

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning
Applications Committee held at
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath
House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15
3HD on 15 July 2021**

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler (Vice Chairman)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">+ Cllr Graham Alleway+ Cllr Peter Barnett+ Cllr Cliff Betton+ Cllr Mark Gordon+ Cllr David Lewis+ Cllr David Mansfield+ Cllr Charlotte Morley | <ul style="list-style-type: none">+ Cllr Robin Perry+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram+ Cllr John Skipper+ Cllr Graham Tapper+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft+ Cllr Valerie White |
|---|---|

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Members in Attendance: Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath and Cllr Pat Tedder

Officers Present: Alastair Barnes, William Hinde, Shannon Kimber,
Jonathan Partington and Eddie Scott.

11/P Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2021 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

12/P Land of 31 & 33 Church Hill, Camberley - Tree Preservation Order (TPO) Confirmation

The item was to consider the confirmation of Surrey Heath Borough Council Tree Preservation Order (TPO) No. 03/21.

The confirmation of the TPO would have normally been dealt with under delegated authority. However, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee as an objection to the order had been received.

The Committee noted the proposed modification in the officer report to amend the title of the TPO to 'Land of 33 Church Hill Camberley'

The recommendation to confirm the TPO was proposed by Councillor Victoria Wheeler, seconded by Councillor Helen Whitcroft and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that Tree Preservation Order No. 03/21 be confirmed with the modification outlined in the officer report.

Note 1

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 confirm the TPO:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, David Mansfield, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, John Skipper, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

13/P Application Number: 20/0514 - 1 Middle Close, Camberley, Surrey, GU15 1NZ

The application was for a proposed single storey front extension including two roof lights, a two storey extension to the western side elevation following demolition of the existing garage, change to main roof form, six roof lights to main front roof slope, two rear dormers and fenestration alterations (this application was a resubmission of 19/0701 to allow for alterations to the height of the building and the front gables, alterations to the dormers and fenestration, and the installation of A.C. units) - retrospective.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee by Councillor Edward Hawkins, on the grounds of residents' concerns over size and bulk, and concerns over the inappropriateness of the air conditioning units and their potential impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of 3 Middle Close.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“Representations

Eleven further written representations has been received, from nine addresses. These objections have been summarised below:

Comments which have been addressed in the committee report:

- Conflict with both national and local plans and supplementary planning documents;
- Too close to adjoining properties;
- Development too high, too dominant and overbearing, the increase height of the gables exacerbate this oppressive development;
- Loss of light;
- Loss of privacy due to overlooking from the higher gables at the front and alterations to the rear dormers;
- Out of keeping with character of Middle Close and the surrounding estate;
- Over development;
- Developer has had no regard for the neighbours during construction, hours of operation have not been followed, nor have the planning conditions;
- The as built plans are not an accurate reflection of what has been constructed (position of retaining wall and the location of the garage door is

shown as being level with the ground level, it isn't, it is approximately 0.4 metres above the ground level, with a slope being proposed)

Comments which do not raise material planning considerations:

- Other comments received have related to the original extensions (approved under 19/0234 and varied by 19/0701);
- Irregularities were reported over a year ago by several residents to planning and enforcement (these concerns have not been ignored, it has taken a year for the application to be valid);
- General dislike of proposal;
- Damage has been made to Middle Close by deliveries;
- The trees to the front of the proposed are overgrown and untidy, this is very uncharacteristic of the road;
- There are access issues to the garden from the side of the house as it is too narrow;
- Noise and disturbance caused by building works;
- Objections have been lost;
[Officer comment: This comment appears to relate to original objections, these are on file with the original file and are not carried over to new applications. For this development neighbouring properties and previous objectors have been notified];
- The development will set a precedent;
- Application has been applied for retrospectively;
- Concerns have been raised regarding the quality of the build and the structure integrity of the retaining wall.

New comments:

- A.C. units are unsightly, excessive and out of scale for a residential dwelling. They are too close to the neighbouring property, result in unreasonable noise pollution as these units are for both heating and cooling and so could be emitting high level sound throughout the year, and are not a safe distance from the neighbouring property *[Officer comment: Comments are awaited from Environmental Health];*
- Loss of trees and vegetation, development was not built in accordance with condition which sought compliance with the tree protection plan;
[Officer comment: See section 7.5, page 41 of Annex B – Officer's delegated report for 19/0234. It is regrettable this condition was not followed. However, this vegetation was compromised prior to the first development and was not covered by a TPO. It has now been lost];
- The parking for this property is not being used and there are a lot of cars now on the road. The garages they seem to be foot and half above ground level. *[Officer comment: Whilst the application has been made retrospectively, the works have not been finished completely, as such the front driveway and ramp to the garage have not been constructed yet];*
- It has insufficient parking
[Officer comment: See section 7.7, page 42 of Annex B];

- Drainage concerns
[Officer comment: The agent has confirmed that the waste water will connect to the mains drainage and the water from guttering and run off will be disposed of on-site through soakaways].

Consultation responses

Paragraphs 5.2 and 6.5.6, respectively –

Officers are still waiting for the Environmental Health Officer's comments on the technical specification of the Air Conditioning units, details of which were on 13th July.

Revised recommendation:

It is recommended that the application be **DEFERRED** until comments have been received from the EHO, so the impacts of the A.C. units can be fully considered. This is also necessary given the additional representations received.”

It was felt that, in addition to the receipt and consideration of Environmental Health's comments on the technical specification of the air conditioning units, Members also needed a further Member Site Visit to consider the size and bulk of the proposal. As a result an amended recommendation to defer the application was put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that application 20/0514 be deferred to allow for receipt of the Environmental Health Officer's comments; and to undertake a Committee Site Visit

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- i. Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that all members of the Committee had received various pieces of correspondence in respect of the application and that a Committee Site Visit had taken place; and
- ii. Councillor Graham Tapper had spoken to the neighbours of the application site on Roundway and had inspected the application site from their garden, but had made no comment and had come into the meeting with an open mind.

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 proposal to defer the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, David Mansfield, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, John Skipper, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

14/P Application Number: 21/0005 - 11 Blackdown Road, Deepcut, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 6SH

The application was for the erection of a part single storey and two storey rear/side extension with the installation of a side window at first floor level to the existing dwelling.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Helen Whitcroft, due to concerns that the proposal would be overdevelopment and out of character with the existing street scene.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

"This application has been DEFERRED.

Following the publication of the agenda, it became apparent that some of the mapping of the 11 Blackdown Road site, including the GIS Map featured in the agenda pack, was incorrect and as a result an adjoining neighbour hadn't received a neighbour notification letter. It is a statutory requirement that all adjoining neighbours are consulted."

The revised recommendation to defer the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler, and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that

- I. **application 21/0005 be deferred to allow for Neighbour Consultation; and**
- II. **The application be determined under delegated authority if withdrawal of the member call-in request is received by the Head of Planning.**

Note 1

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 defer the application:
Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, David Mansfield, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, John Skipper, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

Chairman