

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
29 June 2022**

Present:

Councillor N.J. Gething (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

R.O. Barratt	J. Button	R.W. Sider BEM
C. Bateson	R. Chandler	B.B. Spoor
M. Beecher	M. Gibson	J. Vinson
A. Brar	N. Islam	
S. Buttar	O. Rybinski	

In Attendance: Councillor S.J Whitmore

37/22 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 01 June 2022 were approved as a correct record.

38/22 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 N Gething, C Bateson, M Beecher, A Brar, S Buttar, J Button, R Chandler, M Gibson, N Islam, O Rybinski and R.W. Sider BEM reported that they had received correspondence and/or telephone calls in relation to application 22/00591/FUL but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

39/22 Planning application 22/00591/FUL Renshaw Industrial Estate, Mill Mead, Staines -upon-Thames, TW18 4UQ

Description:

Demolition and redevelopment to provide 2 new buildings (5-11 storeys) comprising build-to-rent residential apartments (Use class C3) including affordable housing, alongside ancillary residential areas (flexible gym, activity space, concierge and residents lounge) and landscaping, public realm, children's play area, bin storage, plant areas and car and cycle parking.

Additional Information:

Consultations

The Health and Safety Executive responded to the consultation:

The plan drawings illustrate that the staircase B2 contains openings (door at the ground floor and windows at the upper floors) that are in the close proximity and at a right angle with the window from the adjoining flat. The fire standard states that in such situations there should be at least 1.8 m between the door and the flat window. Resolving this issue is likely to affect the appearance of the development.

The plan drawings illustrate that the lifts in cores A1 and B1 descend to the basement level. The fire safety standard states that a lift should not continue down to serve a basement storey if it is in a building (or part of a building) served by only one escape staircase. Resolving this issue may affect land use planning considerations such as the design, layout and appearance of the development if, for example, separate lifts are to be provided for the basement.

The fire safety standard states that the opening at the top of the smoke shaft should be located at least 0.5 m above any surrounding structures. The smoke shaft should be located at the remote end of the corridor, to keep the smoke away from the staircase. Resolving this issue will require relocation of the external top smoke shafts, which will affect land use planning consideration such as the appearance of the development.

The fire safety standard states that the smoke shaft should extend a minimum of 2.5 m above the ceiling of the highest storey, which is served by the shaft. It appears that the above solution is proposed to avoid this extension on the roof level.

The fire safety standard also states that only natural smoke shafts, mechanical smoke ventilation systems or pressure differential systems are suitable for buildings over 30 m in height. Therefore, automatic open vents (AOVs) in the different elevations are not suitable.

However, when an engineered approach to fire safety is applied and a computational fluid dynamic (CFD) analysis used, a "Qualitative Design Review" (QDR) is needed. This should determine whether the fire safety provisions are appropriate and if the proposed solution affords an appropriate level of fire safety.

It does not appear that a QDR has yet been undertaken, such that it has informed the design presented to the LPA. The outcome of a QDR may require subsequent changes which may affect land use planning considerations such as the design and appearance of the building.

The applicant is aware of the points raised and is confident that these can be resolved without any significant elevation or planning implications.

Recommendation

In **Section 8: Recommendation** of the report (A) paragraph 1, the third bullet be revised to read:

That the affordable housing viability assessment will be subject to a viability review mechanism to be reviewed on an open book basis to ascertain whether any additional on-site provision or financial contribution in lieu can be made.

And the fourth bullet revised to read:

In the event that units are sold off for private sales in the future, a clawback payment will be required by the local planning authority.

Conditions

Condition 8 should be amended to read:

No development, with the exception of demolition and site clearance, shall take place until:-

- (i) The potential risk from soil contamination and impacts that have been identified shall be subject to a site investigation to fully characterise the nature and extent of any land and/or groundwater contamination and its implications. The site investigation shall not be commenced until the extent and methodology of the site investigation have been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- (ii) A written method statement for the remediation of land and/or groundwater contamination affecting the site shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of remediation. The method statement shall include an implementation timetable and monitoring proposals, and a remediation verification methodology.

The site shall be remediated in accordance with the approved method statement, with no deviation from the statement without the express written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

Condition 12 should be amended to read:

The development shall incorporate a minimum of 138 x JA Solar 460W Mono MBB Percium Half-Cell Silver Frame MC4 – (Width: 1,052mm x Height: 2,112mm) on Block A and 75 x JA Solar 460W Mono MBB Percium Half-Cell Silver Frame MC4 – (Width: 1,052mm x Height: 2,112mm) on Block B. These agreed measures shall be implemented with the construction of each building

and made operational prior to occupation, and thereafter retained unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority in writing.

