

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
5 February 2025**

Present:

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

Councillors:

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

Apologies: Councillor R. Chandler

8/25 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held 8 January 2025 were approved as a correct record.

9/25 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 Beecher and Woodward reported that they had considered the initial draft of the report in relation to application 24/01268/RVC at the Environment and Sustainability Committee on 14 January 2025 but had maintained an impartial role and had kept an open mind.

Councillor Nichols reported that he had received emails and presentations in relation to both applications 24/01268/RVC and 24/01370/MIS but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

10/25 Planning application - 24/01370/MIS Northern Runway, Heathrow Airport, Hounslow

Description: Adjoining Authority Consultation - Consultation by the London Borough of Hillingdon for enabling works to allow implementation of full runway alternation during easterly operations at Heathrow Airport including the creation of a new 'hold area' at the western end of the northern runway, the construction of new access and exit taxiways, the construction of an acoustic noise barrier to the south of Longford Village and temporary construction compounds (Hillingdon ref: 41573/APP/2024/2838)

Additional Information:

The Senior Planning Officer advised the following: Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL) invited officers to attend a meeting to clarify points raised in the Committee Report. This included clarification on benefits of the proposals and that noise mitigation schemes are available to residents in Stanwell Moor. Following this meeting, the EHO Noise Officer acknowledged these matters and continues to raise objections to the proposal.

There were no public speakers registered for this item.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- The increase from 36 flights to approximately 328 planes landing over Stanwell Moor would significantly increase noise and negatively affect the residents who live in the area.
- The proposed noise mitigation measures would not have any major impact on residents, especially when spending time in their gardens or when opening windows
- The construction of an acoustic noise barrier would have limited impact

The Committee voted on the proposal as follows:

For: 12

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

Decision: The Committee **resolved** to raise objection to the neighbouring authority consultation on noise grounds.

11/25 Planning application - 24/01268/RVC Development Site at Former the Old Telephone Exchange, Elmsleigh Road, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 4PN

Description: Variation of Condition 2 (plan numbers) relating to planning permission 20/01199/FUL for the demolition of the former Masonic Hall and redevelopment of site to provide 206 dwellings together with car and cycle parking, hard and soft landscaping and other associated works. to update the approved plans to remove reference to Affordable Housing.

Additional Information:

There was none.

Public Speaking:

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

-Fairview had initially agreed with a Registered Provider to deliver on-site affordable housing as per the s106 agreement.

-Multiple Registered Providers withdrew from negotiations

-Fairview and officers explored alternative solutions, including seeking other providers, without success

-It was concluded that a commuted sum of £3.85 million in lieu of on-site delivery was the best alternative

-The sum had been independently assessed by the Council's Viability Assessor and was in line with planning policy

-The Council considered the Rent Plus model but determined it was not appropriate for this site as it cannot be incorporated into the current s73 application (s73 refers to a variation or relaxation of a condition. In this case it was to vary the plan number condition to substitute the approved conditions to conditions that had no reference to affordable housing)

-Fairview was committed to continued investment in Spelthorne borough

-The delivery of 206 homes at Elmsleigh Road was stalled due to the inability to find a suitable Registered Provider

-The proposed payment will enable the Council to deliver alternative affordable housing for those in greatest need

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- The Council had missed an opportunity by not challenging the breach to the Section 106 agreement at the time
- If we accepted the commuted sum, Fairview Homes would either likely sell the units as buy to let, sell privately or could engage further with registered providers
- The progression of this application could set a potential precedent to other developers in the area. The legal representative clarified that a precedent was unlikely and the circumstances were due to national issues with affordable homes.
- The Council could consider the revision of our Affordable Housing policy to allow for different registered provider models
- The Committee raised concerns regarding the building's existing building safety regulations. The Planning Development Manager clarified that the building would need to be compliant with building regulations relevant at the time but this was not a matter for the Planning Committee
- It was suggested that provision be made for a second staircase in the building. The Planning Development manager clarified that this was not a requirement under Building Regulations.
- The viability assessment was outdated as it was based on the original planning application
- All alternative proposals had been explored and it was now prudent to accept the money contribution to put towards off-site affordable housing
- Frustration was expressed regarding the current system in place for social housing
- The applicant should consider a voluntary increase in their contribution towards off-site affordable housing
- The launch of a section 106 clearing service by the Government may help to tackle demand for affordable housing delivery
- Lessons learnt in relation to this application should be applied in future to avoid being in a similar situation
- Decisions regarding larger developments and Section 106 enforcement should come to Committee for decision in future
- The Committee reflected on the requirement in the Section 106 agreement, completed at appeal which imposed that Fairview Homes would not be

allowed to occupy more than 50% of units unless a Registered Provider were found for the agreed allocation of 70 affordable homes.

In light of the above consideration, Councillor Geraci **proposed** an amended motion as follows: "To permit the applicant to occupy 50% of the premises, after which they will need to have a registered provider in place. We invite the applicants to liaise with the Council as to whether our Affordable Homes Policy requires any amendments and therefore the commuted sum will be rejected".

Following further consideration, Councillor Geraci **withdrew** his amendment to the original motion.

The meeting adjourned at 20:33
The meeting reconvened at 20:43

A recorded vote was requested by Councillor Clarke

The Committee voted on the motion as follows:

For: Councillors Beecher, Burrell, Button, Clarke, Gibson, Lee, Nichols and Woodward (8)

Against: Councillors Bateson, Beatty, Geraci and Rutherford (4)

Abstain: Councillors Howkins (1)

Decision: The application was **approved** subject to the prior completion of a section 106 agreement.

12/25 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.

13/25 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.