

Minutes of the Planning Committee
25 June 2025

Present:

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

Councillors:

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

Substitutions: Councillors J. Button (In place of S.N. Beatty)
A. Gale (In place of M. Beecher)

In Attendance: Councillor Williams

31/25 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 May 2025 were approved as a correct record.

32/25 Disclosures of Interest Under the Member's Code of Conduct

There were none.

33/25 Declarations of interest under the Council's Planning Code

There were none.

34/25 Planning application 25/00508/FUL - Shepperton Splash, New Road, Shepperton, TW17 0QQ

Description:

Temporary change of use of land for car parking in support of temporary film-making operations.

Additional Information:

The last sentence in paragraph 3.2 should be deleted as follows:

3.2 'There is an existing access to New road which currently serves Shepperton Splash and the car boot sale which operates on Saturdays during the summer months. ~~The car boot area, which is on adjoining land under the ownership of the applicant is separate from this facility~~'

Revision to Condition 01 replacing 17 weeks with 19 weeks, ending 07 November 2025.

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, J Long, GSR Productions spoke for the proposed development raising the following key points:

1. The application is for temporary parking for a 4 month period
2. The land is currently used for parking by 'Splash' and as part of a car Boot sale at weekends.
3. This application is not for additional parking but is an alternative space
4. Over the 4 months the filed would only be used for 79 days
5. Only 33 of the 79 days would result in more than 120 cars using the site
6. No parking at weekends therefore will not impact on the 'Splash' visitors
7. All cars would drive straight into the site and will then be checked some distance from the entrance thus preventing queuing on New Road
8. No vans or trucks will park on this site
9. Cars will arrive between 6am and 8am and leave between 6pm and 8pm.
10. Staff would be required to avoid Charlton Village and surrounding residential areas
1. Cars will initially use the spaces to the south of the site first which is screened from the main road by a copse of trees.

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:

1. The application is an inappropriate use of green belt land
2. This would result in an increase in traffic in the surrounding area
3. This could result in the increase risk of flooding

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

1. If the application was approved the applicant would have to repair any damage caused to the site
2. The temporary parking would take place in a wet season so repairs would not be able to be undertaken until the following spring/summer
3. The applicant would lay down matting across the site if there was a prolonged period of rain
4. Surrey County Council Highways Department are planning on carrying out roadworks later in the year directly outside of the entrance so this could result in a gridlock situation in peak hours
5. The site is uneven
6. The applicant should be looking at alternative sites that may be more suitable
7. Concerns around lighting needed on the site and the impact that this could have on residents
8. Increase in the level of traffic would be to the detriment of the residents living in the surrounding area
9. As this application is only for weekend parking this would not impact on the ability for the weekend car boot sale to be held
10. This is a 'one-off' request and would not be repeated
11. There would be a constant stream of traffic accessing and leaving the site from early in the morning until late at night

Councillor Clarke requested a recorded vote

For	Cllrs Buck, Button, Gale, Nichols
Against	Cllrs Bateson, Clarke, Geraci, Gibson, Howkins, Lee, Rutherford, Woodward
Abstain	Cllrs Burrell, Chandler

The motion to approve the application FELL.

It was proposed by Councillor Geraci and seconded by Councillor Clarke that the Local Planning Authority is minded to refuse the application as it amounts to inappropriate development with the Green Belt under the NPPF and there are no very special circumstances that will outweigh any harm.

The Committee voted on the revised motion as follows:

For – 9

Against – 1

Abstain - 2

Decision:

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

The application amounts to inappropriate development with the Green Belt under the NPPF and there are no very special circumstances that will outweigh any harm.

35/25 Planning application 25/00308/RVC and 25/00307/RVC, Old Station, Moor Lane, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 4BB

Description:

25/00308/RVC

Variation of Conditions 2 (Approved Plans) and 3 (Materials) of planning approval 24/01052/FUL for 'External Alterations including new openings at lower ground level, access ramps and railings to create an external play area' to allow for amendments to the approved plans including extension to the fence line to extend across the widened ramp that replaces existing staircase; the installation of an entrance gate within the proposed fence line extension; increase in railing height from 1.3m to 1.8m; and for the materials to be approved as part of this application and with a subsequent compliance condition.

25/00307/RVC

Variation of Conditions 2 (Approved Plans) and 3 (Materials) of approval 24/01053/LBC for 'Internal and External Alterations including new openings at lower ground level, access ramps and railings to create an external play area' to allow for amendments to the approved plans including internal alterations to openings and layout; extension to the fence line to extend across the widened ramp that replaces existing staircase, the installation of an entrance gate within the proposed fence line extension; increase in railing height from 1.3m to 1.8m; and for the materials to be approved a spart of this application and with a subsequent compliance condition.

Additional Information:

Reference is made in the report to the railings being 1.2m in height. They are in fact 1.3m in height as set out in the application description.

Paragraph 8.2 of both applications to amend Condition 2 regarding plans to:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; E1000 re B; E1100 rev B; E1101 rev B; E1102 re B, E1190 rev B; E1199 rev B, E2000 rev B; EL101 rev P2; EL102 rev P2; PD101 rev P5, PD102 rev P5; PD103 re P5 received on 02 September 2024 and drawings nos. 201; 202 1; 202 2; 202 3; 203; 204; 205; 206; 207; 208; 209 and 210 received ~~29.05~~ 25.06. 2025.

Public Speaking:

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

1. The plans do not show the Old Station Mews (apartments and car parking). The Mews is in very close proximity to the proposed changes and therefore the plans should show how the Old Station Mews fits into the site
2. Residents wanted guarantees put in place that there would be sufficient space allowed for manoeuvring in and out of the parking spaces.
3. When previously considered by the Planning Committee it was agreed that the fencing had been chosen to respect the listed building status and preserve its charm.
4. Why was the increase in the height of the railings not mentioned at the previous meeting?

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Councillor Williams spoke as Ward Councillor against the proposed development. He declared to the meeting that he was also a resident of Moor Lane, Staines-upon-Thames. He raised the following key points:

1. The concerns of the residents have been ignored and the maps provided by the applicant do not include the Old Station Mews building
2. The residents' vehicle movements and turning circle, especially for the disabled bay has not been taken into account
3. How the 6 feet high fence will affect the residents' amenity has not been addressed
4. There is no explanation with regard to how at least 50 people would be able to access the site to drop off and pick up the children
5. The surrounding area consists mainly of double yellow lines and permit holder only parking so there is limited on street parking

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

1. The application did not include any alterations to the parking that had previously been agreed by this Committee.
2. Why does the applicant want to increase the height of the railings?.
3. The increased height of the railings is not necessary
4. The ramp is replacing the staircase that was previously there.
5. Could the Committee refuse the increase in height of the railings but approve the ramps – no, this is one application so if the committee refuses one part, they refuse it all.
6. Any increase in security can only be positive for the safeguarding of the children.
7. The increase in the height of the railings would provide additional security and would prevent people gaining access to the children

8. Increase in the height of the railings would have a negative impact on the vista of the site

The Committee voted on the proposal as follows:

For: 11

Against: 2

Abstain: 1

Decision:

The application was **approved** subject to conditions as set out in the recommendation section of the report.

36/25 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 Interim Planning Development Manager.

The Committee **resolved** that the report of the Interim Planning Development Manager be received and noted.

37/25 Major Planning Applications

The Interim Planning Development Manager submitted a report outlining major applications that may be brought before the Planning Committee for determination.

The Committee **resolved** that the report of the Interim Planning Development Manager be received and noted.