

**Minutes of the Planning Committee  
23 August 2023**

**Present:**

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

**Councillors:**

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

**Apologies:** Apologies were received from Councillor K. Howkins.

**In Attendance:** Councillors J. Button and J.R. Sexton

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.

**46/23 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 July 2023 were approved as a correct record.

**47/23 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 Bateson, Beatty, Buck, Chandler, Mathur, Rutherford and Gibson declared that they had received correspondence in relation to applications 22/01615/OUT and 23/00058/FUL. Councillor Gibson also declared she had made an informal visit to the site in application 23/00058/FUL but in all instances Councillors had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillors Beecher, Burrell and Williams declared that they had received correspondence in relation to application 23/00058/FUL. Councillor Williams also declared that he was the Chair of Development Sub Committee but in all instances Councillors had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillors Clarke and Lee declared that they had received correspondence in relation to application 22/01615/OUT but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor Dunn declared she had received information, and had attended public events in relation to application 22/01615/OUT. She also reported that she had received correspondence in relation to application 23/00058/FUL, however in both instances had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor Nichols declared he had received correspondence in relation to application 22/01615/OUT and had attended a public exhibition of proposals for the site. He also declared that he had received correspondence in relation to application 23/00058/FUL. He further declared he was a director of Knowle Green Estates, but in all instances had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

As ward Councillor registered to speak on application 23/00058/FUL, Councillor Caplin declared he had received correspondence in relation to application 23/00058/FUL and had responded minimally, but still maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor Gibson also spoke on behalf of all members present who were part of the Development Sub Committee and declared an interest in relation to application 23/00058/FUL.

**48/23      Planning application - 22/01615/OUT, Bugle Nurseries, Upper Halliford Road, Shepperton TW17 8SN**

**Description:**

Outline application with approval sought for scale, access and siting, with details of layout, appearance and landscaping reserved, for the demolition of existing buildings and structures, removal of waste transfer facility and the redevelopment of the site for up to 80 residential units and the provision of

open space and a play area, plus associated works for landscaping, parking areas, pedestrian, cycle and vehicular routes.

### **Additional Information:**

Paul Tomson, Team Leader, Planning Development Management reported on the following updates:

1. One late letter of objection has been received. The issues raised are already covered in the report.
2. A consultation response has been received from the Group Head of Neighbourhood Services regarding bin collection. She raises no objection subject to the imposition of a condition to prevent the turning area at the end of the new roadway from being used for parking.
3. A letter has been received from the applicant setting out the background to the case and setting out why he disagrees with each reason for refusal in the Committee report: - Inappropriate development in the Green Belt; housing mix; and the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

The note under the reasons for refusal on page 67 should refer to 'reasons for refusal' at the end rather than 'conditions'.

### **Public Speaking:**

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

- The applicant had worked positively with the council in its preparation of the emerging Local Plan 2022-2037
- The scheme achieved all draft site allocation requirements which included 80 homes and 50% affordable housing and the strategic gap
- A non-determination appeal was submitted due to delays in the Local Plan process
- The scheme was an appropriate development in the Green Belt
- This scheme allowed for the complete redevelopment of previously developed land with no greater impact on openness
- Extant permission did not set a limit on what was regarded as appropriate development
- This scheme was justified considering special circumstances related to the Council's worsening housing land supply
- The objection to the housing unit mix was an aged policy requirement which no longer reflected housing needs
- The applicant had responded to the current housing needs

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- The proposed landscaping reflected a better use of land
- This site rewarded the process of creating hard standing ground and turning this into housing
- This was an overdevelopment
- Local residents were not supportive of this application
- The application made no reference to providing any social or key worker housing
- The principle of developing on Green Belt was unacceptable
- The incentive of a playground on site offered in a previous application was omitted from the current scheme
- The design and appearance of the site was poor
- Concern was raised of how the open space would be managed
- Concern was raised regarding remediation of the waste transfer created at the rear of the site
- It was unlikely that local people could afford detached three to four bedroom dwellings

The Committee voted on the motion as follows:

For: 13

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

**Decision:**

The application would have been refused had the Council been able to formally determine it. The reasons for refusal will form the basis of the Council's case at Planning Appeal.

**49/23 Planning application - 23/00058/FUL, Vacant Land adjacent to the White House, Kingston Road, Ashford TW15 3SE****Description:**

Erection of a residential Block for 17 residential units, with associated parking, servicing, and landscaping / amenity provision.

**Additional Information:**

Russ Mouny, Team Leader, Planning Development Management reported on the following updates:

The County Highway Authority has confirmed that having assessed the application on safety, capacity and policy grounds, it raises no objection subject to conditions.

An additional informative is recommended:

*It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that the electricity supply is sufficient to meet future demands and that any power balancing technology is in place if required. Electric Vehicle Charging Points shall be provided in accordance with the Surrey County Council Vehicular, Cycle and Electric Vehicle Parking Guidance for New Development 2022. Where undercover parking areas (multi-storey car parks, basement or undercroft parking) are proposed, the developer and LPA should liaise with Building Control Teams and the Local Fire Service to understand any additional requirements. If an active connection costs on average more than £3600 to install, the developer must provide cabling (defined as a 'cabled route' within the 2022 Building Regulations) and two formal quotes from the distribution network operator showing this.*

It is recommended that Condition 2 is updated to change plan number 1423-DNA-ZZ-GF-DR-A-1000 Rev 3 to Rev 5 received 22/08/23.

