

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning  
Applications Committee held at  
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath  
House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15  
3HD on 9 June 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

Substitutes: Cllr Morgan Rise (In place of Cllr Liz Noble)

Members in Attendance: Cllr Paul Deach and Cllr Josephine Hawkins

Officers Present: Alistair Barnes, Duncan Carty, Gavin Chinniah  
Jonathan Partington, Eddie Scott, Sarah Shepherd and  
Luke Simpson

**8/P Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The notes of the meeting held on 5 May 2022 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**9/P Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 02-22**

The Committee received a report which sought authority to confirm Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 02-22. As an objection to the order had been received, the decision whether to confirm the order was reserved to the Planning Applications Committee.

Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 08/21 was served on the 1st of September 2021 to protect 1 x Beech Tree at the property of 19 Highclere Drive, Camberley. The TPO was made in response to a residents concern that the tree was about to be imminently felled, which was indeed the case and so the need for a Tree Preservation Order was considered expedient. Following the expiration of TPO 08/21, a new order, 02/22/TPO was subsequently served.

**RESOLVED that Tree Preservation Order 02/22 be confirmed.**

**10/P Application Number: 21/0769 - Frimhurst Farm, Deepcut Bridge Road,**

## **Deepcut, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 6RF**

The application was for the erection of a residential development of 65 dwellings along with associated estate roads and accesses onto Deepcut Bridge Road, car parking, bin stores and external landscaping following the demolition of all existing buildings.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

### **“Further clarification**

#### **Foul and surface water outlets:**

In 2014, shared private sewers were adopted by the water utilities companies – in this case Thames Water. There is no policy for or against raised foul sewers and it would be a matter for Thames Water to provide an alternative sewer provision in this location, if it were required. It is understood that the landowner (and therefore applicant) has the right to use this foul sewer.

The Local Lead Flood Authority (Surrey County Council) [LLFA] has advised regarding the drainage and flood risk matters (see below). Thames Water do not normally comment on planning applications and have not done so in this case. They are, however, informed of all applications and will comment where they consider it is required. Any connections to the Thames Water drainage system would be a matter for that organisation.

In terms of the surface water outlet into the Basingstoke Canal, the applicant has advised that an outflow to the canal currently exists and has been used for over 20 years and, as such, a drainage easement exists and has been acquired by prescription.

#### **Other matters:**

It is not considered that enhancements to the canal towpath for the length of the towpath, or in part, would meet the tests for imposing conditions or other limitations on a development of this scale. It is understood that enhancements to the canal network are to be provided by the much larger Deepcut (Mindenhurst) development.

The applicant has indicated that the development will be phased, constructing from east to west across the site. As such, amendments to Conditions 5 and 26 have been requested.

### **Further Consultee Comments**

- The Local Lead Flood Authority has raised no objections to the proposal subject to conditions and the following advice:

*“Discussions are ongoing with the applicant and the Canal Trust [the Basingstoke Canal Authority] in relation to the existing historic unconsented*

*outflow into the canal. At this time, the applicant has demonstrated that on-site management of surface water is proposed in accordance with national guidance. Approval to connect to the canal has not yet been given and legal issues will need to be resolved should planning permission be granted and prior to the agreement of details pursuant to condition.”*  
[See Amended proposed Conditions 30 and 31, below].

- The Basingstoke Canal Authority has advised that further evidence regarding the proscriptive rights to discharge surface water into the Canal is needed. They note that this is a land property matter.
- The County Archaeological Officer has confirmed that following the receipt of further details, including the recording of a Nissan hut on the site, the previously requested condition [proposed Condition 32] is now not required.
- Highways England has withdrawn their request for a construction and environment management plan condition. The condition, as requested separately by the County Highway Authority, [proposed Condition 14] remains as per the officer report.
- The Housing Services Manager raises no objection to the proposal.