Condition 13 should be amended to read:

The development hereby permitted shall not commence, with the exception of demolition and site clearance, 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 final solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+/40% allowance for climate change) storm events, during all stages of the development. The final solution should follow the principles set out in the approved drainage strategy. Associated discharge rates and storage volumes shall be provided using a maximum discharge rate of 1.4 l/s for the 1 in 1 year rainfall event and 5.1 l/s for the 1 in 100 year rainfall event.

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 Network Asset Management Highways Laboratory and Information Centre Merrow Lane Guildford Surrey GU4 7BQ 2 sections of each element including details of any flow restrictions and maintenance/risk reducing features (silt traps, inspection chambers etc.).

c) 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 from increased flood risk.

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

e) Details of how the drainage system will be protected during construction and how runoff (including any pollutant

Condition 20 should be amended to read:

Prior to the occupation of the development a Travel Plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the sustainable development aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, and Surrey County Council's "Travel Plans Good Practice Guide". The approved Travel Plan shall be implemented upon first occupation and for each and every subsequent occupation of the development, thereafter maintain and develop the Travel Plan to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Condition 24 should be amended to read:

The development hereby permitted shall not commence, with the exception of demolition and site clearance, until details of the proposed finished floor levels and flood mitigation works for the proposed basement carpark have been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority.

Those details shall include:

- a) The ground finished floor levels should be set to a minimum level of 15.58m AOD as recommended in the Flood Risk Assessment.
- b) The basement car parking entrance should be protected by a ramp, with a minimum crest level of 15.58m AOD. The basement design should include either a pumped discharge system or a suitable sump to ensure flood water can be removed

Condition 28 should be amended to read:

Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, a scheme of hard and soft landscaping for the external amenity space within the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These scheme shall include, as appropriate, proposed finished levels or contours, means of enclosure, pedestrian access and circulation areas, location and design of play areas, hard surfacing materials and minor artefacts and structure (eg furniture, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting, external services, etc). Soft landscape details shall include planting plan, specification (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment), schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate, as well as any works to enhance wildlife habitats where appropriate. In addition, implementation timetables and maintenance programmes detailing all operations to be carried out to allow successful establishment of soft landscaping.

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the timetable agreed with the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of species, size and number as originally approved, to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of two years from the date of this permission.

Informatives

An additional informative is recommended:

With reference to condition 19 (EV Charging), the applicant is requested to provide all proposed parking spaces in relation to this planning permission

with power supply (through feeder pillar or equivalent) to provide additional fast charge sockets.

Public Speaking:

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

- This application was an improvement on the previous application
- Changes to stairs and ventilation were needed to meet fire safety requirements
- Units did not comply with M4(2) planning regulations in respect of disabled access.
- Shower rooms unsuited to wheelchair access
- Accessible flats are too far from the lifts
- 13 accessible parking spaces are too far from the lifts
- Proposed children's play area would only be accessible by crossing Furlong Road
- A bigger play area with proper play equipment was needed

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Rachel Allwood, Dandara Living Developments Ltd spoke for the proposed development raising the following key points:

- Previous planning application for a building of this scale on this site had been approved in 2014
- Following the previous refusal the height of the building, the number of homes had been reduced and the parking ratio had been increased.
- This was a policy compliant proposal
- Two public consultations had been held with 1000 properties invited to comment; only 38 objections were received over the two consultations
- No objections were received from statutory consultees
- All the units meet the National Space Standards
- The application site was sustainable, being close to shops, services and public transport.
- Electric vehicle charging spaces were to be provided
- Homes would be energy efficient
- The proposed 391 units would help reduce the number of residents on the Housing Waiting List

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- This new application provided a better parking ratio
- There is good infrastructure surrounding the site
- This would be a good use of a brownfield site

- The applicant had already lodged an appeal against the refusal of the first application submitted for this site and this application was an improvement
- Would like to see an increase in the number of parking spaces
- Need more amenity space
- Demolition of the existing building would create 30k tonnes of additional CO2 which would be in contravention of SP7 & EN3
- Concerns over only one road leading to and from the site
- Site is in a town centre location near to a railway station and bus routes so potentially less car usage by residents
- All the units within the proposed development met the National Space Standards
- 10% of the energy usage was to be renewable
- The development would not improve the general ambience of the area
- This development would provide much needed rental accommodation and would help the Council meet their 5 year housing target

Decision:

The application was **approved** as per the recommendation subject to the applicant first entering into a S106.

40/22 Planning application 22/00589/HOU - 44 Chaucer Road, Ashford, TW15 2QT

Councillor M Gibson left the meeting at 20:11

This application was brought before the Committee for consideration as the applicant was an employee of Spelthorne Borough Council

Description:

Erection of single storey side extension and a single storey rear extension.

Additional Information:

There was no additional information

Public Speaking:

There were no public speakers for this item

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- The applicant had worked well with the Planning Team
- The application was very straight forward

Decision:

The application was **approved** in accordance with Officer's recommendation.

41/22 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.

42/22 Major Planning Applications

The 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.