

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning
Applications Committee held at
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath
House, Knoll Road, Camberley, GU15
3HD on 20 January 2022**

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

+ Cllr Graham Alleway	+ Cllr Charlotte Morley
+ Cllr Peter Barnett	+ Cllr Robin Perry
- Cllr Cliff Betton	+ Cllr Darryl Ratiram
+ Cllr Stuart Black	+ Cllr Graham Tapper
+ Cllr Mark Gordon	+ Cllr Helen Whitcroft
+ Cllr David Lewis	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr David Mansfield	

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Morgan Rise (In place of Cllr Cliff Betton)

Members in Attendance: Cllr Emma-Jane McGrath and Cllr Pat Tedder

Officers Present: Simon Chalcraft, Michael Gavin
Gavin Chinniah, Bex Green, Julia Greenfield
William Hinde, Shannon Kimber, Jonathan Partington
James Robinson, Eddie Scott, Nick Steevens
Patricia Terceiro and Ryno Van der Hoven

44/P Minutes of Previous Meeting

The Committee were advised that it was proposed that the following text would be inserted into minute 41/P relating to application 21/1003 – Princess Royal Barracks, Brunswick Road, Deepcut, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 6RN:

‘A verbal update was also given to the meeting in respect of Schedule 5 Part 6 Village Green and Combined NEAP/LEAP Paragraph 1.4 for the amended trigger number to be 350 to correspond with the text.’

The minutes were subsequently confirmed by the Committee.

45/P Exclusion of Press and Public

In accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), the press and public were excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the ground that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, as set out below:

<u>Minute</u> 45/P (Part)	<u>Paragraph(s)</u> 1 and 3
------------------------------	--------------------------------

46/P Planning Enforcement Update

The Committee considered an information item which provided an overview of function and performance of the Corporate Enforcement Service for the period 1st September 2021 – 31st December 2021.

During the period in question, the Planning Enforcement Team investigated allegations of planning breaches, as shown below:

Number of referrals received	72
No breach found	19
Breach resolved	8
Not expedient to pursue	5
Enforcement Notices issued	4
Requisition of Information Notices (PCN/S16/S330) issued	2
Planning applications received dealing with matters under investigation	6
Pending consideration	33

In addition to this it was noted that a number of enforcement notices had been issued on a number of sites including:

- 1-23 St Georges Court, St Georges Road, Camberley, GU15 3QZ – ref: 21/0221/ENF
- Graylands, Windlesham Road, Chobham, Surrey, GU24 8SN – ref: 20/137/ENF£
- Hall Grove Farm Industrial Estate, Bagshot, Surrey, GU19 5HP – ref: 21/0059/ENF – (Notice A)
- Land lying to the East of Hall Grove Farm Industrial Estate, Bagshot, Surrey, GU19 5HP – ref: 21/0059/ENF – (Notice B)
- 19 Bedford Avenue, Frimley Green, Camberley, GU16 6HP – ref: 20/0028/ENF

Members noted that with greater additional resource in place, the enforcement service had been concentrating on resolving the highest priority, often historic investigations as well as reviewing internal procedures to ensure that the planning enforcement process was streamlined and efficient.

On reviewing practices in respect of the dealing of retrospective planning applications, the need for the enforcement service to have greater involvement

from the outset to provide assistance to case officers and share any vital information was underlined. Furthermore, a new process had now been implemented to ensure that where appropriate, enforcement notices were issued in a timely manner for refused retrospective planning applications with a separate new expediency report template created.

The Committee noted that unfortunately, due to a large number of significant high priority urgent investigations in existence, to date, resource had been prioritised to focus on dealing with such investigations. However, the team had made significant progress in reviewing the outstanding investigations and had moved into the new year in a much better position, noting in particular the added temporary resource in the form of an additional Planning Enforcement Officer. Therefore, officers were working to formally commence the compliance role from the start new financial year. Following discussion from Members, it was advised that the monitoring of compliance would be prioritised following a risk-based assessment of sites; and such process could be shared with Members in due course. Moreover, it was noted that an additional software programme, Enterprise, had been procured in order to enable more complex reporting in respect of data, caseloads and workloads.

RESOLVED that the update be noted.

47/P Review of Exempt Items

The Committee reviewed the report which had been considered at the meeting following the exclusion of members of the press and public, as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information.

RESOLVED that the annex associated with minute 46/P remain exempt.

