

**Minutes of the Planning Committee  
20 September 2017**

**Present:**

Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley (Chairman)  
Councillor H.A. Thomson (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

R.O. Barratt	A.T. Jones
I.J. Beardsmore	R.W. Sider BEM

**Apologies:** Apologies were received from Councillor C.B. Barnard, Councillor J.R. Boughtflower, Councillor S.J. Burkmar, Councillor R. Chandler, Councillor S.M. Doran, Councillor M.P.C. Francis, Councillor N. Islam and Councillor D. Patel

**In Attendance:**

Councillors who are not members of the Committee, but attended the meeting and spoke on an application in or affecting their ward, are set out below in relation to the relevant application.

Councillor N. Gething	17/00782/FUL - Headline House, Stanwell Road, Ashford, TW15 3HQ
-----------------------	---

**534/17 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 August 2017 were approved as a correct record subject to Minute 517/17 being amended to read, by the inclusion of the words in italics and deletion of the words struck through, as follows:

*It was moved, seconded and agreed to amend the recommendation to refuse planning permission by removing reasons numbers 3, 5, 7 and 8.*

The application was **REFUSED** planning permission ~~subject to the removal of reasons numbers 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8.~~

**535/17 Disclosures of Interest**

**a) Disclosures of interest under the Members' Code of Conduct**

There were none.

**b) Declarations of interest under the Council's Planning Code**

Councillors R.A. Smith Ainsley, H.A. Thomson, R.O. Barratt and R.W. Sider BEM reported that they had received correspondence in relation to application 17/00782/FUL - Headline House, Stanwell Road, Ashford TW15 3HQ - but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor N. Gething, speaking as a ward councillor in relation to application 17/00782/FUL - Headline House, Stanwell Road, Ashford TW15 3HQ - declared that he had spoken with residents in relation to the application and had not expressed any comments.

**536/17 17/00782/FUL - Headline House, Stanwell Road, Ashford, TW15 3HQ**

**Description:**

The demolition of the existing building and erection of a two storey building with second floor accommodation to provide 5 no. one bedroom flats and 5 no. two bedroom flats with associated parking and amenity space.

**Additional Information:**

The Planning Development Manager reported the following:

Consultation Response

A consultation response had been received from the Council's Tree Officer raising no objection to the proposals.

Amendment to Planning Committee Report

Paragraph 5.1 (2<sup>nd</sup> line) on page 29 of the committee report: 24 **25** responses from 24 **22** residences have been received to date, including comments from SCAN.

Representations

16 no. letters of objection from 13 residences had been received, three of which had written in previously. Most of the issues raised were already covered in report, however, the following issues were also raised:

- Drainage
- Impact on local businesses
- High activity levels along boundary to no. 2 Chaucer Road
- Residents' permit parking should be introduced along Chaucer Road

**Public Speaking:**

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Marian Rough spoke against the proposed development raising the following key points:

- Drainage concerns – a condition is required

- There have been a number of objections
- Loss of privacy
- Parking concerns
- Issues over times of construction

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Kevin Davies spoke for the proposed development raising the following key points:

- Almost identical to previous application approved.
- Transport and air quality assessment now submitted
- Thames Water has no objection
- Will provide a new connection to Chaucer Road
- Meets parking and amenity standards
- Impact on listed church is ok
- There is the possibility of a parking scheme

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Councillor N. Gething spoke as Ward Councillor against the proposed development raising the following key points:

- Surrey County Council has refused to consider a parking scheme.
- Proposal will exacerbate parking issue
- Party Wall Act issues
- Drainage concerns
- Existing planning permission should be issued
- Should be refused as they already have enough units

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Size, mass etc. is identical to previous approved scheme with minor alterations
- No reason to refuse
- Drainage is ok
- Party Wall Act is not a planning consideration

**Decision:**

The application was **approved** as per agenda.

**537/17 17/00366/FUL - Monkey Puzzle House, 69-71 Windmill Road, Sunbury, TW16 7DT**

**Description:**

Alterations and extension to the existing building to provide 14 apartments.

**Additional Information:**

The Planning Development Manager reported the following:

Amendment to Planning Committee Report

Executive Summary on page 48, 3<sup>rd</sup> line, should read 2016 not 2-0116.

Para. 8.7 on page 51, the proposed mix of residential units is 12 x 2 bed and 2 x 3 bed. The mix referred to in this paragraph (5<sup>th</sup> line), 4 x 1 bed and 12 x 2 bed, is the approved development under 16/01179/PDO.

**Public Speaking:**

There was none.

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Existing building is presentable; reservations on proposed design
- Principal of residential already conceded
- Affordable housing concerns/lack of affordable housing

**Decision:**

The application was **approved** as per agenda.

**538/17 14/00175/UNDEV - 6 Stanhope Heath Stanwell TW19 7PH**

**Description:**

Unauthorised conversion of dwelling to three flats.

**Additional Information:**

The Planning Development Manager reported the following:

A late letter of representation had been received on behalf of the owner which raised the following points:

- Each unit has a garden
- Each unit has its own facilities
- The internal area is sufficient
- Council tax has been paid since 2014
- Adequate parking on and off street
- Visual appearance is acceptable
- Did not realise planning permission was needed
- Occupiers do not cause noise or disturbance
- Tenants would be made homeless and children are settled into school.

**Public Speaking:**

There was none.

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- The unauthorised use is frustrating
- Enforcement action is supported

- Accommodation is substandard
- Is a disaster area
- Children need to be re-schooled

**Decision:**

The Committee resolved to agree to take enforcement action against the unauthorised use.

**539/17 Planning Appeals Report**

The Chairman informed the Committee that if any Member had any detailed queries regarding the report on Appeals lodged and decisions received since the last meeting, they should contact the Planning Development Manager.

**Resolved** that the report of the Planning Development Manager be received and noted.

**540/17 Urgent Items**

There were none.