

**Minutes of the Planning Committee  
15 October 2025**

**Present:**

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

**Councillors:**

|             |             |                 |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| C. Bateson  | M. Buck     | L. E. Nichols   |
| S.N. Beatty | T. Burrell  | K.E. Rutherford |
| M. Beecher  | R. Chandler |                 |
| S. Bhadye   | M.J. Lee    |                 |

**Substitutions:** Councillors S.C. Mooney  
D. Saliagopoulos

**Apologies:** Councillors D.C. Clarke, K. Howkins and P.N. Woodward

**63/25 Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings held on 20 and 27 August and 17 September were approved as a correct record.

**64/25 Disclosures of Interest Under the Member's Code of Conduct**

Councillor Mooney advised that she was also a Surrey County Councillor.

**65/25 Declarations of interest under the Council's Planning Code**

Councillors Bateson, Beecher, Burrell, Chandler, Lee declared that they had received emails in respect of all the applications to be considered at this meeting and that if they had sent a reply, it was only an acknowledgement.

Councillors Mooney declared that she had received emails in respect of Planning Applications 25/00293/FUL and 25/00291/FUL and had not responded.

Councillors Beatty, Nichols, Rutherford and Gibson declared that they had received emails in respect of Planning Application 25/00866/FUL and had not responded.

**66/25 Planning application 25/00293/FUL - Terminal House, Station Approach, Shepperton, TW17 8AS (Building A to the South-East of the Railway Line)**

**Description:**

Two-storey side extension to the commercial building.

**Additional Information:**

Before the conditions were read out to the Committee they were advised that one letter of representation had been received raising concerns regarding Parking.

The following conditions are recommended:

**10. No development shall take place until:-**

- (i) A comprehensive desk-top study, carried out to identify and evaluate all potential sources and impacts of land and/or groundwater contamination relevant to the site, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- (ii) Where any such potential sources and impacts have been identified, a site investigation has been carried out to fully characterise the nature and extent of any land and/or groundwater contamination and its implications. The site investigation shall not be commenced until the extent and methodology of the site investigation have been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- (iii) A written method statement for the remediation of land and/or groundwater contamination affecting the site shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of remediation. The method statement shall include an implementation timetable and monitoring proposals, and a remediation verification methodology.

The site shall be remediated in accordance with the approved method statement, with no deviation from the statement without the express written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-.To protect the amenities of future occupiers and the environment from the effects of potentially harmful substances.

NOTE The requirements of the above Condition must be carried out in accordance with current best practice. The applicant is therefore advised to contact Spelthorne's Pollution Control team on 01784 446251 for further advice and information before any work commences.

In accordance with policies SP6 and EN15 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

**11.** Prior to the first use or occupation of the development, and on completion of the agreed contamination remediation works, a validation report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-To protect the amenities of future occupiers and the environment from the effects of potentially harmful substances.

NOTE The requirements of the above Condition must be carried out in accordance with current best practice. The applicant is therefore advised to contact Spelthorne's Pollution Control team on 01784 446251 for further advice and information before any work commences.

In accordance with policies SP6 and EN15 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

**12.** No construction of development above damp-proof course level shall take place until such time as a scheme to dispose of foul and surface water, to include roof drainage to be sealed at ground level, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: This condition seeks to ensure the development does not cause an unacceptable risk to the groundwater. This is in line with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The following additional informative is also recommended:

**5.** The applicant should be mindful not to create excessive dust emissions during demolition works, particularly where any asbestos containing materials may be present. A Refurbishment and Demolition asbestos survey is required to determine if asbestos containing materials are present. If removal of asbestos containing materials is required appropriate removal (without significant damage), handling and disposal by competent persons is required. The Health & Safety Executive (HSE) have produced a guide to safe removal of asbestos containing materials, which outlines good practice, how to prepare and what equipment is needed, how to remove it and how to deal with the waste once removed. There is also information on the HSE website about how to comply with the regulations, including a more generic guide to working safely with asbestos - <http://www.hse.gov.uk/asbestos>

### **Public Speaking:**

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

1. Parking spaces will be reduce from 28 to 24 which is 9 below the allowed number of spaces.
2. No parking controls on residential roads surrounding the application site the office workers will choose to park on these rather than take public transport.
3. County Highway's comments that there is good accessibility to public transport does not address the reality that on-street parking displacement would directly harm residents.
4. Increase in the level of traffic and manoeuvring during peak hours poses a significant threat to pedestrians including children walking to and from school.
5. Plan lack required cycle storage
6. No provision shown for waste storage and collection.

