

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
14 November 2018**

Present:

Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley (Chairman)

Councillor H.A. Thomson (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

C. Barnard

Q.R. Edgington

N. Islam

I.J. Beardsmore

T.J.M. Evans

S.C. Mooney

S.J. Burkmar

M.P.C. Francis

R.W. Sider BEM

Apologies: Apologies were received from Councillors S.M. Doran, A.L. Griffiths and M. Madams.

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 B.B. Spoor Item 18/01269/HOU - 44 Kings Avenue Sunbury On Thames TW16 7QE

262/18 Minutes

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

263/18 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

A presentation and site visits had been offered to all Planning Committee members by the applicant in relation to planning application 18/01101/FUL – 17-51 London Road, Staines-upon-Thames.

A presentation had been offered to all Planning Committee members by the applicant in relation to planning application 18/01084/FUL – Matthew Arnold Secondary School, Staines-upon-Thames.

Councillors R.A. Smith Ainsley, H.A. Thomson, C. Barnard, T. Evans, M. Francis, N. Islam, S. Mooney, and R.W. Sider BEM reported that they had received correspondence in relation to application 18/01270/HOU – 9 Stanhope Way, Stanwell, but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley had also received correspondence in relation to item 18/01269/HOU - 44 Kings Avenue, Sunbury-on-Thames but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

264/18 Planning Application - 18/01101/FUL: 17-51 London Road, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 4EX

Announcement

The Chairman informed members and those present at the meeting of one aspect to Item 4a Berkeley Homes Development at London Road, Staines upon Thames. The report identified that affordable rented housing was to be provided which would be subject to a legal agreement if the Committee was minded to approve the application in accordance with the recommendations. The Council's Housing Company, Knowle Green Estates Ltd was in discussions with the applicant to provide this affordable rented housing. He advised members that the identity of the housing provider was not a planning matter but an executive one and subject to the agreement of Cabinet if it should go forward.

The recommendation of the officer takes into account the circumstances where the Council or a Registered Provider will become involved with this aspect of housing delivery.

Description:

This application sought approval for the erection of six buildings to provide 474 residential homes (Class C3) and flexible commercial space at ground and first floors (Class A1, A2, A3, B1, D1 or D2) car parking, pedestrian and vehicular access, landscaping and associated works.

Additional Information:

The Planning Development Manager gave the following updates:

3 late letters of objection had been received raising the following concerns:

- Provision of applicant's affordable housing viability report on the Council's website,
- Representations made by the residents and leaseholders of Ash House have been ignored or not adequately addressed.

Executive Summary (Corrections)

In the first paragraph (page 10) the commercial floorspace should read **2,555m²** (not 2513 m²).

In the fifth paragraph the number of parking spaces should read **27** not 24.

Main Report (Corrections)

Para 3.16 (page 16) 'The building would be 12 storeys and approximately **39** metres tall...' (not 26.7m).

Para 7.68 (page 29) 'In addition these assessments were undertaken **against** the current vacant site conditions.'

Para 7.95 (page 33) 'It further examines **the cumulative effects including** nearby schemes as well as the national and local planning policy context.'

Condition Update

Condition 2 requires the relevant approved plan numbers to be inserted as follows:

17660 U078 B1 GA(10)001-01, B1 GA(10)001-02, B1 GA(10)002, B1 GA(10)003, B1 GA(10)017, B2 GA(10)001-01, B2 GA(10)001-02, B2 GA(10)002-01, B2 GA(10)002-02, B2 GA(10)011-01, B2 GA(10)011-02, B3 GA(10)001, B3 GA(10)002, B3 GA(10)012, B4 GA(10)001, B4 GA(10)002, B4 GA(10)011, B5 GA(10)001, B5 GA(10)002, B5 GA(10)003, B5 GA(10)009, B6 GA(10)013-01, B6 GA(10)013-01, B6 GA(10)003-02, B6 GA(10)003-01, B6 GA(10)002-02, B6 GA(10)002-01, B6 GA(10)001-02, B6 GA(10)001-01, B3 GA(11)004, B4 GA(11)001, B4 GA(11)002, B4 GA(11)003, B4 GA(11)004, B5 GA(11)001, B5 GA(11)002, B5 GA(11)003, B5 GA(11)004, B6 GA(11)001, B6 GA(11)002, B6 GA(11)003, B6 GA(11)004, B1 GA(12)001, B1 GA(12)002, B2 GA(12)001, B2 GA(12)002, B2 GA(12)002, B3 GA(12)002, B4 GA(12)001, B4 GA(12)002, B5 GA(12)001, B5 GA(12)002, B6 GA(12)001, B6 GA(12)002, Z AS(21)103, Z AS(21)102, Z AS(21)104, Z AS(21)101, B1 GA(11)001, Z TP(10)017, Z TP(11)103, Z TP(11)002, Z TP(11)101, Z TP(11)102, Z TP(11)001, Z TP(11)104, Z TP(12)001, Z TP(12)002, Z TP(12)003, Z TP(10)008, Z TP(10)009, Z TP(10)010, Z TP(10)011, Z TP(10)010, Z TP(10)012, Z TP(10)013, Z TP(10)014, Z TP(10)015, Z TP(10)016, Z TP(10)000, Z TP(00)00, Z TP(00)002, Z TP(10)001, Z TP(10)002, Z TP(10)003, Z TP(10)004, Z TP(10)005, Z TP(10)006, Z TP(10)007 and BKH-BGS_HTA-L_XX-00_DR_0900 Rev P dated 23 July 2018 and E1330 L(LE)001, L(LE)001 Rev A dated 20 Dec 2017.

Public Speaking:

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

- Significantly bigger development than the approved scheme
- Closer to Ash House
- Contrary to revised NPPF
- Impact on SPA
- Loss of daylight
- Sheer size of development, height and proximity to Ash House
- Concern over viability report
- Lack of affordable housing

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

- Inadequate affordable housing
- Loss of sunlight, daylight
- Loss of privacy
- Too many single person units
- Lack of parking spaces
- Proper pedestrian crossing to Fairfield Avenue required

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

- Will transform a derelict eyesore site
- Will deliver more homes including on site affordable rented housing
- Have worked with officers, councillors and the community
- Provide high quality developments
- Will provide a mixed use development
- Will provide a bespoke community plan
- Provide local employment opportunities

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Site has been an eyesore for around 10 years
- Will have a greater impact on Ash House than approved scheme; overbearing on Ash House
- Confirmation on CIL payment required
- Inadequate affordable housing
- High standard of dwellings proposed
- Lack of parking / inadequate parking
- Electrical charge points are provided
- Site is within Town Centre
- Concerns over close proximity to Ash House
- Adverse impact on privacy of Ash House
- High density concerns
- Over dominant, overbearing
- Applicant hasn't worked successfully with the community
- Site already has planning permission
- Will be an adequate distance from Ash House
- Will provide the highest building in Staines
- Massive overdevelopment
- Too many small units
- Less cars now for the young population
- Already provide nearly 590 dwellings
- Inadequate open space, Birch Green will become inadequate, contrary to policy CO3
- Driverless cars will increase resulting in more cars in the future
- Driverless cars will lead to less cars in the future
- There is no planning policy relating to driverless cars

- Good level of rented affordable housing
- The future need is for a large number of single occupancy units
- Government advice is to achieve greater densities to achieve the level of housing needed for residents
- If level of housing not achieved, there will be greater pressure to build in the green belt.

