

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
2 May 2018**

Present:

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

Councillors:

C. Barnard	S.J. Burkmar	A.T. Jones
R.O. Barratt	S.M. Doran	R.W. Sider BEM
I.J. Beardsmore	Q.R. Edgington	
J.R. Boughtflower	M.P.C. Francis	

Apologies: Apologies were received from Councillor N. Islam

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 M.M. Attewell	Item 122/18 - Shepperton Quarry, Littleton Lane, Shepperton
Councillor N.J. Gething	Item 119/18 - Wardle Dental Surgery, Church Road, Ashford
Councillor A.L. Griffiths	Item 118/18 - Vicarage Road, Sunbury-upon-Thames

114/18 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 April 2018 were approved as a correct record.

115/18 Disclosures of Interest

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

Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley declared a conflict of interest on behalf of the Committee members for application 18/00102/FUL, land to the east of 355 London Road, Ashford because it had been made by the Council.

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

Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley reported that he had received correspondence in relation to applications 18/00308/SCC and 18/00304/SCC but had

maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor M. Francis had received correspondence in relation to applications 17/01923/FUL and 18/00432/T56 but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor Beardsmore reported that he had raised an objection to application 18/00432/T56, but had come to the meeting with an open mind. He intended to listen to the debate and then make an informed decision as to whether to choose to abstain from voting.

116/18 17/01923/FUL - Charter Square, High Street, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 4BY

Description:

This Application sought planning consent for the redevelopment of Phase 1B of the Charter Square development for 104 multi-residential units above commercial space on the ground floor and a separate 2 storey commercial building fronting London Road. The development would also provide 27 car parking spaces below grade in a basement level, 108 secure cycle spaces at grade and a pocket park with children's play space.

Additional Information:

The Planning Development Manager informed the Committee that one late representation was received regarding the delivery of the Link Road and the legal agreements concerning Phase 1 A and Phase 1B. The planning and legal officers were satisfied that robust measures were in place to ensure the delivery of the road.

She advised of an amendment to condition 23 to refer to "commencement" rather than "occupation".

Public Speaking:

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

- They were already delivering 260 homes under phase 1
- The development would provide 21% affordable homes
- A pocket park would be provided
- The development would be within Staines Town Centre, close to amenities and public transport
- A car club was proposed
- There would be a reduction in traffic compared with the approved application
- High quality design and landscaping

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Increased density – better community living
- Affordable housing was proposed
- Car club proposed
- Increased height but design is positive with pocket park
- Corporate Plan 2016-19 says we should meet the housing needs of our residents – no rented housing proposed, contrary to policy HO3
- The issue is government policy not LP policy HO3
- Lack of car parking
- Long term capital investment needed
- SCAN advises that proposal does not meet the Equalities Act
- Concern over increase in height of building
- Flats would be devoid of sunshine
- Query over pocket park
- Effective use of land
- Sustainable development
- Government policy requires increase in housing in such areas

Decision:

The Application was **approved** as per the officer report subject to a legal agreement and amendment to condition 23 as outlined above.

**117/18 17/01938/FUL - 20 Bridge Street, Staines upon Thames, TW18
4TW**

Description:

This Application sought permission for the demolition of the existing building and erection of a five storey building of 9 self-contained flats comprising 3 one bedroom flats, 5 two bedroom flats and 1 three bedroom flat with associated cycle parking.

Additional Information:

The Planning Development Manager informed the Committee that the Environment Agency had responded by objecting to the application due to flood risk concerns. Officers will discuss this with the Environment Agency and the applicant and it was proposed to bring this application to a future Planning Committee meeting.

Decision:

It was resolved to **defer** this application to enable the flooding objection from the Environment Agency to be discussed.

118/18 18/00432/T56 - Vicarage Road, Sunbury upon Thames, TW16 7UB

Description:

This Application sought planning permission for the installation of a 17.5m high mobile phone mast, microwave dish, 3 equipment cabinets and ancillary equipment.