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. Terminal House was listed for sale with an auction house and marketed as a potential House of Multiple Occupation with 76 units, so concerns have been raised about potential future usage.
2. Concerned about the developer splitting the units into different planning applications when it should have been considered as one application site.
3. Numerous planning applications have previously been submitted for this site, some of which are still awaiting a decision.

### **Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

1. The development would have a detrimental effect that would see an increase in on-street parking
2. Further planning applications may be submitted for a change of use to residential units
3. Not adequate off-street parking provided
4. The application meets the parking provision for commercial use
5. The building would need to be used for commercial purposes for at least two years before the developer could submit a change of use application

Councillor Geraci proposed and Councillor Rutherford seconded that an additional condition be add as follows:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended), or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order, the extension hereby approved shall be used only for purposes within Use Class E of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended), or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order.

Reason: To ensure that the development is maintained for commercial purposes.

Councillor Mooney requested a recorded vote

|                |                                                                                   |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>For</b>     | Councillors Bateson, Beatty, Beecher, Buck, Burrell, Gibson – <b>6 votes</b>      |
| <b>Abstain</b> | Councillors Nichols and Rutherford – <b>2 votes</b>                               |
| <b>Against</b> | Councillors Bhadye, Chandler, Geraci, Lee, Mooney, Saliagopoulos – <b>6 votes</b> |

The Chair used her casting vote to vote in favour of the application.

**Decision:**

The application was **approved** subject to the additional conditions and informative referred to in the Updates and subject to the further condition as outlined below:

**13.** Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended), or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order, the extension hereby approved shall be used only for purposes within Use Class E of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended), or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order.

**67/25      Planning application 25/00291/FUL - Terminal House, Station Approach, Shepperton, TW17 8AS (Building B to the North-West of the Railway Line)**

**Description:**

Two-storey side extension to the commercial building

**Additional Information:**

Before the conditions were read out to the Committee they were advised that one letter of representation had been received raising concerns regarding Parking.

The following conditions are recommended:

**13.** No development shall take place until:

- (i) A comprehensive desk-top study, carried out to identify and evaluate all potential sources and impacts of land and/or groundwater contamination relevant to the site, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- (ii) Where any such potential sources and impacts have been identified, a site investigation has been carried out to fully characterise the nature and extent of any land and/or groundwater contamination and its implications. The site investigation shall not be commenced until the extent and methodology of the site investigation have been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- (iii) A written method statement for the remediation of land and/or groundwater contamination affecting the site shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of remediation. The method statement shall include an implementation timetable and monitoring proposals, and a remediation verification methodology.

The site shall be remediated in accordance with the approved method statement, with no deviation from the statement without the express written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:- To protect the amenities of future occupiers and the environment from the effects of potentially harmful substances.

NOTE The requirements of the above Condition must be carried out in accordance with current best practice. The applicant is therefore advised to contact Spelthorne's Pollution Control team on 01784 446251 for further advice and information before any work commences.

In accordance with policies SP6 and EN15 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

**14.** Prior to the first use or occupation of the development, and on completion of the agreed contamination remediation works, a validation report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:- To protect the amenities of future occupiers and the environment from the effects of potentially harmful substances.

NOTE The requirements of the above Condition must be carried out in accordance with current best practice. The applicant is therefore advised to contact Spelthorne's Pollution Control team on 01784 446251 for further advice and information before any work commences.

