

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning  
Applications Committee held at  
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath  
House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15  
3HD on 22 February 2024**

---

+ Cllr Cliff Betton (Chair)  
+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler (Vice Chair)

+ Cllr Mary Glauert	- Cllr Kevin Thompson
+ Cllr Shaun Garrett	+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+ Cllr Liz Noble	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr David O'Mahoney	+ Cllr Richard Wilson
+ Cllr Murray Rowlands	

+ Present

- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes:

Councillor David Whitcroft

Members in Attendance:

Cllr Jonny Cope,  
Cllr Nirmal Kang,  
Cllr Sarbie Kang  
Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath  
Cllr Pat Tedder.

Officers Present:

Gavin Chinniah - Head of Planning  
Jonathan Partington - Development Manager  
William Hinde - Principal Solicitor  
Duncan Carty - Principal Planning Officer  
Navil Rahman - Principal Planning Officer  
Julia Taylor - Planning Officer  
Eddie Scott - Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Jenny Murton - Senior Democratic Services Officer

**40/P Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held on 25 January 2024 were approved as being a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**41/P Application Number: 23/0486 - The Ferns, Woodlands Lane, Windlesham, Surrey, GU20 6AS\***

This planning application related to demolition of existing dwelling and erection of seven dwellings with associated landscaping and parking.

The application had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee after being called in by Councillor Victoria Wheeler, owing to concerns the proposal did not adhere to the Windlesham Neighbourhood Plan, the loss of trees, the ecological impact of the development and the overdevelopment of the site.

There was an amendment to condition 5 in the Planning Updates report to include requirement for hedge planting to the boundary of the site.

In accordance with the Council's public speaking scheme, Ann Fenton on behalf of the Windlesham Heathpark Wood Group and Tony Murphy spoke in Objection to the application and Katie Walker (Agent) spoke For the application.

The Committee questioned the Agent on the density of surrounding properties in Woodlands Lane and requested the sizes of the proposed parking spaces, garages and garage entrances to be confirmed. The Head of Planning confirmed that the application proposed 22 dwellings per hectare.

Sustainable aspects were also discussed including the distance from the proposed application's location to the nearest bus stop, and its proximity to the centre of Windlesham and other local amenities.

It was also confirmed by the Agent that none of the proposed dwellings would be classified as affordable housing but this was in line with relevant regulations.

The Committee queried why application 15/0590, the erection of up to 140 dwellings and community facilities, with associated landscaping, open space, car parking and the use of land to provide a SANG, that was allowed on appeal back in July 2017 had still not been built. The Head of Planning confirmed that a subsequent application was approved in 2022 and the delay was due to ongoing legal negotiations

The Committee questioned if this application (23/0486/FFU) formed part of mitigation for the Heathpark Wood site and the case officer confirmed it did not. The case officer also clarified that the application's land did not need to be registered on the Council's brownfield register to be considered a brownfield site.

The Committee wanted clarification that details regarding density and garage and parking space sizes adhered to the Windlesham Neighbourhood Plan. Members asked that if it could not be determined that it did indeed meet the requirements in the adopted Windlesham Neighbourhood Plan, could the application be deferred.

The Committee questioned the figures for net new dwellings in the Windlesham Neighbourhood Plan and who was responsible for updating this Plan. The case officer confirmed that according to the Council's Local Plan, 47 net new units had been adopted in Windlesham compared to 386 net new units in West End. Surrey Heath's housing need had also increased since the adoption of the local plan by 68%.

The Committee questioned the Biodiversity Net Gain information and obligations, and it was highlighted by officers that BNG was not relevant for this application as the legislation only impacts developments of this size submitted after 2 April 2024.

The officer recommendation to grant the application subject to conditions and a legal agreement was unanimously not supported by the committee.