## **Changes to RECOMMENDATION**

### **DELETE Condition 32**

### **AMENDED conditions (amendments in bold):**

#### **Condition 2**

The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans: 1417/100 Rev C and 1417/100-1 Rev C received on 29 April 2022; HT-Hi-Ep-x3-01, HT-Hi-Ep-x3-02, HT-Hi-01 Rev A, HT-Hi-02 Rev A, HT-Hi-Ep-01, HT-Hi-Ep-02, HT-Ep-Hi-x2-01, HT-Ep-Hi-x2-02, HT-Cr-01 Rev A, HT-Cr-02 Rev A, HT-Ok-01 Rev B, HT-Ok-02 Rev A, HT-Ok-03, HT-Ok-04, HT-Ok-05, HT-Go-01 Rev A, HT-Go-01, HT-Go-02 Rev A, HT-Lo-01 Rev A, HT-Lo-02 Rev A, HT-Lo-03, HT-Lo-04, HT-Cb-01 Rev A, HT-Cb-02 Rev A, HT-Cb-03 Rev A, HT-Ma-01 Rev A, HT-Ma-02 Rev A, HT-Ma-03 Rev A, HT-Ma-04 Rev A, HT-As-01, HT-As-02, HT-La-01 Rev A, HT-La-02 Rev A, HT-Wi-Pe-x2-Wi-01 Rev A, HT-Wi-Pe-x2-Wi-02, HT-We-Pe-x2-Wi-03, HT-Wi-Pe-x2-**Wi**-04 Rev A, HT-Wi-Pe-x3-Ra-01 Rev B, HT-Wi-Pe-x3-Ra-02 Rev A, HT-Wi-Pe-x3-Ra-03 Rev A, HT-Wi-Pe-x3-Ra-04 Rev B, HT-Pe-x2-01 Rev B, HT-Pe-x2-02 Rev B, HT-Pe-x3-01 Rev B, HT-Pe-x3-02 Rev B, HT-Pe-x3-03 Rev A, HT-Pe-x3-04 Rev A, HT-Ra-01 Rev A and HT-Ra-02 Rev A received on 6 May 2022, 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.

#### **Condition 5**

The **visitor** parking spaces shown on the approved plan 1417/100 Rev C shall be made available for use prior to the first occupation of the development and shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles. **The on-plot parking spaces shown on the approved plan 1417/100 Rev C shall be made available for use prior to the occupation of the dwelling to which it relates and shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles.**

Reason: To ensure the provision of on-site parking accommodation and to accord with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

### **Condition 26**

Details of the play space and trim trail, as identified on approved Drawing Number 1417/100 Rev C shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be provided prior to the occupation **of the 20<sup>th</sup> dwelling within the approved** development and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of future occupiers and to comply with Policy DM16 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

### **Condition 30**

The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the **local** planning authority. The design must satisfy the SuDS Hierarchy and be compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, NPPF and Ministerial Statement on SuDS. The required drainage details shall include:

**a) Evidence that the proposed final solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+40% allowance for climate change) storm events and 10% allowance for urban creep, during all stages of development. High-level overflows from the proposed infiltration basin(s) should be provided using a discharge rate of 5 litres/sec (total combined), including evidence of a viable surface water outfall.**

**b) Detailed drainage design drawings and calculations to include: a finalised drainage layout detailing the location of drainage elements, pipe diameters, levels, and long and cross sections of each element including details of any flow restrictions and maintenance/risk reducing features (silt traps, inspection chambers etc). Confirmation is required of a 1 metre unsaturated zone from the base of any proposed soakaway to the seasonal high groundwater level and confirmation of half-drain times and ground stability in proximity to the canal.**

**c) Details of how the drainage system will be protected during construction and how runoff (including any pollutants) from the development site will be managed before the drainage system is operational.**

d) Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system.

e) A plan showing exceedance flows (i.e. during rainfall greater than design events or during blockage) and how property on and off site will be protected **from increased flood risk**.

Reason: To ensure the design meets the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site and to accord with Policy DM10 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the NPPF.

### **Condition 31**

Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), provide the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key drainage elements (surface water attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls), **and confirm any defects have been rectified**.

Reason: To ensure the drainage system is constructed to the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS.

