

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
22 July 2026**

Present:

Councillor D.L. Geraci (Vice-Chair)

Councillors:

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

Apologies: Councillors M. Gibson, T. Burrell and R. Chandler

23/26 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 May 2026 were approved as a correct record subject to 3 minor amendments being made.

24/26 Disclosures of Interest Under the Member's Code of Conduct

There were none.

25/26 Declarations of interest under the Council's Planning Code

In relation to application 25/01461/FUL Councillors Barker, Bateson, Beatty, Buck, Clarke, Geraci, Grant, Lee, Nichols, Rutherford and Woodward reported that they had received correspondence in relation to application and had received a telephone call/voicemail but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

26/26 Planning application 25/01461/FUL - The Vineries Site, Spout Lane, Stanwell Moor, TW19 6BN

Description:

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of an office, welfare and maintenance building, replacement of existing hardstanding, with retention of

existing storage yard (Use Class B8). Associated car and cycle parking, refuse storage and landscaping.

Additional Information:

54 letters of support had been received on this application. These letters had been collated through a community consultation company called 'Your Shout'.

The Council had received a copy of the communication from the applicant to the Committee Members and Ward Councillors summarising the benefits of the scheme.

Paragraph 7.44 in the Committee Report and Conditions 14 and 15 should refer to Policy E4 which has superseded Policies EN13 and EN11 from the Core Strategy Document.

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Jim McIlroy, Chairman of Stanwell Moor Residents Association (SMRA) spoke against the proposed development raising the following key points:

1. The proposal would result in an increase in commercial traffic through a residential area
2. The proposal would result in unchecked industrialisation of the village
3. The applicant already operated from another site that had adequate potential for expansion so this site would not be needed
4. The village roads were not suitable for Heavy Goods Vehicles.
5. The proposals would represent a significant over development of the site
6. The proposal to replace permeable ground with reinforced concrete would reduce the natural drainage from the site and would contribute to an increase in surface water run-off
7. The Environment Agency submitted an objection to this application citing the following:

"The application proposes works that may be within 8 metres of a culvert, the Holme Drain main river culvert and does not comply with the requirements of planning as it does not adequately assess the impact of the development's proximity to the culvert."

8. The application was in contrary to paragraph 181 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy E3 of the Emerging Spelthorne Local Plan.

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Olivia Frost from Savills spoke for the proposed development raising the following key points:

1. The site already benefited from lawful B8 Storage and Distribution Use

2. The application was not requesting a change of use
3. The site was considered to be Grey Belt Lane
4. Concerns relating to flooding, drainage and highways had been addressed
5. The Environment Agency had no objections on flood risk grounds
6. The application was not expected to contribute to a material increase in traffic
7. The County Highway Authority had no objections
8. Outdated buildings would be replaced with a modern facility
9. The appearance of the site would be improved and substantial landscaping and screening for neighbouring properties would be put in place
10. Local residents had welcomed the proposed changes
11. The development incorporated sustainability measures including air source heat pumps, EV charging infrastructure, cycle parking and energy efficient design.
12. The proposals would provide improved facilities for all the employees
1. The proposals would improve an existing lawful site whilst delivering clear environmental, economic and operational benefits.

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

1. The vehicles entering and exiting the site would be large and heavy
2. There was only one road in and out of the village, so it currently retained a semi-rural village feel
3. The only route to exit the site was via Spout Lane that led to Horton Road. In the middle of the village, Horton Road had a ninety degrees bend that already contributed to this being an accident blackspot
4. Increasing traffic along Spout Lane would add to the potential risk of an accident
5. HGV driving through Stanwell Moor were already causing damage to the village
6. The applicant had not provided a 7-day traffic count
7. The site regularly flooded
8. The original application was rejected by the Environment Agency due to flooding issues
9. The surface water discharge point would still be into an open ditch along Spout Lane that ran in front of the houses in that lane
10. The application included more tarmac and concrete areas which would create more run-off water, increasing the risk of flooding

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

1. Concerns were raised about the increase in concrete areas that could create a flooding risk
2. Additional run-off water from the site would go straight into the drainage ditch in Spout Lane
3. How would an oil spillage be prevented from entering the water table
4. The footprint for the proposed commercial building would be twice the size of the original building
5. This proposal would have an adverse effect on green belt land
6. The site was considered to be grey belt land under paragraph 154 of the NPPF and would fit into the exception, paragraph 154(g) that stated that development in the Green Belt would not be inappropriate if the application is for the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land
7. The proposed new building would be 5ft taller than the existing building
8. There might be bats using the derelict buildings; had a bat survey been undertaken
9. Failure of the applicant to provide a 7-day vehicle count was an issue
10. There would be an increase in the noise level from the site due to the increase in traffic entering and leaving the site that would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring residents
11. There was currently a restriction on the site that prevented lorries from entering or leaving the site before 7am and after 7pm, however there was no restriction on manoeuvring around the site
12. Consideration should be given to installing solar panels on the flat roof of the new building

The meeting adjourned at 20.07

The meeting reconvened at 20.14

The Committee requested that an additional condition be added to Condition 4 within the report to include reference to an acoustic fence being erected adjacent to the neighbouring property of Amberley and that the boundary fence should be in situ before the building was occupied. This could mitigate any increase in noise levels for the neighbouring properties.

The Committee requested that Condition 14 be amended to expand the restrictions with regard to activity on the site. In addition to entering and leaving the site, manoeuvring within the site should also be restricted to only between the hours of 7am and 7pm. The Committee also asked that the wording 'articulated lorries' be amended to 'Heavy Goods Vehicles' to encapsulate both ridged and articulated lorries.

Decision:

The application was approved subject to changes to Conditions 4 and 14, and Reasons 14 and 15:

Condition 4 –

Prior to the occupation of the development, details of a scheme of the means of enclosure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local

Planning Authority indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. **The scheme shall include acoustic fencing adjacent to the neighbouring property of Amberley.** The boundary treatment shall be completed before the building is occupied. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and maintained as approved.

Condition 14 –

No deliveries, servicing, loading and unloading **or manoeuvring** from articulated lorries **Heavy Goods Vehicles** (HGVs) shall take place outside the approved hours of operation (07.00 to 19.00 Monday to Saturday and no operation on Sundays or Bank Holidays unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority)

Reason 14 –

Reason: To protect residential amenity and in accordance with Policy ~~EN11~~ **E4** of the Spelthorne Local Plan.

Reason 15 –

Reason: To protect residential amenity and in accordance with Policy ~~EN11~~ **E4** of the Spelthorne Local Plane

27/26 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.

28/26 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.