An alternative recommendation proposed by Councillor Victoria Wheeler, seconded by Councillor Richard Wilson, to refuse the application due to several reasons was put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 23/0486/FFU be refused due to the following reasons:**

- **The application failed to meet the minimum size standards for car garages, detailed in policies 4.1 and 4.2 in the adopted Windlesham Neighbourhood Plan.**
- **The application failed to adhere to policy 2.1 of the Windlesham Neighbourhood Plan due to its failure to maintain the established density within Windlesham village.**
- **The Urban Design consultant's objections to the proposed layout as a result of lack of place making and extent of landscaping (this can be found at 7.4.10 in the officer's report).**

**NOTE 1**

In line with Part 4, Section D, Paragraph 18 of the constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting For the amended motion to refuse the application:

Councillors, Shaun Garrett, Mary Glauert, Liz Noble, David O'Mahoney, Helen Whitcroft, Victoria Wheeler, Valerie White and Richard Wilson.

Voting Against the amended motion to refuse the application:

Councillor David Whitcroft.

Abstaining:

Councillor Cliff Betton.

**NOTE 2**

Councillors Victoria Wheeler and Richard Wilson noted for the record they had spoken to residents regarding this application who had been opposed to it.

**42/P Application Number: 23/1224 - Threapwood, 36 The Maultway, Camberley, Surrey, GU15 1PS\***

This planning application related to the redevelopment of site to provide a housing development (Class C3) comprising a mix of houses and flats (24 residential units), with associated landscaping, car and cycle parking.

This application had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee because it is a major development (a development of 10 dwellings or over).

In accordance with the Council's public speaking scheme, Maxine Camar and James Lee spoke in Objection of the application.

The Committee asked for clarification of the location of properties 12 and 13 Curtis Close in relation to the proposed application.

The Committee commented on the number of reasons to refuse the application, in particular the recommendation to refuse from Surrey County Council's Highways Authority.

The Committee questioned the topography of the proposed application's site and asked the case officer for more detail.

The Committee asked if there was a sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) plan regarding the application and it was confirmed by the case officer and Head of Planning that insufficient information had been submitted by way of a drainage scheme to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in adverse harm to the drainage and flood risk of the surrounding area (this forms part of objection 9 in the officer's report on page 62).

Councillor Cope in his role as Ward Councillor spoke in Objection of the application and questioned whether there was an impact to the properties on Oaken Copse, owing to the separation distance and the topography. The case officer confirmed there should not be an impact to the properties on Oaken Corpse.

The Committee queried if a public footpath would be lost if this application was approved and the Principal Solicitor confirmed it was not a public footpath.

The officer recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Shaun Garrett, seconded by Councillor Valerie White, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 23/1224/FFU be refused.**

**NOTE 1**

In line 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 motion to refuse the application was unanimous from all the Committee Members present.

**43/P Application: 23/1100 - Watchmoor Park, Watchmoor Road, Camberley, Surrey**

This planning application related to a hybrid planning application comprising: full planning application for the erection of one industrial and logistics unit within Use Classes E(g)(iii), B2, and B8 together with access, parking and landscaping and Outline application (all matters reserved) for the erection of up to 19,000 sqm of flexible industrial and logistics floor space within Use Classes E(g)(iii), B2, and B8 following demolition of existing buildings on land at Watchmoor Park.

The Committee was satisfied with the application and officer's report and believed it was an effective way forward regarding the creation of jobs and use of the site.

Members queried if a prospective buyer had been identified for the site and it was confirmed that a specific buyer had not been secured.

The case officer confirmed that this application would create 511 full-time equivalent jobs and an additional 137 jobs during the construction phase.

The officer recommendation to approve the application subject to conditions and a legal agreement was proposed by Councillor Mary Glauert, seconded by Councillor Murray Rowlands, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 23/1100/FFU be granted, subject to conditions and a legal agreement.**

**NOTE 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillors Cliff Betton, Shaun Garrett, Mary Glauert, Liz Noble, David O'Mahoney, Murray Rowlands, David Whitcroft, Helen Whitcroft, Valerie White and Richard Wilson had all received correspondence from the Agent for the application (23/1100/FFU), but had all come to the meeting with an open mind.

**NOTE 2**

Councillor Murray Rowlands declared he had been on an unofficial visit to the site.

**NOTE 3**

Councillor Cliff Betton declared for the record that his business is located in Watchmoor Park, but was not connected to this application.

**NOTE 4**

In line with Part 4, Section D, Paragraph 18 of the constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

All Committee Members present voted in favour of the officer recommendation to grant the application, subject to conditions and a legal agreement.

