**To:**
**All members of the Planning Committee**

*Please reply to:*
Contact: Karen Wyeth
Service: Committee Services
Direct line: 01784 446341
E-mail: k.wyeth@spelthorne.gov.uk
Date: 9 November 2026

Supplementary Agenda

**Planning Committee - Wednesday, 11 November 2026**

Dear Councillor

I enclose the following items which were marked 'to follow' on the agenda for the Planning Committee meeting to be held on Wednesday, 11 November 2026:

**2. Minutes** **3 - 14**

To confirm the minutes of the meetings held on 14 October 2026 and 28 October 2026 as a correct record.

Minutes to follow.

Yours sincerely

Karen Wyeth
Corporate Governance

To the members of the Planning Committee

Councillors:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| D.L. Geraci (Vice-Chair) | T. Burrell | M.J. Lee |
| L. Barker | R. Chandler | L. E. Nichols |
| C. Bateson | D.C. Clarke | K.E. Rutherford |
| S.N. Beatty | K.M. Grant | P.N. Woodward |
| M. Buck | K. Howkins | |

**Spelthorne Borough Council, Council Offices, Knowle Green**

**Staines-upon-Thames TW18 1XB**

www.spelthorne.gov.uk customer.services@spelthorne.gov.uk telephone 01784 451499

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of the Planning Committee**
**14 October 2026**

**Present:**

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

Councillors:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| C. Bateson | T. Burrell | K.M. Grant |
| S.N. Beatty | R. Chandler | L. E. Nichols |
| M. Buck | D.C. Clarke | K.E. Rutherford |

**Apologies:** Councillors L. Barker, K. Howkins, M.J. Lee and P.N. Woodward

## 29/26 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2026 were approved as a correct record.

## 30/26 Disclosures of Interest Under the Member's Code of Conduct

There were none.

## 31/26 Declarations of interest under the Council's Planning Code

There were none.

## 32/26 Planning application 26/00714/FUL - Land Accessed from Sheep Walk, Shepperton

**Description:**

Vehicular access track to serve the flexible electricity generation facility

**Additional Information:**
There was none.

**Public Speaking:**

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

1. The access onto Sheep Walk is a pre-existing arrangement and this proposal is for an alternative access.

2. The application had no objections from the consulted statutory and non-statutory consultees.

3. No harm had been identified to highway safety, biodiversity or flooding.

1. There would not be any change to the character of the area or the amenity of any adjoining or neighbouring properties.

2. The proposal site had been assessed as Grey Belt land.

3. The proposal would deliver an enhanced means of access onto Sheep Walk,

4. The proposal would deliver a 23.37% biodiversity uplift.

5. This would assist with the delivery of the electricity generation facility and therefore aid the transition to low energy provision.

6. The officers' recommendation to permit this application is a testament to its strong public benefit which would fair outweigh any perceived harm.

7. The application is deemed to fully comply with the adopted development plan.

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

1. The proposed concrete path may increase the cases of fly tipping so could some sort of security gate be installed to prevent this occurring.

2. Sheep Walk would be affected by the overflow ditch that would need to be dug as part of the River Thames Scheme.

3. Paths would be made of permeable material, not concrete.

4. Disagreed that this site was not greenbelt.

5. The proposed access point would be nice to have but as there is already access to the site was it needed.

6. There had been a history of unauthorised work and enforcement on this site – Officers advised that this was not correct.

7. The Committee requested that the following additional informative be added:

   The applicant is advised to make the access secure to safeguard the land from fly-tipping.

**Decision:**

The application was approved subject to conditions as set out in Paragraph 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3 of the recommendations plus the additional informative being added to the Decision Notice:

**Informative 10 –** The applicant is advised to make the access secure to safeguard the land from fly-tipping.

**33/26 Amendments to Planning Committee Terms of Reference, Planning Delegations and Planning Code following the Town and Country Planning Act (Discharge of Local Planning Authority Functions) (England) Regulations 2026**

The Committee considered a report that asked the members to note the changes under the Town and Country Planning (Discharge of Local Planning Authority Functions) (England) Regulations 2026 and the introduction of the National Scheme of Delegation and to appoint the Nominated Officer and Nominated Member and any substitutions.