48/P Application Number: 21/1122- Erlwood Manor, London Road, Windlesham, Surrey, GU20 6PH

The application was for alterations to existing buildings and landscape; demolition of Biology East; construction of a three storey collaboration hub and link building; landscaping; creation of footpaths; associated infrastructure and other works.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“UPDATE

Correction to page 9 of the agenda: The applicant is UCB Celltech (UCB)

Conditions

Condition 3 (Materials) amended to read:

Prior to construction, alteration and extension works relating to the Collaboration Hub and Manor House, details and samples of materials to be used for the external surfaces of those buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. In respect of the Manor House these details shall include detailed drawings at 1:100 and 1:20 and shall include details of treatment

of the north elevation and terrace base. The development shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved details. In relation to all other alteration works at the site the external materials shall match those of the building concerned.
Reason: To ensure a high quality of construction and appearance and to comply with policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012.

Condition 8 (Archaeology) is replaced by a new condition:

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the submitted Archaeology Desk-Based assessment, Savills, Revised Draft, December 2021.

Reason: To ensure full assessment of the potential archaeological value of the site and to comply with policy DM17 of the CSDMP 2012.

Condition 15 (Trees): add clause *k) A strategy for removal of invasive species, this to include details of management over a period of 5 years following completion of the development to ensure eradication.*

Condition 18 (Woodland management plan) is deleted.

Condition 19 (Lighting) is amended to read:

Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved a lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details and retained as such for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect biodiversity and prevent light pollution and to comply with policies CP14A and DM9 of the CSDMP 2012.

Additional condition (Lighting during development works)

Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved a Demolition and Construction Phases Lighting Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and works shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect biodiversity and to comply with policy CP14A of the CSDMP 2012.

Additional condition (Protection of trees during demolition)

Prior to commencement of demolition works a Demolition Tree Protection Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the works shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect trees during demolition works and to comply with policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012.

Additional Informative

Pursuant to condition 9 (Travel Plan) the applicant is requested to consider inclusion of a station-to-site shuttle bus service to transport employees.”

Following consideration of the Planning Updates, the Committee wished to clarify that the proposed Condition 17 in the officer’s report should also refer to any

superseding landscaping management plan, which had not yet been agreed with the Local Planning Authority. As a result it was agreed to add the words, 'or a variation to' after 'approved landscaping plan', in the proposed condition.

Furthermore following discussion, the Committee agreed to amend condition 10 of the officer's report to specify '15 passive rapid or fast charging electric vehicle charging points'.

The officer recommendation, as amended, was proposed by Councillor Robin Perry, seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that application 21/1122 be granted subject to the conditions in the Officer Report and Planning Updates, as amended.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that herself, her fellow Ward Councillors and Parish Councillors had met the applicant, on site, and reviewed the existing building and discussed the plans for the site; however she came into 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 officer recommendation to grant the application:

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

49/P Application Number: 20/0514 - 1 Middle Close, Camberley, Surrey, GU15 1NZ

The application was for a proposed single storey front extension including two roof lights, a two storey extension to the western side elevation following demolition of the existing garage, change to main roof form, six roof lights to main front roof slope, two rear dormers and fenestration alterations (this application is a resubmission of 19/0701 to allow for alterations to the height of the building and the front gables, alterations to the dormers and fenestration, and the installation of fixed plant for heating and cooling units) - retrospective.

The application would have normally been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee by Councillor Edward Hawkins on the grounds of residents' concerns over size and bulk, and concerns over the inappropriateness of the heating and cooling units and their potential impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of 3 Middle Close.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“UPDATE

Representations

A further five representations have been received from four addresses. These objection comments have been summarised below:

- Overdevelopment of site
- Built without permission or building regulations/retrospective application
- Overlooking/loss of privacy
- Noise and emissions pollution from heating and cooling units
- Removal of trees
- Concreting rear garden
- Removal of earth and erection of retaining wall
- Non-porous driveway, resulting in drainage issues of run-off on to 3 Middle Close
- Not in keeping with wider character of the estate
- Noise and disruption from the building works, blocking of the roads, workers pouring cement down the rain drains, builders' rubble in the front garden, flood lit rear garden, the complete disregard to anyone and everyone and the general attitude of the property owner
- Negative impact on outlook
- Disagreement that the block plan and orientation between number 1 and number 3 is correct
- Heating and cooling units are industrial looking and out of keeping for the character of the area
- Disagreement with the accuracy of the noise survey

Conditions

Condition 1 amended (change in italics):

Within 4 weeks of the date of this decision, the new acoustic enclosure to the three heating and cooling units to the western side elevation of 1 Middle Close will be enclosed in a new acoustic casing with Caice 150mm Acoustic Louvered section as per design by acoustic specialist, set out in the approved noise impact assessment (Nova Acoustics, dated 1st December 2021) and annotated in the approved plans, *and thereafter the acoustic casing shall be retained and maintained.*

Reason: To prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions and in accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and to protect the residential amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.”

