

**Minutes of the Planning Committee  
12 November 2025**

**Present:**

Councillor M. Gibson (Chair)  
Councillor D.L. Geraci (Vice-Chair)

**Councillors:**

C. Bateson	D.C. Clarke	K.E. Rutherford
S.N. Beatty	K. Howkins	P.N. Woodward
M. Beecher	M.J. Lee	
T. Burrell	L. E. Nichols	

**Apologies:** Councillors R. Chandler

**Substitution:** Councillors D. Saliagopoulos

**In Attendance:** Councillors J. Caplin and H. Williams

**71/25 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2025 were approved as a correct record.

**72/25 Disclosures of Interest Under the Member's Code of Conduct**

There were none.

**73/25 Declarations of interest under the Council's Planning Code**

Councillors Howkins, Rutherford and Woodward declared that they had received emails in respect of Application 25/01064/FUL.

Councillor Rutherford declared that she had received emails in respect of Application 25/01088/HOU.

Councillor Saliagopoulos declared that she had received telephone calls from residents in respect of both applications.

**74/25 Planning application 25/01064/FUL - 67 High Street, Staines-upon-Thames TW18 4PU**

**Description:**

Change of Use of Ground Floor from Vacant Bank to a Proposed Bingo Hall

**Additional Information:**

There was none.

**Public Speaking:**

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

1. The application conflicts with TC1 and TC2 of the adopted Core Strategy and Policy EC2 of the emerging Local Plan
2. TC1 identifies Staines Town as the principal town within the Borough and developments should contribute to the vitality and viability of the centre
3. TC2 refers to the maintenance of the dominance of retailing in the shopping frontage that would support the town's primary retail role particularly in primary area such as the High Street
4. Non-retail usage should not be allowed if it denies retail space; converting the empty bank building into a Bingo Hall would result in the loss of the potential for retail usage
5. There is no evidence that this site is unviable for retail usage

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

1. The building is a local listed building and not a statutory listed building
2. No alterations could be made to the facade but internal alterations would be considered
3. Consider this to be a gaming centre, not a Bingo Hall
4. Would result in the removal of potential retail space
5. Why is the application for 24 hours opening
6. The operators could add further gambling games onto the electronic screens
7. No alcohol or food would be served on the premises. Would this be enforceable
8. Where would the customers park
9. Increase in noise for neighbouring residential properties
10. Users of the Bingo Hall would have to be over 18 yrs
11. Staines does not need a Bingo Hall but does need more vibrant public houses instead

12. If the operators wanted to game this from a Bingo Hall to a adult gaming centre they would need to submit a planning application
13. Too close to a children's nursery
14. This application does not result in overdevelopment of the site as the building is not to be altered
15. Could a condition be added to restrict the opening hours to 9am to 11pm.

Councillor Geraci proposed, Councillor Rutherford seconded and the Committee agreed to add the following condition:

The use hereby permitted shall only take place between the following hours, 09.00 and 23.00, the reason to safeguard the amenity of nearby residential properties.

The Committee voted as follows:

For – 1  
Against – 10  
Abstain – 2

Councillor Lee requested that his vote to abstain appeared in the minutes.

The motion to approve the application **FELL**

It was proposed by Councillor Geraci and seconded by Councillor Woodward that the Local Planning Authority is minded to refuse the application as the proposed use would introduce a non-Class E use in the designated primary shopping area, it will negatively affect the amenity of local residents and will not positively contribute to the viability and vitality of the high street contrary to policy TC2, EN11 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 and the NPPF.

The Committee voted as follows:

For – 10  
Against – 1  
Abstain – 2

**Decision:**

The motion to **refuse** the application was carried for the following reasons:

The Local Planning Authority is minded to refuse the application as the proposed use would introduce a non-Class E use in the designated primary shopping area, it will negatively affect the amenity of local residents and will not positively contribute to the viability and vitality of the high street contrary to policy TC2, EN11 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 and the NPPF.

**75/25 Planning application 25/01088/HOU - 35 Park Road, Ashford  
TW15 1EX**

**Description:**

Garage conversion to habitable room, part single part two storey side and rear extension, loft conversion with rear dormer and hip to gable roof extension.

**Additional Information:**

There was none.

**Public Speaking:**

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Kevin Swinburne submitted a statement against the proposed development that was read out by the Democratic Services Manager and raised the following key points:

1. Reduction in privacy due to the dormer window
2. Risk to his property if the chimney breast is removed within 35 Park Road
3. Feel that this property would eventually become a House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO)
4. If it is turned into an HMO this would increase the number of vehicles using the already busy road
5. Park Road is a family orientated residential road and fear that the proposed changes would change the feel of the road

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

1. The development is not in keeping with the character of the street
2. Increase in on-road parking pressures
3. The street character has already changed due to previous applications approved
4. It should be considered whether the proposed extensions and the resulting shaping and form remain consistent in respecting the character of the area as per EN1
5. Visual symmetry between the semi-detached properties would be altered  
Design SPD advises that a 2 storey side extension should be set back
6. Parking issue/loss of garage

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

1. Could a condition be put forward to ensure that the work on the party wall is completed before any other building work commences
2. Could a condition be put on that this property remains a family home and is not to be converted into a House of Multiple Occupancy
3. The application proposed 3 bedrooms as 2 further rooms could be used as bedrooms therefore it is considered to be a 5 bedroom property
4. Overdevelopment of the site

Councillor Geraci proposed, Councillor Rutherford seconded and the Committee agreed to add the following condition:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 as amended or any order revoking and re-enacting that order, the extended property shall be used only for purposes within use Class C3 of the scheduled of the Town and Country Planning Use Class Order 1987 as amended or in any provision equivalent to that class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that order. The reason is to ensure that the property is maintained as a dwelling house and to safeguard the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

The Committee voted as follows:

For - 9

Against - 1

Abstain - 3

### **Decision:**

The application was approved subject to conditions as set out in the recommendation section of the report and the additional condition agreed as above.

### **76/25 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.

The Committee were advised that a decision had now been made in respect of Planning Application 25/00856/HOU, 14 Furzewood, Sunbury-on-Thames, TW16 6SJ; the appeal had been **dismissed**.

Committee **resolved** that the report of the Planning Development Manager be received and noted.

### **77/25 Major Planning Applications**

The Planning Development Manager submitted a report outlining major applications that may be brought before the Planning Committee for determination.

Committee **resolved** that the report of the Planning Development Manager be received and noted.