Additional Information:

The Planning Development Manager informed the Committee that no objection was raised by the Tree Officer, Pollution Control (Environmental Health) or the County Highways Authority.

The following informatives were recommended:

1. The applicant will need to provide a Category 0 Design & Check Certificate for the proposed mast installation (see Annex C of BD2/12 for model certificate). -

<http://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/ha/standards/dmr/vol1/section1.htm>)

on the highway. Assuming that the steel mast is CE marked suitable, this design/check would principally be for foundations (i.e. a declaration that the choice/design of the proposed foundation is suitable for the mast at this specific location). The location would be a lower priority site using the UKRLG document 'Provision of Road Restraint Systems on local Roads', meaning that the level of risk is generally acceptable (this relates to vehicles leaving the road and encountering a hazard -.

<http://www.ukroadsliaisongroup.org/en/utilities/document-summary.cfm?docid=5803F825-EFC-4858-B2A75 D0DCE3382A9>)

2. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway or any works that may affect a drainage channel/culvert or water course. The applicant is advised that a permit must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the highway. All works on the highway will require a permit and an application will need to be submitted to the County Council's Street Works Team up to 3 months in advance of the intended start date, depending on the scale of the works proposed and the classification of the road.

The Planning Development Manager advised the Committee that six additional representations were received raising comments similar to those set out in the committee report.

Public Speaking:

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

- No objection to the mast but did object to its location
- Loss of grass verge
- Removal of trees

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Location is a concern
- Intrusive
- Concerns over loss of tree – visual amenity concerns
- Trees absorb pollution, loss of tree would lead to increase in pollution
- Surrey County Council has agreed to the use of their land which has caused a problem
- Cannot refuse it
- Impact on street scene
- Concern over size of base
- Impact on adjoining buildings
- Health and safety issues

Councillor I.J. Beardsmore requested that it was recorded in the Minutes that he ~~would~~ *did* abstain from voting.

Decision:

The Application was **refused** for the following reason:

The proposed mast would, by reason of its siting and appearance, fail to make a positive contribution to the street scene, would be out of character with the surrounding area and fail to achieve a satisfactory relationship with the adjoining buildings, contrary to policy EN1a and b of the Council's Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

[*amended by Planning Committee at meeting on 17/05/2018]

119/18 8/00138/FUL - Wardle Dental Surgery, 68 Church Road, Ashford, TW15 2TW

Description:

This Application sought permission for the erection of a roof extension including front and side dormers and the raising of the ridge height, the erection of a part two storey, part single storey rear extension with habitable space in the roof, the provision of parking space, and the creation of 4 one bedroom flats.

Additional information:

The Planning Development Manager informed the Committee that the Relevant Planning History section (Paragraph 2, Page 96) should read '11/00733/OUT Application Refused 01.12.2011' rather than '11/00733/OUT Grant Conditional 01.12.2011'.

Condition 2 should be altered to reflect an amended plan received to allow for an update to an annotation on the plan, which now states the ground floor flat is a '1 bedroom flat':

“The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans; JSD-16-57/100 Rev A, JSD-16-57/102 Rev A (Received 03.04.2018), JSD-16-57/101 Rev C (Received 20.04.2018”.

Three additional letters of representation were received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds which were not already in the committee report:

Concerns over present car parking and access to the road for emergency vehicles.

- The site would be overused/overdeveloped
- Concerns over the reduced area of the surgery, which would lead to overcrowding of the site for residential purposes
- Concerns over rubbish collections and who would maintain strips of ground within the site
- Excessive density
- The site is a dangerous part of Ashford's road network, and cars park on yellow lines
- Concerns over the description of the development
- The car parking spaces are narrower than other car parks, and vehicles now tend to be wider

Public Speaking:

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

- Parking concerns – lack of parking, on street parking in Brownrigg road, cars block existing accesses
- Overcrowded development
- Plans do not show all development at 70 and 72 Church Road

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at committee meetings, Ward Councillor Gething spoke against the proposed development and raised the following key points:

- Loss of dentist
- Parking concerns
- Impact on street scene – already agreed
- Impact on war memorial – already agreed

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Query over size of flat
- Impact on war memorial is ok
- Difficult to refuse
- Does it make a positive contribution to the street scene?
- There is a car park in Ashford
- Very little different to previous proposal
- Dentist already operates on site with limited parking

Decision:

The Application was **approved** as per the recommendation in the Officer's report.