**44/P Application Number: 23/1147 - Farnborough Airport consultation**

The meeting was adjourned for a comfort break from 8:37pm to 8:41pm.

Rushmoor Borough Council is the determining authority and Surrey Heath is only a consultee. This application was being reported to the Planning Applications Committee because the proposal is a major development (i.e. is a variation of condition proposal for a development of over 1,000 sq.m.).

This consultation is by Rushmoor Borough Council (RBC) for a proposal at Farnborough Airport. This relates to a variation of condition application proposing to increasing the maximum number of flights (including weekend flights), the size

of the threshold for larger aircraft, and revised Public Safety Zone Maps. The proposals are to provide increased capacity for the airport for up to 2040. Rushmoor is expected to report the application (their reference 23/00794/REVPP) to their planning committee in March 2024.

There was an update in the Planning Updates report and the amended reason for objection was:

1. It had not been demonstrated that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on residential amenity from increased aircraft noise patterns from increased aircraft movements under, and close to, the flightpath over this Borough, **particularly noting the increases for non-weekday movements**. The assumptions of future aircraft specifications to reduce impacts on noise have not been adequately substantiated or could be adequately controlled failing to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance within the Noise Policy Statement for England 2010.
2. It had not been demonstrated that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on air pollution on the Motorway M3 Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) from increased traffic movements on the Motorway generated by the proposal failing to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Committee discussed the impact of aircraft noise on areas of the borough and referenced Heathrow and Fairoaks airports in comparison.

In discussing Fairoaks Airport, Councillors queried if operations could be tempted to move to Farnborough Airport if it was permitted to allow more flights.

The Committee discussed Mytchett ward, which is Surrey Heath's closest ward geographically to Farnborough Airport, and how residents were affected by the flight path and Farnborough Airport's current operations. It was highlighted that Surrey Heath would not benefit from a Sound Insulation Grant Scheme.

The Committee questioned how the number of additional flights would be recorded and the effects that an increase in flights could have on Surrey Heath resident's quality of life.

The Committee queried where additional flights would be parked and how much additional hard standing would be required.

The officer recommendation to raise an objection, including the amended reasons for objection as stated in the Planning Updates report, was proposed by Councillor White, seconded by Councillor Noble, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that an objection is raised by the council, and would include the amended reasons for objection, as stated in the Planning Updates report dated 22 February 2024.**

### **NOTE 1**

Councillor White declared for the record that her husband is a pilot although it was not known how often he used Farnborough Airport.

Councillor Richard Wilson stated for the record that he was a Member of the British Airline Pilots Association.

### **NOTE 2**

In line with Part 4, Section D, Paragraph 18 of the constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

All Committee Members present voted in favour of the officer recommendation that an objection is raised by the council, and it would include the updated reasons as stated in the Planning Updates report discussed.

## **45/P Application Number: 23/1178 - Land r/o 19 The Crofters, Deepcut, Camberley, Surrey**

This planning application related to proposed change of land use of former road to residential garden land (C3) and the erection of a close-boarded fence.

This application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation but was being reported to the Planning Applications Committee because the applicant had been employed by the Council as a Planning Officer, within the previous four years.

There were several updates in the Planning Updates report suggested by the Council's Scientific Officer. These included:

- Prior to commencement, the applicant shall submit an intrusive site investigation report by a competent person(s) to confirm whether the area is suitable for residential use. If contamination is found, a remediation plan based upon the findings of the site investigation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The land shall be remediated in accordance with the approved plan.
- If necessary, prior to the use of the land, a validation report with substantiating evidence demonstrating that the agreed remediation has been carried out, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.
- The applicant may wish to install suitable acoustic fences at extended boundary, to reduce the noise level in garden areas to below the upper value of 55 dB or more desirable 50 LAeq, as recommended in BS8233 for external residential amenity areas.

The Committee commended the application on the benefit it would be to the site's appearance and the case officer confirmed that other neighbours on the street had carried out similar work.

The case officer had been at the council six months so had no prior working relationship with the applicant.

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

**RESOLVED that application 23/1178/FFU be granted, subject to conditions.**

**NOTE 1**

All Committee Members present voted in favour of the officer recommendation to grant the application, subject to conditions.

Chair