### **Public Speaking:**

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

- This was an ill-conceived application considering the Council's position as a Local Planning Authority
- The application was non-compliant with many Council policies
- The location had never been developed for residential use
- Sole access into the site was bordered by a hazardous road junction with constant use by lorries
- The hostel was an inappropriate height which violated policy EN1
- The hostel was overbearing and overlooked residents' gardens and a children's nursery
- This development would result in a harmful loss of privacy along both Kingston and Ashford Roads
- Approval would set a dangerous precedence with harmful repercussions for local communities and over similar applications
- This development did not make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area
- The design of the hostel was an eyesore to the local area
- The density of the housing development violated policy HO5
- There was no affordable housing which violated policy HO3 and section five of the NPPF
- There was a lack of amenity space
- The application violated the Council's parking standards with an insufficient number of spaces

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

- The proposal was deemed acceptable on the grounds of housing size and type, character and density, residential distances, impact upon existing residential dwellings, daylight and sunlight provision, affordable housing, parking provision, highways and sustainability.
- This development would provide high quality affordable housing to key workers and to local people on the housing register
- The site was previously developed land which was not within Green Belt
- The provisions of EN1 were followed, with the building positioned obliquely to the existing White House Hostel to minimise overlooking
- The proposal still complied with the Council's residential design guide
- Car parking was provided at a ratio of 1:1
- Electric vehicle charging points were provided for parking spaces which fulfilled Surrey County Council requirements
- This development was the first Council scheme with a whole life carbon assessment
- The development exceeded adopted policies on renewable energy provision and reduction in carbon emissions
- All apartments exceeded internal space standards
- There would be a contribution of £25,000 to the enhancement of play space area at Fordbridge park which would benefit both residents and the wider community
- This development would help to meet demand for homes at affordable rents

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

- Concern was raised regarding road safety for residents crossing on a busy road with frequent road works in operation
- There would be increased traffic and obstructions in the area
- Concern was raised regarding the maintenance of blue hoarding panels around the site
- The consideration of adding a pedestrian crossing was suggested
- There were limited transport links
- This building was not in keeping with the street scene
- Concern was raised regarding the sharing of waste facilities with the hostel next door

#### **Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- The units were not affordable and would attract buyers from outside of the borough
- There was inadequate parking

- The financial contribution of £25,000 towards improvements to Fordbridge park would have no financial benefit to the Council as the developer
- This application breached a number of Council policies
- The design of the building was not in keeping with the street scene and not comparable with nearby residential properties
- There was inadequate parking which would cause surplus parking on the other side of Kingston Road which would impact on residents leaving their properties
- There was a lack of amenity space offered
- There were poor transport links
- There was a lack of communication with residents
- There were poor crossing facilities, particularly for children and disabled residents
- A residential development in close proximity to the hostel was inappropriate
- The Council should be complying with its own policies and exceeding them
- The prospect of adding underground parking was suggested
- Road safety assurances should be made before developing residential properties

A recorded vote was requested by Councillor Beecher.

For (1)	D Clarke
Against (11)	C Bateson, S Beatty, M Beecher, M Buck, T Burrell, S Dunn, D Geraci, M Lee, K Rutherford, H Williams, M Gibson
Abstain (3)	R Chandler, A Mathur, L Nichols,

The motion to approve the application FELL.

It was proposed by Councillor Geraci and seconded by Councillor Bateson that the proposal would have a poor standard of layout, be a cramped overdevelopment of the site with excessive density and height and poor level of amenity space, would not make a positive contribution to the street scene and would be of excessive height out of character with the surrounding area, contrary to policies EN1 and HO5 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies DPD, 2009.

The voting was as follows:

For: 14  
Against: 0  
Abstain: 1

**Decision:**

The application was **overturned** and **refused** planning permission for the following reason:

The proposal would have a poor standard of layout, be a cramped overdevelopment of the site with excessive density and height and poor level of amenity space, would not make a positive contribution to the street scene and would be of excessive height out of character with the surrounding area, contrary to policies EN1 and HO5 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies DPD, 2009.

**50/23 Planning application - 23/00799/HOU, 41 Windsor Road, Sunbury on Thames TW16 7QY****Description:**

Erection of single storey side and rear extension.

**Additional Information:**

There was none.

**Public Speaking:**

There were no public speakers.

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

-The process of determining this application at Planning Committee solely due to the applicant being a member of staff at Spelthorne Borough Council seemed inefficient. **The Planning Development Manager advised this would be looked at when the Council's Planning Code is reviewed.**

The Committee voted on the application as follows:

For: 15

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

**Decision:**

The application was approved subject to conditions as set out at paragraph 8 of the report.

**51/23 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.

The meeting ended at 21:27