

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning
Applications Committee held at
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath
House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15
3HD on 12 November 2020**

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr Victoria Wheeler (Vice Chairman)

| | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|
| + Cllr Graham Alleway | - Cllr Robin Perry |
| + Cllr Peter Barnett | + Cllr Darryl Ratiram |
| + Cllr Cliff Betton | + Cllr Morgan Rise |
| + Cllr Colin Dougan | + Cllr Graham Tapper |
| + Cllr Shaun Garrett | + Cllr Helen Whitcroft |
| + Cllr David Lewis | + Cllr Valerie White |
| + Cllr Charlotte Morley | |

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Paul Deach (in place of Cllr Robin Perry)

Members in Attendance: Cllr Pat Tedder

Officers Present: Ross Cahalane, Jonathan Partington, Gavin Ramothal, Eddie Scott and Patricia Terceiro

35/P Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2020 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

36/P Application Number: 18/0588 - Wyverne Lodge, Dukes Covert, Bagshot, GU19 5HU

The application was for the erection of a rear swimming pool building including changing room facilities to facilitate external swim schools/teachers (retrospective) and proposed side infill extension to provide a one-way entrance and exit.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of the Executive Head of Regulatory.

This application was deferred from determination at the Planning Applications Committee meeting on 15 October 2020.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“Representations

An additional objection has been received from a neighbour and their appointed planning and highway consultant, raising the following planning related issues:

- The Committee Report and proposed recommendation to grant planning permission subject to 6 conditions, is extensive and detailed, but based on incorrect and insufficient information leaving the permission, if granted in November 2020, open to challenge.
- The application fails to include essential scalable plan information about the existing and proposed house and grounds or the existing proposed car parking layout or vehicle tracking / arrangements.
- The applicants have had more than 2 years to rectify these problems and it seems likely now in the face of repeated objections and the requests for more information by the Case Officer, that the applicant has deliberately withheld and obscured key information.

[Officer Comment: It is considered that all relevant planning issues are covered in the Officer's Report and based on up-to-date and on-the-ground information]

Green Belt

- There are several permitted and lawful swimming pools in the area better located and better suited to this use with adequate off-street car parking. within 50 yards is an existing pool granted business use by the Council, and has been in operation for the last 14 years, 1 mile towards Bracknell are 3 swimming pools, with Bracknell leisure centre 500 yards further. Some 3 miles away towards Camberley, SHBC is building a new swimming and leisure centre.
- The proposal fails to demonstrate very special circumstances exist and therefore the presumption must be to protect the Green Belt. It is therefore inappropriate development. This proposal only demonstrates that there are private commercial reasons for this planning application. The applicant has submitted a further document in support naming 9 items that will increase the well-being, health and skills of all users. However, there is no exceptional or vitally important quantitative or qualitative need, with all of the other above pools in operation.

[Officer Comment: Each application must be considered on its own site specific planning merits. Sections 7.2 and 7.6 of the Committee Report cover the impact on the Green Belt and all matters which in combination are considered to amount to Very Special Circumstances]

Character and amenity

- The building is bigger than agreed, and is nearer neighbour's boundary.
- The proposed extensions and use, by reason of its proximity and existing and proposed over-bearing impact to neighbours and failure to respect and character and quality of Dukes Covert would be contrary to the design requirements of Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development.

[Officer Comment: Sections 7.3 and 7.4 of the Committee Report address character and amenity matters.]

Highways

- The proposed development during and outside of the Covid Pandemic would not accord with DM11 (Traffic Management and Highway Safety) because it would adversely affect the safe and efficient flow of traffic movement on the highway.
- The County Highway Authority (CHA) has not provided independent or full comments in their consultation response.
- There are no reasonable or enforceable planning conditions that could be attached to mitigate the impact of this proposal. The LPA cannot force all cars to be parked off-road. Condition 5 would be easy to remove/relax, and would still lead to overspill car parking.
- The commercial swim school has led to major parking problems in Dukes Covert and adverse impact on Dukes Covert - a quiet but narrow residential cul-de-sac set within the Green Belt. Thoughtless on-street car parking is ongoing, and is usually at its worst over the weekend.
- If permission is granted, as soon as the COVID Pandemic is over, the applicant will increase the swimming activity and this will cause traffic problems which will eventually result in an accident.