Decision:

The recommendation to approve was overturned and the application was refused planning permission for the following reasons:

- 1.) The proposed development, by reason of the height, bulk and location does not make a positive contribution to and would have an overbearing impact on the street scene and would be out of character with the surrounding area, contrary to policy EN1 (a) of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document, 2009.
- 2.) The proposed development, by reason of its height, bulk and location, would have an overbearing impact on, and fail to achieve a satisfactory relationship to the adjoining properties, especially Ash House, resulting in a significant harmful impact in terms of loss of privacy and light, contrary to policy EN1 (b) of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document, 2009.
- 3.) The proposed development would provide insufficient affordable housing, contrary to policy HO3 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document, 2009.
- 4.) The proposed development would provide inadequate open space contrary to policy CO3 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document, 2009.
- 5.) The proposed development provides inadequate parking provision, resulting in on street parking in the surrounding roads with associated traffic congestion, contrary to policy CC3 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document, 2009.

265/18 Planning Application - 18/01084/FUL: Matthew Arnold Secondary School, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 1PE

Description:

This application sought approval for the erection of a new school building, relocation of 2 floodlit sports pitches, demolition of the existing school building and associated landscaping.

Additional Information:

The Planning Development Manager gave the following updates:

SuDS

A further consultation response had been received from the Lead Local Flood Authority raising no objection to the further drainage details provided, subject to the following conditions and informative:

1) The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. The design must satisfy the SuDS Hierarchy and be compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, NPPF and Ministerial Statement on SuDS. The required drainage details shall include:

a) Evidence that the proposed solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+40%) allowance for climate change storm events, during all stages of the development (Pre, Post and during), associated storages volumes shall be provided using an infiltration based strategy (as per the SuDS pro-forma or otherwise as agreed by the LPA).

b) Detailed drainage design drawings and calculations to include: a finalised drainage layout detailing the location of drainage elements, pipe diameters, levels, and long and cross sections of each element including details of any flow restrictions and maintenance/risk reducing features (silt traps, inspection chambers etc.).

c) Details of how the drainage system will be protected during construction and how runoff (including any pollutants) from the development site will be managed before the drainage system is operational.

d) Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system.

e) A plan showing exceedance flows (i.e. during rainfall greater than design events or during blockage) and how property on and off site will be protected.

Reason: To ensure the design meets the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site.

2) Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), provide the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key drainage elements (surface water attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls).

Reason: To ensure the Drainage System is constructed to the National Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS.

Informative

If proposed site works affect an Ordinary Watercourse, Surrey County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority should be contacted to obtain prior written Consent. More details are available on our website.

If proposed works result in infiltration of surface water to ground within a Source Protection Zone the Environment Agency will require proof of surface water treatment to achieve water quality standards.

Representation

One additional late letter of representation has been received on behalf of a Group of Residents on Kingston Road in relation to the use of the pitches and noise, including a video clip of the current all-weather pitch in use. The issues raised include:

- Existing pitches are often used beyond the conditioned hours.
- The noise from the pitches is in breach of the World Health Organisation guidelines for community use which states a 50dB upper noise limit in relation to residential properties.
- The noise report does not address cumulative noise impact associated with the 3 pitches (note: an amended noise impact has been submitted which has dealt with this).

Noise Issues

The submitted amended noise assessment has assessed noise associated with the new pitches and existing pitch compared with the existing situation and demonstrates that there will be no greater noise impact associated with the proposals. The Environmental Health Department has no objection on noise grounds.

Condition 13 amendment (page 100)

No demolition (***aside from building EFAE***) shall commence until a demolition method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The demolition works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved method statement.

N.B reference to site clearance or building operations removed.

Public Speaking:

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

- Welcome the application for the school to be rebuilt.
- Concern over the all-weather flood pitch
- Noise concerns – noise heard in the bedroom on Kingston Road
- There is a 60m buffer zone around the existing all weather pitch
- Traffic management

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

- School has served the local population since the 1950s.
- School is central to the economy and social development for the wider population is Staines and the local community.
- 700 student on role; no increase to this in the near future

- Last 3 years has seen the best GCSE results ever
- The recent Ofsted report was “Good”
- The existing buildings have deteriorated significantly, are no longer fit for purpose and not economically viable to refurbish
- The proposals will create a better learning environment for students and staff
- The BREEAM is very good
- Has been designed to minimise the impact on local residents
- The floodlights use the latest technology/with less light spill

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Most aspects of the proposal are not particularly contentious, the contentious aspect is near Kingston Road
- An informative should be added advising the school that a notice should be put up near the pitch advising that neighbours should be respected
- Discussion over whether the pitch could be relocated behind the school building or whether the larger pitch could be moved.
- The pitch could not be positioned behind the school building as it will be on the Scheduled Ancient Monument
- Complaints about breach of current hours of use - must be raised with the planning enforcement officers
- Discussion over whether noise is different on the all-weather pitch compared with the multi-use pitch
- Noise concerns
- No additional noise would occur

Decision:

The recommendation to approve was agreed, subject to the additions and amendments referred to above and the following informative:

The applicant is advised that following completion of the two pitches and before they are brought into use, appropriate signs should be erected asking that the amenity of the surrounding neighbours is respected.

266/18 Adjournment

During consideration of Application - 18/01084/FUL it was moved by Councillor Beardsmore and seconded by Councillor Sider that having sat continuously for three hours, Standing Order 5.1 be suspended to allow the meeting to continue to the conclusion of the current item of business and then stand adjourned for the remaining business.

Resolved to adjourn the meeting following the conclusion of consideration of Application - 18/01084/FUL, until Monday 19 November 2018.

**Reconvened Planning Committee
19 November 2018**

Councillors:

C. Barnard	S.J. Burkmar	N. Islam
I.J. Beardsmore	M.P.C. Francis	S.C. Mooney
		R.W. Sider BEM

Apologies: Apologies were received from Councillors S.M. Doran, Q.R. Edgington, T.J.M. Evans, A.L. Griffiths and M. Madams.

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 B.B. Spoor Item 18/01269/HOU - 44 Kings Avenue Sunbury On Thames TW16 7QE

267/18 Planning Application - 18/01228/FUL: Ashford Depot, Poplar Road, Ashford, TW15 1YF

Description:

This planning application sought an amendment to a previously approved scheme for the demolition of the existing buildings on site comprising the original warehouse buildings of the Ashford Depot and the redevelopment of the site for 37 dwellings, including 6 houses and 31 flats in 2 blocks with parking, landscaping and amenity space provision, along with the creation of a new access along Feltham Hill Road.

Additional Information:

The Planning Development Manager gave the following updates:

Consultation Responses

Surrey Wildlife Trust – No objection subject to a condition that the mitigation measures in the ecological report are implemented. (Note: this is attached as condition 20).

Lead Local Flood Authority no objection subject to the following conditions:

1) The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. The design must satisfy the SuDS Hierarchy and be compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical

Standards for SuDS, NPPF and Ministerial Statement on SuDS. The required drainage details shall include:

- a) The results of infiltration testing completed in accordance with BRE Digest: 365 and confirmation of groundwater levels.
- b) Evidence that the proposed solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+40%) allowance for climate change storm events and 10% allowance for urban creep, during all stages of the development (Pre, Post and during). Should the results of infiltration testing prove unsatisfactory then a discharge rate of 2 litres/sec should be applied (as per the SuDS pro-forma or otherwise as agreed by the LPA).
- c) Detailed drainage design drawings and calculations to include: a finalised drainage layout detailing the location of drainage elements, pipe diameters, levels, and long and cross sections of each element including details of any flow restrictions and maintenance/risk reducing features (silt traps, inspection chambers etc.).
- d) Details of how the drainage system will be protected during construction and how runoff (including any pollutants) from the development site will be managed before the drainage system is operational.
- e) Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system.
- f) A plan showing exceedance flows (i.e. during rainfall greater than design events or during blockage) and how property on and off site will be protected.

Reason: To ensure the design meets the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site.

2) Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), provide the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key drainage elements (surface water attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls).

Reason: To ensure the Drainage System is constructed to the National Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS.

Informative

If proposed site works affect an Ordinary Watercourse, Surrey County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority should be contacted to obtain prior written Consent. More details are available at www.surreycc.gov.uk

If proposed works result in infiltration of surface water to ground within a Source Protection Zone the Environment Agency will require proof of surface water treatment to achieve water quality standards

Public Speaking:

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

- Very similar application to the approved scheme
- Very minor differences
- No changes for statutory consultees
- S106 drafted and is ready for signing
- Applicant aiming to complete in 2020
- Will secure the redevelopment of an unused site
- Will meet housing needs
- Is in compliance with national and local planning policy

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Surrey CC has no objection and will be looking at a parking review
- Query over window changes
- Do not like the appearance of a blocked up window
- Preference for two bed rather than one bed units
- Lack of affordable housing
- Concerns over national planning policy raised

Decision:

The recommendation to approve was agreed subject to the additional conditions and informative referred to above.

268/18 Planning Application - 18/01270/HOU: 9 Stanhope Way, Stanwell, Staines-upon-Thames, TW19 7PJ

Description

The application sought permission for a two storey side extension, a part single storey, part two storey rear extension, and the erection of a new front porch and shed/storage area.

Additional Information

The Planning Development Manager gave the following updates:

The Council had received one additional letter of representation from a neighbour unable to attend tonight's Planning Committee meeting. The neighbour had also emailed this letter to all of the members of the Committee.

Of the matters not raised within the previous letters of representation, the letter raised the following concerns:

- The extension would block out light including to the kitchen and garage of a neighbouring property, which is now claimed to be a habitable room.
- Impact on the skyline
- Does not comply with Technical Space Standards

- The senders of a number of letters of support cannot view or see the site from their properties.

Public Speaking

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

- No adverse impact on neighbouring properties
- Small changes over and above that approved previously and also that approved under permitted development
- More in keeping with street scene
- Complies with policy EN1
- Gable roofs exist elsewhere in the Borough
- Designed to meet the needs of the family
- Current property is in a state of disrepair
- Changes will improve the property

Debate

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Very little to disagree with
- Understand concerns of neighbours
- Complex planning history
- Contrary to policy EN1 although some of the extensions built are permitted development
- Query over photos within the appendix
- Objections are nimbyism
- May lead to possible future planning applications
- Large and overbearing
- Not in keeping with the street scene
- Query over whether the prayer room is for private use
- Insufficient parking – significant parking problems
- Questions over side access
- Boundary issues
- No continuity of relationship between the two dwellings
- Already an overdevelopment of the site
- Concern that work may have already commenced
- Would be difficult to refuse

Decision

The recommendation to approve was agreed.

**269/18 Planning Application - 18/01269/HOU: 44 Kings Avenue,
Sunbury-on-Thames, TW16 7QE**

Description

This application sought approval for the erection of a single storey rear extension (following demolition of the existing conservatory), a hip to gable

end front and rear roof extension with the installation of 3 no. eastern and 3 no. western facing dormers and a rear facing Juliet balcony.

Additional Information

The Planning Development Manager gave the following updates:

The Council had received one additional letter of objection, most of the concerns raised are covered in the report. The only additional issues related to Building Regulations (which are not a planning matter) and raising objections because of the way the owners and their builders have dealt with the whole planning process.

Public Speaking

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

- Loss of privacy to kitchen, patio, conservatory and garden of adjoining dwellings associated with the Juliette balcony

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

- Impact on street scene
- Out of character with the area
- Badly designed

Debate

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Reasonable development
- Will intrude into the adjoin dwelling
- The proposal could be deferred to get the Juliet balcony set in and the length of the extension to be reduced
- Query over whether the development has commenced

Decision

The recommendation to approve was agreed.

270/18 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.

271/18 Urgent Items

There were none.