

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
12 December 2023**

Present:

Councillor M. Gibson (Chair)

Councillors:

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

Apologies: Apologies were received from Councillor D.L. Geraci and Councillor K. Howkins

In Attendance:

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.

69/23 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 November 2023 were approved as a correct record.

70/23 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 Beatty, Beecher, Buck, Burrell, Chandler, Clarke, Lee and Woodward reported that they had received correspondence in relation to application 23/01224/FUL but had not responded, maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor Dunn reported that she had received correspondence in relation to application 23/01224/FUL and had made a visit to the site. She also read out a statement as advised by the legal representative which summarised her position in which she remained impartial and open minded.

Councillor Nichols reported that he had received correspondence in relation to application 23/01224/FUL but had not responded, and also made a visit to the site. In both instances he had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor Rutherford reported that she had received correspondence in relation to application 23/01224/FUL but had not responded, and also reported that she had knowledge of the site in relation to application 23/01221/FUL, but in all instances maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

71/23 Planning application - 23/01224/FUL Beech Dale, Highfield Road, Sunbury-on-Thames, TW16 6DL

Description:

Demolition of existing bungalow and garage and erection of a replacement two storey house with rooms in the roof space that includes the installation of 3 no. rear dormers. The provision of a first-floor southern facing balcony.

Additional Information:

Vanya Popova, Planning Officer reported on the following update:

Paragraph 7.9 to note No. 7 Tadmor Close is a bungalow with no first floor accommodation whereas No. 6 does have first floor accommodation. No change to assessment in regard to the properties to the rear of the application site.

Public Speaking:

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

-The building did not consider its overbearing impact on neighbouring properties

-the development was exaggerated in bulk and mass and was higher and wider than all other buildings

- The impact on natural light in both neighbouring gardens and homes was of grave concern
- The measurements on Beech Dale's plans were misleading
- The three-storey build posed a direct threat to well-being and the legal right to enjoy property
- No other house on the road or wider area had a balcony to blatantly survey neighbours with direct vision into bedroom windows
- Neighbours would be directly overlooked by the 15 proposed front windows and 10 rear windows
- The owners had removed trees and hedges, taking away natural habitat for wildlife by fully concreting the front garden
- There were flood risk concerns as this development would impact drainage
- The introduction of a newbuild on the greenbelt boundary was overbearing, hugely disruptive and would set a precedent for others to follow

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Kevin Yates although scheduled to speak **for** the proposed development, did not arrive in person. His prepared statement was read out by the Committee Manager, raising the following key points:

- The new build was in accordance with planning policy
- The development was intended to be a fully sustainable and eco-friendly family home
- Efforts would be made to limit disruption to neighbours during the build
- A lot of time had been spent discussing this application with the Planning Team prior to submission

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

- The current application did not address issues highlighted in the previously submitted application
- This development was totally out of character on a rural road
- This proposal was not in keeping with the other properties in the surrounding area

- The design of the property did not fit in with the design codes for future development in the borough
- The development paid no regard to the environment as it overlooked greenbelt land which did not fit into surrounding landscape
- The impact on neighbouring properties including their loss of daylight should not be ignored
- There was a duty to respect human rights specifically in relation to neighbouring properties and the enjoyment of their homes

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- The proposed building was bulky and resembled a mansion
- The plans would not make any positive contributions to the surrounding area
- This proposal was out of place compared to the surrounding locality
- There were 12 letters of objection
- The size of this house was too big for the plot of land it occupied
- There were too many windows across the frontage of the house
- The proposal was well designed and suitable for a family
- Concern was raised regarding the application of the 45 degree vertical and horizontal guide within the plans
- This application was not in breach of planning policy and guidance

The Committee voted on the application as follows:

For: 7

Against: 7

Abstain: 1

Thereafter, by 7 votes in favour, 7 votes against and one abstention, on the Chair's casting vote the motion to approve the application was agreed.

Decision:

The application was **approved**.

72/23 Planning application - 23/01221/FUL Windmill Court (Former Dimensions Data House), Brooklands Close, Sunbury-on-Thames, TW16 7DX

Description:

Development of the site to provide a new self-storage facility (Use Class B8) and new light Industrial workspace / incubator units (Use Class E(g)(iii)) with associated car and cycle parking, landscaping and other works ancillary to the development.

Additional Information:

Kelly Walker, Principal Planning Officer reported on the following update:

Amend plan number condition 9, due to amended plan no. 23009GA-D-014A submitted, showing single storey Direct Access units at the rear.

Public Speaking:

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

- The facility would directly benefit the local community
- The site was located within an employment zone where employment generating uses were supported
- Self-storage facilities provided flexible low-cost space that businesses can grow and work from
- The proposed development incorporated Fab Lab floorspace which comprised of affordable and flexible industrial style workplaces
- The proposed building was designed to make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area
- The proposal utilised natural materials including brick which was in keeping with existing surrounding development
- There were no objections to the scheme from any statutory bodies

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- The facility was accessible to customers for 24 hours which could cause disturbance to residential properties in the surrounding area

-Concern was raised regarding parking provision on site and for off street parking options

The Committee voted on the application as follows:

For: 15

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Decision:

The application was **approved**.

73/23 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.

74/23 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.

Meeting ended at: 21:00pm