[Officer Comment: Section 7.5 of the Committee Report addresses highway matters. The Update to the Report states that the CHA has undertaken an assessment of the application and the Transport Statement (submitted by the objecting neighbour) in terms of the likely net additional traffic generation, access arrangements and parking provision, and is satisfied that the current application would not have a material impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining public highway. The CHA therefore has no highway requirements, commenting that it is satisfied that the on-site parking provision is sufficient for the proposed level of activity. The CHA has also commented that the proposed condition (No. 5) restricting the number of users of the pool to a maximum of five per session will mitigate against the risk of overspill parking. This condition is considered enforceable and additional permission would be needed for any variation to it.]

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

RESOLVED that application 18/0588 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- i. Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that all the Committee had received correspondence on the application;

- ii. Councillor Valerie White declared that she had previously, but not recently, had conversations with the applicant and the neighbour in the past; and
- iii. Councillor Victoria Wheeler had previously had conversations with the neighbours to the application site.

Note 2

A roll call vote was taken on the officer recommendation to grant the application and the voting was as follows:

Voting in favour of the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Paul Deach, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

Voting against the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway and Victoria Wheeler.

37/P Application Number: 20/0592/FFU - Queen Anne House, Bridge Road, Bagshot, Surrey, GU19 5AT

The planning application was for change of use from Office (Class B1c) to residential (Class C3) comprising 5 no. flats (1x 3 Bed, 2x 2 Bed and 2x 1 Bed) and erection of 4 no. dwellings (1x 4 Bed, 2x 2 Bed and 1x 1 Bed) including pedestrian accesses off Bridge Road with associated parking, landscaping and cycle and refuse storage.

This application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Valerie White on the grounds of overdevelopment, parking and highway issues.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“Corrections

Para 6.1 should read ‘...*four representations*...’.

Para 4.7 should read ‘...*sufficient parking is provided for all units and three parking spaces are provided for visitors*’.

Representations

One representation has been received in support of the proposal, so long as that the development is provided with adequate soft-landscaping.

Parking provision

To clarify, the proposed parking provision would be as follows:

| Dwelling type | Recommended provision | No of spaces provided and location |
|----------------------|------------------------------|---|
| 2-bed flat (unit 1) | 1 space per unit | 1 space in the communal parking area |
| 2-bed flat (unit 2) | 1 space per unit | 1 space in the communal |

| | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | parking area |
| 1-bed flat (unit 3) | 1 space per unit | 1 space in the communal parking area |
| 1-bed flat (unit 4) | 1 space per unit | 1 space in the communal parking area |
| 3-bed flat (unit 5) | 2 spaces per unit | 2 spaces in the communal parking area |
| 4-bed dwelling (unit 6) | 2 spaces per unit | 2 spaces within the plot |
| 2-bed dwelling (unit 7) | 1 space per unit | 2 spaces in the communal parking area |
| 2-bed dwelling (unit 8) | 1 space per unit | 2 spaces in the communal parking area |
| 1-bed bungalow (unit 9) | 1 space per unit | 1 space within the plot |
| Total | 11 | 13 |

Three visitor parking spaces would be provided.

Amendment to Conditions

The applicant has proposed that in place of “No development shall commence”, the following conditions be reworded such that they are pre-occupation. This is considered acceptable and the amended conditions are provided below:

4. A landscape scheme to include hard and soft landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be carried out as approved and implemented prior to first occupation. The scheme shall include indication of all hard surfaces, walls, fences, access features, the existing trees and hedges to be retained, together with the new planting to be carried out and the details of the measures to be taken to protect existing features during the construction of the development.

Any landscaping which, within 5 years of the completion of the landscaping scheme, dies, becomes diseased, is removed, damaged or becomes defective in anyway shall be replaced in kind.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

7. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Report and Tree Protection Plan (Arbtech TPP 01) prepared by ArbTech received 08 July 2020. Within 7 days of commencement of development digital photographs shall be submitted to the Council that record all aspects of any facilitation tree works and the physical tree and ground protection measures that have been implemented in accordance with the Arboricultural Report. The tree protection measures shall be retained until completion of all works hereby permitted.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the heritage asset and locality in accordance with Policies DM17 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.”

Members acknowledged the openness of the current site and felt that if fencing were to be erected around the perimeter of the site, harm would be caused to the

existing visual and residential amenities. As a result an additional informative was added to the officer's recommendation to emphasise that no close board fencing should be erected around the site.

