

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning
Applications Committee held at
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House
on 15 December 2016**

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr David Mansfield (Vice Chairman)

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| - Cllr Richard Brooks | + Cllr Adrian Page |
| + Cllr Nick Chambers | + Cllr Robin Perry |
| + Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman | + Cllr Ian Sams |
| + Cllr Colin Dougan | Cllr Conrad Sturt |
| - Cllr Surinder Gandhum | + Cllr Pat Tedder |
| + Cllr Jonathan Lytle | + Cllr Victoria Wheeler |
| - Cllr Katia Malcaus Cooper | + Cllr Valerie White |
- + Present
- Apologies for absence presented

Substitutes: Cllr Max Nelson (In place of Cllr Richard Brooks)

In Attendance: Duncan Carty, Jonathan Partington, Gareth John, Lee Brewin and Jenny Rickard

28/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 November 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

29/P Application Number: 16/0916 - 30 Chertsey Road, Chobham, Woking GU24 8PQ

The application was for the Advertisement Consent to display advertisement surround to ATM proposed by planning application SU/2016/0915. (Additional info recv'd 26/10/16)

This application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers; however, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Tedder.

Some Members felt that the site was not appropriate for an external ATM as there would be issues with safety and parking. There was also no proposal to install bollards at the site to help prevent ram raiding the ATM. It was also felt that the shop would be open enough hours during the day to use the post office money withdrawal facility inside.

Members were advised that the post office opening hours would be 6am – 9pm on Monday to Saturday and 7am to 5pm on Sundays.

Resolved that application 16/0916 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Colin Dougan.

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 approve the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Max Nelson, Adrian Page and Robin Perry.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Mansfield, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

30/P Application Number: 16/0915 - 30 Chertsey Road, Chobham, Woking GU24 8PQ

The application was for the installation of ATM to right hand side of the shop front. (Additional info recv'd 26/10/16).

The application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers; however, it had been reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Tedder.

Resolved that application 16/0915 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Max Nelson and seconded by Councillor Robin Perry.

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 approve the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, Max Nelson, Adrian Page and Robin Perry.

Voting against the recommendation to approve the application:

Councillors David Mansfield, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

31/P Application Number: 16/0681 - Pinewood, 93 College Ride, Bagshot, GU19 5EP

The application was for the erection of a part three storey, part four storey 69 bedroom (Class C2) Care Home with link to and conversion of existing locally listed building from offices (Class B1a) to provide ancillary facilities to Care Home with associated landscaping, formation of access road and parking and associated works.

Members received the following updates:

'Paragraph 6.1, page 39 - Correction: There has been one representation in support and 4 representations raising an objection.

A legal agreement has been provided to provide mitigation against impact on the SPA and Travel Plan monitoring, in a similar manner to SU/10/0606. However, this has not been checked (because the legal fee not paid).

Paragraph 7.10, page 44 -The LLFA has raised an objection on lack of drainage information. However, the Council's Drainage Engineer considers that the LLFA concerns could be considered by condition(s). A reason for refusal on drainage has, therefore, not been added.'

Members were concerned about the lack of parking spaces at the site and safety issues regarding no pavements on College Ride.

Resolved that application 16/0681 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr Elsemore, representing the agent spoke in support.

Note 2

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Victoria Wheeler and seconded by Councillor David Mansfield.

Note 3

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 Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

32/P Application Number: 16/0631 - Land rear of The Parade, Frimley, Camberley

The application was for the outline application for the erection of 7 No. residential dwellings, with vehicular access, car parking with alterations/reduction to existing public car park/servicing areas (all matters reserved). (Additional information rec'd 23/11/2016).

The application would normally have been determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation for Officers; however, it was reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Sams.

Members received the following updates:

'Economic Development Officer – No comments.

The agent has responded to the proposed reasons 1, 2 and 3 of the officer report by providing:

- An affordable housing statement was received on 14/12 which concludes that the Written Ministerial Statement, the associated Court judgement and updates to National Planning Practice Guidance which indicate that affordable housing should not be sought for schemes of 10 dwellings or less, with less weight given to local policies which would require an on-site provision; and*
- An addendum report has been received today to indicate improvements to the approach could be provided including a revised surface treatment (e.g. cobble edge and block paving access road), use of different colour hard surface treatments, variations in texture and levels, use of bollards to define spaces, traffic calming measures (e.g. raised tables), kerbing to define different surfaces, and the introduction of soft landscaping; with a plan has been provided which indicates that on-site ecological mitigation can be provided on this site. This includes the provision of trees, tree mounted bat boxes, bat boxes integral to the buildings and landscaping.*

Officer response

- The addendum report indicates possible enhancements to the approach but it is not considered that this would overcome reason 1 and the objections on character grounds.*
- The addendum report indicates possible ecological enhancements including further tree provision, and the provision of bat boxes (in the trees and within the fabric of the dwellings). The Tree Officer has indicated that there are too many trees, too close together with some under the tree canopies of existing retained trees, which may prove difficult to establish on the long-term. However, broad leaf hedging, along with some tree planting may be possible instead. It is too late, however, for SWT comments to be provided. At this late stage it is therefore recommended that reason 2 remains.*
- The agent has not demonstrated why local policies for affordable housing provision should be set aside in favour of the national position; has not provided any viability information; information about whether the developer can be defined as a small developer; and whether the Borough has*

conditions where housing needs are not so extreme, and the house prices so high, that a different approach to the national position is not required. As such, it is recommended that reason 3 remains.

