

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
20 August 2025 & 27 August 2025 (Carry over Meeting)**

Present 20 August:

Councillor M. Gibson (Chair)
Councillor D.L. Geraci (Vice-Chair)

Councillors:

C. Bateson	R. Chandler	L. E. Nichols
S.N. Beatty	D.C. Clarke	K.E. Rutherford
M. Beecher	K. Howkins	P.N. Woodward
M. Buck	M.J. Lee	

Substitutions: Councillors J. Button

Apologies: Councillors T. Burrell

In Attendance: Councillors Attewell

Councillor Burrell was present for the carry over meeting so Councillor Button was not in attendance.

Councillor sent his apologies for the carry over meeting

47/25 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 July 2025 were approved as a correct record.

48/25 Disclosures of Interest Under the Member's Code of Conduct

Councillor Nichols declared that as he was a member of the Knowle Green Estates Board he would not be taking part in the debate nor voting on Application 25/0788/FUL.

49/25 Declarations of interest under the Council's Planning Code

Councillors Bateson, Beatty, Beecher, Buck, Chandler, Clarke, Geraci, Gibson, Howkins, Lee, Nichols, Rutherford and Woodward reported that they had received email correspondence in relation to application 25/00617/FUL but had not responded, maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillors Beatty, Beecher, Buck, Chandler, Clarke, Gibson, Howkins, Lee, Nichols, Rutherford and Woodward reported that they had received email correspondence in relation to application 25/00714/FUL but had not responded, maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

50/25 Planning application 25/00617/FUL - 116-118 Pavilion Gardens, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 1HW

Description:

Proposed 2 no. attached dwellings and extensions with alterations to existing dwellings, with associated parking and amenity space following the demolition of the existing garages and the creation of a new vehicular crossover.

Additional Information:

Parking Provision –

Correction to Paragraph 7.35 in the Committee report:-

‘The Council’s Supplementary Planning Guidance Parking Standards state that 3 bed dwellings would require a minimum of 2.25 car parking spaces and 2 bed dwellings would require 1.5 car parking spaces, this rounded up would be a total requirement of ~~(10)~~ 8 spaces for all 4 dwellings. On balance, the shortfall of ~~(4)~~ 2 spaces is not considered to be justifiable for refusal, as these ~~(4)~~ 2 spaces could be provided on the street if parked horizontally in front of the proposed off-street parking spaces and in any case sustainable transport is encouraged given the location of the development’.

Letters of Representation

The Council has received an additional 11 letters of objection to the works. Most of the points raised have already been covered in the report. The additional points not covered are:

1. Potential for trees to cause a loss of daylight – these trees can be pruned if required
2. Conflict with the Spelthorne Design Code – this document has not been formally adopted

The Planning Department has been copied into an email which has been sent to the Planning Committee members with a petition against the application.

The applicant should state 'Mr Lipa Fried'.

The Recommended Decision and paragraph 7.3 should state 'Grant Planning Permission' rather than 'Grant Prior Approval'.

Condition 1 to state:

'The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason – This condition is required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004'.

Public Speaking:

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

1. The proposed design is too wide and creates a terrace row of houses
2. The neighbouring properties' daylight would be negatively impacted
3. There would not be enough car parking spaces and would create more on-street parking thereby increasing the danger to pedestrians
4. There would be an increase in noise and traffic
5. Loss of privacy to neighbouring properties

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

1. Proposal is in contravention of EN1 as it creates a modern style terrace block of houses in a road predominantly consisting of semi-detached properties and does not make a positive contribution to the street scene
2. Inadequate off road parking provision
3. Overdevelopment of the site as it is in contravention of the two-thirds rule of the width of the original dwelling
4. The density of the site is nearing the top of what is acceptable under EN5
5. The middle two dwellings will be boxed in and therefore is in breach of the SPD
6. 34 letters of objections had been received and a petition had been signed by over 105 residents

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

1. Increase in on-road parking would cause additional congestion
2. Overdevelopment of the site
3. Proposed garages at the front of the house would affect the light going into the property
4. Parking does not meet the required 8 parking spaces
5. Would the trees at the rear of the property remain
6. This development would create a row of terrace houses and would set a precedent
7. Doesn't contribute to the street scene in a positive way
8. Garage cannot be counted towards the number of parking spaces

The Committee voted on the motion as follows:

For – 3

Against – 11

Abstain - 0

The motion to approve the application subject to conditions as set out in Paragraphs 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3 of the report **FELL**

It was proposed by Councillor Geraci and seconded by Councillor Woodward that the application is overturned and refused for the following reason:

The proposal is considered to be out of character as it is creating a terrace of properties and narrow plots and so does not positively contribute to the street scene and similarly does not respect the prevailing character of the semi-detached properties on the road, contrary to Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009, the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on the Design of Residential Extensions and New residential Development 2011, and the NPPF 2024.