In accordance with policies SP6 and EN15 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

**15.** No construction of development above damp-proof course level shall take place until such time as a scheme to dispose of foul and surface water, to include roof drainage to be sealed at ground level, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason:-This condition seeks to ensure the development does not cause an unacceptable risk to the groundwater. This is in line with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The following additional informative is also recommended:

**5.** The applicant should be mindful not to create excessive dust emissions during demolition works, particularly where any asbestos containing materials may be present. A Refurbishment and Demolition asbestos survey is required to determine if asbestos containing materials are present. If removal of asbestos containing materials is required appropriate removal (without significant damage), handling and disposal by competent persons is required. The Health & Safety Executive (HSE) have produced a guide to safe removal of asbestos containing materials, which outlines good practice, how to prepare and what equipment is needed, how to remove it and how to deal with the waste once removed. There is also information on the HSE website about how to comply with the regulations, including a more generic guide to working safely with asbestos - <http://www.hse.gov.uk/asbestos>

### **Public Speaking:**

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

1. The proposed extension would add 187 square metres of office space that would equate to 12-18 additional workers. Available parking space would reduce from 26 to 22, 8 below the allowed maximum of 30 spaces.
2. No parking controls on residential roads surrounding the application site the office workers will choose to park on these rather than take public transport.

3. Building B is situated closer to residential roads than Building A. There are already issues with on-street parking by office workers and commuters and additional demand will only exacerbate the situation.
4. Increase in the level of traffic and manoeuvring during peak hours poses a significant threat to pedestrians including children walking to and from school.
5. There would be a loss of privacy for a number of residential properties surrounding the proposed application site:
  - a) The proposed extension would have windows facing 4, and 6 Old Charlton Road and 13 Station Road,
  - b) The Ground floor offices would see into a ground floor bedroom of 4 Old Charlton Road,
  - c) The first floor offices would have direct line of sight into the ground floor bedroom on 4 and 6 Old Charlton Road and also 13 Station Road,

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:

4. Terminal House was listed for sale with an auction house and marketed as a potential House of Multiple Occupation with 76 units, so concerns have been raised about potential future usage.
5. Concerned about the developer splitting the units into different planning applications when it should have been considered as one application site.
6. Numerous planning applications have previously been submitted for this site, some of which are still awaiting a decision.

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

6. The development would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area that would see an increase in on-street parking
7. Further planning applications may be submitted for a change of use to residential units
8. Not adequate off-street parking provided
9. The application meets the parking provision for commercial use
10. The application site is in a flood zone
11. A number of properties would be overlooked and result in lack of privacy



12. The building would need to be used for commercial purposes for at least two years before the developer could submit a change of use application
13. There might be an operational impact on neighbouring properties if the businesses worked hours outside of the normal 9am to 5pm eg noise, light
14. Cannot see any benefit to the local residents
15. An additional condition be added to prevent permitted development
16. Any additional applications received for this site should be brought to committee and not be decided under delegated authority

Councillor Saliagopoulos requested a recorded vote

|                |                                                                                                        |
|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>For</b>     | Councillors Beecher, Buck, Burrell, Gibson – <b>4 votes</b>                                            |
| <b>Against</b> | Councillors Bateson, Bhadye, Chandler, Geraci, Lee, Mooney, Rutherford, Saliagopoulos – <b>8 votes</b> |
| <b>Abstain</b> | Councillors Beatty, Nichols – <b>2 votes</b>                                                           |

The motion to approve the application **FELL**

It was proposed by Councillor Geraci and seconded by Councillor Mooney that the Local Planning Authority is minded to refuse the application as the extension is considered to have an overbearing impact and effect on the amenity of the neighbouring properties of 4 Old Charlton Road, 6 Old Charlton Road and 13 Station Road and would amount to an intensification of use under EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009.

The committee voted on the proposed motion as follows:

**For – 12**  
**Against – 1**  
**Abstain - 1**

**Decision:**

The motion to **refuse** the application was carried for the following reasons:

The extension is considered to have an overbearing impact and effect on the amenity of the neighbouring properties of 4 Old Charlton Road, 6 Old Charlton Road and 13 Station Road and would amount to an intensification of use under EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009.

