

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning
Applications Committee held at
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath
House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15
3HD on 9 January 2020**

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

+ Cllr Graham Alleway	- Cllr Sam Kay
+ Cllr Peter Barnett	+ Cllr David Lewis
+ Cllr Cliff Betton	+ Cllr Charlotte Morley
+ Cllr Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Morgan Rise
+ Cllr Sarah Jane Croke	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
- Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler
- Cllr Shaun Garrett	

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Helen Whitcroft

Members in Attendance: Cllr Paul Deach, Cllr Tim FitzGerald, Cllr Sharon Galliford, Cllr David Mansfield, Cllr Emma McGrath, Cllr Adrian Page

Officers Present: Duncan Carty, Michelle Fielder, Jess Harris-Hooton, Julia Hutley-Savage, Shannon Kimber, Jonathan Partington, Neil Praise and Eddie Scott.

26/P Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 December 2019 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

27/P Application Number: 19/0235 - WOODSIDE COTTAGE, CHAPEL LANE, BAGSHOT, GU19 5DE

The application was for the residential development of 44 dwellings comprising 7 No. two bedroom, 9 No. three bedroom, 16 No. four bedroom two storey homes and 7 No. one bedroom and 5 No. two bedroom flats within a three storey building along with access, parking/garaging, and landscaping, following the demolition of existing dwelling and associated outbuildings. (amended & additional plans & info rec'd 02/07/2019 & 10/07/2019 & 29/07/2019). (Additional & Amended Docs & Plans - Rec'd 31.10.2019).

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“For the avoidance of doubt, there are 388 number of objections in total from 339 number of objectors with new representations raising the following new issues:

- The use of the layby as an access/egress to residential drives (as would be required if the one way system were to be provided on Chapel Lane) would prejudice its use for parking/access and impact on covenants.

This is a lower figure than previously totalled (across the original/update reports) because of duplication of representations in the system.

The applicant has confirmed that there will be a management company to maintain the landscaping (beyond the demise of the private residential dwellings) with a charge to those residents. The charge will not apply to the affordable housing units with the provider responsible for landscaping within the demise of these properties.

The County Highway Authority has raised no objections to the proposal (see the appended response) following the receipt of the Traffic Watch/Chapel Lane Action Group report subject to the amended condition below.

Amendment to Condition

19. Prior to the occupation of the development, Chapel Lane shall be improved in general accordance with Drawing No. 1807052-03 Rev L received on **27 November 2019** and Drawing No. 1807052-02 Rev E [within Appendix D of the Transport Statement) received on 19 March 2019] providing a footpath link for the site frontage along with traffic calming build outs, works to the existing layby in front of the site on Chapel Lane and surface treatment/road markings.

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

Additional Condition

25. Prior to the construction of the development above slab level, details of the measures for energy efficiencies shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of energy efficiency and to comply with Policy Cp2 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.”

As this application had triggered the Council’s Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Neil Lennox, on behalf of the Bagshot Society, and Dr Catherine Mahoney spoke in objection to the application. Mr Douglas Bond and Mr Phil Bell, on behalf of the agent, shared a public speaking slot and spoke in support of the application. Mr Noel Fierz also spoke in support of the application.

Arising from the Committee’s discussions, there were significant concerns in respect of impacts on residential amenity, the loss of mature trees, including TPO protected trees, and impact on the character of the area. Whilst highway matters (including proposals for a one-way system for Chapel Lane) were raised, concerns

were also raised about the impact of the increased traffic on Chapel Lane including the comings and goings of additional vehicles and resulting intensification in the movement of such traffic that would have such impact on residential amenity.

As there was no proposer and seconder for the officer's recommendation, an alternative recommendation to refuse the application, for the reasons below, was proposed by Councillor Valerie White and seconded by Councillor Helen Whitcroft. The recommendation was put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that

- I. Application 19/0235 be refused for the following reasons:**
 - **Over-density**
 - **Impact on Character of the Area**
 - **Impact of increased traffic on Chapel Lane on Residential Amenity**
 - **Loss of trees (including protected TPO trees).**
- II. The reasons for refusal be finalised by the Executive Head of Regulatory after consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee.**

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- i. There had been a Member Site Visit on the application.
- ii. All Members of the Committee had received various phone calls and pieces of correspondence in relation to the application.
- iii. Councillors Peter Barnett, Morgan Rise and Victoria Wheeler had spoken to residents in respect of the planning portal in relation to the application, but did not pass comment on the material content of the application.
- iv. Councillor Peter Barnett had made an objection to the application prior to being a Councillor, but declared he did not have a closed mind on the application in relation to Section 25 Localism Act 2011.

