

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning  
Applications Committee held at  
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath  
House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15  
3HD on 7 March 2019**

---

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)  
+ Cllr Valerie White (Vice Chairman)

- |                             |                         |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| - Cllr Nick Chambers        | - Cllr Max Nelson       |
| + Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman | + Cllr Adrian Page      |
| - Cllr Colin Dougan         | + Cllr Robin Perry      |
| - Cllr Surinder Gandhum     | + Cllr Ian Sams         |
| + Cllr Jonathan Lytle       | Cllr Conrad Sturt       |
| - Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper | + Cllr Pat Tedder       |
| - Cllr David Mansfield      | + Cllr Victoria Wheeler |
- + Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Paul Ilnicki (in place of Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper)

Members in Attendance: Cllr Paul Deach and Cllr Darryl Ratiram

Officers Present: Ross Cahalane, Duncan Carty, Michelle Fielder, Gareth John, Jonathan Partington and Eddie Scott

**47/P Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 7 February 2019 were confirmed and signed by the chairman.

**48/P Application Number: 18/0033 - Kings Court & Land to front of Kings Court, 91-93 High Street, Camberley, GU15 3RN**

The application was for the change of use of existing building to provide 23 x 1-bed and 7 x 2-bed apartments and extensions to existing building to provide a further 32 x 1-bed and 17 x 2-bed apartments and 2 retail units, with associated parking, access and layby, roof garden, bin and cycle storage, following part demolition of existing building. (Amended plan rec'd 04/07/2018, 21/12/2018 & 11/02/2019.)

Members were advised of the following updates:

“The applicant has confirmed that the existing building has been converted and is now fully occupied [under the prior approval SU/14/0336] (as 23 no one bed and 7 no two bed flats).

The amendments to proposal received on 11 February 2019 (and referred to in the update report) have, due to the road widening proposal, resulted in the loss of the originally proposed layby.

County Highway Authority has provided a list of proposed conditions. These include a method of construction statement (already provided at Condition 4), provision of parking/servicing/road widening (an adaptation of Condition 10), construction of carriageway and footway realignment, securing of cycle parking and pedestrian inter-visibility splays (new conditions) and informatives.

Reasons for Proposed Conditions 4, 5, 6, 8 and 10 to refer to the NPPF 2019.

#### AN AMENDMENT TO CONDITIONS:

4. No development shall take place until a Method of Construction Statement, to include details of:

- (a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
- (b) loading and unloading of plant and materials
- (c) storage of plant and materials
- (d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management)
- (e) provision of boundary hoarding
- (f) hours of construction
- (g) measures to keep the public highway clean

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction period.

Reason: The condition above is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety or residential amenity; nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to accord with Policies CP11, DM9 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

5. 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) the results of infiltration testing completed in accordance with BRE Digest: 2365 and confirmation of groundwater levels;
- (b) evidence of the proposed solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+40% allowance for climate change) storm events, during all stages of development (pre, post and during), associated discharge rates and storage volumes shall be provided using a maximum discharge rate of 2 litres/sec (as per SuDS pro-forma or otherwise as agreed by the Local Planning Authority);
- (c) detailed drainage design drawings and calculations to include: a finalised drainage layout detailing 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 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;

- (e) details of management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system; and
- (f) 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.

Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction period.

Reason: To ensure that the design meets the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on and off the site and to comply with Policies CP2 and DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

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

Reason: To ensure that the design meets the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and to comply with Policies CP2 and DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

8. No development shall take place until a scheme to deal with contamination of the site has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall include:

- (a) a contaminated land desk study and suggested site assessment methodology;
- (b) a site investigation report based upon (a);
- (c) a remediation action plan based upon (a) and (b);
- (d) a "discovery strategy" dealing with unforeseen contamination discovered during construction;
- (e) a "validation strategy" identifying measures to validate the works undertaken as a result of (c) and (d); and
- (f) a verification report appended with substantiating evidence demonstrating the agreed remediation has been carried out.

The development shall be carried out and completed wholly in accordance with the agreed details unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory strategy is put in place for addressing contaminated land, making the land suitable for the development hereby approved without resulting in risk to construction workers, future users of the land, occupiers of nearby land and the environment generally in accordance with Policies CP2 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

10. The car parking and servicing area, and access thereto and road widening, shown on Drawing No. 17.17-D-210 Rev F received on 11 February 2019 shall be provided prior to the occupation of the extension to the building hereby approved

unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority having first consulted with the County Highway Authority. Once approved these areas shall be retained for the purposes of the use as indicated on this approved drawing in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and to comply with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

**ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS:**

11. Prior to the first occupation of any new dwelling the proposed carriageway and footway realignment as broadly identified on Drawing No. 17.17-D-210 Rev F received on 11 February 2019 shall be constructed in accordance with a detailed scheme to be agreed with and meeting the requirements of the County Highway Authority. Such works shall include all necessary adjustment to the existing kerbing, drainage, surfacing materials, road signage and road markings.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and to comply with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

12. Prior to the first occupation of any new dwelling the secure parking of bicycles within the development site shall be provided as identified on Drawing No. 17.17-D-210 Rev F received on 11 February 2019.

