

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning
Applications Committee held Virtually
- Public Meeting on 17 December 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 Sharon Galliford (in place of Cllr Peter Barnett)

Members in Attendance: Cllr Pat Tedder

Officers Present: Sarita Bishop, Ross Cahalane, Will Hinde, Gavin Ramothal,
Jenny Rickard, Jonathan Partington and Eddie Scott

40/P Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2020 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

41/P Application Number: 20/0153 - Land To The Rear Of 42 Station Road, Frimley, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 7HF

The application was for the erection of a two storey building comprising 4 two bedroom flats with associated amenity space

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been referred for determination by the Executive Head of Regulatory as the owner of the site had been a Surrey Heath councillor within the last four years

Members received the following updates on the application:

"An email has been received from Mr. D. Allen requesting that the application be deferred until the January meeting. In summary, Mr Allen claims that the agenda report was received less than 48 hours before the meeting and so there has been no time to rebut anything, despite asking to see the report for the past 6 weeks. He states that in every point in the report there is a mistake or serious irregularity and so the applicant would therefore like the opportunity to remedy this. He is also critical of the case officer's handling of the application.

Officer comment:

The agenda was published on the website on Friday 4/12 and so the applicant would have had sufficient time to consider its content. No report is made available until it is published. No substantive explanation has been given as to why the report is incorrect. In the opinion of the officers there are no valid grounds to defer determination of this application.

Consultation responses

The consultation response received from the Council's Drainage Officer recommends refusal for the following reason(s):

- Insufficient information provided for consideration.
- The applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated that the development won't affect neighbouring property, further details are required. This location does have a flood history and the development is proposed within floodplain. No development will be permitted without prior LPA approval of a fully detailed drainage proposal and flood mitigation scheme.
- The dwelling is removing an area of floodplain that needs to be off-set by a respective reduction of ground levels elsewhere within the application site. Full details are required to indicate where land levels around the dwelling are being reduced to compensate for the loss of floodplain, providing evidence that the overall development will not displace potential standing flood water to neighbouring properties.
- Applicant to retain any existing overland flow routes will across the proposed development site to allow for land to drain after a flood. The applicant needs to demonstrate that the development will not impede flows and will not cause any nuisance flooding to any neighbouring properties.
- Applicant to provide a full site survey of the existing site topography showing the development boundary and an indicative grid of levels throughout the existing site, without any changes, to give an accurate representation of the current site conditions.
- Applicant to provide a fully detailed drainage proposal drawing, clearly annotated with all proposed attenuation measures including any asset levels (cover, soffit and invert, as appropriate). All drainage proposals to be supported by construction details.
- No pumped surface water drainage systems will be permitted.
- There is no public surface water drainage system shown to be connected directly adjacent or within the property boundary. Details of the proposed off-site surface water connection to be provided, to include the route of the surface water connection, outside of the application boundary to its outfall (known Thames Water owned asset). Details of the discharge route to

include pipe sizes, levels, locations of any on-line access chambers and any other known property or asset connections to the pipework.

- Details of the existing, retained property surface water drainage systems to be provided.
- Any new habitable buildings within the proposed development outline to have a minimum FFL of 62.1m AOD.
- As the site is liable to flood, all foul drainage systems are required to have suitable protection to prevent surface water ingress. Full details of the foul drainage system to be provided.
- Applicant is required to agree a suitable development schedule with the LPA to ensure that the drainage scheme is undertaken before any increase of risk including the retention of floodplain capacity, ensuring attenuation for the building footprint during construction, and for maintenance of overland flood routes that allow neighbouring land to drain. If the LPA agreed drainage scheme cannot be implemented prior to the building due to site constraints, a programme of temporary works will need to be agreed with the LPA to demonstrate that the working methods throughout the development period will not increase flood risk to neighbouring properties.
- Maintenance schedule for the joint development drainage responsibilities will need to be provided once the fundamental scheme details are agreed with the LPA. The schedule details provided for consideration should replicate the documentation to be provided to all property purchasers and include copies of the approved drainage layout plan, construction details, and ongoing maintenance responsibilities. The maintenance schedule should clearly state the periodic maintenance required for all identity referenced assets and apportion the financial responsibilities for the properties served, should any expense be incurred by future repair or replacement work.
- All agreed land levels to be maintained in perpetuity. All drainage systems, porous surfaces, attenuation volumes and floodplain mitigation assets to be maintained throughout the lifetime of the development.
- Full site drainage and flood mitigation works to be completed, in accordance with final LPA approved drainage submission drawings, prior to first occupation.

ADDITIONAL REASON FOR REFUSAL

As such a reason for refusal on drainage grounds is proposed as follows:

6. The majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 2. In the absence of a detailed drainage proposal and flood mitigation scheme it has not been adequately demonstrated that the proposal would be acceptable in flood risk terms in relation to the site and neighbouring properties. As such the proposal would conflict with the objectives of Policy DM10 of the Surrey

Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2011-2028 and the National Planning Policy Framework/Practice Guidance.

As there was a technical problem with the viewing of the public speakers' recorded video speeches, Members agreed to defer the application.

The proposal to defer the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler and carried.

RESOLVED that application 20/0153 be deferred.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- I. Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that:
 - a. A number of members of the Committee had been Councillors at the same time as the owner of the site**
 - b. The owner of the site had contacted himself.****
- II. Councillor Helen Whitcroft declared that she had regularly exchanged comments on Social Media with the owner of the site on other matters. However she had come into the meeting with an open mind.**
- III. Councillor Darryl Ratiram declared that:
 - a) He had been copied into two pieces of correspondence between Mr Allen and the Council on the day of the meeting;**
 - b) and one of the emails had expressed concern about the Council which he had raised with Officers separately and as a result would vote in abstention on the application.****

42/P Application Number: 20/0819 - Laurel Farm, Fairfield Lane, West End, Woking, Surrey, GU24 9QX

The application was for the erection of detached single storey three bedroom dwelling (Class C3) following demolition of two agricultural barns.

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 Graham Alleway due to concerns regarding the impact on the Green Belt.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

"AMENDED CONDITION

A Phase 3 contamination report has been submitted. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has commented that the proposed protection and monitoring

measures are sufficient to part discharge the proposed Condition 4. This is now proposed to be re-worded as follows, to ensure that the agreed works are verified before occupation:

4. (i) The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until a verification report appended with substantiating evidence demonstrating the agreed remediation (as recommended in Section 8 of the Phase 3 Remediation Strategy and Verification Plan – Castledine Environmental – Ref 3070D P3 West – Woking – dated 27/11/2020) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority;

(ii) Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the development shall be carried out and completed wholly in accordance with all other parts of the above agreed Remediation Strategy.

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 Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.”

Members of the Committee held reservations whether the effect of the proposed dwelling on the 0.15 deficit in housing land supply was enough to outweigh the Green Belt protection policy. In addition it was suggested that the proposal was in conflict with the exceptions in paragraph 145 in the NPPF which implied that like-for-like buildings of the same use could replace one another and it was appreciated the existing barn was inherently an agricultural building as opposed to the proposed residential dwelling.

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

RESOLVED that application 20/0819 be granted subject to the conditions to the officer report and update.

Note 1

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

Voting in favour of the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Cliff Betton, Colin Dougan, Shaun Garrett, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Helen Whitcroft, Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway and Victoria Wheeler

Voting in abstention on the recommendation to grant the application:

Councillor Sharon Galliford.

Chairman