

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
19 August 2020**

Present:

Councillor T. Lagden (Chairman)
Councillor M. Gibson (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

C. Bateson	N. Islam	R.A. Smith-Ainsley
S.A. Dunn	J. McIlroy	B.B. Spoor
N.J. Gething	R.J. Noble	J. Vinson
A.C. Harman	R.W. Sider BEM	
H. Harvey	V. Siva	

Apologies: Apologies were received from Councillor R.W. Sider BEM who was late due to attendance at another Committee meeting.

In Attendance:

Councillors who are not members of the Committee, but attended the meeting, are set out below:

Councillor R.O. Barratt
Councillor S. Buttar

182/20 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 July 2020 were approved as a correct record.

183/20 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

In relation to Application No. 20/00052/FUL, Councillor S. Dunn reported that she had received correspondence but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind. Councillor H. Harvey disclosed that she lived near to the property but had a neutral stance and kept an open mind.

Councillor Noble advised that he had considerable communications with residents in relation to Application No. 20/00150/FUL and had visited the site on several occasions. He had not expressed any opinion nor had a predetermined view.

184/20 Planning Application No. 20/00052/FUL - Inglewood, Green Street, Sunbury on Thames, TW16 6QB

Description:

This application was for the conversion of a house of multiple occupation (HMO) to 8 residential flats involving extension and alteration to the front and rear with associated parking, refuse storage and amenity space.

Additional Information:

The Principal Planning Officer advised the Committee that one additional email had been received objecting to the application which raised the following points:

- Although a speaker was not able to attend the meeting to present the case against it, that does not mean there are no objections to the proposal
- Will provide extra strain on local utilities and services
- The bat provisions should be properly monitored
- There should be no more than 8 flats proposed on the site.

Additional Condition

It was recommended that the following additional condition should be added:

The parking spaces and garages shown on the submitted plan should be completed prior to the occupation of the dwellings to which they relate, and thereafter the approved facilities together with the means of access thereto should be maintained as approved, and be reserved for the benefit of the development hereby permitted.

Reason

To ensure that the facilities provided are reserved for the benefit of the development for which they are specifically required, in accordance with policy CC3 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

Public Speaking:

There were no public speakers.

Councillor R.W. Sider BEM joined the meeting during the officer's presentation on this application and did not take part in the debate or vote on the matter.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Will benefit the area
- We do not have a 5 year housing land supply and therefore there is a presumption to approve
- No material change on highway grounds since the last approval
- No renewable energy proposed
- Query over whether they meet the technical standards
- Query over the size of the garages
- Impact on the trees

Decision:

The application was **approved** as per the agenda subject to the following additional informative:

The applicant is requested to incorporate, where possible, the following measures into the development hereby approved:

- An increase in bicycle provision,
- Electric vehicle charging points, and
- The use of solar photovoltaics

185/20 Planning Application No. 20/00150/FUL - 11 Hogarth Avenue, Ashford, TW15 1QB

Description:

Change of use of the existing dwelling to a 7 bedroom House of Multiple Occupation (HMO) including increase to height of an existing rear extension and conversion of two integral garages to habitable accommodation.

Additional Information:

One e-mail had been received from a previous objector raising concerns over an additional window opening being added to the rear elevation and not shown on plans.

Officer note: This would not require a separate planning application.

This planning application had been called in by Councillor Noble citing concerns on the impact upon the character of the area, the amenity of adjoining properties and parking concerns.

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, the Committee Manager read a statement from Laura O'Brien on behalf of residents against the proposed development raising the following key points:

- Will add 3 bedrooms not 2 as suggested
- Concern that without careful monitoring could result in more than 7 individuals living there
- Out of character with area and street scene
- Unacceptable impact on residential amenity

- Will cause further unacceptable on-street parking and danger

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, the Committee Manager read a statement from Andrew Reginiano for the proposed development raising the following key points:

- Condition of planning application that property has no more than 7 occupants
- Tenancy agreements will include strict guidelines about respect for neighbours, parking and noise
- 4 parking spaces allocated for tenants
- Environmental impact minimal

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

- Concerns over parking
- Lots of activity with convenience store nearby

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- An HMO for 6 people would be permitted development. This is one more person.
- Would not be overbearing or result in a loss of light
- Landscaping, cycle parking, refuse and car parking provided
- Concern over height of extension
- Concern over possible number of tenants
- Each planning application should be considered on its merits
- If this application was to be refused because of concern of number of tenants, even though there is a planning condition limiting the number of tenants to 7, the Council would be at risk on appeal
- Conversion of garage door to fenestration will improve the appearance of the property

Decision:

The application was **approved** as per the officer's recommendation.

186/20 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.

187/20 Urgent Items

There were none.