

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Applications Committee held at Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15 3HD on 23 September 2021**

---

+ 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 John Skipper
+ Cllr Mark Gordon	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr David Lewis	+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+* Cllr David Mansfield	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr Charlotte Morley	

+ Present  
- Apologies for absence presented

\*Present for minutes 22/P and 23/P

Members in Attendance: Cllr Richard Brooks, Cllr Tim FitzGerald,  
Cllr Shaun Garrett, Cllr Sashi Mylvaganam,  
Cllr Morgan Rise and Cllr Pat Tedder

Officers Present: Duncan Carty, Gavin Chinniah, Julia Greenfield,  
William Hinde, Jonathan Partington, Neil Praine, Eddie Scott  
and Ryno Van der Hoven

Also Present: Nick Molyneaux (Viability Consultant)

**22/P Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 August 2021 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

**23/P Application Number: 20/1048: 22-30 Sturt Road, Frimley Green, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 6HY**

The application was for the erection of a residential development of 160 dwellings, including the conversion of the pumphouse building into residential dwellings, to provide 36 no one bedroom and 48 no two bedroom flats; 30 no two bedroom, 37 no three bedroom and 9 no four bedroom houses, along with associated estate roads and accesses onto Sturt Road, car parking, bin and cycle storage, local area of play and external landscaping following the demolition of all other buildings.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

**“UPDATE**

In the second recommendation set out in the update report (Page 21 of the Agenda report), the satisfactory legal agreement needs to be completed by 28 October 2021.

The infrastructure payment through CIL, discounting SANG, is **£498,520**.

The Council's Drainage Engineer has raised no objections.

The Council's Viability Advisers, the DixonSearle Partnership, have provided a summary on viability which is provided as an Annex to this Update.

The County Highway Authority have advised further on the lack of need for controlled crossings across Sturt Road as follows:

*"Controlled crossings were not required as the likely level of pedestrian use throughout the day would be insufficient to meet the criteria for controlled crossings. It is considered that crossings will only operate correctly if they are used on a regular basis throughout the day. If there are too few pedestrians for most of the day drivers may tend to ignore the crossing and put pedestrians at risk on the occasions when they are using the facility."*

**Correction**

Para 7.4.25 of the original report: The nearby church is the Church of St Andrew."

Following the introduction of the Officer's report and recommendation, Nick Molyneux of the DixonSearle Partnership (DSP), as the Council's Viability Advisors, presented the viability position.

As the application had triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr David Gilchrist spoke on behalf of the applicant. Mr David Whitcroft, on behalf of the Mytchett, Frimley Green & Deepcut Society, and Mr Alister Mogford spoke in objection to the application.

It was noted that some Members had concerns in respect of the proposed affordable housing provision (15 affordable dwellings (discount market sales), with a review procedure mechanism). Reservations focussed in on how this figure fell short of the 40% affordable housing requirement in The Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan (CSDMP) and the associated viability assessment. It was reaffirmed that the affordable housing would not go below the 9.4% provision (indicated in the officer update report) and that the provision would be the subject of a secured in perpetuity if the application was approved.

Members expressed reservations in respect of the overall parking layout of the scheme, but also in particular respect of the flatted developments and in particular plots 86, 87 and 88. The Committee felt they needed more information on the proposal's features relating to sustainability including the provision solar panels and ground source heat pumps.

The Committee also had unanswered questions in respect of whether the elements of the scheme would be in accordance with the Council's Residential Design Guide. This was in respect of the requirement for parking arrangements to

be softened by soft landscaping; and the levels of amenity space provided for the flatted units.

As a result of the need for further clarity on these elements of the application, a proposal to defer the application for investigation into these matters was proposed by Councillor Helen Whitcroft, seconded by Councillor Edward Hawkins and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 20/1048 be deferred in order to receive further information on the following matters:**

- **Amenity space in regard to compliance with the Residential Design Guide**
- **Parking layout**
- **Sustainable energy features**
- **Landscaping.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Helen Whitcroft declared that her father was attending the Committee meeting as a public speaker, but she had come to the meeting with an open mind.

