

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning  
Applications Committee held at  
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath  
House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15  
3HD on 5 May 2022**

---

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

- Cllr Graham Alleway	+ Cllr Liz Noble
Cllr Peter Barnett	+ Cllr Robin Perry
+ Cllr Cliff Betton	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Stuart Black	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Mark Gordon	- Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+ Cllr David Lewis	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr Charlotte Morley	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

\* Present from midway through minute 4/P

\*<sup>2</sup> Present from midway through minute 6/P

Substitutes: Cllr Morgan Rise (In place of Cllr Helen Whitcroft) and Cllr Pat Tedder (In place of Cllr Graham Alleway)

Members in Attendance: Cllr Sharon Galliford

Officers Present: Sarita Bishop  
Duncan Carty  
Gavin Chinniah  
William Hinde  
Jonathan Partington  
Emma Pearman  
Eddie Scott  
Sarah Shepherd

**1/P Chairman's Welcome**

The Chairman took the opportunity to formally welcome Councillor Liz Noble to the Council and Planning Applications Committee.

**2/P Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 April 2022 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**3/P Application Number 22/0167 - Langshot Equestrian Film Studio, Gracious Pond Road, Chobham, Woking, Surrey, GU24 8HJ**

The application was withdrawn by the applicant prior to Committee meeting.

4/P

**Application Number 21/0936 - Orchard Cottage, Shepherds Lane, Windlesham, Surrey, GU20 6HL**

The application was for the erection of a two-storey, 66 bedroom care home for older people with associated parking and landscaping.

This application had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee as the floor area exceeded 1000 square metres.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

**"Secretary of State** – As the application would be a departure from the development plan, if Members resolve to grant permission then the application would have to be referred to the Secretary of State prior to any decision being issued.

**Doctor's surgery** – The applicant has been asked for information to clarify why a doctor's surgery was not part of this permission. The applicant has stated:

*It is appreciated that a doctors surgery formed part of the original planning permission relating to this site. It is also appreciated that this proposal followed on a short time after the doctors surgery central to Windlesham was closed. This decision was made over 10 years ago on the basis that it was believed inefficient and ineffective to retain the surgery in Windlesham.*

*The preference then was to centralise the provision, funding and delivery of the GP Service to residents of Windlesham at the Lightwater Surgery, only a short distance away (less than 2 miles from the application site and only little over a mile from the centre of Windlesham). It is understood and it remains the case and that there remains insufficient funding available or deemed necessity, to make the provision of a doctors surgery on the site of Orchard Cottage, a viable prospect.*

*It is notable here that NHS Frimley Clinical Commissioning Group have not responded to the current application, despite having been consulted.*

To clarify further, there is no requirement for the applicant to provide the doctor's surgery as part of the extant permission. This was not requested by Members at Committee when the previous application (15/0272) was granted.

The CCG have been chased again for a response but have no response has been received.

**CO2 savings** – The applicant has provided further information as follows:

*I have sought advice on quantification of the CO2 saving likely to arise from this particular array of solar panels. The advice I have received is that these will result in a saving of some 20.0 kg/m<sup>2</sup>/yr equivalent to an overall quantity of c.64 tonnes.CO<sub>2</sub>/annum. If we include the ground source system, designed to provide all of the homes heating and cooling requirements, the saving across both systems should result in a saving of c. 40.0 kg/m<sup>2</sup>/yr, amounting to a conservatively estimated saving, of in excess of 100 tonnes/CO<sub>2</sub>/annum.*

It is noted that the extant scheme did not propose solar panels or the ground source heating system.

**Nursing care** – The applicant has clarified that nursing care at the home is not currently proposed, however more specialised residential/dementia care will be offered. There is flexibility to provide nursing care in the future if required.

**Residents' cars** – The applicant has advised that while it is not their policy to not permit residents to have their own cars, due to their care needs (they will have to meet proposed Condition 17) it is very unlikely that they would still be physically able to drive. The applicant is comfortable therefore advising that none of the residents will have their own cars at the site.

**Double bedroom accommodation** – To clarify, four rooms proposed are double bedrooms, two on the ground floor and two on first floor.

**Comparison of other sites and parking spaces** – The applicant has advised that the following homes are all 66-bed care homes run by the same operator (LNT Care Developments) with fewer parking spaces:

- Canterbury House, Faversham – 22 spaces (Officers note this is 16 min walk from a railway station and 4 min walk from an hourly bus service)
- Harrier Grange, Andover – 18 spaces (Officers note this is a 31 min walk from a railway station and 8 min walk from a regular bus service)
- Briggs Lodge, Devizes – 22 spaces (Officers note a number of buses stop immediately outside the care home but there is no railway station nearby)

For comparison, this site is a 25-minute walk from a bus service with less than hourly frequency Monday to Friday, and a 46-minute walk from the nearest station (Longcross).

The applicant has further advised that:

- It is of paramount importance to the care home operator that the parking provision is suitable, as not to provide sufficient parking would result in serious implications for the operation of the proposed care home and would mean it was not as attractive to future residents
- The adopted parking standards are a maximum and here they have sought to provide the maximum
- As a comparison - Lakeview Care Home in Lightwater has 58 beds and offers 19 parking spaces; Kingsley Court in Bisley is a 60-bed care home that only offered 19 spaces until recently extended
- The same ratio here would mean 29 spaces for Lakeview and 30 for Kingsbury Court, neither of which will be achieved even with the proposed extensions of provision.

**County Highways further response** – They have confirmed that the parking standards for care homes take account of staff requirements as well as that of visitors and residents. They state that even with 24 staff all driving to work which is a worst-case scenario, 9 spaces would be left for visitors which they consider is sufficient as visitor numbers will be spread throughout the day. "

As the application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr Alistair Wood spoke on behalf of the applicant in support of the application.

