Minutes of the Planning Committee
26 July 2023

Present:

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

Councillors:

C. Bateson	R. Chandler	L. E. Nichols
S.N. Beatty	S.A. Dunn	K. Rutherford
M. Beecher	K. Howkins	H.R.D. Williams
M. Buck	M. Lee	
T. Burrell	A. Mathur	

Apologies: Councillors D. Clarke

38/23 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 June 2023 were approved as a correct record.

39/23 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 Dunn and Nichols both reported that they had attended a public presentation delivered by Surrey Officers in relation to application 23/00557/SCC, but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor Howkins reported that she had made an informal visit to the site in relation to applications 23/00517/FUL and 23/00518/FUL. She also reported that she was familiar with the site in application 22/01666/FUL and had engaged with residents on this application but had still maintained an impartial role and kept an open mind.

Councillor Mathur reported that he had made an informal visit to the sites in relation to applications 23/00517/FUL, 23/00518/FUL and 22/01666/FUL but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

40/23 Planning application - 23/00517/FUL Buildings 3, 4, 6, 11, 15 & 17, Littleton Lane, Trading Estate, Shepperton TW17 0NF

Description:
The use of Building 3 for the storage of equipment and materials ancillary to vehicle body repairs, Building 4 for the storage of plant and equipment for groundworks / civils, Building 6 for the storage of plant and equipment for groundworks / civils, Building 11 for general storage, Building 15 for the manufacture of exhibition equipment and Building 17 as a cafe, for a temporary period ending 01 May 2026.

Additional Information:

Russ Mounty, Team Leader, Planning Development Management reported on the following update:

Financial Considerations

Under S155 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016, Local Planning Authorities are now required to ensure that potential financial benefits of certain development proposals are made public when a Local Planning Authority is considering whether or not to grant planning permission for planning applications which are being determined by the Council's Planning Committee. A financial benefit must be recorded regardless of whether it is material to the Local Planning Authority's decision on a planning application, but planning officers are required to indicate their opinion as to whether the benefit is material to the application or not. In consideration of S155 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016. The proposal is not CIL liable. It would be liable to pay business rates, but this is not a material planning consideration in the determination of this proposal.

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, James Leuenberger spoke for the proposed developments in applications 23/00517/FUL and 23/00518/FUL raising the following key points:

-Changes in use would support the existing employment offer provided by the site
-The wider redevelopment of the site was approved by members in August 2021

-The applicant was in the process of reviewing the various pre-commencement actions required to bring this development forward
-The proposed change of use would provide clarity to existing tenants and ensure lawful operation
-The proposal did not represent inappropriate development
-There was not a material change of use that would impact the Green Belt.
-The principle of the proposed commercial uses was acceptable
-There was no impact upon the character and appearance of the area, the highway network including vehicle movements, and the flood risk of the area
-No objections or comments were received from statutory bodies
-This was an improvement on the use of the site

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

-There would be an increase in lorry movements within the local vicinity
-The site was earmarked for inclusion within the River Flood Relief Thames Diversion
-The site should operate on a uniform expiry date as opposed to differing dates
-The site should be cleaned for return to public use as promised by operators
-The applicant should be given a timed planning application until August 2024

Debate:
During the debate the following key issues were raised:

-There may be increased traffic movement resulting from the changed use of skips to shipping containers. Officers clarified that there would be less traffic movement as a result of this changed use.
-There would be more pollution as a result of the increased lorry movements in the area
-Local residents associations had spent time liaising and waiting for the applicant to commence restorative work
-The site in it's current state included whole areas of desolate land with no skips
-The uses of shipping containers was not clear

The Committee voted on the application as follows:

For: 12
Against: 3
Abstain: 0

Decision:

The application was **approved** as recommended.

41/23 Planning application - 23/00518/FUL Area B, Buildings 12 and 19, Littleton Lane Trading Estate, Shepperton TW17 0NF

Description:
The use of Area B for the storage of shipping containers, Building 12 for general storage, and Building 19 for manufacture of safety case for camera equipment, manufacture of timber/wood products, van export, motor vehicle repair and restoration, vehicle radiator repair and exhibition furniture production.

Additional Information:

Russ Mounty, Team Leader, Planning Development Management reported on the following update:

Financial Considerations

Under S155 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016, Local Planning Authorities are now required to ensure that potential financial benefits of certain development proposals are made public when a Local Planning Authority is considering whether or not to grant planning permission for planning applications which are being determined by the Council's Planning Committee. A financial benefit must be recorded regardless of whether it is material to the Local Planning Authority's decision on a planning application, but planning officers are required to indicate their opinion as to whether the benefit is material to the application or not. In consideration of S155 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016. The proposal is not CIL liable. It would be liable to pay business rates, but this is not a material planning consideration in the determination of this proposal.

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, James Leuenberger spoke for the proposed development and had raised any key points as part of his combined statement during consideration of application 23/00517/FUL

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

-There would be increased vehicle and lorry movements within the local vicinity
-Residential houses near the site would be subjected to heightened noise and dust
-The site was subject to numerous planning applications most of which were due to expire on 10 August 2024
-This application should coincide with a uniform expiry date
-This site was due for inclusion in the River Thames Diversion

-The site should be cleared for public use as promised by the operator
-Many meetings regarding the clearance of the site had been held with various residents associations and Councillors

Debate:
Due to the similarity between applications 23/00517/FUL and 23/00518/FUL most points were raised during the debate on application 23/00517/FUL

The Committee voted on the application as follows:

For: 12
Against: 3
Abstain: 0

Decision:
The application was **approved** as recommended.

