

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning  
Applications Committee held at Council  
Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll  
Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 19  
January 2023**

---

+ 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  
\* In attendance virtually, did not vote

Members in Attendance: Cllrs Paul Deach and Pat Tedder

Officers Present: Alistair Barnes, Arboricultural Officer  
Sarita Bishop, Principal Planning Officer  
Duncan Carty, Principal Planning Officer  
Gavin Chinniah, Head of Planning  
Sarah Shepherd, Senior Solicitor  
Chris Esson, Adult Social Care, Surrey County Council  
Julia Greenfield, Corporate Enforcement Manager  
Tom Lawlor, NHS Integrated Care Board  
Katie Newton, Adult Social Care, Surrey County Council  
Rowan Speed, Planning Officer  
Nick Steevens, Strategic Director: Environment & Community  
Navil Rahman, Principal Planning Officer  
Iain Williams, Development Management Team Leader

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

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2022 be agreed as being a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **45/P Corporate Enforcement Quarter 2 Update**

The Committee received a report providing an update on the work of the Council's Corporate Enforcement Team between 24<sup>th</sup> September 2022 and 31<sup>st</sup> December 2022.

The Committee was informed that following a successful round of recruitment two new Senior Corporate Enforcement Officers would start working with the team during January 2023 and Bex Green had been promoted to the post of Principal Planning Enforcement Officer.

During the reporting period, the Planning Enforcement Team investigated 52 allegations of planning breaches of which 14 were deemed to have not breached planning

regulations. One Enforcement Notice had been issued, One Breach of Condition Notice had been issued and one High Court Injunction had been obtained and served.

It was noted that the Planning Inspectorate was currently taking longer to determine appeals than in the past. It was agreed that where enforcement work had been delayed due to the submission of an appeal to the Planning Inspectorate then this information would be included in future reports and members would be kept abreast of any developments.

The Committee noted the update.

#### **46/P Tree Preservation Order 06-22 - Brompton Gardens**

The Committee considered a report seeking the approval of a Tree Preservation Order on trees within and adjacent to Brompton Gardens, West End, Woking.

The Tree Preservation Order (TPO) had been served on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2022 to protect seven trees within the immediate vicinity of Brompton Gardens and three objections were subsequently received. The objections cited concerns that the TPO was unreasonable and targeted residents of Brompton Gardens and not the wider countryside. It was also considered disproportionate to place restrictions on current residents.

The Committee was informed that, whilst a TPO had not been imposed when the development had originally been built, the impact of developments on trees built up over time and the imposition of the TPO at this juncture would ensure that sufficient root volume would be maintained around the trees in question to enable their long term health and survival.

The Officer recommendation to confirm the Tree Preservation Order was proposed by Councillor Wheeler, seconded by Councillor Lewis, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED** that Tree Preservation Order 06/22 be confirmed.

#### **NOTE 1**

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, Paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in favour of the motion to confirm the Tree Preservation Order was as follows:

Voting in favour of the motion to confirm the order:

Councillors Alleway, Barnett, Black, Hawkins, Lewis, Perry, Ratiram, Whitcroft, Wheeler and White.

Voting against the motion to confirm the order:

Councillors Betton and Tapper.

#### **47/P Application Number 21/0544/FFU: Kings Lodge Care Home, 122 Kings Ride, Camberley, GU15 4LZ\***

The application was for the erection of 2 two storey buildings with accommodation in the roof and roof terrace to provide a 24 bedroom specialist early onset dementia nursing home and a 40 bedroom respite and respite centre together with associated car parking (including amendments to the existing parking layout), access arrangements and landscaping.

As the application had triggered the Council's public speaking scheme Ms. Sarah Parkin spoke in support of the application.

The application site was within the Countryside (beyond the Green Belt) on the east side of Kings Ride and to the north of the settlement of Camberley and lies close to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA).

It was reported that in February 2020, the Planning Inspectorate had dismissed an appeal in respect of planning application 16/0779 for the erection of 4no. blocks to provide 21no. two /three bed units and 20 two bedroom units of extra care residential accommodation on the same site. The appeal decision cited as grounds for refusal the fact that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area (including its countryside setting) and impact that it would have on the SPA. Due to how recently the Appeal Decision had been made it was considered to be a material consideration when considering the current application (Application 21/0544/FFU).

A comparison of application 16/0779 and the current application (21/0544) showed that although the block that was proposed at the front of the property in the current application (Zone 1) was considered to have been sufficiently reduced in scale to ameliorate the objections cited in the Planning Appeal Decision the block proposed for the rear of the site (Zone 2) was not considered to be sufficiently different to override the concerns in the Appeal Decision.

It was acknowledged that whilst the provision of healthcare services was not a planning concern, the development was situated outside the settlement area and the benefits the development might bring to an area had to be balanced against the impact that the development would have on the character area. To this end advice had been sought from the local Integrated Care Board and the Adult Social Care Team at Surrey County Council as to the level of demand for the facilities that the proposed development would provide.