### **ADDITIONAL conditions**

#### **(New) Condition 32**

No gates shall be provided across the main access road, as shown on approved Drawing Number 1417/100 Rev C, unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To integrate this development within the wider local area and to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### **Condition 33**

Prior to completion or first occupation of the development hereby approved, whichever is the sooner; a woodland management plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The management plan should be prepared by a qualified and experienced forestry or arboricultural consultant, the Woodland Management Plan will aim to enhance the ecological value of the woodland within the control of the applicant. Details to be included must cover a period of at least 15-20 years and should include the following elements:

- a) A statement of the overall design vision for the woodland and for individual trees retained as part of the development.
- b) Type and frequency of management operations to achieve and sustain canopy, understorey, and ground cover, to remove invasive

- species and to provide reinstatement including planting where tree loss or vandalism occurs.
- c) Frequency of safety inspections, which should be at least three yearly in areas of high risk, less often in lower risk areas
  - d) Confirmation that the tree work is carried out by suitably qualified and insured tree contractors to British Standard 3998 (2010).
  - e) Special measures relating to Protected Species or habitats, e.g. intensive operations to avoid March-June nesting season or flowering periods as well as Description and evaluation of ecological features to be managed and created for protected species.
  - f) Inspection for pests, vermin and diseases and proposed remedial measures.
  - g) Recommendations relating to how trees within the immediate vicinity of properties or within private areas are to be protected, such that these are retained without the loss of their canopy or value as habitat.
  - h) Confirmation of cyclical management plan assessments and revisions to evaluate the plan's success and identification of any proposed actions, including Preparation of a costed work schedule for securing biodiversity enhancements in perpetuity;
  - i) Financial provision to ensure long term security for the woodland, including secure tenure and secure financial management.
  - j) A 5 yearly review and report, provided to the Local Authority for the duration of the plan demonstrating the ecological improvements within the site.

The Woodland Management Plan shall be implemented as approved and within a timescale agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Required to ensure that woodland areas are satisfactorily safeguarded, managed and maintained in the long term /in perpetuity in the interest of nature conservation and the visual amenity of the area and to mitigate the impact of the proposed development in accord with Policies DM9 and CP14A of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.”

As the application triggered the Council's Public Speaking scheme, Mr Geoff France spoke on behalf of the applicant on the application.

Members noted a consultation response submitted by Natural England in respect of the application. Members acknowledged Natural England's request for a Construction Environment Management Plan in reference to the Basingstoke Canal Site of Special Scientific Interest and agreed to amend Condition 14 of the Officer Report in order to allow for consultation with Natural England on the submission of the Construction Management Plan.

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

**RESOLVED that**

- I. **application 21/0769 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and planning updates, as amended; and**
- II. **the wording of the amended condition be agreed by the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Ward Councillors.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillors Helen Whitcroft and Morgan Rise declared that they had met with the applicant but came to 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 refuse the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Stuart Black, Mark Gordon, David Lewis, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

**11/P Application Number: 21/1268 - 29, 30 & 30A Brackendale Close, Camberley**

The application was for the redevelopment of site to provide 30 no. Affordable Apartments with associated access, hardstanding, carparking, landscaping, Bin and Cycle stores following the demolition of No. 29 and No. 30 Brackendale Close and associated outbuildings.

As the application triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Ms Lizzie Beresford spoke on behalf of the Brackendale Close Resident's Association in objection to the application.

Citing the nearby Scarlet Oaks development, Members felt that the level of proposed parking was inadequate for the proposed quantum of development which would have a knock-on effect on nearby residential amenity. It was agreed that an additional reason for refusal would be added to the officer's recommendation on the premise that the potential number of occupants along with visitor and disabled parking was insufficient for the location and environment and would result in an unacceptable level of cumulative impact.