**68/25      Planning application 25/00866/FUL - 29-35 High Street,  
Shepperton, TW17 9AB**

**Description:**

**Additional Information:**

The Local Planning Authority (LPA) re-advertised amended plans and a revised address on 29 September 2025. The LPA has received 9 additional

letters of representation, which in addition to the comments raised in the letters of representation summarised in paragraph 5.1 of the committee report, raise the following issues:

1. Concerns over the shortfall in amenity space, the loss of existing amenity space, and concerns over the justification for the shortfall.
2. Policy EN1 is breached, and the proposed density is therefore unacceptable under policy HO5.
3. Concerns over internal daylight, outlook and living conditions for future occupiers.
4. The layout of the car park is not safe and suitable for all users.
5. The scheme is contrary to the Council's policies.
6. The harms of the scheme outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole under paragraph 11.
7. Concerns over a 45% shortfall in parking provision and highway safety.
8. The loss of employment space is contrary to policy EM1 and TC3.
9. Concerns over the housing mix.
10. The officer's report is inconsistent and selective in applying the relevant planning policies, fails to address material planning harms, and fails to maintain impartiality and public confidence.
11. Planning appeal APP/Z3635/D/25/3366506 has been misquoted, the link provided in the officer report is incorrect, and the Inspectors findings have been misrepresented in a misleading manner for a scheme that related to a minor domestic extension (**Officer Note:** The link to the appeal decision provided in the officer report did not work correctly – However, the appeal decision is at the time of writing, available to view on the Planning Inspectorate's website. The appeal was referenced to demonstrate that the SPD is guidance and not to compare two different schemes).
12. Concerns a shortfall in separation distance would set a precedent.

Paragraph 5 of the Executive Summary should refer to 15 car parking spaces.

The Environmental Health Officer has requested conditions and informatives relating to noise. Officers do not consider that all of the requested conditions would meet the six tests for conditions set out in the NPPF. It is recommended however that **Condition 9** is replaced with the following:

Following construction of any groundwork and foundations, no construction of development above damp course level shall take place until a report is submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority which includes details and drawings demonstrating how 10% of the energy requirements generated by the development as a whole will be achieved utilising renewable energy methods and showing in detail the estimated sizing of each of the contributing technologies to the overall percentage. The detailed report shall identify how renewable energy, passive energy and efficiency measures will be generated and utilised for each of the proposed buildings to meet collectively the requirement for the scheme and will include details on noise omitted by air source heat pumps including any mitigation measures. The

agreed measures shall be implemented with the construction of each building and thereafter retained.

A response has been received from Neighbourhood Services that does not raise objections but would wish for the site entrance to remain clear. In response, the LPA recommend the following Condition and Informative:

**Condition 12.** Prior to occupation, facilities within the curtilage of the site for the storage of refuse and recycling materials shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed details shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved and retained thereafter

*Reason:-* To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties and the appearance of the locality in accordance with policies SP6 and EN1 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

**Informative 10.** The applicant is advised that the entrance to the site should remain clear from any obstructions, including from vehicles, to ensure that waste and refuse vehicles can collect bins from the site

A further condition is also recommended as follows:

**Condition 13.** Prior to the occupation of the development, details of a scheme of the means of enclosure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the building(s)/use is/are occupied. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and maintained as approved

*Reason:-* To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties and the appearance of the locality in accordance with policies SP6 and EN1 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

Two further **Informatives** are also recommended:

**11.** The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway. The applicant is advised that prior approval must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, or verge to form a vehicle crossover to install dropped kerbs. [www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/permits-and-licences/vehicle-crossovers-or-dropped-kerbs](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/permits-and-licences/vehicle-crossovers-or-dropped-kerbs)

**12.** The developer is advised that as part of the detailed design of the highway works required by the above conditions, the County Highway Authority may require necessary accommodation works to street lights, road signs, road markings, highway drainage, surface covers, street trees, highway verges,

highway surfaces, surface edge restraints and any other street furniture/equipment.

