

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
4 March 2026**

Present:

Councillor D.L. Geraci (Vice-Chair)

Councillors:

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

Substitutions: Councillors K.M. Grant

Apologies: Councillors M. Gibson and M. Buck

1/26 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 09 December 2025 were approved as a correct record.

2/26 Disclosures of Interest Under the Member's Code of Conduct

There were none.

3/26 Declarations of interest under the Council's Planning Code

Councillors Bateson, Beatty, Burrell, Chandler, Clarke, Geraci, Howkins, Lee, Nichols, Rutherford and Woodward all declared that they had received an email from the objector to Application 26/00011/RVC but had not responded.

4/26 Planning application 25/00642/RVC - Spelthorne Leisure Centre, Knowle Green, Staines-upon-Thames TW18 1AJ

Description:

Variation to Condition 2 (revised plans), condition 7 (soft and hard landscape) and condition 18 (car parking management plan) imposed upon planning permission 20/01486/FUL for the construction of a new leisure centre, to allow revised parking arrangements, amended location of EV charging points and other associated works to the car park.

Additional Information:

There was none.

Public Speaking:

There were no public speakers for or against this application.

No Ward Councillor spoke on this application.

Councillor Chandler left the chamber at 19.27 and returned at 19:32. She was advised by the Chair that she would not be able to vote on this application when she returned as Standing Order 21.2 of the Council's Constitution stated that no member at a Regulatory Committee may vote unless they have been present for the entire consideration of the item under discussion.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

1. The proposed height of the new barrier could prevent emergency vehicles from accessing the Leisure Centre Car Park
2. Need to ensure that there are sufficient disabled parking spaces
3. There will be 2 dedicated EV charging bays for disabled drivers

The Committee agreed that officers would add an informative with regard to the barrier to ensure that either the height could be raised or the barrier fully opened to ensure that emergency vehicle would be able to access the car park if called out for an emergency.

Decision:

The application was approved, subject to the following informative being added to the decision notice:

14. The applicant must ensure that the height-restriction barrier at the car park entrance can be adjusted to permit emergency vehicle access when necessary.

**5/26 Planning application 26/00011/RVC - 35 Park Road, Ashford,
 TW15 1EX**

Description:

Removal of Condition 4 (restricting the use of the extended property to Use Class C3 only) attached to planning permission 25/01088/HOU.

Additional Information:

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Kevin Swinburne submitted a statement that was read out at the meeting by the Democratic Services Manager, raising the following key points:

1. Property is not being developed as per the original planning application
2. Scale of works is overdevelopment for the area
3. Issues in respect of the party wall agreement
4. Building works being undertaken has damaged the speaker's boiler which had to be replaced
5. Working guidelines have not been followed
6. The Health and Safety Executive had to attend the property due to the way in which the works were being carried out
7. Bushes and trees that provided privacy have now been removed making lack of privacy worse
8. Condition 4 was put on application to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring properties
9. There is already a high concentration of HMOs within Ashford and surrounding areas so do not need another one

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

1. Developer has already breached conditions
2. What enforcement action has been taken
3. Too many HMOs already in the Borough
4. Planning Enforcement Team have looked at the development and have notified the developer that the development not lawful
5. Officers' recommendation to refuse the application is correct
6. The Committee should not take the applicant into consideration when deciding whether to grant or refuse this application.

Decision:

The Committee **resolved** to refuse the application.

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.

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

7/26 Major Planning Applications

The Interim 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 Interim Planning Development Manager be received and noted.