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

**RESOLVED that**

- I. **application 21/1268 be refused for the reasons in the officer report, and the additional reason for refusal; and**
- II. **the wording of the additional reason for refusal be delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Ward Councillors.**

### **Note 1**

It was noted for the record that

- i. Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that he had been contacted by residents in respect of the application, but did not engage and came into the meeting with an open mind;
- ii. Councillor Cliff Betton declared that his daughter use to own and live at 28 Brackendale Close, but had since sold and moved out of the property;
- iii. Councillors Robin Perry and Edward Hawkins declared that all Committee members had received various pieces of correspondence relating to the application.

### **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 refuse the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Stuart Black, Mark Gordon, David Lewis, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

## **12/P Application Number: 21/0895 - Novartis, 200 Frimley Business Park, Frimley, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 7SR**

The application was for the demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide 4no. industrial/warehouse buildings (5no. units) (Flexible Use Class B2/B8/E(g)(i)-(iii)) together with associated landscaping works and car parking/servicing.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“Amended drawing for Units 3 and 4 have been provided which amend the cladding panel finish on the east elevation (facing the access road) for Unit 3. A corresponding amendment to Condition 2 is proposed.

The applicant has requested amendments to conditions. These include the inclusion of research and development within the range of uses. The parking demand, as indicated in the SCC parking guidance, for such a use is the same as light industrial and it falls within the business uses which are allowed in the core employment area. As such, this addition to the acceptable uses in Condition 4 is accepted.

Other suggested changes, where applicable, have been referred to the consultee who requested them and the amendments can only be agreed with their agreement. The landscape drawings provided would not provide a satisfactory level of detail and as such the proposed condition [Condition 14] will remain as shown on the agenda report. However, amendments to tree conditions [proposed



Conditions 9 and 13] have been amended and amalgamated into one condition see below.

### **Additional Consultee Comments**

The Council's Urban Design Consultant has confirmed that no objections are raised to the proposal but has raised concerns about more recent amendments to the proposed east elevation of Units 3 & 4, which face the main access road. These changes were amended to address tree concerns, and included the deletion of a row of ground floor windows and replacement with patterned cladding. The Council's Consultant would prefer the original arrangement. [Officer comment: *It is considered that these changes are not considered so harmful to warrant the refusal of this application on character grounds*].

### **Additional Representation**

One representation has been received raising an objection on the impact of light spillage on wildlife (hedgehogs, foxes, deer) and residential amenity.

### **Changes to RECOMMENDATION**

#### **AMENDED conditions (amendments in bold):**

##### **Condition 3**

The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans: 11294/PL/003, 11294/PL/004 (Units 2 and 5), 11294/PL/008, 11294/PL/011 and 11294/PL/013 received on 6 August 2021; 11294/PL/007 Rev A and 11294/PL/010 Rev A received on 10 December 2021; 11294/PL/015 Rev B received on 4 May 2022; and 11294/PL/002 Rev E and 11294/PL/005 Rev A received on 9 May 2022; **and 11294/PL/009 Rev B received on 1 June 2022;** and 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.

##### **Condition 4**

The premises shall be used for **research and development**, light industrial, general industrial or warehousing (storage and distribution) uses only; and for no other purpose (including any other purposes in Classes B2, B8 and E of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, as amended, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order). **The office accommodation shown on the approved floor plans shall only be used as ancillary offices to support the use of the unit to which it is provided.**

Reason: To support the business use of the site and that sufficient on-site parking accommodation is provided and to accord with Policies CP1, CP8, CP11 and

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

### **Condition 6**

No storage of goods, plant, equipment or materials shall take place within the curtilage of the site otherwise than within the buildings hereby approved; as shown on the approved site layout plan 11294/PL/002 Rev E.

