

**Minutes of the Planning Committee  
16 October 2024**

**Present:**

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

**Councillors:**

C. Bateson	R. Chandler	K.E. Rutherford
S.N. Beatty	D.C. Clarke	P.N. Woodward
T. Burrell	K. Howkins	
J. Button	M.J. Lee	

**Substitutions:** Councillors K.M. Grant and A. Gale

**Apologies:** Councillors M. Beecher and L. E. Nichols

**In Attendance:** Councillor H.R.D. Williams

**37/24 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 September 2024 were approved as a correct record.

**38/24 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 Gale, Geraci, Gibson and Grant reported that they had spoken with constituents in relation to application 24/01019FUL but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor Burrell reported that he had received correspondence in relation to application 23/01524/FUL but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor Howkins reported that she had received correspondence in relation to application 24/00939/ADV asking her to call it in but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

**39/24 Planning application - 24/01019/FUL 22 Sidney Road, Staines-upon-Thames**

**Description:**

Proposed change of use from a single family dwelling (Use Class C3) to an 8 person House of Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Sui Generis).

**Additional Information:**

There was none.

**Public Speaking:**

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

- Speaking on behalf of 54 residents
- Concerns that there would be a substantial increase in noise
- Concerns relating to over-density with 11 HMO's within a mile of the application site
- The proposal contradicts policies EN1 and HO1, requiring developments to respect the character of an area
- The application would undermine the Article 4 direction which would be enacted in 2025
- Concerns over parking specifically that it would not meet the minimum requirement outlined in policy CC3
- Concerns over inability to enforce the limit of eight individuals living in the HMO
- Concerns over conflict of interest and transparency

The Principle Planning Officer advised that policy EN1 referred to the built form and that the outside of the property would not be changing. The application would not contradict policy HO1 as the property would still be for residential use.

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

- The application would offer affordable housing for key workers
- Multigenerational households rare
- Prior to the property being a family home it was a B&B
- The application provides ample communal space
- The property is in an area of sustainable transport
- The property is close to local amenities

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

- Concern that the property was too small for the proposed number of residents
- Concern over who would take care of outside spaces
- Concern over limited number of parking space

The Principle Planning Officer advised that the application would exceed the minimal requirements for space.

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

- Was reading a statement on behalf of residents
- Concerns over the limited number of parking spaces in a street with significant parking pressure
- Concern that it would negatively impact the character of the road
- Concern over the high density nature of the application

The Principle Planning Officer advised that the County Highway Authority had raised no objection and that the Committee needed to consider any harm caused by the proposal not the harm that was already there. The Committee were advised that each application had to be judged on its own merits and not in relation to HMO's approved elsewhere.

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Concerns over the number of parking spaces.
- Concern over how the limit of eight people would be enforced.
- Concern that even though the application is in an area of sustainable travel, residents would still need cars.
- That a previous HMO in the same road was refused.
- Concern over lack of kitchen amenities for eight people.
- Concern that a future application may be made to turn the two garages into additional rooms.
- Concern that shift workers would mean people entering/exiting the property either very early or very late.
- Concern over living conditions and effect on mental health.
- The number of objections from neighbours.

Councillor Clarke requested a named vote.

The Committee voted on the motion as follows:

For (1)	M Gibson
Against (10)	C Bateson, S Beatty, J Button, R Chandler, D Clarke, A Gale, D Geraci, K Howkins, K Rutherford, P Woodward
Abstain (3)	T Burrell, K Grant, M Lee

The motion to approve the application FELL.

It was proposed by Councillor Geraci and seconded by Councillor Rutherford that the Local Planning Authority is minded to refuse the application as the proposed development would, by virtue of the number of proposed occupants, be an unneighbourly proposal resulting in an unacceptable level of activity, noise and disturbance to surrounding residential properties and would provide inadequate onsite parking, contrary to policies EN11 and CC3 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies DPD, 2009.

The Committee voted on the revised motion as follows:

**For: 13**  
**Against: 1**  
**Abstain: 0**

**Decision:** The motion to refuse the application was carried for the following reason:

The proposed development would, by virtue of the number of proposed occupants, be an unneighbourly proposal resulting in an unacceptable level of activity, noise and disturbance to surrounding residential properties and would provide inadequate onsite parking, contrary to policies EN11 and CC3 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies DPD, 2009.

**40/24 Planning application - 24/00939/ADV Shepperton Studios, Studios Road, Shepperton, TW17 0QD**

**Description:**

Advertisement consent for 13 no. fascia, flexface internally illuminated signs across stages 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15 and the multi-story car park.

**Additional Information:**

The Planning Officer reported that the extension of time to 18.10.2024 had been agreed with the applicant.

The Planning Officer advised that an additional site layout plan showing the current stage numbers was to be added to Condition 6 with plan number: "Shepperton Studios North and South Site Map" received 10.10.2024.

The Planning Officer further advised that a late letter of representation had been received (objecting) citing light pollution and unnecessary signage as reasons.

**Public Speaking:**

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

- Support conditions proposed by officers.
- Read letters of representation many of which refer to existing issues on site and the Studio was working to address those.

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

- That there were multiple issues with the Shepperton Studios site
- The internal lights within the studio were already causing light pollution

The Planning Officer advised that the closest resident was 150m away with the furthest residence being 700m and as such the impact of light pollution would be negligible. The proposed strength of the lights would be 300 candela, which was less than used for a Supermarket signage.

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Concern over the timings during which the signs would be illuminated particularly during the winter months.
- Concern over light pollution.
- Concern over highway safety in relation to those adverts which would face the road.

**Councillor Woodward left the meeting at 20:57**

- Concern over the effect of light pollution on wildlife
- Specific concern over the one sign at an oblique angle to Oberon Way

The Chair gave permission for Sara Dufield to speak again

Sara Dufield advised that there could be a split decision whereby the Committee approved all signs but the one of concern, alternatively the decision could be deferred allowing Shepperton Studios to amend the application and remove the one sign.

A vote was taken on whether the Committee would prefer to make a split decision or defer the decision.

The Committee voted as follows:

**Split Decision: 1**

**Deferral: 8**

**Abstain: 4**

It was proposed by Councillor Geraci and seconded by Councillor Clarke that the application is deferred for the planning committee to request more information on the illumination and impact on neighbouring properties in Oberon Way on the northern part of the site.

The Committee voted as follows:

**For: 13**

**Against: 0**

**Abstain: 0**

**Decision:**

The motion to **defer** the application was approved

**41/24 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.

**42/24 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 21:37**