

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 4 August 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\* for Cllr Graham Tapper

Members in Attendance: Cllr Paul Deach and Cllr Pat Tedder

Officers Present: Duncan Carty  
Gavin Chinniah  
Sarita Bishop  
Julia Greenfield  
William Hinde  
Jonathan Partington  
Melissa Turney

\*Councillors Peter Barnett, Morgan Rise and Victoria Wheeler arrived part way through consideration of Application Number 21/1176. Under the terms of the adopted Constitution they were unable to take part in the deliberations and voting on that item.

#### **14/P Minutes of Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held on 9<sup>th</sup> June 2022 be approved as being a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **15/P Planning Enforcement Performance Report**

The Committee received a report summarising the work of the Council's Corporate Enforcement Service during the period 25<sup>th</sup> March 2022 to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2022.

It was reported that the Corporate Enforcement Team had investigated 51 allegations of planning breaches during the reporting period. Of these, no breaches of planning conditions had been found in 13 cases, 2 breaches had been resolved, planning applications which covered the matters under investigation had

been received in respect of 2 cases, 34 cases were pending further investigation and 4 Planning Enforcement Notices had been issued.

It was reported that resourcing continued to be an issue for the service and was impacting on the Council's ability to carry out effective monitoring work. Notwithstanding this, the Enforcement Team continued to exceed its key performance indicator target with 88% of initial site visits being completed within the target timescales in the Local Enforcement Plan.

The Committee noted the report.

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

The application was for the erection of 3 detached three bedroom dwellings with associated car parking, refuse storage and collection point and landscaping following the demolition of the existing dwelling and all associated structures.

As the application had triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Steve Wright spoke in objection to the application and Mr Nicholas Cobbold, spoke in support of the application.

Members were advised that the application had been deferred to obtain further information on drainage and the following update was provided.

*"The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), Surrey County Council, has advised that the non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage do not apply for minor applications. The applicant should still follow the drainage hierarchy of disposal and implement SuDS where feasible. However, as the Applicant has not provided full details of the mitigation proposals and it was suggested that the following condition is included on the Decision Notice should permission be granted.*

*Suggested Condition: The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. The design must satisfy the SuDS Hierarchy and be compliant with the NPPF and the accompanying PPG.*

*Reason: To ensure the development does not increase flood risk on or off site.*

The Council's Drainage Engineer has discussed the matter with the LLFA and has confirmed that the level of detail within drainage conditions 18 and 19 remains suitable and no changes are proposed to these."

The Committee raised concerns about access to the rear of the properties in the event of an emergency, the adequacy of the parking provision including the possibility that the garage could be converted to accommodation at a future date increasing pressure on the site, the lack of detail in relation to the drainage of foul and storm and the increased pressure that the additional housing would place on the surrounding highways. The Committee was advised that the County Highways Authority had assessed the application and were satisfied that there would be

sufficient space to access the rear properties in the event of an emergency and that the proposed parking provision was in line with Surrey County Council's recommended parking standards. It was agreed that a condition preventing the conversion of the garage to accommodation should be added to the application.

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Betton, seconded by Councillor Hawkins put to the vote and lost.

Following discussion about reasons for refusal and questions raised in relation to the proposed development, Members indicated a preference for refusing the planning application based on character and design, highways, amenity impact along with drainage. However, the Committee was referred to the report and advice received from consultees to the planning application in relation to each area identified for refusal. Furthermore, it was advised that all of the reasons given were not defensible at appeal and therefore were not considered as reason for refusal for the planning application. Although, the drainage element of the application was conditioned, Members requested upfront information to satisfy this concern. It was therefore agreed that the application would be deferred only on this element of the application and would be reported back to the Committee once details were worked up in full on a drainage strategy for the site. Once this drainage strategy had been completed, the application would be reported back to the Committee for consideration of this outstanding matter only.

A revised recommendation to defer the application to enable more detailed work to be done on the drainage matters was proposed by Councillor Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Alleway, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that the application be deferred to enable more details to be obtained in respect of drainage matters on the property.**

#### **NOTE 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillors Mark Gordon and Valerie White declared that they had met with the neighbouring residents 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, and the officer's original recommendation to grant the application, was as follows:

Voting in favour of the officer recommendation to approve the application:  
Councillors Cliff Betton, Edward Hawkins, Robin Perry and Darryl Ratiram

Voting against the officer recommendation to approve the application:  
Councillors Graham Alleway, Stuart Black, Mark Gordon, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Liz Noble, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

#### **Note 3:**

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, Paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application, and the revised recommendation to defer the application, was as follows:

Voting in favour of the revised recommendation to defer the application:  
Councillors Graham Alleway, Cliff Betton, Stuart Black, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Liz Noble, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

**17/P Application Number 21/1370: Princess Royal Barracks Loop Road, Brunswick Road, Deepcut, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 6RN,**

The application was for reserved matters in respect of the Loop Road phase 5k pursuant to condition 4 (Reserved matters, access, layout, scale appearance and landscaping) and the partial submission of details pursuant to conditions 16 (detailed ecological management strategy and management plan), 29 (tree retention and protection plans), 32 (hard and soft landscaping) and 33 (landscape management plan) of planning permission reference: 12/0546, dated 4<sup>th</sup> April 2014 (as amended) and Schedule 5 Part 8 (provision of the Other Open Space) of the Section 106 agreement dated 17<sup>th</sup> April 2014 as varied.

The Committee was informed that the application was for a significant piece of infrastructure work that formed an integral part of the overall movement strategy for the site providing vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access through the Mindenhurst development. It was noted that conditions had been placed on the application to ensure that the impact on existing and proposed trees would be fully considered with appropriate controls being in place during the works.