The Committee raised concerns in respect of the potential harm created by the construction of the proposal in relation highway safety and inconvenience to other highways users. As a result, it was agreed to add an additional requirement to condition 7 of the officer's recommendation in order to require signage as part of the specified vehicle routing.

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Graham Tapper, and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that**

- I. application 21/0936 be granted subject to the conditions in the Officer Report, as amended; and**
- II. the application be referred to the Secretary of State due to a departure from the Development Plan.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Pat Tedder knew the owner of the site, but they were not the applicant.

**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 officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Edward Hawkins, Charlotte Morley, Liz Noble, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise and Graham Tapper.

Voting against the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Stuart Black, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

**Note 3**

In line with Part 4, Section D, Paragraph 18 of the Constitution, Councillors Mark Gordon, David Lewis and Victoria Wheeler did not vote on the application as they were not present for the whole consideration of the application.

**5/P Application Number 19/2313 - Hudson House, Albany Park, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 7PL**

The application was for the change of use from warehousing to light industrial, general industrial and warehousing

The application was referred to the Planning Applications Committee because its floor area exceeded 1,000 square metres and Surrey Heath Borough Council was the applicant.

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Robin Perry, seconded by Councillor Charlotte Morley, and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 19/2313 be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the Officer's report.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that:

- i. Councillor Edward Hawkins made a group declaration acknowledging that the applicant was Surrey Heath Borough Council; and
- ii. Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that her current employer owned a building on Albany Park.

**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 Officer Recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Stuart Black, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Liz Noble, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

**6/P Application Number 21/0901 - Windlesham Garden Centre, London Road, Windlesham, Surrey, GU20 6LL**

The application was for the demolition of part of the existing building, erection of a single storey glass house extension (use class 'E') and designation of a smoking area with associated alterations, resurfacing of existing car park with associated lighting and creation of a raised veranda and porch to existing farm shop (retrospective) and provision of smoking shelter, cycle parking and electric vehicle charging points.

The application had been referred to the Planning Applications Committee because of its association with 20/0494, which had also been reported to the meeting.

Members were advised of the following updates:

**“UPDATED  
Condition 4**

Add “cycle parking” after “adequately signed”

Members had notable concerns in respect of the proposal's negative effect on the residential amenities of nearby residents. This constituted the adverse impact of the lighting and noise associated with proposal. As a result it was agreed by the Committee to amend condition 2 of the officer's recommendation to require use of a temporary barrier to prevent use of the section of the car park which was north of Homestead Cottages and were adjacent to Holm Place and The Bear House. It was also agreed to require, by a further condition, that the lighting in this area be switched off between 8pm to 7am; and that the lighting for the rest of the site be switched off between 12.30am and 7am.

Furthermore, in the interest of further protecting nearby residential amenity, a condition was added to stipulate that no servicing or deliveries should take place between midnight and 7am, during Monday to Saturday; nor midnight to 9am on Sunday. To this effect, it was agreed to also add a further condition to stipulate that the gates at the entrance of the site from the A30 should be closed between the hours of 12:30am to 7.30am.

The Officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Morgan Rise, seconded by Councillor Liz Noble and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 21/0901 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report, as amended and the additional conditions.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that:

- i. Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that the Committee had received various pieces of correspondence in respect of the application;
- ii. Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that:
  - a) She had met with the applicant onsite alongside other Ward Councillors and local residents;
  - b) She had attended a Licensing Sub-Committee meeting in respect of a Licensing application for the site, but she came into the meeting with an open mind.
  - c) She had been copied into correspondence between neighbours and the former restaurant manager regarding noise disturbance complaints;
- iii. Councillor Valerie White declared that:
  - a) She had met with the applicant onsite alongside other Ward Councillors and local residents;
  - b) She had attended a Licensing Sub-Committee meeting in respect of a Licensing application for the site, but she came 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 Officer Recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Stuart Black, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Liz Noble, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

**7/P Application Number 20/0494 - Windlesham Garden Centre, London Road, Windlesham, Surrey, GU20 6LL**

The application was for the demolition of the existing glass house and other buildings on site and the erection of a replacement building within A1 use. (Retrospective).

This application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, the application had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Victoria Wheeler due to concern that the proposal was inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Reference was made to the Castle Grove Nursery application and dismissed appeal (ref. 18/1118) having regard to the loss of glasshouses and the need for very special circumstances.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

**“UPDATE**

**Opening hours** – the applicant has clarified that the opening hours are 8am-6pm Monday to Saturday and 10am – 6pm on Sundays. They have stated that small units such as these are not restricted under the Sunday Trading Act.

**Occupation of the units** - The applicant has advised also that one of the units has been recently occupied, and the tenant is a sustainable clothing retailer, although the unit has not been fully fitted out yet and the applicant advises that this is a temporary opening. The tenants for the remaining two units are not yet known.”

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Morgan Rise, seconded by Councillor Robin Perry and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 20/0494 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer's report.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that:

- i. Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that:
  - a) She had met with the applicant onsite alongside other Ward Councillors and local residents;
  - b) She had attended a Licensing Sub-Committee meeting in respect of a Licensing application for the site, but she came into the meeting with an open mind.
  - c) She had been copied into correspondence between neighbours and the former restaurant manager regarding noise disturbance complaints;

- ii. Councillor Valerie White declared that:
  - a) She had met with the applicant onsite alongside other Ward Councillors and local residents;
  - b) She had attended a Licensing Sub-Committee meeting in respect of a Licensing application for the site, but she came 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 Officer Recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Cliff Betton, Stuart Black, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, and Graham Tapper.

Voting against the Officer Recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Liz Noble, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Chairman