42/23 Planning application - 22/01666/FUL Land at Ashford Road, Ashford Road, Shepperton TW15 1TZ

Description:
Demolition of existing buildings/structures including Ash House and Oak House in Littleton Road and redevelopment of the site with the erection of two buildings subdivided into seven units for speculative B2 general industrial, B8 storage and distribution, and E(g)(iii) light industrial purposes with ancillary offices, together with associated car parking servicing and landscape planting.

Additional Information:

Matthew Churchill, Principal Planning Officer reported on the following updates:

<u>Financial Considerations</u>
Under S155 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016, Local Planning Authorities are now required to ensure that potential financial benefits of certain development proposals are made public when a Local Planning Authority is considering whether or not to grant planning permission for planning applications which are being determined by the Council's Planning Committee. A financial benefit must be recorded regardless of whether it is material to the Local Planning Authority's decision on a planning application, but planning officers are required to indicate their opinion as to whether the benefit is material to the application or not. In consideration of S155 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016. The proposal is not CIL liable. It would be liable to pay business rates, but this is not a material planning consideration in the determination of this proposal.
An additional sentence is added to the end of paragraph 1.6 to read "*However, it should be noted that employment land would be safeguarded by policy EC1 in the new local plan."*

A further letter of representation has been received commenting on HGV movements on surrounding roads and the need for restrictions.

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

-This development would have an unacceptable overbearing impact upon the residents of in Spelthorne Lane
-The proposal was contrary to objectives of the Council's Core Strategy, Policies and National Planning Policy Framework
-The site coverage was doubled
-The site was in an inappropriate location
-The increase in heavy goods vehicular traffic in the area would increase hazards to pedestrians
-There would be no restrictions on the operation of the warehouse which would create excessive noise
-There would be disturbance to local residents and wildlife through the general operations on site
-There was a significant shortfall in parking spaces for the number of anticipated employees
-The site offered poor public transport links and would result in additional on street parking which was already at a premium in the immediate vicinity
-The acoustic barrier had an unacceptable impact upon the street scene and character of the surrounding area
-The proposal to bring the building line to that currently occupied by Littleton House would encroach upon the privacy of the residents in Littleton Road
-It would be more in keeping with the area for a development of Class E Commercial, Business and Service enterprise or additional residential properties

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

-This site was a designated Employment Area within the Local Plan
-Industrial use is safeguarded and encouraged
-The applicant had made an effort to mitigate any impacts on nearby residential properties
-All statutory consultees raised no objection
-The scheme made the most efficient use of the land required by policy
-There was a need to develop a high quality scheme
-There were no technical issues to be addressed
-The site was not overdeveloped
-there was no guidance in respect of separation distances for commercial development
-The BRE 25-degree rule that the scheme complies with was not discussed in the report

-Little mention was made of the daylight assessment which factually demonstrated that the proposed scheme was acceptable
-County Highways confirmed the scheme was acceptable including the parking provision
-The site would provide an excellent opportunity to encourage sustainable travel patterns
-Concerns regarding overdevelopment and overbearing impact did not outweigh the substantial benefits of the scheme

Debate:
During the debate the following key issues were raised:

-The restoration or reuse of the building as residential properties would be better than demolishing the existing building
-This proposal was for the wrong area
-There were 167 letters of objection to this application
-A petition signed by 185 local residents raised opposition to this scheme
-This was an overdevelopment with houses and gardens backing onto the site
-Neighbouring properties had a right to privacy
-There was inadequate parking
-Public transport for employees on site would be poor
-There was already enough congestion in the area
-Statutory consultees had recommended conditions and informatives reflecting flaws with the application
-This proposal would exacerbate the noise problem in the area
-The applicant did not present intended uses of the proposed warehouse

A recorded vote was requested by Councillor Howkins.

For (0)	
Against (15):	M Gibson, D Geraci, C Bateson, S Beatty, M Beecher, M Buck, T Burrell, R Chandler, S Dunn, K Howkins, M Lee, A Mathur, L Nichols, K Rutherford, H Williams
Abstain (0)	

Decision:
The application was **refused** as recommended.

43/23 Planning application - 23/00557/SCC Sunbury Fire Station, Staines Road West, Sunbury-on-Thames TW16 7BG

Description:

Surrey County Council consultation for the redevelopment of the former Sunbury Fire Station site for a mixed-use hub building incorporating Class E (Commercial, business and service) and Class F1 (Learning and non-residential) uses including library plus 12 no. supported independent living units (use class C3). (SCC Consultation reference: 2023-0051)

Additional Information:
There was none.

Public Speaking:
There was none.

Debate:
During the debate the following key issues were raised:

-Youth provision was a disappointing omission within the report
-This project covered many aspects of community wellbeing
-This hub was an excellent addition to the area which experienced deprivation
- This brought together missing aspects of old Spelthorne Family Centre
-There should be repurposing of the old family centre when this new hub is established
-The design of the building would fit in with existing buildings in the area
-Concern was raised regarding inadequate parking
-The suggestion of increasing the height of the building was raised
-The suggestion of underground parking was raised
-The materials used for the building should be in keeping with surrounding buildings
-The building was not aesthetically pleasing
-The use of a library was unnecessary
-It would be useful for Surrey County Council to put forward other comparable developments
-There was suggestion of following Spelthorne's new Passivhaus building model
-Concern was raised regarding noise during the construction period considering a retirement home was in close vicinity

The Committee voted on the application as follows:

For: 14
Against: 0
Abstain: 1

Decision:
Resolved to inform Surrey County Council that this Council has NO OBJECTION to this application subject to the following additions:

Spelthorne Borough Council would wish Surrey County Council to give consideration to the following:

- youth provision in the community facility
- to consult the council on the external materials to be used on the building.

44/23 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.

45/23 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.

The meeting closed at 21:32