**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 alternative proposal to defer the determination of the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Cliff Betton, Edward Hawkins, Mark Gordon, David Lewis, David Mansfield, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, John Skipper, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

**24/P Application Number: 20/0405 - Land At Bagshot Retail Park, 150-152 London Road, Bagshot, Surrey, GU19 5DF**

The application was for the amalgamation of existing (Class E) retail units (Units 2B & 2C) for use as a foodstore (Class E) along with internal works (including a reduction in mezzanine floorspace), changes to the building elevations (including a revised shop front), site layout (including revised servicing and car parking arrangements), revised opening and servicing hours, external plant area, trolley bay and associated works.

Members were advised of the following updates:

**“UPDATE**

The Council's GIS system names the properties to be amalgamated as Units 2A & 2B. This has been amended on the proposal description.

The Council's retail adviser raises no objections subject to clarification on retail impact. This clarification was subsequently provided by the applicant and a view was taken by officers on these submissions. Officers are satisfied that all outstanding matters have been addressed.

### **Representations**

Waitrose & Partners have sent a further representation, maintaining their objection to the proposal, and requested that, if approved, they are given the opportunity to comment on the servicing plan (requested by Condition 6). They have also requested additional text to the condition to ensure that the open parts of the service yard shall be maintained free from obstruction and not used for storage purposes (whether temporary or permanent).

*[Officer comment: It is considered that the servicing plan will provide such information and the temporary storage of goods in the service yard (as they are offloaded and before they are taken into the building) would not be easily enforceable. The more permanent storage could more easily be enforced. It is noted that the Waitrose service yard is only accessed by vehicles through the service yard to the rear of the proposed store. The servicing plan will be provided to ensure access is maintained through this service yard to the Waitrose service yard beyond and control deliveries (during the proposed extension of servicing hours). No amendment to this condition is therefore considered to be necessary. If approved, any application to agree these details will be published and they can be notified at that time].*

Two further objections have been received but these objections raise no new issues.

### **Corrections**

Para 4.2: The net retail floorspace provided under this proposal (for Units 2A & 2B) is 1,019 square metres. This is the amount proposed to be limited by Condition 4.

Para 4.3: The approved opening hours for the existing development is 07:00 to **23:00** hours on Mondays to Saturdays and 10:00 to **18:00** hours on Sundays [Condition 6 of permission 16/1041 and the same as Condition 26 of earlier permission 13/0435].

Para 7.3.8: The retail assessment considers that the proposal would result in a trade diversion from Bagshot of 1.9%.

### **Response from applicant**

The applicant has commented on the officer report by a two page email summarised below:

- The proposal would not lead to an adverse impact on any defined centre or planned investment within any centre and the proposal complies with the sequential test.
- Under the terms of national and local policy, there is no requirement to consider retail impact and that any retail impact would need to be

“significant adverse”. The benchmark for what is deemed unacceptable is high.

- The existing Co-op stores being top-up shopping destinations is demonstrated by the Council’s retail evidence base [Town Centre Uses & Future Directions Study (August 2021)].
- Bagshot is defined as a district centre.
- The former BHS site had also been discounted in the sequential test because there were a number of constraints which make it unsuitable for a food retailer and Camberley is a different catchment for Lidl from Bagshot.
- The pre-application public consultation exercise undertaken by the applicant concluded that of 7,805 properties notified of the proposal, there were 1,979 replies of which 12,483 were in support and 452 were not in support (with 44 undecided).

The applicant has sought amendments to Condition 9, relating to the provision of electric charging points. The applicant is concerned that it will need to be tested how much the charging points are used to see if there is a demand for 13 charging points. They have suggested providing a number (below 13) and add the remainder if demand arises.

The County Highway Authority has agreed with the principle of this approach but has suggested a shorter timescale to deliver the remainder (6 months after occupation). However, it is considered that the wording of this condition needs to reflect the overall provision requirement and there are other mechanisms to challenge these requirements e.g. the NMA procedure. A longer period (6 months) to provide the full amount is accepted. An amended condition in this regard is therefore proposed.

