

**Minutes of the Planning Committee  
8 February 2023**

**Present:**

Councillor N.J. Gething (Chairman)  
Councillor M. Gibson (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

C. Bateson	R. Chandler	B.B. Spoor
M. Beecher	K. Howkins	J. Vinson
A. Brar	O. Rybinski	S.J Whitmore
J. Button	R.W. Sider BEM	

**Substitutions:** Councillors C.F. Barnard

**Apologies:** Councillors R.O. Barratt and S. Buttar

**6/23 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2023 were approved as a correct record.

**7/23 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 Gething, Rybinski, Sider, Spoor, Vinson, Whitmore *\*and Button* [\*Amended by Planning Committee 05/04/2023] reported that they had received correspondence in relation to applications 21/00947/FUL and 22/01562/FUL but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views, and kept an open mind.

Councillors Beecher and Gibson had received correspondence in relation to applications 21/00947/FUL and 22/01562/FUL and had made an informal visit to the site in item 4 but maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views, and kept an open mind.

Councillor Bateson and Howkins reported that they had visited the site in item 4 but maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views, and kept an open mind.

Councillor Howkins also reported that she was fully versed with application 22/01562/FUL and had corresponded with the applicant. She would not be taking part in the debate or vote to remain balanced.

Councillor Whitmore declared interest in application 22/01562/FUL upon reading the report in further detail. He would withdraw from the debate and vote.

**8/23 Planning application- 21/00947/FUL - Cadline House, Drake Avenue, Staines-upon-Thames**

**Description:** Demolition of an existing building and construction of new build 2.5 storey residential building comprising of 13 flats and 15 under-croft car spaces.

**Additional Information:** The Senior Planning Officer informed the Committee of two changes to the report:

**1. Updates to paras 7.6 and 7.7**

Paragraph 7.6 figure 3,286 should read 3,424 dwellings. Paragraph 7.7 figure 4.43 years should read 4.6 year supply.

**2. Condition 20 to be amended as follows:**

~~That~~ **Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, final details of the Action Plan as generally set out in section 9 of the Travel Plan written by Capital Transport Planning (June 2021) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and be implemented in accordance with the details and timetable set out in table 3 of the travel plan and thereafter maintained in perpetuity.**

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

- The number of units should be reduced further
- There were already 23 conditions and nine informatives which showed the scheme was not straightforward

- The Environmental Health Officer's report found issues which included contamination risk assessments which needed to be resubmitted
- The Lead Local Flood Authority still required a SuDS drainage strategy
- The condition to ensure correct boundary treatment was still undetermined
- The Secured by Design standard should be considered as a condition and not informative for this application and others
- The applicant was not compliant with Lifetime Homes
- There was inadequate provision for disabled and elderly persons
- There was inadequate parking
- There was issue with safe access due to bikes and pedestrians mixing with refuse vehicles and lorries
- There was an ineffective travel plan
- There were issues related to amenity space
- The development was not sustainable

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

- There were no objections from statutory consultees
- The objector talked of matters dealt with by conditions and building regulations
- The applicant would adhere to all agreed conditions and adhere to the building regulations
- There was no objection from the Environment Agency particularly in relation to Sweeps Ditch
- Units were reduced to ensure all proposed units achieve minimum requirements
- Parking arrangements were not questioned by Surrey County Council
- Lifetime Homes would be dealt with through building regulations
- The officer recommendation should be followed

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- The development would provide homes to residents in the borough
- There was concern with amenity space and communal space
- Cars would have to queue on Gresham Road when waiting for the entrance gate to open which would be dangerous
- An entrance from Drake Avenue would be more practical
- There was no recent parking survey data beyond summer 2021
- There would be potential pollution into Sweeps Ditch which could affect threatened species
- The design of the development complimented the surrounding area
- There could be potential hazards with children living near Sweeps Ditch
- Access into and out of the development would be problematic for vehicles particularly when all parking spaces were occupied
- A Secured by Design certificate was not provided by the applicant
- The entrance area was not a concern as there was space for two cars
- This development was a good use of Brownfield Land

- There should be an amendment to condition 23 with Sweeps Ditch included in enhancement measures to safeguard wildlife on site
- Improvements could be made to make this a better development
- There was no justification to refuse this development on advice from statutory bodies

The Committee voted on this application as follows:

For- 11  
Against- 0  
Abstain- 3

**Decision:**

The application was **approved** subject to the reported amendment to condition 20 and the following additional informative:

The applicant is advised to consider protecting wildlife within Sweeps Ditch when implementing the enhancement measures in accordance with condition 23.

**9/23 Planning application- 22/01562/FUL - Land to South of New Road, Littleton, Shepperton**

**Description:**

Use of land to the South of New Road for car parking, including access from New Road, with alterations to existing fence line to facilitate pedestrian access for a temporary period of 24 months, alongside associated infrastructure.