As the application had triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr Gordon Naisby and Mr Stephen Craig spoke in objection to the application. Mr Sam Peacock spoke on behalf of the applicant in favour of the application.

Committee members had various, notable concerns in respect of the proposal. It was felt by the Committee that the proposed heating and cooling units would be overbearing and have an adverse impact on both the residential and visual amenities enjoyed by 3 Middle Close. It was also noted that the units would be cluttered and industrial in a residential area. Furthermore, it was opined that the increased height of the front gables would appear as unsubservient to the existing dwelling; and when combined with the existing extensions resulted in a building which was prominent, incongruous and out of keeping in relation to the existing streetscene.

As there was no proposer and seconder for the officer's recommendation the recommendation to grant the application fell.

An alternative recommendation to refuse the application for the reasons outlined above was proposed by Councillor Edward Hawkins, seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED that

- I. application 20/0514 be refused for the following reasons:**
 - i. impact on residential amenity**
 - ii. negative impact on visual amenities**
 - iii. out of keeping with the existing streetscene; and**
- II. the final wording of the reasons for refusal be delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.**

Note 1

It was noted for the record that:

- i. Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that two Committee Site Visits had taken place in respect of the application and the Committee received various pieces of correspondence from neighbours;
- ii. Councillor Graham Tapper had received correspondence and had engaged with neighbours in respect of the application, but came into the meeting with an open mind; and;
- iii. Councillor Victoria Wheeler declared that she had received direct email correspondence in respect of the proposal.

Note 2

In line with Part 5 Section D of the Council's Constitution, as the application had previously been deferred by the Planning Applications Committee in order to conduct a Member Site Visit, only those members who attended the deferred-for Site Visit were able to vote on the application.

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 refuse the application:

Councillors Graham Alleway, Peter Barnett, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

50/P Application Number: 21/0306 - 9 Christie Close, Lightwater, Surrey, GU18 5UG

The application was for the change of use from amenity land to garden land, and erection of a part two storey and part single storey side/rear extension, following demolition of existing garage.

The application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of the Head of Planning, because the applicant was the daughter of former Councillor Mr Surinder Gandhum.

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

RESOLVED that application 21/0306 be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the Officer Report.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Councillor Edward Hawkins declared that members of the Committee knew the father of the applicant from when he was a serving Surrey Heath Borough 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, Stuart Black, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Victoria Wheeler, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

51/P Application Number: 21/0902 - Clear Spring, Brick Hill, Chobham, Woking, Surrey, GU24 8TH

The application was for a single storey rear extension.

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Victoria Wheeler because of concern over the harm to the Green Belt. The application was deferred from the 9 December 2021 Planning Applications Committee in order to verify from the planning history that permitted development rights had not already been removed.

Members were advised of the following updates on the application:

“UPDATE

Conditions

The proposed plans for approval include velux windows which are permitted development. To provide clarity on what works are to be undertaken it is proposed to update condition 4 to enable all the works shown on the approved plans to be undertaken as follows:

Amended condition 4 (change in italics)

Notwithstanding the provisions of Class A, Class B, Class C, Class D, Class E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no further extensions, roof alterations, porches or outbuildings shall be erected on the site without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Unless otherwise shown on the approved plans any other development under the Classes stated above undertaken or implemented between the date of this decision and the commencement of the development hereby approved shall be demolished and all material debris resulting permanently removed from the land within one month of the development hereby approved coming into first use.

Reason: To retain control in the interests of the openness of the Green Belt and to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework”.

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

RESOLVED that application 21/0902 be granted subject to the conditions in the officer report and planning updates.

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, Stuart Black, Mark Gordon, Edward Hawkins, David Lewis, Charlotte Morley, Robin Perry, Darryl Ratiram, Morgan Rise, Graham Tapper, Helen Whitcroft and Valerie White.

Voting against the officer recommendation to grant the application:

Councillor Victoria Wheeler.

Chairman