieved for the new access, which the County Highway Authority have confirmed is satisfactory. As such, Condition 3 is proposed to be amended as follows:

3. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until the proposed vehicular/pedestrian access has been constructed and provided with visibility zones in accordance with Plan SG-116 Rev A received 24.8.17 and thereafter the visibility zones shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction above 1.05m high.'

Members were advised that there was extant consent at this site with a default position of approval for up to 10 units.

Some Members had concerns regarding the design as it would not be in keeping with the area. In addition they had concerns about the access to the site.

Resolved that application 17/0504 be approved as amended subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve as amended was proposed by Councillor Jonathan Lytle and seconded by Councillor Nick Chambers.

Note 2

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 Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Surinder Gandhum, Paul Ilnicki, Jonathan Lytle, Max Nelson, Robin Perry, Victoria Wheeler and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, and Valerie White.

18/P Application Number: 17/0503 - Land at former Sparks Garage, 2 London Road, Camberley GU15 3UZ

The application was for the approval of the reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout, scale) pursuant to condition 1 of SU16/0536 for the erection of 9 x 2 bed flats with associated parking and landscaping. (Amended & Additional Plan- Rec'd 25/07/2017) (Amended and additional plan recv'd 31/7/17). (Amended and Additional Plans - Rec'd 02/08/2017).

This application should be read in-conjunction with application 17/0504 reported elsewhere on this agenda.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The Council's Arboricultural Officer has not objected, subject to a condition (Condition 3 which was already proposed). The Drainage Officer has stated that some minor revisions will be required to the submitted drainage details but is satisfied that these can be secured through the existing drainage condition on the outline permission. (Condition 15 of 17/0504 above).'

Although the County Highway Authority did not object to the landscaping and boundary fence in terms of the access to Pear Tree Court, the applicant has provided a revised landscaping plan to set back the fence in this location, to ensure the visibility from that access is not compromised. As such, condition 1 is proposed to be amended as follows to reflect the new plan:

The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans:

- SG-102 Rev A Ground and First Floor floorplans received 28.7.17
- SG-103 Rev A Second floor and Roof plans received 28.7.17
- SG-119 Elevation plans received 31.7.17
- SG-111 Refuse Store received 2.6.17
- SG-107 Cycle store received 25.7.17
- SG-112 Rev A Sections received 28.7.17
- SG-109 Rev C Proposed indicative soft landscaping plan received 24.8.17

And boundary treatments as shown on the following plans:

- SG-104 Rev B Elevation plans received 24.8.17
- SG-114 Rev A Elevation plans received 28.7.17

Unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.'

Members were advised that there was an extant consent at this site with a default position of approval for up to 10 units.

Some Members had concerns regarding the design as it would not be in keeping with the area. In addition they had concerns about the access to the site.

Resolved that application 17/0503 be approved as amended subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory and an amendment of the application description.

Note 1

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

Note 2

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

Councillors Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Surinder Gandhum, Paul Innicki, Jonathan Lytle, Max Nelson, Robin Perry and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Katia Malcaus Cooper, David Mansfield, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

19/P Application Number: 17/0307 - Rosebank Nurseries, Chertsey Road, Chobham GU24 8PL

The application was for the erection of 4 No. five bedroom and 1 No. four bedroom dwellings with associated access, parking/garaging and landscaping following the demolition of existing buildings.

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers; however, it had been called in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Wheeler as she considered it inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Condition 2 to be updated to read:

2. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans: 11, 12, 13, 14, 21, 22, 23, 24, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 41, 42, 43, 44, 51, 52, 53, 54, 1001 and 1003, unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning and as advised in ID.17a of the Planning Practice Guidance'.

Some Members felt that replacing the see-through glass house with houses was harmful to the Green Belt

It was clarified for Members that the poly tunnels counted as floor volume.

Resolved that application 17/0307 be approved as amended subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory and a satisfactory legal agreement.

In the event that a satisfactory legal agreement is not completed in respect of SAMM and Affordable Housing contribution by 6 September 2017 and unless the prior agreement has been obtained from the Executive Head of Regulatory for an extension of time to complete the agreement, the recommendation would be to refuse for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve as amended was proposed by Councillor Jonathan Lytle and seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan.

Note 2

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 Nick Chambers, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Surinder Gandhum, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max Nelson and Robin Perry.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application as amended:

Councillors Paul Ilnicki, Katia Malcaus Cooper, Conrad Sturt, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank