

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
30 May 2018**

Present:

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

Councillors:

C. Barnard	M.P.C. Francis	M.J. Madams
S.J. Burkmar	A.L. Griffiths	R.W. Sider BEM
T.J.M. Evans	N. Islam	

Apologies: Apologies were received from Councillor S.M. Doran, Councillor Q.R. Edgington, Councillor S.C. Mooney and Councillor D. Patel

147/18 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 May 2018 were approved as a correct record.

148/18 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

There were none.

149/18 18/00321/FUL - Dolphin House, 140 Windmill Road, Sunbury On Thames, TW16 7HS

Description:

This application sought approval for the erection of a 7th floor on top of the existing main building to create 7 flats and other external alterations including an increase in height of the parapet wall by 850mm and new flat roof to the existing tower.

Additional Information:

The Planning Development Manager advised the committee that since the report was prepared, there had been an update on the housing need assessment for the Borough referred to in the document which had been circulated to all members. This demonstrated that we now have a five year

housing supply based on the Government's draft methodology. This did not have any implications for the recommendation to approve the application, since the proposals accord with the Council's development plan and the NPPF and in particular the requirements to encourage housing developments and the effective use of urban and previously developed land.

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Bal Heer spoke for the proposed development and raised the following key points:

- He thanked the planning case officer for co-operating with the applicant's team
- Endorsed the officer's recommendation.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Increase in density
- Lack of amenity space
- Halliford Park is not nearby
- Query over census data
- No affordable housing offered
- Parking will be available nearby outside working hours
- Concern over construction disruption for existing residents
- Hours of construction should be added to the decision notice
- Design in keeping with the existing building
- Need for Housing

Decision:

The Application was **approved** subject to an additional informative to read as follows:

The applicant is advised that the developer is requested to only work during the following hours:

8.00 am to 6.00pm Monday to Friday,

9.00 am to 1.00pm Saturday and no working on Sunday and public holidays.

150/18 17/01938/FUL - 20 Bridge Street, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 4TW

Description:

This application sought approval for the demolition of the existing two storey building and erection of a five storey building of 9 self-contained flats with associated cycle parking.

Additional Information:

Since the report was prepared, there had been an update on the housing need assessment for the Borough referred to in the document which was circulated to all members. This demonstrated that we have a five year housing supply based on the Government's draft methodology. This did not have any implications for the recommendation to approve this application,

since the proposals accord with the Council's development plan and the NPPF and in particular the requirements to encourage housing developments and the effective use of urban and previously developed land.

The Council's Conservation Advisor raised no objection on historic building grounds.

The Environment Agency raised no objection and advised that the sequential test and safe access and egress tests should be met as set out in the NPPF. The officers were satisfied with the proposals on flooding grounds subject to the following condition being imposed as recommended by the Environment Agency:

Finished floor levels are required to be set no lower than 16.525 m above Ordnance Datum (AOD).

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants for the lifetime of the development.

The Planning Development Manager advised that condition 9 on page 39 should be amended after "include" on the 3rd line by inserting the following: *"the setting out and"*.

The presenting officer advised the proposed development was for 3 no. 1 bed flats and 6 no. 2 bed flats and the description should be amended accordingly.

Public Speaking:

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

- He was not opposed to development or resistant to change
- The proposal would result in loss of light
- Overbearing impact; dark oppressive tunnel
- Staines Town Society had objected to the scheme.

The Planning Officer advised that the objection by Staines Town Society was included in the report to Committee.

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

- Benefits of the scheme are detailed in the officer's report
- Highly sustainable location
- There is an identified need for housing
- Applicant has amended the scheme to reduce impact on neighbour
- There will be some loss of light but the BRE guidelines are still met
- There is a 4m separation distance
- There will be wide views for neighbours to the east and west
- Contemporary design which is set in
- Conservation Officer has no objection
- Town Centre location; close to bus and train services
- No objection from County Highway Authority

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Had sympathy for the speaker against the proposal but it would be challenging to sustain a reason for refusal
- The applicant had made an effort to take concerns on board
- Concern expressed regarding proposed materials
- Height concerns
- The design does not enhance Staines conservation area
- No objection to modern building
- Concern over impact on street scene
- Impact on adjoining neighbour to the north
- Loss of daylight and sunlight to neighbour to the north / adverse impact
- Loss of amenity to adjoining properties
- Top floor should be removed
- 25 degree and 45 degree guides should be met
- Have to consider people not at meeting who will benefit from new proposal
- Financial impact on residents

Decision:

The recommendation to approve was overturned and the Application was **refused** planning permission for the following two reasons:

The proposed development would, by reason of its bulk and close proximity to the two top floor flats in the southern elevation of Provident House to the north, result in an unacceptable overbearing impact on these two flats causing a significant harmful impact in terms of loss of daylight and sunlight, contrary to policy EN1 b) of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 and the Councils Supplementary Planning Document on Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development, 2011.

The top floor element of the proposed development would result in a scheme which fails to respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the surrounding area, contrary to policy EN1 a) of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009.

151/18 Permissions in Principle and Technical Detail Consent Applications

The Planning Development Manager presented a report to the Committee on the introduction of a new form of planning consent which will come into effect from 1 June 2018. It will apply to development where the “main purpose” is housing, but some non-residential development may also be proposed. The application procedure will be restricted to minor development where there is a maximum of up to 9 dwellings, floorspace of under 1,000 square metres or a site area of less than one hectare.

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

152/18 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.

153/18 Urgent Items

There were none.