

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
28 June 2017**

Present:

Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley (Chairman)

Councillors:

C.B. Barnard

S.M. Doran

A.T. Jones

R.O. Barratt

P.C. Forbes-Forsyth

S.J. Burkmar

M.P.C. Francis

Apologies: Apologies were received from Councillor H.A. Thomson, Councillor J.R. Boughtflower, Councillor N. Islam and Councillor R.W. Sider BEM

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.

456/17 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 31 May 2017 were approved as a correct record.

457/17 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 A.T. Jones reported that he had met residents in relation to application 17/00630/FUL – 7-11 Manygate Lane, Shepperton, but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

458/17 17/00630/FUL - 7-11 Manygate Lane, Shepperton

Description:

The demolition of existing houses and erection of a new building with three floors of accommodation, to provide 22 no. 1 bed and 2 bed sheltered apartments for the elderly, including communal facilities

Additional Information:

There was none.

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Jeremy Smith spoke against the proposal raising the following key points:

- Overdevelopment of the site.
- Insufficient regard paid to character of the area.
- Concern over bulk, scale and depth.
- Density concerns.
- Loss of garden area.

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Alex King spoke for the proposal raising the following key points:

- Have worked with planning officers to overcome appeal decision.
- Significant economic benefit for local shops.
- Acceptable in design term.

As Councillor R.W. Sider BEM (in his capacity as Ward Councillor for the proposed development) had given his apologies for the meeting the Chairman read out a statement on his behalf raising the following points against the proposal:

- Overdevelopment of the site.
- Concern over density and scale.
- Detrimental effect on character of the area.
- Traffic issues.
- Lack of affordable housing
- Detrimental outlook for existing properties.
- Minimal change from appeal scheme.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Appeal Inspector's only concern was design.
- Amendments made to move building away from the boundary.
- Roof design of third storey (set in the roof) is more attractive.
- Cannot introduce any new reasons for refusal to revised scheme, can only address the reasons the Inspector dismissed the appeal.
- Query over why the appeal decision is a material consideration.
- Aware of difficulties in Manygate Lane.
- Satisfied changes do address issues raised before.
- Parking is in excess of what is required.

Decision:

The application was **approved** as per the Planning Committee report.

459/17 17/00263/FUL - Land to the north of Hanworth Road and to the west of Costco, Sunbury On Thames.

Description:

The erection of a new building to provide a car dealership with the provision of car parking, associated infrastructure and landscaping.

Additional Information:

The Planning Development Manager reported the following:

With reference to paragraph 7.15 (Air Quality), the applicant has confirmed in writing that they agree to the payment of £6,000 towards the cost of providing a public electric vehicle charging point. This is attached as a Head of Term for a S106 agreement on page 68 of the agenda.

The planning agent has also requested amendments to some of the planning conditions in the committee report. We have reviewed these and have accepted some of the changes which are set out below:

Condition 3

~~Before any work on the development hereby permitted is first commenced~~
Prior to the erection/installation of external facing materials, details of the materials and detailing to be used for the external surfaces of the building and the surface material for the parking spaces be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Condition 10

~~Demolition works and~~ Construction of the development hereby approved must only be carried out on site between 08:00 – 18:00 Monday to Friday, 08:00 – 13:00 Saturday and none at all on Sunday, Public Holidays or Bank Holidays, **unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Condition 11

~~Before any construction commences,~~ **Prior to occupation of the building** details including a technical specification of all proposed external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The external lighting on the site shall at all times accord with the approved details.

Condition 14

Notwithstanding the submitted travel plan, prior to the ~~commencement~~ **occupation** of the development a Travel Plan shall be submitted for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the sustainable development aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, and Surrey County Council's "Travel Plans Good Practice Guide".

Condition 21

With the exception of cars, ~~No~~ goods or articles shall be stored on any part of the application site except inside the buildings.

Condition 25

Prior to the commencement of construction **occupation of the building**, a scheme to provide bird and bat boxes on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed scheme shall be implemented before the buildings are occupied and thereafter maintained.

Condition 28

That the premises be not ~~used~~ **be open to visiting members of the public** for the ~~purposes~~ **use** hereby permitted before 06:00 hours or after 23:00 hours on any day.

Public Speaking:

There were no public speakers.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Will be a great asset for Spelthorne and Sunbury.
- Increase in jobs for the borough.
- Traffic issues.
- Will be a statement site for the brand – top prestige car company – Spelthorne means Business.
- Fire safety issues (Officer note: not a planning matter).
- Would lead to a reduction in noise as the building will block traffic for residents.

Decision:

The application was **approved** subject to the amendments set out above and the prior signing of the s106 agreement.

460/17 17/00353/FUL - HSBC, 47-49 Church Road, Ashford

Description:

The erection of a third floor on top of the existing property to provide 4 flats, alterations to the existing second floor to convert 2 flats to 4 flats, and associated alterations.

Additional Information:

There was none.

Public Speaking:

There were no public speakers.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Will improve the appearance of the building.
- Parking spaces will need to be controlled.

- An application for an additional storey adjoining the site was previously approved.
- Impact on adjoin properties and within the street scene is an improvement.
- Reduction in internal floor space compared with appeal scheme.
- Increase in amenity space compared with appeal scheme.

Decision:

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

461/17 TPO 255/2017 - 36 and 38 Richmond Road, Staines Upon Thames

Description:

Tree Preservation Order relating to 36 and 38 Richmond Road, Staines-Upon-Thames.

Additional Information:

There was none.

Public Speaking:

There were no public speakers.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issue was raised:

- Concern that Sweeps Ditch will not be kept clear. (Suggestion that the member should contact the Group Head for Neighbourhood Services)

Decision:

The Tree Preservation Order was confirmed without modification.

462/17 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.

463/17 Urgent Items

There were none.