The Committee was informed that in respect of people with early onset dementia it was County Council's Policy to support people to live in their own homes for as long as possible or accommodate them through some form of alternative care provision for example rehabilitation units, or supported accommodation. Consequently the Council expected that only three or four people a year would be placed in a care home of the type proposed. The Committee was informed that whilst there was a shortage of care home beds nationally when compared to neighbouring authorities Surrey Heath currently had the most care home beds per capita. The geographical location of the proposed development within the Borough would also attract residents from outside Surrey and the Integrated Care Board expressed concern that this combined with the expected increase in the number of care home residents would place an untenable pressure on primary care providers locally.

It was considered that size of the block that was proposed at the rear of the site would have a harmful urbanising impact on the openness and intrinsic rural character of the Countryside and would have an adverse visual impact on views from the public footpath at the rear. In addition there was insufficient evidence to support the need for either an early onset dementia facility or a reablement centre of the type proposed in the area and as such it was not considered to be a sustainable development and therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies CP1, CP2, DM9 and DM14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

The Officer recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Lewis, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED** that application 21/0544/FFU be refused.

#### **NOTE 1**

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, Paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in favour of the motion to refuse the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the motion to refuse:

Councillors Alleway, Barnett, Black, Hawkins, Lewis, Perry, Ratiram, Whitcroft, Wheeler and White.

Voting against the motion to refuse:

Councillors Betton and Tapper.

#### **48/P Application Number 22/1166/ADV: 129A London Road, Camberley, GU15 3JY**

The application was for retrospective advertisement consent for the erection of a hoarding to support signage advertising Camberley town Centre. The hoarding replaced a previous one which had reached the end of its usable life and was required to provide protection to pedestrians from the derelict and vacant buildings between 129 and 139 London Road.

It was noted that the application was for retrospective permission because the previous hoardings had been declared unsafe and their replacement had been done as a matter of urgency.

The officer recommendation to grant the application, subject to the conditions in the report and the update sheet, was proposed by Councillor Betton, seconded by Councillor Perry, put to the vote and carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED** that application 22/1166/ADV be approved.

#### **NOTE 1**

It was noted for the record that the Council was the applicant.

#### **49/P Application Number 22/0821/FFU: Former Garrison Church of St Barbara, Deepcut Bridge Road, Deecut, GU16 6RS\***

The application was for internal and external alterations to the former Garrison Church of Barbara, a Grade II listed building. The application included the part demolition of the north east elevation of the church and erection of a single storey side extension to provide a church hall.

As the application had triggered the Council's public speaking scheme Mr Keith Maynard spoke in support of the application.

It was considered that not only would the development of the proposed church hall provide a valuable community facility but it would also secure the long term retention, maintenance and use of a Grade II listed building. It was expected that the proposals would cause limited harm to the Grade II listed building however on balance it was considered that this would constitute "less than substantial harm" for the purposes of Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The officer proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions in the officer report and the update sheet was proposed by Councillor Whitcroft, seconded by Councillor White, put to the vote and carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED** that application 22/0821/FFU be approved.

NOTE 1

It was noted for the record that all members of the Committee had received correspondence from SKANSKA.

NOTE 2

It was noted for the record that Councillor Whitcroft had attended meetings with representatives from SKANSKA and the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) in her capacity as ward councilor.

**50/P Application Number 22/0820/LLB: Former Garrison Church of St Barbara, Deepcut Bridge Road, Deepcut, GU16 6RS**

The application was for listed building consent for internal and external alterations to the former Garrison Church of St Barbara's, a Grade II listed building to include part demolition of the north east elevation and erection of a single story side extension to provide a church hall.

In considering whether to grant planning permission, Section 16(2) of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Area Act 1990 imposed a legal duty on planning authorities to "have special regard to the desirability of preserving buildings or its setting or any feature of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

The building in question was considered to be a rare surviving example of a tin tabernacle church and was as a result of high architectural significance. Furthermore the lack of alteration since its construction, in circa 1900, reinforced this significance. Historic England had confirmed that the proposed works would allow for the provision of a well designed functional annex which was sympathetic to the character of the listed building with no adverse impact on the historic setting. It was also considered that any harm caused to the building's heritage would be outweighed by the public benefits that would be brought about through the provision of facilities and services that would contribute to securing the future community use of the building and help safeguard the long term conservation of the building.

The officer recommendation to grant Listed building Consent, subject to the conditions in the officer's report and the update sheet, was proposed by Councillor Betton, seconded by Councillor Black, put to the vote and carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED** that application 22/0820/LLB be approved.

NOTE 1

It was noted for the record that all members of the Committee had received correspondence from SKANSKA.

NOTE 2

It was noted for the record that Councillor Whitcroft had attended meetings with representatives from SKANSKA and the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) in her capacity as ward councilor.

**51/P Application Number 22/0233/RRM: Southern SANG, Princess Royal Barracks, Brunswick Road Deepcut, GU16 6RN**

The application was for approval of reserved matters for the Southern SANG and SANGS link (phases 5a, 5b and 5c) pursuant to condition 4 (reserved matters, access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) and the submission of partial details to comply with

conditions 16 (detailed ecological management strategy & management plan), 29 (tree retention and protection plans), 32 (hard and soft landscaping) and 33 (landscape management plan) of planning permission ref: 12/0546 dated 04 April 2014 (as amended) and Schedule 5 Part 2 (Provision of SANG land) of the Section 106 agreement dated 17 April 2014 as varied.

It was noted that the application had been deferred from the Committee's meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2022 to enable a resolution to be sought in relation to vehicles from Pirbright Barracks using Brunswick Road to access local training areas. It was reported that following the decision to defer, the Defence Infrastructure Organisation had confirmed that the gate which permitted access from Pirbright Barracks had been closed to all traffic on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2022. Amended plans had also been submitted proposing the installation a new barrier located to the east of the access into the Officers' Mess site to prevent vehicles travelling along the road except in an emergency.

The officer recommendation to grant the application, subject to the conditions in the report and the update sheet, was proposed by Councillor Betton, seconded by Councillor Tapper, put to the vote and carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED** that application 22/0233/RRM be approved.

**NOTE 1**

It was noted for the record that all members of the Committee had received correspondence from SKANSKA.

**NOTE 2**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Whitcroft had attended meetings with representatives from SKANSKA and the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) in her capacity as ward councilor.

**52/P Application Number 19/2193/MPO: Deepcut Bridge Road Improvements, Deepcut Bridge Road, Deepcut, GU16 6RN**

The application was for environmental improvements on Deepcut Bridge Road between Camberley Manor Care Home to the north and just beyond the British Telecom Deepcut Telephone Exchange to the south.

The proposed scheme would improve the existing streetscape along Deepcut Bridge Road through the integration of on street parking into the design of the highway, provide additional soft landscaping, improve the visual appearance of the highway environment and provide a combined footway and cycleway alongside the eastern side of the road.

It was reported that further correspondence had been received from Surrey County Council, in their capacity as the Highways Authority, in relation to the colour and type of block pavements that were to be used in the Section 278 works; it was proposed that decisions on these would be delegated to officers in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee.

Concerns about the width of the combined cycle way and footpath being less than the 3m recommended by the Department of Transport were acknowledged however it was stressed that widening it to the recommended width along the cycle footway's entire length would necessitate the removal of a significant number of health, mature trees; something that was opposed by local residents and ward councillors. The Committee was informed that Surrey County Council had confirmed that they were satisfied that the proposed scheme was acceptable from a safety point of view.

The Officer recommendation that the application, as set out in the report and the update sheet, be approved was proposed by Councillor Whitcroft, seconded by Council Wheeler, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED** that application 19/2193/MPO be agreed.

**NOTE 1**

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, Paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in favour of the motion to approve the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the motion to approve:

Councillors Alleway, Barnett, Betton, Black, Hawkins, Lewis, Perry, Ratiram, Whitcroft, Wheeler and White

Voting against the motion to approve:

Councillor Tapper.

**NOTE 2**

It was noted for the record that all members of the Committee had received correspondence from SKANSKA.

**NOTE 3**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Whitcroft had attended meetings with representatives from SKANSKA and the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) in her capacity as ward councillor.

**53/P Application Number 22/0944/FFU: Valley End Farm, Brick Hill, Chobham, GU24 8TE**

The application was for the erection of a single storey side extension and construction of an outdoor swimming pool to the rear.

It was noted that the application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation however Councillor Wheeler had called in the application due to concerns over the impact that it would have on the openness of the Green Belt.

The Committee was informed the 12% increase in floorspace and 10.5% volume increase that would arise following the construction of the extension was well below the acceptable threshold of 30%. Consequently the proposed extension was not considered to be a disproportionate addition to the main building. It was noted that the proposed swimming pool did not require planning permission and could be built under permitted development rights.

The Officer recommendation to approve the application, subject to the officer report and the update sheet, was proposed by Councillor Betton, seconded by Councillor perry, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED** that application 22/0944/FFU be approved.

**NOTE 1**

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, Paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in favour of the motion to approve the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the motion to approve:

Councillors Alleway, Barnett, Betton, Black, Hawkins, Lewis, Perry, Ratiram, Tapper, Whitcroft and White

Voting against the motion to approve:

None

Abstaining:

Councillor Wheeler

**54/P Application Number 22/0490/LLB: 63A High Street, Bagshot, GU19 5AH**

The application was for the internal refurbishment of windows and door to the Grade II Listed Building, together with alterations to upgrade existing fire doors with the installation of intumescent strips and smoke seals and raising the floor level of the ground floor W/Cs and door openings to improve their accessibility.

It was considered that the proposed works would not result in any significant harm to either the quality and setting of the building or the wider surrounding area.

The officer recommendation to grant listed building consent, as set out in the officers' report and the update sheet was proposed by Councillor Perry, seconded by Councillor Lewis put to the vote and carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED** that application 22/0490/LLB be approved.

**NOTE 1**

It was noted for the record that the Council was the owner of the building.

**NOTE 2**

It was noted for the record that Councillor White was Chairman of the Library Trustees which occupied the building.

Chairman