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 recommendation to refuse the application for the reasons outlined above:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Vivienne Chapman, Sarah Jane Croke, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

28/P Application Number: 19/0154 - ROSEDENE FARM & LAND TO THE SOUTH OF FENNS LANE, WEST END, WOKING, GU24 9QF

The Committee considered an outline application for the erection of 74 dwellings (and the retention of Rosedene Farm), provision of accesses, landscaping and play space along with an area of public open space following the demolition of existing buildings. (Amended info rec'd 9/4/19) (Additional info rec'd 30/04/19), (Amended/additional plans & info rec'd 06/11/19).

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“The applicant has provided a letter supporting the proposal in Green Belt terms which are summarised below:

- The low quality of the land and its previously developed nature (buildings/hardstanding);
- Comparisons with the proposal at Fair Oaks Airport (which is not yet determined);
- In the weighing of very special circumstances, case law has indicated that a combination of factors can provide sufficient “very special circumstances” and this is a matter of planning judgement;
- Benefits of providing the public open space and overall enhancement of the site; and
- Disagrees with the conclusion that the Five Year Land Supply Paper can demonstrate a 5.52 year supply of deliverable housing sites.

The content of this letter is noted.

Two further objections have been received raising no new issues.

A further objection from the West End Action Group has been received, responding to additional/amended details provided by the applicant, raising the following new issues:

- Serious underestimating of traffic movements on Fenns Lane due to limited survey and weather conditions at that time; and
- The land is more open, and the impact of the development would be much greater, than indicated in the amended landscape assessment.

West End Parish Council has confirmed that, in responding to additional/amended details provided by the applicant, their original objections still stand.”

As this application had triggered the Council’s Public Speaking Scheme, Mr Guy Consterdine, on behalf of the West End Action Group, and Dr J W Llewelyn spoke in objection to the application and Ms Liz Alexander and Mr Ian Newton, on behalf of the agent, shared a public speaking slot and spoke in support of the application.

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Graham Alleway and seconded by Charlotte Morley and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that application 19/0154 be refused for the reasons set out in the Officer Report

Note 1

It was noted for the record that all Members of the Committee had received various pieces of correspondence in respect of 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 recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Vivienne Chapman, Sarah Jane Croke, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

29/P Application Number: 19/0440 - PRINCESS ROYAL BARRACKS, BRUNSWICK ROAD, DEEPCUT, CAMBERLEY, GU16 6RN

The application was a reserved matters submission comprising full details of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for a new public house pursuant to planning permission 12/0546 (as subsequently amended by permission 18/619 and 18/1002), including a section of footpath / cycleway connection forming a part of the Village Green to the north of the public house site, together with submissions to discharge the following conditions: Condition 9 (Affordable Housing Strategy), Condition 16 (Ecological Mitigation and management), Condition 17 (Public Open Space), Condition 23 (Visibility Zone), Condition 28 (Cycle Parking [Non-Residential]), Condition 29 (Tree Protection & Retention), Condition 32 (Hard & Soft Landscaping), Condition 34 (Hedges & Hedgerows) and Condition 52 (Archaeology). (Amended plans and additional information rec'd 04/09/2019.) (Amended plans and additional information rec'd 18/09/2019.) (Amended plans and additional plans & information rec'd 23/10/2019.) (Amended plan rec'd 1/11/19.) (Amended plans rec'd 12.11.19.)

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“UPDATE

Report correction

As printed and appearing on the web the report contains a formatting error after paragraph 7.4.14. This affects the section heading pertaining to '7.5 Amenity Considerations' and paragraphs 7.5.1 and 7.5.2. For clarity paragraph 7.4.14 to 7.5.6 are reproduced below.