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

**RESOLVED that application 21/1370 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and update sheet, as amended.**

**NOTE 1**

Councillor Hawkins indicated that the Committee had received correspondence from Skanska in relation to the application.

**18/P Application Number 21/1288: Princess Royal Barracks ANGST, Brunswick Road, Deepcut, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 6RN**

The application was in respect of a Reserved Matters application for Blackdown Road ANGST and Sports Pitches (Phase5g and 5h) pursuant to condition 4 (reserved matters, access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) and partial submission of details pursuant to conditions 16 (detailed ecological management strategy and management plan), 21 (LAPS and LEAPS), 29 (tree retention and protection plans), 32 (hard and Soft landscaping), 33 (landscape management plan) and 43 (foul drainage) attached to 12/0546 dated 4<sup>th</sup> April 2014 (As amended), 12/0546 as amended by 18/0619 and 1/1002 and Schedules 5 Parts 5 (ANGST), 9 (LEAPS AND LAPS) and 12 (Blackdown Playing Field and Upgrade to Blackdown Playing Field of the Section 106 agreement dated 17<sup>th</sup> April 2014 as varied pursuant to the T\_CP (Modification and Discharge of Planning Obligations) 1992.

It was clarified that the land that the playground on Woodend Road currently occupied was owned by the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) and leased to Surrey Heath Borough Council. The land would eventually be transferred into the Council's ownership and a financial contribution would be provided for the play area. Ongoing responsibility for the maintenance of the air raid shelter within the woodland was still to be determined and this had been conditioned for in the application.

The Committee commended the quality of the Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) that had already been delivered on the Mindenhurst development and considered that the application would enhance the area further.

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Morgan Rise seconded by Councillor Cliff Betton and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 21/1288 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and update sheet, as amended**

**NOTE 1**

Councillor Hawkins indicated that the Committee had received correspondence from Skansa in relation to the application.

**19/P Application Number 21/1333: 134 & 136 London Road, Bagshot, Surrey, GU19 5BZ**

The applications was for all reserved matters (landscaping) pursuant to outline planning permission 20/0090/OOU (erection of 26 residential units (Class C3) following the demolition of both existing dwellings with new vehicular access off London Road. Access, appearance, layout and scale to be considered with landscaping reserved).

This application proposed the discharge of the landscaping reserved matter.

It was confirmed that conditions to ensure the replacement of the proposed wildflower meadow in the event that it was damaged within five years had been added to the application.

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

**RESOLVED that application 21/1333 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and update sheet, as amended.**

**20/P Application Number 21/0344: 99 - 109 Guildford Road, Lightwater, Surrey, GU18 5SB**

The application was for the erection of 5 buildings to comprise 18 terrace style houses and 12 apartments within a flatted block with associated landscaping, access and car parking following demolition of the existing buildings on site.

It was noted that the application was subject to a non-determination appeal and consequently the Planning Inspectorate was now the determining authority.

The Officer recommendations that an objection to the application on the following grounds be placed on record was proposed by Councillor Valerie White, seconded by Councillor Betton and carried unanimously.

Reasons for refusal:

1. The proposed development by reasons of its layout and density, dominated by a central parking and servicing area with a lack of soft landscaping, would result in an incongruous form of development. In addition, the flatted block that would provide insufficient amenity space and the height, depth and crown roof of this block would be harmful to the visual amenities of the streetscene. As such, the overall proposal would amount to an over development of the site that would fail to respect and successfully improve the character and quality of the area and fail to comply with Principles B1 and B5(d) of the Lightwater Village Design Statement SPD 2007; Principles 6.2, 6.3, 6.4 and 6.7 of the Residential Design Guide SPD 2017; and Policies CP2 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.
2. The proposed development would provide insufficient private amenity space for the flatted block which would result in poor living conditions for future occupiers failing to comply with Principles 8.5 and 8.6 of the Residential Design Guide SPD 2017; and Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.
3. It has not been demonstrated that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the health of trees around the site failing to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.
4. The Local Planning Authority, following an Appropriate Assessment and in the light of available information, is unable to satisfy itself that the proposal (in combination with other projects) would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and the relevant Site of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI). In this respect significant concerns remain with regard to the adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA in that there is likely to be an increase in dog walking, general recreational use and damage to the habitat and the protected species within the protected areas. Accordingly, since the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that Regulation 62 (of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (Habitats Regulations)) applies in this case then it must refuse the application in accordance with Regulation 61(5) of the Habitats Regulations and Article 6(3) of Directive 92/43/EE. For the same reason the proposal conflicts with the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 (as saved) and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD 2019.

5. The proposal fails to provide the necessary mix of affordable housing, including First Homes and social rented units, and no viability evidence has been provided to justify the applicant's position. Furthermore, in the absence of a completed legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the proposal fails to secure any provision for affordable housing. The application is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of Policy CP5 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, the National Planning Policy Framework, and advice within the Surrey Heath First Homes Policy Guidance Note 2021 and Written Ministerial Statement (24.05.21).

**RESOLVED that application 21/0344 would have been refused for the reasons set out in the officer report.**

**21/P Exclusion of Public and Press**

**RESOLVED** that pursuant to Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of item 11 Planning Enforcement Priority Cases as the items involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 3:

- (1) Information relating to any individual
- (3) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

**22/P Planning Enforcement Priority Cases**

The Committee considered a report setting out the current status of planning enforcement priority cases.

**RESOLVED that the contents of the report be noted.**

Chairman