The Committee were advised that with effect from 31 October new regulations come into force under the Town and County Planning Act (Discharge of Local Planning Authority Functions) (England) Regulations 2026 (Regulations). These changes involved significant changes to the way in which planning applications are determined.

The right of Ward Councillors to call in planning application for determination by the Planning Committee had been withdrawn.

Each planning application would fall within either Schedule 1 or Schedule 2. The majority of applications would fall within Schedule 1, and these would have to be determined by the Nominated Officer and cannot be determined by members of the Planning Committee. Applications that fall within Schedule 2 may, with the agreement of the Nominated Officer and Nominated Member be determined by the Planning Committee. In place of the current call in procedure, Ward Members would be able to ask the Nominated Officer and Nominated Member to consider an application.

Councillor Geraci proposed
Councillor Rutherford Seconded that

The Nominated Officer should be the Planning Development Management Team Leader (currently P Tomson)
The Substitute Nominated officer should be the Planning Development Management Team Leader (currently K Walker)

Councillor Geraci proposed
Councillor Bateson seconded that

The Nominated Member should be the Chair of the Planning Committee
The Substitute Nominated Member should be the Vice-Chair of the Planning Committee

The Committee **resolved to:**

1. Note the upcoming statutory changes under the Town and Country Planning (Discharge of Local Planning Authority Functions) (England) Regulations 2026 and the introduction of the National Scheme of Delegation as set out in the report; and

2. Appoint the Chair of the Planning Committee as the Nominated Member and the Vice-Chair as a substitute Nominated Member and the Planning Development Management Team Leader (P Tomson) as the Nominated Officer with the Planning Development Management Team Leader (K Walker) as the substitute Nominated Officer.

## 34/26 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 Interim Planning Development Manager.

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

## 35/26 Major Planning Applications

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

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

**Minutes of the Planning Committee**
**28 October 2026**

**Present:**

Councillor D.L. Geraci (Vice-Chair)

Councillors:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| C. Bateson | T. Burrell | K. Howkins |
| S.N. Beatty | D.C. Clarke | K.E. Rutherford |
| M. Buck | K.M. Grant | P.N. Woodward |

**Substitutions:** Councillors J.A. Turner (In place of L. E. Nichols)

S.C. Mooney (In place of M.J. Lee)

D. Saliagopoulos (In place of R. Chandler)

**Apologies:** Councillors L. Barker

**In Attendance:** Councillors M.M. Attewell and J.R. Sexton

## 36/26 Disclosures of Interest Under the Member's Code of Conduct

There were none.

## 37/26 Declarations of interest under the Council's Planning Code

In relation to application 26/00909/FUL, Councillors Buck, Burrell, and Howkins reported that they had received correspondence in relation to application but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

In relation to application 26/00752/HOU Councillors Bateson, Beatty, Buck, Burrell, Grant, Howkins, Mooney, Rutherford, Turner, and Woodward reported that they had received correspondence in relation to application but had

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

Councillor Howkins also declared she knew the previous owners of the site.

Councillor Attewell declared as ward councillor, she had received correspondence and spoken with residents regarding the application.

In relation to application 26/00800/HOU, Councillors Beatty, Grant, Howkins, Rutherford, Turner, and Woodward reported that they had received correspondence in relation to application but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor Sexton declared as ward councillor, she had received correspondence and spoken with residents regarding the application.

## 38/26 Planning application 26/00909/FUL - Various Locations in International Way and Lincoln Way, Sunbury-on-Thames TW16 7HR

**Description:**
Erection and alteration of estate boundary fencing at four locations, two accessing Windmill Road and two accessing Lincoln Way. Installation of installation of three pedestrian gates.