The Committee voted on the new motion as follows:

For – 12

Against – 0

Abstain - 2

Decision:

The application was **overturned** and refused for the following reason: -

The proposal is considered to be out of character as it is creating a terrace of properties and narrow plots and so does not positively contribute to the street scene and similarly does not respect the prevailing character of the semi-detached properties on the road, contrary to Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009, the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on the

Design of Residential Extensions and New residential Development 2011, and the NPPF 2024.

51/25 Planning application 25/0206/FUL - Franklin House, Station Approach, Shepperton, TW17 8AR

Description:

Two-storey front extension and additional floor

Additional Information:

There was none.

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Ken Snaith (Shepperton Residents Association) spoke against the proposed development raising the following key points:

1. The building will consist of 9 offices but only 2 parking spaces
2. The Highways Authority requested a minimum of 6 cycle bays but only 3 are shown on the plans
3. This application should not be considered in isolation but considered alongside the applicants' other proposals for adjacent properties

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

1. This application should be deferred to be considered at the same time as the proposed development of Terminal House so that the cumulative effect can be gauged
2. This application forms part of a significant intensification on this plot
3. There would be lack of available on-site parking and result in a large overspill of vehicles having to park on the surrounding roads

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

Councillor Lee requested a recorded vote.

For	Councillors Button, Beatty, Geraci, Nichols, Gibson – 5 votes
Against	Councillors Beecher, Chandler, Clarke, Howkins, Lee, Woodward – 6 votes
Abstain	Councillors Bateson, Buck, Rutherford – 3 votes

The motion to approve the application subject to conditions as set out in Paragraphs 8 of the report **FELL**

It was proposed by Councillor Howkins and seconded by Councillor Woodward that the application is overturned and refused for the following reason:

Excessive intensification on a contained plot in accordance with NPPF and EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD adopted in 2009

Councillor Gibson requested a recorded vote.

For	Councillors Beecher, Chandler, Clarke, Howkins, Lee, Woodward – 6 votes
Against	Councillors Button, Beatty, Geraci, Nichols, Rutherford, Gibson – 6 votes
Abstain	Councillors Bateson, Buck – 2 votes

The motion to refuse the application for the following reasons **FELL**

Excessive intensification on a contained plot in accordance with NPPF and EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD adopted in 2009

The Committee debated the original motion to approve the application.

Councillor Gibson requested a recorded vote.

For	Councillors Button, Beatty, Buck, Nichols, Gibson – 5 votes
Against	Councillors Chandler, Clarke, Geraci, Howkins, Lee, Woodward – 6 votes
Abstain	Councillors Bateson, Beecher, Rutherford – 3 votes

The motion to approve the application subject to conditions as set out in Paragraphs 8 of the report **FELL**

It was proposed by Councillor Geraci and seconded by Councillor Clarke that the application is overturned and refused for the following reason:

The development does not positively contribute to the street scene and the character of the area due to the size and scale contrary to Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 and the NPPF 2024.

Councillor Gibson requested a recorded vote.

For	Councillors Beecher, Chandler, Clarke, Geraci, Howkins, Lee, Woodward – 7 votes
Against	Councillors Button, Beatty, Nichols, Gibson – 4 votes
Abstain	Councillors Bateson, Buck, Rutherford – 3 votes

Decision:

The application was **overturned** and refused for the following reason: -

The development does not positively contribute to the street scene and the character of the area due to the size and scale contrary to Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 and the NPPF 2024.

The Committee resolved to defer the remaining items on the agenda to a carry over meeting to be held on 27 August 2025.