120/18 18/00102/FUL - Land To The East of 355 London Road, Ashford.

Description:

This Application sought permission for the erection of a 1.8 metre high palisade style fence and access gates to replace an existing chain link style fence along the southern boundary of the application site.

Additional information:

The Planning Development Manager reported that Thames Water had responded raising no objection.

Public Speaking:

There were no Public Speakers for this item.

Debate:

During the debate the following issues were raised:

- Colour of fencing, green might be more pleasing to the eye
- Cost of fencing - could a less expensive alternative be found?

Decision:

The Application was **approved** as per the recommendation in the Officer's report.

121/18 18/00308/SCC - Shepperton Quarry, Littleton Lane, Shepperton

Description:

A Surrey County Council consultation relating to a retrospective application to continue the use of land as a recycling facility for construction and demolition waste, using crushing and screening plant to produce recycled soils and aggregates, stockpiling of waste and recycled products. The proposal included the importation of waste material for recycling and retention of screen bunding, two storey site office and two storey weighbridge office for a temporary period until 30 September 2019.

The application included the importation of material to the site for recycling which was not part of the most recent permission.

Additional information:

The Planning Development Manager reported that two applications were submitted last year. One by Bretts which was subsequently withdrawn and then one by Killoughery Waste Management which was not made valid due to the late payment of fee. Consequently, neither of these applications were determined by Surrey County Council (SCC).

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at Committee meetings, Ken Snaith spoke against the proposed development and raised the following key points:

- Gravel raising has been completed
- Site is within the Green Belt and no very special circumstance apply for the importation of material
- The importation of material is not required for Bretts' needs
- SCC has taken no action on the unauthorised importation of material
- It would set a significant precedent
- Traffic concerns

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at committee meetings, Ward Councillor Attewell spoke against the proposed development and raised the following key points:

- Recycling should finish by 2020 and the land restored
- There has been a breach of control
- No action has been taken by SCC
- Lorry movements pass through the villages
- Killoughery operate the site as a base

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- There should be no importation of waste
- The crusher on site should be used for crushing existing material only
- There are no very special circumstances to permit this in the green belt
- Concern that the proposal is retrospective
- Roads are craters due to HGVs, residents are fed up with being ignored

Decision:

- **Agreed** that the County Council be informed that this Council strongly objects to the application regarding the importation of recycling material to the site which represents inappropriate development within the green belt for which no very special circumstances have been demonstrated, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, subject to the addition of the following words: 'The County Council is advised that in the event that the application is refused, an enforcement notice should be served requiring the cessation of the unauthorised importation of recycling material to the site. The Enforcement notice should come into effect within 3 months from the date of it being served.'

122/18 18/00304/SCC - Shepperton Quarry, Littleton Lane, Shepperton

Description:

A Surrey County Council (SCC) Consultation relating to a retrospective application that sought to continue the use and siting of two container units for employee welfare purposes, ancillary to the proposed aggregates recycling facility and the site for a temporary period until 30 September 2019

Additional information:

There was none.

Public Speaking:

This item was debated as part of the previous item 121/18.

Debate:

This item was debated as part of the previous item 121/18.

Decision:

It was **agreed** to raise no objection.

123/18 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.

124/18 Development Management Performance

The Chairman informed the Committee that if any Member had any detailed queries regarding the report they should contact the Planning Development Manager.

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

125/18 Urgent Items

There were none.