

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
15 November 2017**

Present:

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

Councillors:

C.B. Barnard	S.J. Burkmar	N. Islam
R.O. Barratt	R. Chandler	A.T. Jones
I.J. Beardsmore	S.M. Doran	R.W. Sider BEM
J.R. Boughtflower	M.P.C. Francis	

Apologies: Apologies were received from Councillor P.C. Edgington

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 17/01274/FUL - Former Brooklands College,
Church Road, Ashford

Councillor S.C. Mooney 17/01320/FUL - Sankby, Leacroft, Staines-
upon-Thames

579/17 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 October 2017 were approved as a correct record.

580/17 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

On behalf of all the Committee, the Chairman reported that members had received a presentation in relation to application 17/01274/FUL - Former

Brooklands College, Church Road, Ashford by Inland Homes in accordance with the Council's Planning Code for large complex schemes.

Councillors R.A. Smith Ainsley, J, Boughtflower, M. Francis and N. Islam, reported that they had received correspondence, and Cllr Islam had had a meeting with the developer, in relation to application 17/01274/FUL - Former Brooklands College, Church Road, Ashford, but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor M. Francis reported that he had received correspondence in relation to application 17/01320/FUL – Sankby, Leacroft, Staines-upon-Thames, but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

581/17 17/01274/FUL - Former Brooklands College, Church Road, Ashford

Description:

This item was a planning application for the redevelopment of the site comprising the demolition of the existing buildings and the construction of new buildings between one and five storeys to accommodate 357 dwellings, 619 sq.m (GIA) of flexible commercial floorspace, 442 sq.m (GIA) of education floorspace, the provision of public open space and associated car parking, cycle parking, access and related infrastructure and associated works.

Additional Information:

The Planning Development Manager reported the following:

1. 10 no. late letters of letters of representation were received (2 separate sets of 3 letters from 2 households). Most of the issues raised were already covered in the report. One of the letters raised an issue relating to the neighbourhood consultation process. A petition from 28 people in support of the proposal had been received.
2. An additional plan was submitted showing the installation of privacy screens around the roof terraces of the 3rd and 4th floor flats to the west of 49 Meadway. Consequently, Condition 2 is to be amended:

Condition 2

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and drawings:

2055-01-DR-0001 Rev. P01; /0100 Rev. P01; /0101 Rev. P01; /0102 Rev. P01; /0103 Rev. P01; /0104 Rev. P01; /0110 Rev. P01; /0400 Rev. P01; /0401 Rev. P01; /0402 Rev. P01; /0403 Rev. P01; /0404 Rev. P01; /0600 Rev. P01; /601 Rev. P01; /0602 Rev. P01; /0603 Rev. P01; /0604 Rev. P01; /0605 Rev. P01; /0606 Rev. P01; /0650 Rev. P01; /0651 Rev. P01 received 21 August 2017.

2055-11-DR-0099 Rev. P01; /0101 Rev. P01; /0102 Rev. P01; /0103 Rev. P01; /0104 Rev. P01; /0450 Rev. P01; /0600 Rev. P01; /0601 Rev. P01; /0602 Rev. P01; /0603 Rev. P01; /0604 Rev. P01 received 21 August 2017.

2055-16-DR-0100 Rev. P01; /0101 Rev. P01; /0102 Rev. P01; /0600 Rev. P01 received 21 August 2017.

2055-21-DR-0100 Rev. P01; /0101 Rev. P01; /0102 Rev. P01; /0600 Rev. P01; /0601 Rev. P01; /0602 Rev. P01 received 21 August 2017.

2055-31-DR-0099 Rev. P01; /0100 Rev. P01; /0101 Rev. P01; /0102 Rev. P01; /0103 Rev. P01; /0104 Rev. P01; /0600 Rev. P01; /0601 Rev. P01; /0602 Rev. P01 received 21 August 2017.

Topographical Survey drawings 1, 2, 3 & 4 received 21 August 2017.

INL20124-01 (North 1 of 2), INL21373-03 (North 1 of 2), INL20124-01 (North 1 of 2), INL20124-01 (South 2 of 2), INL21373-03 (South 2 of 2), INL21373 10, INL21373 15 received 21 August 2017.

Plan no. 2055-01-SK-0003 Rev. P03 received 13 November 2017.

Reason: - For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning

3. A revised response from the County Highway Authority was received. The only difference is the change of the term: "*non single vehicle modes of transport*" to "*non single motorised vehicle modes of transport*" (i.e. cycling, walking, use of public transport, etc.). Accordingly, the last sentence of paragraph 10.2 (3(b)) of the Heads of Terms has been amended:

(b) Provision of one car club vehicle for a minimum of two years, with all costs associated with the provision of the vehicle including provision of parking space and pump priming being met by the developer. When the first car is used by residents of the development for more than 25% of the time averaged over one month then a second car shall be provided with all costs associated with the provision of the second vehicle including provision of parking space being met by the developer. If either the first or second vehicle is removed then the money that would have been invested into either vehicle should be reinvested into the travel plan in order to provide non-single **motorised** vehicle modes of transport.

4. Paragraph 4.19 to be amended:

There are also some areas of land which will be open to the public (**1.41 ha**) including the Pocket Park and Town Square. Public amenity space will be provided in the form of a large public park, consisting of an open grass

area and children play area. The proposal will provide space of some 1.86 ha in total, 1.41 ha public and 0.45 ha private.