**Additional Information:**
Paragraph 3.6 of the Committee report should state:- Enforcement history indicates that in March 2025, Heras fencing was erected at several locations along ~~International Way~~ Windmill Road and Lincoln Way, preventing pedestrian access and egress through the estate. As a result, pedestrian access has been restricted to the main estate entrance on the eastern side of the site, where pedestrians and vehicles have access via secured gates. The Council has received no objection from the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service.

**Public Speaking:**
In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Clive Snelling spoke against the proposed development raising the following key points:

1. The play equipment and area had been updated to accommodate requested facilities
2. The fencing was installed to prevent children running into the road
3. An increasing number of vans and mopeds were entering the estate and damaging the pedestrian gates
4. The fencing proposal was including within the estate management manifesto which had a majority acceptance
5. The fencing proposal was reported in the annual newsletter advising it would be permanent

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

1. She called the application in to Committee because she was contacted by residents
2. The residents stated they felt the proposals would make the site feel like a prison
3. There aren't very many entrances and exits, and the proposals would reduce the number

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

1. If approved as put forward, there was a risk it breached the original S106 agreement
2. The Committee could request a Deed of Variation to address the S106 agreement.
3. The gates addressed identified risks
4. The applicant had gone through appropriate channels
5. The gates were being provided for the safety of residents
6. The site was still accessible from Windmill Road despite the gates
7. The deed of variation should be for the managing agents to decide
8. A majority of the reasons provided against the proposal were not material planning considerations
9. The S106 agreement was not clear which gates needed to be accessible
10. Closing off some access points isn't beneficial for pedestrians, and they would have to walk further to utilise the open access points
11. The Council may be open to legal challenge if the decision was challenged without amending the S106 agreement.

Councillor Beatty left the Chamber at 19:43 and returned at 19:48. As he was not present for the entirety of the item, he did not vote.

Councillor Saliagopoulos left the meeting at 20:02

It was proposed by Councillor Rutherford and seconded by Councillor Clarke to amend the recommendation to require the applicant first entering into a Deed of Variation to the existing Section 106 agreement in relation to access to the public open space and play area, if approved.

**Decision:**

The Committee **resolved** to approve the planning application subject to the applicant first entering into a Deed of Variation to the existing Section 106 agreement in relation to access to the public open space and play area.

Meeting adjourned: 20:06
Meeting reconvened: 20:20

**39/26 Planning application 26/00752/HOU - 53 Manor Farm Avenue, Shepperton TW17 9AG**

**Description:**
Proposed erection of a single storey rear extension following demolition of existing extension, erection of single storey side extension. Erection of new roof with ridge height increase, 3 no. side facing dormers, 1 no. front dormer and roof lights.

**Additional Information:**
1.Two late letters of objection have been received.

Most of the issues raised are already covered in the report. However, the following additional issues are raised:

- Proposal breaches the 25 degree guide laid out in the Design Code.
- A daylight/sunlight report should be submitted.
- Construction phase impacts
- Highway safety
- Right to light (this is a civil matter and not a planning matter)

With regard to the 25-degree line, this not considered to be applicable to the house extension proposed. The 45-degree line rules are applicable.

The purpose of the 25-degree line is to assess new development sited to the front or rear of an existing property.

With regard to a daylight/sunlight report this is not considered necessary because the proposed development does not break any of the Council's 45-degree line rules.

2. Condition 3 (Drawing numbers) plan no's updated:

230926 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11 all received 27.10.2026

The updated drawings clarify details of the 45-degree line in relation to the neighbouring property Number 55 Manor Farm Avenue.