Reason: The above condition is required in recognition of Section 9 "Promoting Sustainable Transport" in the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

13. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until pedestrian inter-visibility splays have been provided on each side of the access in accordance with the requirements of the County Highway Authority. Such details will require open panels or through visible panels either side of the access (excepting brick piers), providing a clear height between 0.6m and 2.0m high.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and to comply with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

**PROPOSED INFORMATIVES:**

1. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway or any works that may affect a drainage channel/culvert or water course. The applicant is advised that a permit and, potentially, a Section 278 agreement must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the highway. All works on the highway will require a permit and an application will need to be submitted to the County Council's Street Works Team up to 3 months in advance of the intended start date, depending on the scale of the works proposed and the classification of the road. Please see <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/the-traffic-management-permit-scheme>.

2. The applicant is advised that Consent may be required under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. Please see [www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-and-community/emergency-planning-and-community-safety/flooding-advice](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-and-community/emergency-planning-and-community-safety/flooding-advice).

3. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to obstruct the public highway by the erection of scaffolding, hoarding or any other device or apparatus for which a licence must be sought from the Highway Authority Local Highways Service.

4. Notwithstanding any permission granted under the Planning Acts, no signs, devices or other apparatus may be erected within the limits of the highway without express approval of the Highway Authority. It is not the policy of the Highway Authority to approve the erection of signs or other devices of a non-statutory nature within the limits of the highway.”

#### Amendment to conditions

Reasons for Proposed Conditions 4, 5 8 and 9 to refer to the NPPF 2019.”

The officer recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Mrs Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Jonathan Lytle, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 18/0033 be granted subject to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement for the provision of a contribution towards the delivery of affordable housing elsewhere in the Borough and a SAMM contribution by 8 April 2019, or any longer period as agreed with the Executive Head of Regulatory, and the conditions set out in the Officer Report and updates.**

#### **Note 1**

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 recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Jonathan Lytle, Adrian Page, Robin Perry and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

#### **49/P Application Number: 18/1025 - Wyvern House, 55 Frimley High Street, Frimley, Camberley, GU16 7HJ**

The application was for a second floor extension including dormer windows above to facilitate conversion of offices (class B1) to 42 flats (36 one bed, 5 two bed, 1 three bed) with associated parking, bin/cycle storage and access from Maybury Close.

Members were advised of the following updates:

“Emails with photographs have been sent by a neighbour to the case officer and Members, to highlight excessive working hours in relation to the office conversion already consented, including weekends. The emails/photos also raise concern regarding work vehicles that have been parking along Maybury Close, loss of light arising from the current proposed upper floor extension and highway safety/capacity impacts from the proposed development.

Officer comments:

*The noise complaints are being investigated by the Council’s Environmental Health department who have powers under environmental health legislation. An informative is recommended to remind the developer of their duty under this legislation.*

*Highway impacts are assessed under Section 7.6 of the Committee Report and an additional construction transport management plan condition is also recommended (see below)*

*The impacts of loss of light have been considered in Section 7.5 of the Committee Report. It is accepted that due to the orientation, there would be some loss of wintertime afternoon sunlight to the Maybury Close dwellings to the northeast. However, it is still considered that given the separation distances and the existing built form relationships, no adverse harm to neighbouring amenity would arise to justify a reason for refusal.*

Contamination (condition 8)

A Phase 1 Environmental Review has been submitted by the applicant. The Council’s Scientific Officer has commented that the report considers contamination in relation to upper floors (second and third floors only). However, the whole building including ground floors will be occupied by residential receptors. Given that the building is unoccupied, the report should consider the whole site, including the landscaping works now proposed, and it fails to do this. It is inappropriate to ignore a known use of any part of the building when considering whether the site can or may be determined as contaminated land. As such, the recommended Condition 8 to deal with potential contamination must still be attached to any planning permissions issued.

Additional condition

*9. No development shall commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan, to include details of:*

- (a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors*
- (b) loading and unloading of plant and materials*
- (c) storage of plant and materials*
- (d) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway*

*has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development.*

*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 Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.*

#### Additional informative

*6. The applicant is reminded that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:*

*8.00 am – 6.00 pm Monday to Fridays*

*8.00 am – 1.00 pm Saturday*

*And not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays”*

As this application had triggered the Council’s Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Anthony Farmer spoke in objection to the application and Mr Chris Wilmshurst, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Following discussion on the application, Members felt they needed a Site Visit, in order to make a considered decision.