One additional letter of comment has been received from an objector not raising any additional issues.'

Clarification was sought on the allocation of parking spaces on the site. Members were advised there would be 10 residential and 76 for the car park.

Resolved that application 16/0631 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

As this application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr Kitcherside spoke in support of the application.

Note 2

The recommendation to refuse the application was proposed by Councillor Ian Sams and seconded by Councillor Victoria Wheeler.

Note 3

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 Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse the application:

Councillor Jonathan Lytle.

33/P Application Number: 16/0691 - 33 Upper Park Road, Camberley, GU15 2EG

The application was for the part demolition and erection of a part two storey, part three storey front, side and rear extension and front/rear dormers to provide extended accommodation in the third floor/roof space and conversion of the building to provide 8 no. one bedroom and 2 no two bedroom flats for use by the learning disabled with associated accommodation. (Amended plans rec'd 17/11/2016).

Members received the following updates:

*'Natural England raises no objection.
The Council's Tree Officer raises no objections.*

Representations (page 56)

One further objection has been received raising no new issues.

Four objections received to the amended scheme, from those who had objected to the original proposal, indicating that their objections remain in place and that although there may be a reduction in windows facing their properties (29/31 Upper Park Road) over the existing arrangement, but there is an increase in habitable room windows (4 to 6) in this elevation.'

Some Members were concerned as to how the flats would be kept for the use of the learning disabled. Officers advised that if the flats were sold on the open market it would be an enforcement issue.

Resolved that application 16/0691 be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Vivienne Chapman and seconded by Councillor Adrian Page.

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 approve the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

34/P Application Number: 16/0962 - Plot A, Trade City, Former BAe Systems, Lyon Way, Frimley, Camberley

The application was for the erection of 1 no. research and development/light industrial/general industry/warehouse building (Class B1b/B1c/B2/B8) with ancillary offices, car parking and landscaping and associated development.

Members received the following updates:

Consultations

The Council's Environmental Health Officer and the Environment Agency raise no objections.

The Local Lead Flood Authority (SCC) also raises no objections subject to conditions (see conditions 12 and 13, already proposed within the officer report, and amended condition 14 below).

The County Highway Authority raises no objections subject to conditions (see conditions 5 and 7, already proposed within the officer report, and additional condition below).

Recommendation

Amend Condition 9 to state:

Any tree or plants, which within a period of five years of commencement of any works in pursuance of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced as soon as practicable with others of similar size and species, following consultation with the Local Planning Authority, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

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.

Amend Condition 10 to state:

No development shall take place until a detailed scheme for remedial works and measures to be undertaken to avoid risk from contaminants and/or gases when the site is developed and proposals for future maintenance and monitoring shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme shall include nomination of a competent person to oversee the implementation of the works. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied/brought into use until there has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority verification by the competent person (indicated above) that any remediation work required and approved under the provisions above has been implemented fully in accordance with the approved details. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, such verification shall comprise: (a) as built drawings of the implemented scheme; (b) photographs of the remediation works in progress; and(c) Certificates demonstrating that imported and/or material left in situ is free of contamination. Thereafter the scheme shall be monitored and maintained in accordance with the approved remediation scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the risk from contamination can be managed and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Delete Condition 11

Amend Condition 14 to state:

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the sustainable drainage system has been construction in accordance with the approved details pursuant to Conditions 13 and 14 above, and details of a management and maintenance plan, indicating who will on and maintain the surface water drainage elements and their associated inspection and maintenance regimes, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved management and maintenance plan.

Reason: To ensure that the sustainable drainage system is designed to technical standards and to limit flood risk and to comply with Policies CP2 and DM10 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Additional condition:

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved on site details of secure cycle storage area(s) and access thereto are to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved the details shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans and thereafter retained.

Reason: To ensure visual amenities are not prejudiced and to promote the use of alternative transport methods to the private car and to accord with Policies DM9 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.'

Some Members sought clarification regarding the change in footprint of the building and the car park. Officers advised that the site was the same size but there would be some loss of landscaping. The proposal for the building was now squarer in shape. There was also some concern about flooding issues. Members were also informed that there had been considerable work carried out installing balancing ponds and pumps. In addition conditions had been amended to take into account flooding concerns.

It was noted that the proposal would bring a different type of employment opportunities to the area in research and development.

Resolved that application 16/0962 be approved subject to the conditions as amended as set out in the report of the executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillor Colin Dougan and seconded by Councillor Jonathan Lytle.

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 approve the application:

Councillors Nick Chambers, Vivienne Chapman, Colin Dougan, Edward Hawkins, Jonathan Lytle, David Mansfield, Max Nelson, Adrian Page, Robin Perry, Ian Sams, Victoria Wheeler and Valerie White.

35/P Exclusion of the Press and Public

The Committee resolved, that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for minute 36/P, on the ground that it would involve a likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 6 and 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

36/P Enforcement

The Committee noted a verbal update from the Executive Head – Regulatory in relation to enforcement action.

37/P Review of Exempt Item

It was resolved that item at minute 36/P remain exempt.

Chairman