7.4.14	In conclusion, the proposal would deliver a satisfactory form of development and would not undermine the objectives of the Deepcut SPD, the Site Wide Design Code, or policies CP4, DM9 and DM17 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.
--------	---

7.5	Amenity Considerations
7.5.1	The Council has a number of planning documents seeking to ensure residential amenity is not compromised. Policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012 and the Residential Design Guide 2017 are relevant considerations as is the Site Wide Design Code (SWDC). At the time of considering this application there are limited dwellings approved / built in close proximity to the proposed public house and as a consequence few existing relationships to consider. The siting and form of the building is not considered to harm the dwellings approved at the Cala site with the form of the side elevation of the building facing this direction actually fronting the green swathe running between the two Cala parcels. In addition, the intervening road and the set back of the building from the site boundaries are sufficient to prevent any overbearing relationship arising. It is noted that the design code and reserved matters application for the residential parcel to the north of the site will need to respond to any approved layout on the application site.
7.5.2	The design and access statement advises the opening hours would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0730 to 2330hrs Monday to Thursday; • 0730 to 0000hrs Friday and Saturday; • 0800 to 2300hrs Sunday; and, • 0730 to 0000 Bank holidays and New Year's Eve 0730 to 0130hrs.
7.5.3	It is considered the above is generally acceptable; however, it is considered Bank Holiday opening should not exceed the opening on Sunday. In addition, discussions with the Council's Environmental Health Officer conclude that the above, and the operation of the public house generally, is acceptable subject to conditions as detailed at draft conditions 4 – 6.
7.5.4	It is also noted that any development has the potential to give rise to temporary effects which can cause inconvenience and disruption to residents and businesses. The hybrid permission sought to address this by imposing planning conditions to control amongst other things, delivery routes, piling techniques, dust suppression techniques and hours of working. Subject to compliance with the planning conditions already imposed it is not considered the development proposed would give rise to conditions not considered at hybrid application stage.
7.5.5	The proposal includes on site ancillary staff accommodation. This takes the form of 7 double bedrooms of 12sqm. This exceeds the 11.5sqm baseline contained within the Technical Housing Standards. In addition, the communal areas provided in terms of their size and general provision are considered to be acceptable. The proposal has been reviewed by the Senior Environmental Health Officer (Home Solutions Team Leader) and the Fire Safety Officer and both confirm the accommodation meets the required amenity and safety standards.
7.5.6	In light of the above it is considered the proposal is acceptable in terms of its amenity impact and provision. The proposal is therefore considered compliant with Policy CP4 and Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the objectives of the Deepcut SPD.

Additional conditions

20. The service yard shown on the approved plans shall be retained for its stated purpose. There shall be no refuse / recycling or food waste storage anywhere on site other than in the locations shown on the approved plans.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Policy CP4, DM9 and DM17 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, the Deecput SPD, the Design Codes and the NPPF.

21. The boundary treatments shown on the approved plans in addition to any to be agreed pursuant to any planning condition shall be implemented prior to the development hereby agreed coming into first use.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Policy CP4, DM9 and DM17 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, the Deecput SPD, the Design Codes and the NPPF.”

Condition 3 was amended by the Committee to require consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of Planning Applications Committee during agreement with the Local Planning Authority in respect of the materials to be used on the site. In addition it was added to the condition that wherever possible the materials used should be porous.

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

RESOLVED that application 19/0440 be granted subject to the conditions in the Officer Report, as amended, and the planning 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 recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Vivienne Chapman, Sarah Jane Croke, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

30/P Application Number: 19/0728 - 9 HEYWOOD DRIVE, BAGSHOT, GU19 5DL

The application was for the raising of land levels in the garden up to 1m in height and erection of a 1.8m closed board fence on new land levels to the sides, and a 2.2m fence to the rear on previous land levels (retrospective).

The application would normally be 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 Cllr Valerie White due to concerns regarding overlooking and loss of privacy at neighbouring properties.

Members had concerns in respect of the proposal's potential to create a loss of privacy onto Number 7's garden and negative impacts on residential amenity. As a result of the discussions, the Committee felt it was appropriate to conduct a Member Site Visit on the application before determination.

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

RESOLVED that application 19/0728 be deferred to conduct a Member Site Visit

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 defer the application to conduct a Member Site Visit:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Vivienne Chapman, Sarah Jane Croke, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

31/P Application Number: 19/2052 - 23 PRIOR ROAD, CAMBERLEY, SURREY, GU15 1BD

The application was for the erection of a part two storey and part single storey side extension to the existing, detached garage, following the demolition of the existing store, and the conversion of the games room in the loft space to form an annexe.

This application had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee because the applicant's wife is a Council employee.

The recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Valerie White, seconded by Councillor Graham Tapper and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that 19/2052 be granted subject to the conditions set out in the Officer Report

Note 1

It was noted for the record that the all members of the Committee knew the applicant's Wife as she was a Council employee.

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's recommendation:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Vivienne Chapman, Sarah Jane Croke, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

Chairman