

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
29 May 2019**

Present:

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

Councillors:

R. Chandler	S.A. Dunn	L. Nichols
S.M. Doran	T. Lagden	R.J. Noble
R.W. Sider BEM	J. McIlroy	V. Siva
S. Buttar	A.J. Mitchell	B.B. Spoor

Apologies: There were none.

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 M. Attewell	Application No. 19/00325/HOU
------------------------	------------------------------

163/19 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 May 2019 were approved as a correct record.

164/19 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

Councillors R.A. Smith-Ainsley, H. Harvey and S. Doran reported that they had made a site visit in relation to application 18/01259/FUL The Old Police Station, 69 Staines Road East, Sunbury on Thames and Councillor B. Spoor had received correspondence in relation to this application. They had all

maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillors R.A. Smith Ainsley, H. Harvey, R. Chandler, S. Doran, S. Dunn, T.Lagden, L. Nichols, R. Noble, R.W. Sider BEM, V. Siva and B. Spoor reported that they had received correspondence in relation to application 19/00444/ADV, Charlton Lane Eco Park, Charlton Lane, Shepperton. Councillors H. Harvey and R.W. Sider BEM had also visited the site. They had all maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

165/19 Application No 18/01259/FUL - The Old Police Station, 69 Staines Road East, Sunbury on Thames, TW16 5AA

Description:

Conversion, extension and alterations of the existing old police station building, which is locally listed, to provide 4 flats together with the erection of a new 2 storey building to provide an additional 4 flats following the demolition of the existing outbuildings. The proposal would provide car parking, landscaping, access and associated works.

Additional Information:

The Planning Development Manager advised the Committee that following the deferral of this application, one additional letter of representation was received and 8 additional letters of objection.

The County Highway Authority confirmed that it raised no objection to the proposal or the proposed highway works.

The Group Head, Neighbourhood Services, raised no objection in relation to household waste.

Public Speaking:

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

- He was speaking on behalf of residents in Priory Close
- Access concerns
- Inadequate parking compared with standards – plus 2 parking spaces to be reserved for disabled drivers
- There was a restricted train service from Sunbury Railway Station
- There were only local shops at Sunbury Cross
- Concerns over emergency service access
- Refuse collection problems
- Traffic problems
- Traffic safety concerns

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

- Commuters or visitors to the public house nearby park to the front of the site. Restrictions will be proposed
- Discussions had taken place regarding highway arrangements with local residents, including the provision of bollards and a gate. He was happy to continue discussions with residents
- Working to provide a sensible solution to highway concerns

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- The building had been vacant for many years and was in disrepair
- It retained the historic appearance of a locally listed building (policy EN5)
- The extension was designed to fit in with the existing building
- The number of units had decreased from 9 to 8
- The amended access arrangement would affect all residents
- Good design
- Was waste provision adequate?
- It did not meet amenity space standards
- It did not meet parking standards
- It did not meet separation distances

Councillor Buttar arrived during this item but did not take part in the debate or vote.

Decision:

The recommendation to approve the application was agreed as set out in the Planning Committee report.

166/19 Application 19/00325/HOU - 2 Bush Road, Shepperton, TW17 0HX

Description:

Erection of a single storey front extension and two storey side and rear extension with incorporation of a garage.

Additional Information:

The Planning Development Manager advised the Committee that an amended plan had been received showing the correct roof design. Condition 2 was amended to reflect this.

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans DP3123/1, DP3123/1b, DP3123/2, 3123/4, DP3123/5 and DP3123/6 Received on 18.04.2019 and **DP3123/3 Received on 24.05.2019.**

Reason:-.For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.

Public Speaking:

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

- There was little change to the front elevation since refused scheme / insufficient change to scheme
- It was out of keeping with the area / adverse impact on visual amenity of road
- The outbuilding at the rear was overbearing (officer note: this was checked and it is permitted development)
- Dominating effect on character of area
- There was no reference to the difference in garden levels with adjoining dwellings
- Extension was not in proportion to the host dwelling and was not subordinate

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

- He had worked hard to address the issues raised with the neighbours

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:

- Overbearing
- Overdevelopment
- Detrimental to the street scene
- Harmful impact on neighbours
- Loss of privacy and loss of light now acceptable with revised scheme but other reasons for refusal not addressed
- Other houses extended nearby are on larger plots

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Amended scheme complies with policies
- Informative should be added to refer to hours of working
- Impact on street scene
- Concern that the extension would create a big house for a family
- There were large extensions nearby

Decision:

The recommendation to **approve** was agreed as set out in the Planning Committee report subject to the following additional informative:

You are advised that the Council will expect the following measures to be taken during any building operations to control noise, pollution and parking:

- (a) Work that is audible beyond the site boundary should only be carried out between 08:00hrs to 18:00hrs Monday to Friday, 08:00hrs to 13:00hrs Saturday and not at all on Sundays or any Public and/or Bank Holidays;
- (b) The quietest available items of plant and machinery should be used on site. Where permanently sited equipment such as generators are necessary, they should be enclosed to reduce noise levels;
- (c) Deliveries should only be received within the hours detailed in (a) above;
- (d) Adequate steps should be taken to prevent dust-causing nuisance beyond the site boundary. Such uses include the use of hoses to damp down stockpiles of materials, which are likely to generate airborne dust, to damp down during stone/slab cutting; and the use of bowsers and wheel washes;
- (e) There should be no burning on site;
- (f) Only minimal security lighting should be used outside the hours stated above; and
- (g) Building materials and machinery should not be stored on the highway and contractors' vehicles should be parked with care so as not to cause an obstruction or block visibility on the highway.

Further details of these noise and pollution measures can be obtained from the Council's Environmental Health Services Unit. In order to meet these requirements and to promote good neighbourliness, the Council recommends that this site is registered with the Considerate Constructors Scheme - www.ccscheme.org.uk/index.php/site-registration of these noise and pollution measures can be obtained from the Council's Environmental Health Services Unit. In order to meet these requirements and to promote good neighbourliness, the Council recommends that this site is registered with the details of these noise and pollution measures can be obtained Considerate Constructors Scheme - www.ccscheme.org.uk/index.php/site-registration Further from the Council's Environmental Health Services Unit. In order to meet these requirements and to promote good neighbourliness, the Council recommends that this site is registered with the Considerate Constructors Scheme - www.ccscheme.org.uk/index.php/site-registration

167/19 Application No. 19/00444/ADV - Charlton Lane Eco Park, Charlton Lane, Shepperton, TW17 8QA

Description:

Retention of the display of a large free standing 6.52m tall non-illuminated sign at the entrance to the Eco Park site, Charlton Lane, Shepperton.

Additional Information:

There was none.

Public Speaking:

There were no public speakers.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- It was in an industrial area

- Encroachment on / contrary to the Green Belt
- Not needed
- Highway safety concerns
- Located in a Semi rural area
- Too large
- Too bright
- Out of scale with area
- Inappropriate
- Intrusive
- Difficult to understand the sign
- Size of sign is in context with the site
- Can be designed in a different colour

Decision:

The recommendation to grant was overturned and **refused** for the following reason:

The advertisement, by reason of its size, materials and prominent location, would have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality, contrary to paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019.

168/19 Urgent Items

There were none.