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Graham Tapper, seconded by Cliff Betton and carried.

RESOLVED that application 20/0592 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and the additional informative.

Note 1

The application was discussed by the Committee concurrently with application 20/0593 as the applications were intrinsically linked. However separate votes were taken on the applications.

Note 2

It was noted for the record that Councillor Valerie White declared that she had visited the site a couple of years ago prior to the application.

Note 3

A roll call vote on the officer recommendation to grant the application was conducted and the voting was as follows:

Voting in favour of the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Paul Deach, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler and Helen Whitcroft.

Voting against the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillor Valerie White.

38/P Application Number: 20/0593/LLB: Queen Anne House - Bridge Road, Bagshot, Surrey, GU19 5AT

The application was for Listed Building Consent for the conversion of Queen Anne House from office (Class B1c) to residential (Class C3) comprising 5 no. flats (1x 3 Bed, 2x 2 Bed and 2x 1 Bed) with associated alterations comprising removal of existing rear canopy, signage and a/c units, new windows, flues and extraction outlets.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee due to the fact that it was intrinsically linked to application 20/0592/FFU which was also determined at the meeting.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application to application 20/0592/FFU, as both applications are intrinsically linked:

“Corrections

Para 6.1 should read ‘...four representations...’.

Para 4.7 should read ‘...sufficient parking is provided for all units and three parking spaces are provided for visitors’.

Representations

One representation has been received in support of the proposal, so long as that the development is provided with adequate soft-landscaping.

Parking provision

To clarify, the proposed parking provision would be as follows:

| Dwelling type | Recommended provision | No of spaces provided and location |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| 2-bed flat (unit 1) | 1 space per unit | 1 space in the communal parking area |
| 2-bed flat (unit 2) | 1 space per unit | 1 space in the communal parking area |
| 1-bed flat (unit 3) | 1 space per unit | 1 space in the communal parking area |
| 1-bed flat (unit 4) | 1 space per unit | 1 space in the communal parking area |
| 3-bed flat (unit 5) | 2 spaces per unit | 2 spaces in the communal parking area |
| 4-bed dwelling (unit 6) | 2 spaces per unit | 2 spaces within the plot |
| 2-bed dwelling (unit 7) | 1 space per unit | 2 spaces in the communal parking area |
| 2-bed dwelling (unit 8) | 1 space per unit | 2 spaces in the communal parking area |
| 1-bed bungalow (unit 9) | 1 space per unit | 1 space within the plot |
| Total | 11 | 13 |

Three visitor parking spaces would be provided.

Amendment to Conditions

The applicant has proposed that in place of “No development shall commence”, the following conditions be reworded such that they are pre-occupation. This is considered acceptable and the amended conditions are provided below:

4. A landscape scheme to include hard and soft landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be carried out as approved and implemented prior to first occupation. The scheme shall include indication of all hard surfaces, walls, fences, access features, the existing trees and hedges to be retained, together with the new planting to be carried out and the details of the measures to be taken to protect existing features during the construction of the development.

Any landscaping which, within 5 years of the completion of the landscaping scheme, dies, becomes diseased, is removed, damaged or becomes defective in anyway shall be replaced in kind.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

7. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Report and Tree Protection Plan (Arbtech TPP 01) prepared by ArbTech received 08 July 2020. Within 7 days of commencement of development digital photographs shall be submitted to the Council that record all aspects of any facilitation tree works and the physical tree and ground protection measures that have been implemented in accordance with the Arboricultural Report. The tree protection measures shall be retained until completion of all works hereby permitted.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the heritage asset and locality in accordance with Policies DM17 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.”

Members acknowledged the openness of the current site and felt that if fencing were to be erected around the perimeter of the site, harm would be caused to the existing visual and residential amenities. As a result an additional informative was added to the officer’s recommendation to emphasise that no close board fencing should be erected around the site.

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Morgan Rise, seconded by Valerie White and carried.

RESOLVED that application 20/0593 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and additional informative.

Note 1

The application was discussed by the Committee concurrently with application 20/0592 as the applications were intrinsically linked. However separate votes were taken on the applications.

Note 2

It was noted for the record that Councillor Valerie White declared that she had visited the site a couple of years ago prior to the application.