**Public Speaking:**
In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Olena Tsikalovska spoke against the proposed development raising the following key points:

1. The sectional drawing relies on a 45-degree line, but guidance requires a 25-degree test
2. The proposed development would lead to a significant risk of loss of daylight and overshadowing
3. The applicant should submit an independent Daylight and Sunlight Assessment
4. The proposed French doors would create direct views into neighbouring gardens, creating a loss of privacy
5. The applicant has incomplete and inaccurate evidence

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:
1. The amendments do not address concerns raised by neighbouring residents
2. The proposed development would be out of scale and not in keeping with the appearance of neighbouring properties
3. Residents have raised concerns about loss of daylight, overshadowing, and loss of privacy
4. The cumulative effects of the development should be considered

**Debate:**
During the debate the following key issues were raised:
1. If the application was deferred, it would not be considered by Committee due to a change in legislation.
2. The extension was single-storey with space available in the roof
3. There have been other alterations to houses on the road, so it would not be out of character
4. The referenced 25-degree line is not applicable to this application
5. The proposed changes were not overbearing
6. There would be adequate parking
7. The cumulative impact of the development should be considered

**Decision:**
The Committee **resolved** to approve the application subject to the conditions as set out in the Recommendation section of the report (paragraph 8.1 to 8.3).

**40/26 Planning application 26/00800/HOU - 40 Fontmell Park, Ashford TW15 2NW**

Meeting adjourned: 20:53
Meeting reconvened 21:01

**Description:**
Erection of a part single storey / part first floor rear extension and alterations to the roof to provide habitable accommodation.

**Additional Information:**
Two further letters of objection raising continued concerns that the proposal will be used as an HMO; inconsistencies in the plans (e.g. garage already converted) and inadequate parking for the number of habitable rooms.

Two e-mails were received from the public speaker, also copied to the members of the Committee confirming the concerns of both direct neighbours and attaching photographs of the extension in its current form from their properties.

The applicant has submitted an Asbestos Survey confirming that there are no concerns regarding Asbestos in the existing building, albeit the survey having taken place after the single storey extension had been erected.

**Public Speaking:**
In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Graeme Brown spoke against the proposed development raising the following key points:

1. The size of the proposal dwarfs the neighbouring properties
2. The extension would be out-of-line with the established rear line of properties
3. There would be overbearing wall impact and overshadowing causing loss of outlook, natural daylight and sky visibility
4. The single storey extension creates a new vertical breach as it is higher and wider
5. Boiler fumes, pump noise and boiler whine will be a problem
6. An environmental survey should be conducted regarding the boiler being close to the neighbouring property
7. The boiler room should be re-located or re-sited from all windows in bordering properties
8. A condition should be added to prevent any further rooms being converted to en-suites
9. The parking spaces do not appear on any plans and should be added as a condition

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Kavita Bengali spoke for the proposed development raising the following key points:
1. Significant time, money and emotion have been invested in creating a long-term family home
2. Opposition to the plans has been driven by speculation
3. Objections have been encouraged by neighbouring residents who believe the property is intended to operate as an HMO
4. The family and their visitors should not be harassed, intimidation, or invasions of privacy due to the misconception
5. Rumours, assumptions and unsupported allegations should not be treated as planning evidence or influence the determination of the application

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

1. Matters relating to the scale, design and impact of the proposed extension that deserve consideration under PS2 of the Spelthorne Local Plan
2. Members should consider if the proposal as currently designed sits with the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene
3. The Committee should consider the scale, footprint and relationship with neighbouring properties alongside the assessment against planning policies and design guidance

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

1. There were a high number of letters in support of the application
2. The application appears overbearing
3. The application is for an extension and there are no material planning considerations to refuse it
4. The extension is no worse than the existing infringement on the 45-degree angle.
5. The loft space is not shown to be habitable
6. The climate change measures are satisfactory

**Decision:**
The Committee **resolved** to approve the application subject to conditions as set out in the Recommendation section of the report (paras. 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3)

## 41/26 Planning Appeals Report

The Chair 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 Interim Planning Development Manager.

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

## 42/26 Major Planning Applications

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

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

This page is intentionally left blank