52/25 Planning application 25/00714/FUL - 60 Avondale Road, Ashford, TW15 3HT

This item was considered at the carry-over meeting held on 27 August 2025

Description:

First floor rear extension to facilitate a change of use from a 6-person HMO (use Class C4) to a 7-person HMO (use Class SUI Generis)

Additional Information:

There was none.

Public Speaking:

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

1. Lack of a lawful vehicle crossover to allow vehicles to access the property so the two parking spaces referred to in the application should not be considered legitimate in planning terms
2. Existing refuse arrangements are not sufficient to support the current level of occupancy so additional occupants would increase the unpleasant odours and hygiene issues arising from inadequate domestic waste and recycling bin provision

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, David Gutwirth (Dimensions Planning and Architecture) spoke for the proposed development raising the following key points:

1. The existing 6-bedroom HMO has been in place for over a year
2. The site has access to facilities and amenities within walking and cycling distance and good access to public transport
3. Two new off-street parking spaces with EV charging which is an enhancement over the current position
4. The proposed extension is policy compliant with regard to natural light
5. There is no unacceptable impact on neighbours' daylight or outlook
6. Proposed conversion of outbuilding will provide a communal gym
7. The new bedroom would be nearly triple the minimum standard for a single occupant
8. This property has operated as an HMO for over 12 months with no complaints reported.
9. The property provides much needed affordable accommodation in the borough

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Councillor ~~*Beatty~~ Burrell read out a statement on behalf of Councillor Geach, Ward Councillor against the proposed development raising the following key points:

1. Increase in on-road parking
2. The potential presence of asbestos in the garage roof that may impact on the health of both the tenants and residents
3. Previous work by the landlord resulted in significant damage to neighbouring residents' properties including the drain on the highway collapsing due to the weight and size of the commercial vehicles used when the works were being carried out
4. Concerns about the proposed new layout of the ground floor as it was felt that this would leave the potential for a further extension to be added subject to another planning application

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

1. There is no drop down kerb so access to the driveway is limited
2. Could the outbuilding be used as living accommodation
3. Can an informative be added to ensure that the front garden is replace by permeable material
4. Did Surrey Highways visit the site on different times of the day to ascertain whether there would be any negative impact on the on-street parking
5. The garage roof could potentially contain asbestos
6. Bedrooms are of a good quality
7. Lack of adequate communal space

8. More information required around how many rubbish and recycling bins would be provided
9. On balance the property is overbearing

The Committee voted on the proposal as follows:

For: 3

Against: 9

Abstain: 1

The motion to approve the application **FELL**

It was proposed by Councillor Geraci and seconded by Council Woodward that the Local Planning Authority is minded to refuse the application as the development will not promote a high standard of amenity for occupants, as there will be no communal living area and removal of the second kitchen, and this will result in more intensive use and disturbance to neighbours due to the lack of on-site communal amenities. Furthermore, the additional occupant will likely increase the parking strain in the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies EN1 and CC3 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009, and the NPPF 2024.

A named vote was requested..

For	Councillors Bateson, Buck, Burrell, Clarke, Geraci, Howkins, Lee, Rutherford, Woodward – 9 votes
Against	Councillors Beecher, Chandler, Nichols, Gibson – 4 votes
Abstain	0 votes

Decision:

The motion to refuse the application was carried for the following reason:

The application will not promote a high standard of amenity for occupants, as there will be no communal living area and removal of the second kitchen, and this will result in more intensive use and disturbance to neighbours due to the lack of on-site communal amenities. Furthermore, the additional occupant will likely increase the parking strain in the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies EN1 and CC3 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009, and the NPPF 2024.

*Amended by Planning Committee held 15 October 2025.

This item was considered at the carry-over meeting held on 27 August 2025

Description:

Provision of access to roof via painted, galvanised steel external staircases and provisions of safety railings to flat roofs as required

Additional Information:

There was none.

Public Speaking:

There were no public speakers for this application

The Committee votes on the proposal as follows:

For: 11

Against – 0

Abstain – 2

Councillor Nichols asked for the minutes to reflect that he abstained from the vote as he sits on the Knowle Green Estates Board who were the applicants.

Decision:

The application was **approved** subject to the conditions as set out in the recommendation section of the report (paras 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3).

54/25 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 Interim Planning Development Manager.

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

55/25 Major Planning Applications

The Interim Planning Development Manager submitted a report outlining major applications that may be brought before the Planning Committee for determination.

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