

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
10 January 2018**

Present:

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

Councillors:

R.O. Barratt	M.P.C. Francis	D. Patel
R. Chandler	N. Islam	R.W. Sider BEM
S.M. Doran	A.T. Jones	

Apologies: Apologies were received from Councillors C.B. Barnard, I.J. Beardsmore, J.R. Boughtflower and P.C. Edgington

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.

Councillor Gething was in attendance to speak on Agenda Item 4b: Application 17/01700/HOU - 27 St. Hildas Avenue, Ashford.

1/18 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2017 were approved as a correct record.

2/18 Disclosures of Interest

a) Disclosures of interest under the Members' Code of Conduct

Councillor R.A. Smith Ainsley declared a 'Conflict of Interest' on behalf of all the Committee members in application 17/01847/PDO - Benwell House, Green Street, Sunbury-on-Thames because it had been made by the Council.

Councillor Barratt declared a pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 4c - 17/01815/HOU - 17 Tennyson Road, Ashford.

b) Declarations of interest under the Council's Planning Code

Councillors R.A. Smith Ainsley, H.A. Thomson, R.O. Barratt, R. Chandler, S. Doran, M. Francis, N. Islam, D. Patel and R.W. Sider BEM reported that they had received correspondence, in relation to application 17/01700/HOU - 27

St. Hildas Avenue, Ashford, but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

3/18 17/01847/PDO - Benwell House, Green Street, Sunbury-on-Thames

Description:

This Item was an application for Prior Approval for the Change of Use from Office (Class B1a) to 33 Residential Flats (Class C3) comprising 14 no. 1 bedroom flats and 19 no. 2 bedroom flats.

Additional Information:

The Planning Development Manager reported the following:

One late letter of representation had been received. Issues raised included:-

- a) The proposal represents a new 24 hour operation.
- b) Over-looking, increased noise and other distractions.
- c) Traffic impact on the surrounding road network.
- d) Impact on community infrastructure (schools, medical services etc.)

Paragraph 3.3 (page 15) should be amended as follows:

“The building would provide ~~3~~ 33 units over three floors....”

Public Speaking:

There were no Public Speakers for this item.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Is a straight forward change of use
- Will help ease our chronic housing shortage in the borough
- Possibility of affordable housing

Decision:

The application was approved as per the recommendation in the Officer's report.

4/18 17/01700/HOU - 27 St. Hildas Avenue, Ashford

Description:

This application sought approval for the erection of a part single storey, part two storey rear extension. It also involved the installation of a pitch roof to the side of the property and the creation of a covered seating area.

Additional Information:

The Planning Development Manager reported the following:

Amended plans had been received showing changes to the roof of the single storey side extension and also the conservatory of the neighbouring dwelling. Consequently, condition 3 should be amended to:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and drawings: L2506/LP rev A; 01; 02; 03; ~~05 rev A and 08~~ received 03.11.2017; *08 rev A received 03.01.2018 and 01 rev A and 05 rev B received 09.01.2018.*

One late letter of objection had been received raising the following points:

- Page two of their original letter of objection is not displayed on the website. (Officer note: This has now been rectified).
- The rear gardens are west facing, and not north facing as stated in the report (Officer note: Para 7.10, 4th line on page 27 should read “west” not “north”).
- The proposal does not comply with the SPD. (Officer note: The SPD is dealt with in the Planning Committee report. The required 1m ‘set-in’ from the side boundary is for 2 storey side extensions, not rear extensions).

Two letters of representation had been received on behalf of the applicant raising the following point:

- Some photographs should be considered showing that the loss of light will not be significant.
- Reference is made to light guidance by the London Borough of Merton

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council’s public speaking procedures, Ian Brimage spoke against the proposal raising the following key points:

- Loss of sunlight and daylight
- Errors in the report (Officer note: this has been corrected)
- Contrary to SPD

In accordance with the Council’s public speaking procedures, Cllr Nick Gething spoke against the proposal raising the following key points:

- Impact on neighbour
- Errors in the report (Officer note: this has been corrected)

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Concern about impact on neighbour
- More information is required to assess the impact on the neighbour
- Queries over the application of the proposal against the Council’s SPD

Decision:

The application was deferred to enable further information to be provided to assess the impact on the neighbouring property.

5/18 17/01815/HOU - 17 Tennyson Road, Ashford

Having declared a pecuniary interest in this property, Councillor Barratt left the room before this matter was discussed and took no part in the debate or the vote on the application.

He indicated that he would not be returning for the remaining Agenda items.

Description:

This application sought approval for the erection of a single storey side extension to the rear of the existing side extension (following the demolition of an existing 'lean to' structure).

Additional Information:

There was none.

Public Speaking:

There were no Public Speakers for this item.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- No change to the street scene
- Will be an improvement on the existing property

Decision:

The application was approved as per the recommendation in the Officer's report.

6/18 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.

7/18 Urgent Items

There were none.