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

### **Condition 8**

**No** development hereby permitted **except demolition** shall commence until **further** details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The design must satisfy the SuDS Hierarchy and be compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, NPPF and Ministerial Statement on SuDS. The required drainage details shall include:

- a) The results of infiltration testing completed in accordance with BRE Digest: 365 and confirmation of groundwater levels.
- b) Evidence that the proposed final solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 (+ 40% allowance for climate change (CC)) storm events, during all stages of the development. If infiltration is deemed unfeasible, associated discharge rates and storage volumes shall be provided using a maximum discharge rate of 8.8 l/s for the 1 in 1 year rainfall event and 25.8 l/s for the 1 in 100 (+CC) rainfall event.
- c) Detailed drainage design drawings and calculations to include: a finalised drainage layout detailing the location of drainage elements, pipe diameters, levels, and long and cross sections of each element including details of any flow restrictions and maintenance/risk reducing features (silt traps, inspection chambers etc)
- d) Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system.
- e) A plan showing exceedance flows (i.e. during rainfall greater than design events or during blockage) and how property on and off site will be protected.
- f) Details of how the drainage system will be protected during construction and how the runoff (including any pollutants) from the development site will be managed before the drainage system is operational.

Reason: To ensure the design meets the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site and to accord with Policy DM10 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), provide the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key drainage elements (surface water attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls).

Reason: To ensure the drainage system is constructed to the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS.

### **Condition 9**

No operations shall commence on site in connection with the development hereby approved (including demolition works, tree works, fires, soil moving, temporary access construction and / or widening or any operations involving the use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery) until **an updated** detailed Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) in accordance with BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the protective fencing is erected as required by the AMS/TPP.

The AMS and TPP shall include full details of the following:

Timing and phasing of Arboricultural works in relation to the approved development.

Detailed tree felling and pruning specification in accordance with BS3998:2010 Recommendations for Tree Works.

Details of a tree protection scheme in accordance with BS5837:2012: which provides for the retention and protection of trees, shrubs and hedges growing on or adjacent to the site which are shown to be retained on the approved plan and trees which are the subject of any Tree Preservation Order. A specification for protective fencing during both demolition and construction phases and a plan indicating the alignment of the protective fencing. Details to include a specification for ground protection within Root Protection Areas (RPA's).

Details of any construction and demolition works required within the root protection area as defined by BS5837:2012 or otherwise protected in the approved Tree Protection Scheme.

Details of the location of any underground services and methods of installation which make provision for protection and the long-term retention of the trees. No

services shall be dug or laid into the ground other than in accordance with the approved details.

Detailed levels and cross-sectional diagrams to show the construction of any roads, parking areas and driveways within Root Protection Areas as proposed, where the installation is to be constructed using a no-dig specification, demonstrating that they can be accommodated where they meet with any adjacent building damp proof courses and adjacent surfaces.

Details of any changes in ground level, including existing and proposed spot levels required within the root protection area as defined by BS5837:2012 or otherwise protected in the approved Tree Protection Scheme.

Details of the arrangements for the implementation, supervision, monitoring and reporting of works required to comply with the arboricultural method statement.

Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

No development or other operations shall take place except in complete accordance with the approved tree protection scheme and Arboricultural Method Statement.

**Where any excavation is proposed to take place either within root protection areas or within tree protection fencing for the removal and or reinstatement of utility services, no activity will commence within these areas until a full Arboricultural Method and Monitoring Statement is provided which demonstrates how these activities will be carried out has been submitted too and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

**Thereafter the works shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details until completion of the development.**

Reason: To protect trees which contribute to the visual amenities of the site and surrounding area and to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Condition 18**

The development hereby approved will be undertaken in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment & Outline Drainage Strategy Report dated February 2022 by Baynham Meikle Partnership Limited [Ref: 13060/R100 Revision 1.2] and Drawing Nos 13060/111 Rev P3 and Drawing Nos 13060/112 Rev P3 received on 28 February 2022; with the recommendations in that document implemented in full.

**Reason: In the interests of nature conservation and to accord with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.“**

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

**RESOLVED that application 21/0895 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and updates.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that Committee members had received a letter from the applicant's planning adviser.

**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 Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Stuart Black, Mark Gordon, David Lewis, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

**13/P Application Number: 21/1176 - Solstrand, Station Road, Bagshot, Surrey, GU19 5AS**

The Committee were advised that the application was to be deferred for further investigation on drainage matters.

The deferral was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 21/1176 be deferred.**

Chairman