

Minutes of the Planning Committee
3 May 2017

Present:

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

Councillors:

C.B. Barnard	S.M. Doran	D. Patel
S.J. Burkmar	P.C. Forbes-Forsyth	R.W. Sider BEM
R. Chandler	M.P.C. Francis	

Apologies: Apologies were received from Councillor R.O. Barratt, Councillor I.J. Beardsmore, Councillor A.C. Harman and Councillor A.T. Jones

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.

397/16 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 April 2017 were approved as a correct record.

398/16 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

Councillor R.A. Smith Ainsley declared an interest on behalf of the Committee in relation to application number 17/00481/HOU - 10 The Wickets, Ashford, TW15 2RR, as the applicants' partner was an officer employed by Spelthorne Borough Council.

Councillor R.A. Smith Ainsley also declared an interest on behalf of the Committee in relation to application number 17/00436/CPD – 135 Elizabeth Avenue, Laleham, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 1JN, as the applicants' wife was an officer employed by Spelthorne Borough Council.

Councillor R.W. Sider BEM reported that he had received correspondence in relation to application 17/00501/SCC - Recycling Facility, Littleton Lane, Shepperton, TW17 0NF - but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor A. Friday, speaking as a ward councillor in relation to application 17/00318/FUL - Blue Peter Cabin, Sunbury Court, Lower Hampton Road, Sunbury-on-Thames, TW16 5PL - declared that he had not received any correspondence in relation to the application and had not expressed any comments.

399/16 17/00318/FUL - Blue Peter Cabin, Sunbury Court, Lower Hampton Road, Sunbury-on-Thames, TW16 5PL

Description:

Proposed change of use from Secure Residential Institution (Use Class C2a) to one Residential Dwelling (Use Class C3) incorporating associated minor external and landscaping works.

Additional Information:

The Assistant Head of Planning (Development Management) reported that a letter had been received on behalf of the applicant, the Salvation Army, raising the following points:

- The former log cabin will be brought into beneficial use as part of the applicant's investment of the site.
- The proposal exceeds the Council's SPD guidance on separation distances for dwellings.
- The trees are not covered by a tree Preservation order. Dense replacement planting to act as a buffer has been proposed.

The Assistant Head of Planning (Development Management) recommended that the following additional condition be imposed:

Within three months from the date of this decision notice, full details of both soft and hard landscape works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. The trees and shrubs shall be planted on the site within a period of 12 months from the date of the approval of the landscaping, or such longer period as may be approved by the Local Planning Authority, and that the planting so provided shall be maintained as approved for a period of 5 years, such maintenance to include the replacement in the current or next planting season whichever is the sooner, of any trees or shrubs that may die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written permission to any variation.

Reason

To minimise the loss of visual amenity occasioned by the development and to enhance the proposed development.

Public Speaking:

At the Chairman's discretion (in the interests of fairness), John Mold spoke against the proposed development and raised the following key points:

- Loss of trees
- Feels like building is within his rear garden
- Needs mature planting
- New grey building looks conspicuous

In accordance with the Council's public speaking procedures, Adam Kindred spoke for the proposed development and raised the following key points:

- Salvation Army been based at Shepperton Court since 1925
- Site has been upgraded recently
- Proposal builds on the legacy of the Salvation Army

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

- Loss of trees
- Privacy concerns

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- A landscaping condition will be imposed on any planning permission
- Query over materials. (Officer note: there is a condition requiring samples to be submitted for approval)
- Loss of privacy
- Quick growing trees like leylandii should be provided
- It is a refurbishment of a building which is already there

Decision:

The application was **approved** as per the agenda subject to the additional landscaping condition referred to above.

Councillor P. Forbes-Forsyth was not present at the start of this agenda item and did not participate in the discussion nor take part in the vote.

400/16 17/00501/SCC - Recycling Facility, Littleton Lane, Shepperton, TW17 0NF

Description:

Surrey County Council application for Brett Aggregates Ltd - Continued use of land as a temporary recycling facility for construction and demolition waste using crushing and screening plant to produce recycled soils and aggregates, stockpiling of waste and recycled products, retention of screen bunding and two storey site office until 30 September 2019 without compliance with Conditions 2 and 8 of planning permission ref: SP/16/00662 dated 8 August 2016.

Additional Information:

The Assistant Head of Planning (Development Management) reported that two letters of objection had been received including one from the Shepperton Residents Association raising the following points:

- Increased HGV movements
- Home Farm works have now ceased
- Material is being brought onto the site from outside
- Concerns that the existing Industrial Estate on site could remain (Officer note: Surrey CC has advised that an Established Use Certificate was granted for this in 1975).

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Ken Snaith spoke against the proposed application raising the following key points:

- The application is questionable
- Site has a long planning history
- Mineral activity has now ceased at Manor Farm
- Large number of lorry movements

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Contentious renewal of permission
- Concern over HGV vehicles
- Green Belt issues
- Sympathise with residents and their expectations
- Site's operation can continue to 2020
- Alternatives would be less acceptable
- Concerns over bringing material onto the site to recycle
- Concerns that additional industrial buildings/uses have appeared on the Shepperton Quarry site which do not have planning permission
- Surrey County Council should encourage Bretts to use/work the land under the existing industrial buildings and to finish working the site
- Proposal will help with restoration of the site
- It is a better solution to moving the materials off site to an alternative location

Decision:

The consultation to raise no objection was agreed, subject to Surrey County Council being advised that Spelthorne Council raises the following matters:

- There is concern that material is being brought onto the site to be recycled. Only materials on the site should be recycled. It is requested that Surrey County Council Enforcement Officers investigate this.
- There is concern that additional industrial buildings/uses have appeared on the Shepperton Quarry site which do not have planning permission. It is requested that Surrey County Council Enforcement Officers investigate this.
- Surrey County Council should encourage Bretts to work the land under the existing industrial buildings for minerals and to finish working the site.

401/16 17/00481/HOU - 10 The Wickets, Ashford, TW15 2RR

Description:

The erection of a single storey rear extension and front porch.

Additional Information:

The Assistant Head of Planning (Development Management) reported that a consultation response had been received from the Council's Tree Officer which raised no objection.

Public Speaking:

There was none.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Proposal is not controversial
- Extension of similar materials to match the existing house

Decision:

The application was **approved** as per the agenda.

402/16 17/00436/CPD - 135 Elizabeth Avenue, Laleham, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 1JN

Description:

A certificate of lawfulness for the proposed development of loft alterations.

Additional Information:

There was none.

Public Speaking:

There was none.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Proposal is not controversial
- Only judging if the proposal is permitted development

Decision:

The application was **approved** as per agenda.

403/16 TPO 254/2017 - Vicarage Cottage, Church Street, Sunbury-on-Thames, TW16 6RQ

Description: Tree Preservation Order relating to Vicarage Cottage, Church Street, Sunbury-on-Thames.

Additional Information:

There was none.

Public Speaking:

There were no public speakers.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issue was raised:

- Supported as too many trees are cut down in the borough

Decision:

The Tree Preservation Order was confirmed without modification.

404/16 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 Assistant Head of Planning and Housing Strategy.

Resolved that the report of the Assistant Head of Planning and Housing Strategy be received and noted.

405/16 Urgent Items

There were none.