**Additional Information:**

The Principal Planning Officer informed the committee of 3 updates to the report:

**1. Update to 4.1 (Consultations) of the report:**

Consultation response from Lead Local Flood Authority (Surrey County Council):

- Initially raised concern regarding surface water management. **No objection following receipt of further information.**

**2. Update to paras. 7.56.**

The site is located in flood zone 3a which represents land having a high probability of flooding with a greater than a 1 in 100 probability of flooding. The analysis set out in paragraphs 7.57 – 7.59 stating the proposal is acceptable on flooding grounds remains.

**3. Two additional conditions to be imposed:**

9. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans 3945-FBA-XX-XX-DR-A-010090 Rev. P01; /010091 Rev. P01; /010092 Rev. P03; and ITL14056-GA-162 Rev. A.

Reason:- For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure the development is completed as approved.

10. No external materials shall be laid on the site until full details of the panels for the roadway and parking areas are submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be then constructed in accordance with the approved materials.

Reason:- To ensure that suitable temporary materials are laid on the site, and in the interest of flood risk.

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

- The Shepperton Residents' Association objected to this application
- There was no economic gain in a remote car park
- This application would encourage other applicants to use economic reasons to develop on green belt
- There was potential danger to parents and children using this temporary car park
- There was a 400 metre walk from the car park to the school gates along a section of narrow footpath which was dangerous, particularly for parents with pushchairs
- There was loss of car parking in the north section before the availability of a multistorey car park in the south
- There was future limited access to Studios Road during the six-month new roundabout construction which had caused problems
- Residents could not be expected to suffer from the result of this proposed solution
- Additional impact on the local highways would cause more misery for residents
- There was disagreement with paragraph 7.51-7.53 of the officer's report
- Traffic which exited the studios through Studios Road would become involved in the one-way traffic diversion for the duration of the new roundabout construction

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

- The officers report outlined that planning permission was granted in July 2019 for expansion of Shepperton Studios which made it the largest film studio in Europe and second largest in the world
- Construction for expansion was underway with programmed completion for this year which was a shorter period than originally envisaged
- Economic benefits of the scheme would be delivered sooner with shorter construction activity
- In August 2022, the Planning Committee approved upgrades to Shepperton Studios' existing carpark
- Shepperton Studios had recently signed a deal with Surrey Wildlife Trust to deliver their biodiversity net gain of 20%
- In order to undertake upgrade works for the existing car park the number of parking spaces needed to be decreased temporarily
- It was not possible to accommodate all displaced parking and there was a need for a secure well managed overflow carpark which would prevent overspill parking onto local roads in residential areas
- The proposed temporary car park was a short walk from the studios and was well screened behind an existing fence line with a tree and shrub boundary
- The temporary car park would have no permanent construction using trackway which was a temporary surface that was removed upon completion of the expansion
- There was no long-term impact caused by the temporary car park
- There was opportunity to take studio traffic off the public highway before they reach the junction of Studios Road and New Road where a new roundabout would be constructed in Spring 2023
- The carpark was not proposed to accommodate additional traffic but to provide parking for existing traffic who were unable to use the current studio car parks due to construction works
- The new roundabout works had the potential to infrequently impact on school drop off for Littleton Infant School
- There would be a parking area dedicated to parents for school drop off and pick up periods
- This application was supported by Littleton Infant School
- There were very special circumstances that clearly outweigh harm to the greenbelt

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Exceptional circumstances for this application were unjustified
- The Studios should find an alternative solution which wouldn't involve use of greenbelt
- It was an unacceptable risk to allow extra pedestrians to cross at New Road where cars travelled at high speed
- There were great benefits of the temporary carpark aside from greenbelt issues
- The updated car park would be properly drained and fitted with electric vehicle charging points

- Previously a shuttlebus for employees had operated which could be utilised again
- There would be no increase in traffic as the same cars would enter and leave the studios daily
- There was concern with restoring the green belt site at the end of the 24-month period
- Greenbelt regulations in the Shepperton area were ignored with no action taken
- There was concern for restoration after two years of sustained weight on ground with land prone to becoming boggy following rainfall
- It was in the nature of the trackway that weight is spread with resulted minimal indentation
- Shepperton Studios supported the community and were proactive with complaints raised

The Committee voted on the application as follows:

For 11  
Against 1  
Abstain 0

**Decision:** The application was **approved** subject to the reported two additional conditions and an amendment to condition 4 as follows:  
After “remediation of the land”, add “and restoration of the site.”

### **10/23 Planning Application- 22/01562/FUL - Updated Report**

The Committee discussed this as part of the previous item

### **11/23 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.

### **12/23 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.