Note 3

A roll call vote on the officer recommendation to grant the application was conducted and the voting was as follows:

Voting in favour of the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Paul Deach, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

39/P Application Number: 20/0510 - The Annexe, 6 Mount Pleasant Close, Lightwater, Surrey, GU18 5TP

The application was for the demolition of existing single storey annexe and construction of a two storey attached 3 bed house with associated access and parking.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans, on the grounds of overdevelopment, not in keeping with the street scene and failing to comply with the Lightwater Village Design Statement.

Members received the following updates on the application:

"Corrections

Para 7.5.9 should read '*...due to the lack of adequate front boundary treatment*'.

Representations

Four written representations have been received following publication of the Committee Agenda which raise the following issues:

- The application would be over development of the site and would not be in keeping with the surrounding properties *[see section 7.5 of the officer's report]*;
- The proposal would lead to further traffic congestion on the roads left hand bend directly where The Annex is situated and the access from the road would be inadequate *[see section 7.7 of the officer's report]*;
- This planning application would not conform to the Lightwater design statement *[see section 7.5 of the officer's report]*.

On 3 November 2020 the applicant also made the following representation in response to the publication of the committee report regarding the (i) width of the proposed plot; (ii) mixed character of the road; (iii) weight afforded to approved application 20/0347/FFU; and, (iv) creation of driveway and boundary treatment.

Officer's comments

Point (i):

In relation to the width of the proposed plot and its relation to local character, it is noted that in the same side of the road as the application property the dwellings to the west are bungalows and the properties to the east are two storey dwellings linked by garages. Directly opposite there are two storey houses. The development in the immediate vicinity of the application site is road frontage development with two storey dwellings and plot widths that do not fall below 10m. The proposed plot, at an approximate 8.2m width, would be narrower than those on its immediate context, which is considered the most sensitive.

The applicant makes reference to the width of plots 9 and 9A further to the west and it is noted that plot 9 would be about the same width as the proposed site and 9A would be slightly narrower. However, these plots accommodate bungalows, which is a different development from the proposed two storey dwelling. As bungalows, the built form is lesser and so smaller plots would be more appropriate by comparison. In addition, the Inspector in para 11 of the 2018 Appeal Decision (page 94 of the Agenda) notes that this area has a different character and, therefore, is not directly comparable. This approach was followed in assessing this proposal.

The plot width for previous application 17/0707 was approximately 7.7m and the plot width for previous application 16/0664 was about 7.6m. In light of the above context, it is not considered the revised plot width would be materially different from the previously dismissed appeals.

Point (ii):

See section 7.4 of the officer's report, where the proposal's impact on the character of the area is discussed.

Point (iii):

The provision of a new dwelling means that the effect on the streetscene would be materially different than a householder extension, as recognised by the Inspector in para 15 of the 2018 Appeal Decision (page 95 of the Agenda). The weight afforded to this permission is a matter of planning judgment and is discussed in para 7.5.4 of the officer's report.

Point (iv):

The creation of a driveway is discussed in paras 7.5.8 and 7.5.9 of the officer's report. In para 15 of the 2017 Appeal Decision (pages 91 and 95 of the Agenda, respectively) the Inspector noted that although these parking arrangements could be achieved under permitted development, it is unlikely that this would be provided without the need created by the proposed dwelling and the same approach was followed in this assessment.

Both appeal decisions refer that the parking spaces, of themselves, would be similar to others in Mount Pleasant Close, however it is the opening up of the site's frontage that would emphasise the proposal's harm to the character of the area (see para 14 of both 2017 and 2018 Appeal Decisions, pages 91 and 95 of the Agenda, respectively). It is also noted that the plans submitted with the 2017 application show a partial boundary treatment to the front elevation, which did not preclude the Inspector of reaching this conclusion. The same approach was followed in assessing this application. It is also noted that there would not be sufficient space to provide soft landscaping to enclose the parking area and soften the proposed built form, as required by Principle 6.8 of the RDG."

The officer recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan, seconded by Councillor Garrett and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that application 20/0510 be refused.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Peter Barnett declared that he had been in correspondence with the applicant and Councillor Sharon Galliford had visited objectors to the application on his behalf.

Note 2

A roll call vote on the application was conducted and the voting was as follows:

Voting in favour of the officer recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Paul Deach, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Victoria Wheeler and Helen Whitcroft.

Voting against the officer recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillors Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton and Graham Tapper.

Chairman