A recommendation to defer the application for a Member Site Visit was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Robin Perry. The recommendation was put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 18/1025 be deferred to conduct a Member Site Visit.**

#### **Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Cllr Edward Hawkins declared that all members of the Committee had received various pieces of correspondence on the application.

#### **Note 2**

Voting in favour of the recommendation to defer the application for a Member Site Visit:

Councillors Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Paul Ilnicki, Robin Perry and Ian Sams.

Voting against the recommendation to defer the application for a Member Site Visit:

Councillors Adrian Page, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

**50/P Application Number: 18/0991 - 79-81 Windsor Road, Chobham, Woking, GU24 8LD**

The application was for a two storey building comprising 1 dwelling and 8 flats including rear dormer windows, additional vehicular access from Windsor Road, parking, landscaping and bin/cycle storage following demolition of existing buildings containing 2 retail units and 2 flats. (Additional information rec'd 07/01/2019 & 21/01/2019.) (Amended plan rec'd 10/01/2019.) (Amended plan rec'd 17/01/2019.) (Amended plan rec'd 18/02/2019.)

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it had been called in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Victoria Wheeler due to concerns regarding overdevelopment.

Members were advised of the following updates:

"Owing to a typographical error, a correction to Condition 8 is proposed as follows:

*The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plans for vehicles to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking and turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purposes.*

*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 Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012."*

As this application had triggered the Council's Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Andrew Black, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

The officer recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Adrian Page and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 18/0991 be granted to subject to completion of a legal agreement to secure the SAMM financial contribution and the conditions set out in the Officer Report.**

**Note 1**

Voting in favour of the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Jonathan Lytle, Pat Tedder and Victoria Wheeler.

**51/P Princess Royal Barracks, Deepcut - Affordable Housing Provision**

The item sought Member approval for the level of affordable housing to be delivered from Phase 4a of the PRB site under hybrid planning permission ref: 12/0546 (as amended), prior to the submission of the relevant reserved matters application(s).

Members were advised of the following updates on the item:

“UPDATE

The Bovis Homes reserved matter application referenced at para.6 of the report is now valid (application reference 18/1027).

A previous affordable submission under condition 9 (as referenced at para 7 of the committee report) proposed 13.5% AH, with informal discussions seeking to increase this as stated in that para. However as also noted in para 7 that submission was withdrawn.

Proposed informative

It is also proposed that an informative be added to any formal approval of the submitted details. The informative should advise the applicant that while the resolution references the provision of up to 30 residential being delivered from the 0.67ha parcel shown as 4a, this agreement does not provide any assurance that the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that this quantum of development can be accommodated in a satisfactory manner on the parcel.

It is considered that a precautionary approach be taken in this matter because the approved (indicative) density plan for the site (contained in the design and access statement approved in 12/0546), shows a density range of between 25 and 45 dwellings per hectare (dph) in this general location. However, to achieve 30 units on the 0.67ha site the density would be approximately 45 dph overall. It is also noted that a design code has not yet been supplied for this parcel and so officers are unable to establish how this level of development may be accommodated on the site and whether such a level could be achieved in a satisfactory manner.

It is therefore suggested the draft informative below be taken forward on the decision letter:

*The applicant is advised that the resolution set out above does not set the quantum of development to be delivered from parcel 4a as identified in this submission. The actual quantum of development that can be satisfactorily accommodated on the site can only be established through the submission of an acceptable reserved matters application and Design Code. Accordingly, the applicant is asked to note the approved density plan for 12/0546 (as amended) which shows a density range of between 25 and 45 dph in this general location. Having regard to this background context this decision letter should not be construed as the Local Planning Authority giving its agreement to an overall density of 45 dph on land parcel 4a.”*

The officer's recommendation was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins and seconded by Councillor Jonathan Lytle, put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that**

- i) the land parcel 4a deliver nil (0%) affordable housing, but the decision letter be caveated to make clear this agreement relates solely to parcel 4a as identified on the attached plan, is limited to the delivery of up to 30 units from that parcel; and**
- ii) any future affordable housing submissions proposing less than 35% from any parcel on the site must be supported by a detailed and robust viability statement and be subject to approval by Planning Applications Committee.**

**Note 1**

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's recommendation:

Councillors Mrs Vivienne Chapman, Edward Hawkins, Paul Ilnicki, Jonathan Lytle, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder and Valerie White.

Voting against the officer's recommendation:

Councillor Victoria Wheeler.

Chairman