

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
28 May 2025**

Present:

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

Councillors:

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

Councillor M. Buck was welcomed to the Committee, following their appointment as a replacement for Councillor J. Button as part of recent changes to Committee memberships.

Apologies: Apologies were received from Councillor R. Chandler

In Attendance: Councillor H.R.D. Williams

25/25 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 April 2025 were approved as a correct record.

26/25 Disclosures of Interest Under the Member's Code of Conduct

There were none.

27/25 Declarations of interest under the Council's Planning Code

Councillors Bateson, Beatty, Beecher, Buck, Burrell, Clarke, Gibson, Lee, Nichols, Rutherford and Woodward reported that they had received email correspondence in relation to application 25/00423/PAP but had not responded, maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor Howkins reported that she had received email correspondence in relation to application 25/00423/PAP but had not responded, and also made a visit to the site. In both instances she had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

As the Ward Councillor speaking on the application, Councillor Williams declared that he had received email correspondence in relation to application 25/00423/PAP and had also received a petition from residents opposing the application.

28/25 Planning application - 25/00423/PAP - Maynard Court, Rosefield Road, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 4QD

Description: Prior Approval notification for the erection of two floors of residential flats on top of the existing detached block of flats. The proposed third and fourth floor extension would consist of 4 apartments per floor with associated parking and refuse facilities.

Additional Information:

There was none.

Public Speaking:

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

- 1) A petition against the development had obtained over 100 signatures
- 2) Previous applications had been refused due to dominant features representing a negative contribution
- 3) The proposed application will overlook residential property, whereas other similar properties which have been extended, overlook commercial property of main thoroughfare
- 4) The application gives the wrong impression that this is a four storey development as the addition of two extra floors makes this a five storey development
- 1) The proposed parking arrangement will take away the grassed area which is the only amenity the residents have
- 2) Cars would be parked directly in front of peoples windows
- 3) This proposal was causing considerable distress to existing occupants many of whom have young children
- 4) The top floor flats would be especially affected with the loss of the loft area

- 5) Additional flats would necessitate a significant upgrade in the current drainage system
- 6) It was questioned whether the application had addressed the issue of flood risk
- 7) The current refuse bin location was already inadequate and frequently overflowing; the proposed site would be both insufficient for the additional 8 two-bedroom flats and inaccessible for collection lorries.
- 8) There was currently an excess of similar developments in the area
- 9) The proposed extension will have the impact of overlooking at least four existing properties with associated loss of light

The Principal Planning Officer clarified the reasons for refusal of the previously two submitted planning applications on the site.

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

- 1) Structural plans confirmed that the building could support extra storeys
- 2) The site was highly accessible, near the town centre, train station, bus stops, and local shops
- 3) Nearby buildings were taller and the proposed 2 extra storeys which would fit the local character of the area
- 4) Officers confirmed there would be no harm to neighbours or the area
- 5) In relation to refuse, bin capacity will double and private collections will be arranged to prevent overflow.
- 6) Historic images showed consistent parking availability at Maynard Court despite commuter pressures
- 7) Flats were safe and though the car park was partly in a flood zone there was a robust drainage system and dry escape route.
- 8) The application met planning policies and improved site issues.

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:

- 1) The purpose of this statement was to stand with the more than 100 residents who voiced their opposition to the application through a signed petition
- 2) Residents of Rosefield Road will be negatively impacted by this proposed development
- 3) Rosefield Road was a residential road, with no other building of similar height or mass to the new proposed development
- 4) This was a prominent building on prominent site at the entrance to Rosefield Road
- 5) This proposal was out of character for the area and will be overbearing
- 6) This was an overdevelopment of the site
- 7) Upper floors will overlook neighbouring houses and adversely impact privacy
- 8) There was insufficient off-street and on-street parking for additional residents
- 9) There was an already insufficient drainage system on the road which caused flooding and extra demand would worsen the situation
- 10) Traffic flows were already constrained on this road and the development will create additional burden on the junction at Kingston Road
- 11) This site had a long history of inadequate waste management which had persistently not been addressed.
- 12) The proposed development did not adequately address waste management issues

The Principal Planning Officer clarified that waste and refuse was not an area of prior approval assessment set out in the General Permitted Development Order (GDPO).

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- 1) There were no objections to the proposal from statutory and non-statutory consultees.
- 2) Concerns were raised about outdated sewage infrastructure and potential flood risk.

- 3) No hydrological study was submitted however a topographical survey was provided.
 - 4) The Development was 10 spaces short of parking requirements.
 - 5) There were Concerns about parking overspill affecting surrounding roads.
 - 6) The site was near a train station, which may reduce parking demand.
 - 7) Suggestions were made for resident-only parking permits and electric vehicle charging points.
 - 8) Concerns were raised about overshadowing, loss of light, and loss of amenity for existing residents.
 - 9) Ground floor flats may be affected by vehicle fumes due to proximity of parking spaces.
 - 10) There will be a loss of hedging and mature trees with no replacement plan.
 - 11) The amenity space was significantly reduced, impacting residents' wellbeing.
 - 12) The scale and massing of the building was seen as out of character with the street scene.
 - 13) The proposal for waste collection to be handled by a private contractor will limit council oversight
 - 13) Concerns were also raised regarding the generally unsatisfactory performance of private waste companies elsewhere in the borough
 - 14) There were concerns about vermin around bin storage areas.
 - 15) Suggestions were made for underground bin storage similar to other recent developments in the borough
 - 16) There were concerns about fire safety impacts, escape routes and access for fire engines. The Principal Planning Officer clarified that as the building would be less than 18 metres in height and less than 7 storeys, the fire safety condition would not be applicable and an assessment was also not required in respect of this prior approval criteria
 - 17) There will be a Loss of loft access for existing residents with no compensation proposed.
 - 18) There was no provision for affordable housing or key worker accommodation though it was acknowledged that the application was below the threshold to provide affordable housing
- Councillor Clarke requested a named vote:

For (4): D Clarke, K Howkins, M Lee, P Woodward

Against (6): C Bateson, S Beatty, M Beecher, M Buck, D Geraci, K Rutherford

Abstain (3): T Burrell, L Nichols, M Gibson

The motion to grant prior approval to application 25/00423/PAP subject to conditions as set out at paragraph 8 of the report **FELL**.

It was **proposed** by Councillor Geraci and **seconded** by Councillor Beecher that the application is overturned and refused for the following reason: -

The proposed development is considered to be detrimental and harmful to the character of the street scene due to height and scale and would be harmful to the amenity of existing occupants of Maynard Court due to loss of light and privacy, contrary to paragraph 135 (c) and (f) of the NPPF 2024.’.

Councillor Howkins requested a recorded vote.

The Committee voted on the new motion as follows:

For (7): C Bateson, S Beatty, M Beecher, M Buck, T Burrell, D Geraci, M Gibson

Against (4): D Clarke, K Howkins, M Lee, P Woodward

Abstain (2): L Nichols, K Rutherford

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

The proposed development would be detrimental in height and scale, and harmful to the character of the street scene. Additionally, it would be harmful to the amenity of existing occupants due to loss of light and privacy, and this is covered by the approval assessment criteria and page 135 of the NPPF, specifically parts C and F.

29/25 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.

The Team Leader, Planning Development Management noted that application 24/01019/FUL (22 Sidney Road, Staines-upon-Thames TW18 4LX) had been allowed at appeal.

Resolved that the report of the Planning Development Manager be received and noted.

30/25 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.