

**Minutes of the Planning Committee  
6 March 2019**

**Present:**

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

Councillors:

I.J. Beardsmore	T.J.M. Evans	R.W. Sider BEM
S.J. Burkmar	M.P.C. Francis	
S. Capes	J.R. Sexton	

**Apologies:** Apologies were received from Councillor C. Barnard, Councillor R.O. Barratt, Councillor R. Chandler, Councillor Q.R. Edgington, ~~and~~ Councillor A.L. Griffiths *and Councillor Doran*. (Amended by Planning Committee at meeting on 3 April 2019)

**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.

**66/19 Minutes**

The Minutes of the Planning Meeting held on 6 February 2019 were approved as a correct record, as were the Minutes of the Extraordinary Planning Meeting held on the 12 February 2019 .

**67/19 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**

**Application No: 18/01533/FUL.**

Councillors H.A. Thomson, T.J.M. Evans, and R.W. Sider BEM reported that they had received correspondence in relation to Item 4, **Application No: 18/01533/FUL** but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor I.J. Beardsmore reported that he had spoken on the Item, but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

**Application No: 18/01282/FUL.**

No declarations to report.

**Application No: 18/01404/FUL.**

Councillor C. R.W. Sider BEM reported that he had received correspondence in relation to Item 6, **Application No: 18/01404/FUL** but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor R.A. Smith Ainsley reported that he had received correspondence on the Item, and had responded so as to provide clarification on the plans, but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor B. Spoor, having, as Ward Councillor, called in Item 6, in relation to **Application No: 18/01404/FUL**, reported that he had nothing to disclose.

**68/19 Two Rivers Bar and Restaurant, 43 Church Street, Staines upon Thames - 18/01533/FUL**

**Description:**

This application was for the Demolition of the existing public house and the erection of a 4-storey building comprising 11 residential units with Use Class A3 (restaurant/café) unit at ground floor, associated parking and landscaping.

**Additional Information:**

The Planning Development Manager advised the committee that:

References to the NPPF 2018 (now 2019) need to be updated.

5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> line down – “The ‘northern’ elevation of the proposed development would face onto these properties extending ~~23.7m~~ **24.8m** in total length and standing 4 storeys high.”

8<sup>th</sup>/9<sup>th</sup>/10<sup>th</sup> line down – “The second floor and third floors would be located between ~~1.9m and 2.8m’s away~~ **2m and 3m away** from the boundary with the closest neighbouring sitting out area.

**Public Speaking:**

There were no Public Speakers.

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Dominant height of building
- Will provide a positive contribution to housing development
- Similar in height to buildings on opposite side of road

- Building is much higher than adjoining buildings
- Scale would be out of character and inappropriate for the site
- Does not respect the historic site
- Inadequate amenity space
- Not close to Lammas Park
- Only 6 minute walk and 3 minute cycle ride to Lammas Park
- Inadequate parking
- Too cramped
- Flats are good for the future of Staines
- Flats are good for the young people
- Unlikely to use the garden
- Improvement compared with other high rise developments
- Design will be acceptable once built
- The A3 use cannot be guaranteed
- Few people use the Public House except Fridays and Saturdays

**Decision:**

The recommendation to **Approve** the application was agreed.

**69/19 103 London Road, Staines upon Thames, TW18 4HN -  
18/01282/FUL**

**Description:**

This application sought the change of use from Class B1 to Class C3 and the demolition of the existing building, followed by the erection of a 4 storey building comprising 8 no.1 bedroom flats and 1 no.2 bedroom flat together with associated parking and amenity space.

**Additional Information:**

The Planning Development Manager advised the committee that:

References to the NPPF 2018 (now 2019) need to be updated.

**Public Speaking:**

There were no Public Speakers.

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- The application is essentially identical to previous proposal approved on appeal
- Proposal is not readily visible from the street scene

**Decision:**

The recommendation to **Approve** the application was agreed.

**70/19 Land Adjoining 42 King George Close and 11 And 12 Camilla Close, Sunbury On Thames, TW16 7NW - 18/01404/FUL**

**Description:**

This application sought the erection of 3 no. dwellings comprising one no. two storey 3 bed house and 2 no. one bed 2 storey back to back units with parking and landscaping.

This Item was called in by Ward Councillor Spoor.

**Additional Information:**

The Planning Development Manager advised the committee that:

References to the NPPF 2018 (now 2019) need to be updated.

Neighbours have been notified of amended plans and an additional 6 letters have been received from existing complaints still objecting to the proposal raising the same issues as previous.

No objection received from the Group Head of Neighbourhood Services on refuse collection.

**Public Speaking:**

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

- Adverse impact on King George Close
- Concerns over access
- One bedroom units not in keeping with King George Close
- Over crowding
- Increased vehicle movements in King George Close
- Concerns over road access safety
- Contrary to Local Plan policy EN1
- Grass would be replaced with hardstanding
- Concern over reduction in trees – some already felled
- Does not improve the character or quality of the area

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

- Complies with the NPPF and the Development Plan
- Site is in a sustainable location close to facilities
- Will meet housing needs
- Density accords with local plan policy
- Separation distances comply with Design SPD
- Acceptable amenity space, car parking and landscaping is proposed
- Design will match the existing dwellings

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

- The site has an open aspect
- Concern over accessing the two smaller units through King George Close
- Back to back dwellings are out of character with King George Close
- Access to some unit shall be only via King George Close
- Contravenes Local Plan policy EN1
- Overdevelopment of the site
- There is no room for overspill parking
- Will not make a positive contribution to the street scene
- Unacceptable design and out of character with the area

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- The amended plans represent an improvement
- Unacceptable appearance
- Cramping of units – “Shoehorn inserts”
- Will result in significant damage to King George Close
- Development is in keeping with the area
- Concerns over the turning head in the road and parking
- Access of refuse vehicles
- Proposal will lead to an improvement in the turning area
- 5 year 'Housing Land Supply guidance
- 'Tilted Balance' guidance

**Decision:**

The recommendation to **Approve** the application was agreed.

**71/19 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.

**72/19 Urgent Items**

There were none.

**73/19 Exempt Business**

**RESOLVED** to move the exclusion of the Press and Public for the following item in view of the likely disclosure of exempt information within the meaning of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 and by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

**74/19 Exempt Report on Planning Appeal**

**Description:**

The Planning Committee considered a report from Officers containing advice from the Council's consultants and legal advisors about matters arising from an appeal against refusal of permission.

Members considered the matters arising from the report and debated them.

**Decision:**

The Committee agreed to **Approve** the recommendation and gave instruction to Officers in order to progress the Appeal.

Given that this advice is legally privileged, the report arising from it and the discussions of Members are necessarily confidential and cannot be published at this time.

This confidentiality is in the Public Interest as it allows the Council to progress the legal proceedings without prejudicing its position.