#### **Amended condition**

*9. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied prior to the provision of **7 parking spaces and a further 6 parking spaces within 6 months of such occupation** with a fast charge socket (current minimum requirements - 7kw Mode 3 with Type 2 connector - 230v AC 32 Amp single phase dedicated supply) in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason: In the interests of site sustainability and to comply with Policies CP2, CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.”*

As the application had triggered the Council’s public speaking scheme, Mr Adrian Fox, who attended on behalf of the agent, Quod, spoke in support of the application.

Members had concerns in respect of the potential negative impact of the deliveries by Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs), associated with the proposal, on the neighbouring residential amenity. As a result it was agreed that condition 5 in the officer’s report would be amended to stipulate that the latest HGV delivery should be completed by 9:30pm. Furthermore, it was agreed that an associated informative be added to the recommendation to reaffirm that deliveries should be conducted in a manner as to minimise impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

To further protect neighbouring residential amenity, the Committee agreed that an informative would be added to the recommendation in relation to the proposal's travel plan; which requested that staff parking be provided on the application site.

Members had reservations in respect of the loss of trees attached to the proposal which would have a negative impact on the visual amenity of the area. It was noted that the details in respect of the hard and soft landscaping would be subject to a details to comply application.

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Graham Tapper and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that**

- I. Application 20/0405 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report, as amended, the additional informatives, and the completion of a legal agreement to secure a £50,000 contribution towards improvements to traffic lighting; and**
- II. The wording of the revised condition and the additional informatives be delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and relevant Ward Councillors; and**
- III. The Committee's concerns in respect of the loss of trees be noted.**

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that:

- I. Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that**
  - i. all Committee Members had received a letter from the adjoining retailer; and**
  - ii. himself and Councillor Victoria Wheeler had been copied into an email to Councillor Valerie White from a resident in respect of the application**
- II. Councillor Valerie White declared that she had received a phone call from the manager of Waitrose checking that she had received their written representation.**

**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 recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors: Graham Alleway, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler and Helen Whitcroft.

Voting against the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors: Cliff Betton, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, John Skipper and Valerie White.

**25/P      Application Number: 21/0724: 151 Gordon Avenue, Camberley, Surrey,**

## **GU15 2NR**

The application was for the change of use of a single family dwelling house (C3) to short term accommodation for up to 6 homeless people (sui generis).

An application of this type would usually be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, the application had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee because the Council was the landowner and the applicant.

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Mark Gordon, seconded by Councillor Graham Tapper and put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED that application 21/0724 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report.**

### **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 recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Cliff Betton, Edward Hawkins, Mark Gordon, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, John Skipper, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

## **26/P Application Number: 21/0799: 17 Sefton Close, West End, Woking, Surrey, GU24 9HT**

The application was for the erection of a two storey rear extension and single storey side extension, following demolition of single garage and conservatory.

The application had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee because the applicant was a serving Councillor of Surrey Heath Borough Council.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

### **“UPDATES**

One recommended additional condition as follows:

*4. No additional windows shall be created in the northern elevation of the two storey extension facing number 16 Sefton Close without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason: In the interests of the amenities enjoyed by neighbouring residents and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.”*

The officer recommendation to grant the application was proposed by Councillor Robin Perry, seconded by Councillor Valerie White and put to the vote and carried.

**Note 1**

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that all members of the Committee knew the applicant as he was a fellow Councillor.

**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 recommendation to grant the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Edward Hawkins, Mark Gordon, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, John Skipper, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

Voting in abstention in respect of the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillor Cliff Betton.

**27/P Information Report**

The Committee were advised of a procedural error which had been made during the determination of a planning application. The Committee noted the relating actions which were due to be taken as a result.

**RESOLVED that the report be noted.**

**28/P Enforcement Monitoring Report**

In accordance with Part 4, Section D, paragraph 10 of the Constitution the Committee considered whether to continue the meeting post-10pm. It was agreed that the item would be deferred for consideration at the next meeting of the Committee.

**RESOLVED that the item be deferred.**

Chairman