**Public Speaking:**

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

1. The proposed building is too high and too close to 13 Manor Farm Avenue.
2. The building separation should be 30m but in the plans the distance is only 17.5m.
3. The BRE test independently carried out showed a reduction in daylight of over 30%.
4. Habitable room within 13 Manor Farm Avenue would be overlooked by the new building.
5. The bins for the 14 flats and businesses would be located right on the boundary of 13 Manor Farm Avenue, less than 2m from the kitchen/breakfast window of the property which we consider to be unhygienic, smelly, noisy and potentially to be a fire risk.
6. The proposed building would only have 155sqm of amenity space which is less than a third of the minimum required.
7. This is an overdevelopment for the plot.

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

1. Pre-application advice was sought from the developer which informed the final design of the proposed development.
2. The additional 8 flats are within the scope of Policy HO5 of the Council's current Local Plan.
3. The proposed building is a balanced and proportionate approach to development.
4. The scheme has been designed to reflect the character and context of the surrounding area, ensuring that it does not constitute overdevelopment.
5. There will not be any harmful impact on the amenities of the neighbouring residential properties.
6. The building would sit back approximately 18 metres from the adjacent boundary of 13 Manor Farm Avenue.
7. Amendments have been put in place to ensure that there is no overlooking from the proposed amenity spaces/shared balconies to adjacent properties.
8. The proposed development is not out of keeping with the existing character of the area and aligns with similar developments found in the surrounding area.

9. The design responds sensitively to its setting, contributing positively to the ongoing development of the area.
10. There were no objections from statutory consultees, including Highways and Drainage.

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:

17. The scale and height of surrounding buildings is not relevant
18. The design of the existing flat resulted in windows being situation that avoided overlooking of surrounding buildings
19. The top storey of the existing building serves as amenity space
20. The proposed building has a lack of amenity space; the top storey cannot be deemed to be communal amenity space as it is only accessible to 3 flats
21. Residents of surrounding properties are concerned about being overlooked resulting in lack of privacy
22. There is a shortfall in the separation distance which may result in a precedent being set for future applications

#### **Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

1. The transport infrastructure is not reliable enough to see residents choose this over their cars
2. The proposed building is overbearing
3. Lack of sufficient parking spaces at the rear of the property
4. Proposed development does not blend in with surrounding buildings and has no green areas
5. The proposed building is more attractive than the one currently in situ
6. Issues surrounding fire safety within the proposed building
7. The proposed building provides disabled access
8. Lack of public amenity space

Councillor Saliagopoulos requested a recorded vote

|                |                                                                                                                                                 |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>For</b>     | Councillor Burrell – <b>1 vote</b>                                                                                                              |
| <b>Abstain</b> | <b>0 votes</b>                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>Against</b> | Councillors Bateson, Beatty, Beecher, Bhadye, Buck, Chandler, Geraci, Lee, Mooney, Nichols, Rutherford, Saliagopoulos, Gibson – <b>13 votes</b> |

The motion to approve the application **FELL**

It was proposed by Councillor Geraci and seconded by Councillor Bateson that the Local Planning Authority is minded to refuse the application as the proposed development represents overdevelopment of the site. It is

considered to be overbearing in nature, will overlook neighbouring properties, not positively contribute to the street scene, will unacceptably increase the density of the area, contains a lack of amenity space and there is a lack of parking, under Policies EN1, CC3 and HO5 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009, NPPF, the Council's SPD on Residential Extensions and New Residential Developments 2011 and the Council's Parking Standards SPG.

The Committee voted on the proposed motion as follows:

**For -13**

**Abstain – 0**

**Against - 1**

**Decision:**

The motion to **refuse** the application was carried for the following reasons:

The application represents overdevelopment of the site. It is considered to be overbearing in nature, will overlook neighbouring properties, not positively contribute to the street scene, will unacceptably increase the density of the area, contains a lack of amenity space and there is a lack of parking, under Policies EN1, CC3 and HO5 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009, NPPF, the Council's SPD on Residential Extensions and New Residential Developments 2011 and the Council's Parking Standards SPG.

### **69/25 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.

The Committee **resolved** that the report of the Interim Planning Development Manager be received and noted.

### **70/25 Major Planning Applications**

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

The Committee **resolved** that the report of the Interim Planning Development Manager be received and noted.