5. Second part of paragraph 8.75 to be amended:

The parking provision for the housing units meet the current parking standards. It is also proposed to provide one bike space per flat and this will be secure by a planning condition. **The parking for the commercial and educational floorspace is for operational purposes and is the same as in the previous proposal.** It is noted that the amended proposal does not provide any public parking but **on its own** it is not considered ~~that this could form~~ **sufficient to justify** a reason to refuse.

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's public speaking procedures, Simon Slatford spoke for the proposal raising the following key points:

- Scheme revised to address the Committee's concerns and previous reasons for refusal
- Height reduced
- Nos. of dwellings reduced
- Density reduced
- Car parking increased by 90 for the dwellings
- Highly sustainable location
- Meets policies HO1 and HO5
- Provides a mix of dwellings to comply with policy HO4
- The maximum amount of affordable housing has been provided on the site and viability has been independently assessed.
- Will make a positive contribution to the area

In accordance with the Council's public speaking procedures, Ben Johnson spoke for the proposal raising the following key points:

- Met with Councillors, Chamber of Commerce, residents association, medical practice and under took public consultation
- Revised brochure of scheme distributed
- Public square and shops to be provided which will revitalise area
- Will open up open space in the heart of the town
- Will provide a large CIL contribution
- Will provide construction jobs and permanent jobs
- Petition from local businesses in support
- Scheme has addressed concerns of Ashford people

In accordance with the Council's public speaking procedures, Ward Councillor Nick Gething spoke against the proposal raising the following key points:

- Pleased with the amount of work the applicant has done with the resubmission
- Overbearing
- Size of buildings D and E will dominate the town
- Change of character

- Concern over level of affordable housing
- Traffic concerns

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Previous concerns have been addressed
- Decrease in the number of units and habitable rooms
- Residents would like some public parking
- We do not control affordable housing assessment process, constrained by independent evaluation
- Under pressure to provide housing
- Scope for high density housing close to public transport
- Current open space is not accessible to the public, proposed open space will be accessible to the public
- Proposal will be accessible
- All minimum size standards of units met
- Crime by Design queries
- Concern that 20 affordable housing units have been lost
- Businesses have suffered since the school closed and this scheme will benefit businesses
- Will put the town on the map which is needed/ will regenerate Ashford
- Pleased with decrease in units
- Infrastructure concerns
- Queries over CIL
- Bulk and massing now acceptable
- Car parking improvements
- Query over disabled parking
- Query over whether it is a gated development
- Query over if the road will be adopted. It was confirmed that it will not be
- Traffic concerns
- Recognition of the Officers' contributions in preparing and presenting the reports and supporting documentation

As Councillor Howard Thomson was not present for all of the debate on this item he did not take part nor vote on the application.

Decision:

The application was **approved** as per agenda subject to it being referred to the Secretary of State and an S106.

582/17 17/01320/FUL - Sankby, Leacroft, Staines-upon-Thames

The Chairman took this Item ahead of Item 4a, due to the attendance at the meeting of public speakers both 'for and against' the proposal.

Description:

This Item is an application for the creation of a new roof with two rear dormers and rooflights to create habitable accommodation at second floor, erection of 2 no. two storey gabled front extensions, single storey rear extension and alterations to the fenestration of the front, rear and side elevations. Subdivision of the property to create 2 no. five bedroom semi-detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space.

Additional Information:

There was none.

Public Speaking:

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

- Only two clear parking spaces was inadequate for the proposal
- Concerns of highway safety due to cars backing out onto the road
- Excessive on street parking already / lack of parking spaces on road
- Multiple occupation concerns

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

- Has developed a number of properties in Spelthorne and none have been converted to guest houses
- Parking provided is sufficient for family houses

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

- High volume of objections received
- Parking in Leacroft is a problem – has done a parking survey which will be considered by the Joint Committee in December
- Multiple occupation concerns
- Unlikely to use parking spaces and will park on road

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Is within walking distance of Staines railway station
- Car parking provided, the use of these is beyond the Council's control
- Meets the Council's Parking standards
- Environmental habitat should remain in the back garden
- Difficult to object when extensions have already been approved
- Previous permissions are not relevant

- Concerns that it may turn into an HMO. An informative is needed
- Vehicles should reverse into the parking spaces not out
- Should be family dwellings.

Decision:

The application was **approved** as per agenda subject to the following additional informative:

The applicant is advised that planning permission is required to use the dwellings for more than six residents living together as a single household or for an HMO of more than six residents.

583/17 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.

584/17 Urgent Items

An urgent report was circulated at the meeting in relation to Pentire, Stable 2, Fordbridge Road, Sunbury on Thames.

This concerned an outbuilding which is being used as a separate residential dwelling without planning permission.

The report was brought to the Planning Committee as an urgent item as it involved the potential loss of a home and the enforcement action was subject to time limits.

It was considered that the residential use had not taken place for more than 4 years and was contrary to Green Belt and Flood Plain policy.

The recommendation was to serve an enforcement notice requiring the cessation of the residential use of the land and building as a separate residential unit, the removal of all fixtures and fittings and all ancillary residential structures.

The time period for compliance was agreed at 6 months.

During the debate the following key points were noted:

- Flooding issues.
- Use of surrounding properties also within the Green Belt.
- Timeline of occupancy/usage as a dwelling without conforming to appropriate planning regulations.

Decision

The Planning Committee **agreed** the recommendation to take enforcement action as detailed in the report.

585/17 Thanks to Mr. Dan Skerten

The Chair extended his thanks, and those of the Planning Committee, to Mr. Dan Skerten, Committee Manager, who recently left Spelthorne Borough Council. Mr. Skerten's work in committee duties was noted and an appreciation for his professional contributions were expressed.