

**Minutes of the Planning Committee  
13 January 2016**

**Present:**

Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley (Chairman)  
Councillor C.M. Frazer (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

|                 |               |                |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|
| I.J. Beardsmore | A.T. Jones    | R.W. Sider BEM |
| S.J. Burkmar    | V.J. Leighton | H.A. Thomson   |
| A.L. Griffiths  | A. Neale      |                |
| I.T.E. Harvey   | O. Rybinski   |                |

**Apologies:** Apologies were received from Councillor R.O. Barratt, Councillor Q.R. Edgington and Councillor N. Islam

**In Attendance:**

Councillors who are not members of the Committee, but attended the meeting and spoke on an application in or affecting their ward, are set out below in relation to the relevant application.

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Councillor N. Gething    | 15/01513/FUL - Headline House, Stanwell Road, Ashford |
| Councillor M.M. Attewell | Observed proceedings                                  |
| Councillor C.F. Barnard  | Observed proceedings                                  |

**1/16 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2015 were approved as a correct record.

**2/16 Disclosures of Interest**

**a) Disclosures of interest under the Members' Code of Conduct**

Councillor I.J. Beardsmore declared a conflict of interest in relation to application 15/01590/SCC – Grazing land opposite Ford Close, Kingston Road, Ashford on the basis that he was a member of the Surrey County Council Planning and Regulatory Committee which determined such items. He stated that he would not debate or vote on the item.

**b) Declarations of interest under the Council's Planning Code**

Councillors R.A. Smith Ainsley, C.M. Frazer, V.J. Leighton, O. Rybinski, A.L. Griffiths, R.W. Sider BEM and H.A. Thomson reported that they had received correspondence in relation to application 15/01513/FUL - Headline House, Stanwell Road, Ashford, but had maintained an impartial role and had kept an open mind.

Councillor I.T.E. Harvey reported that he had received correspondence in relation to application 15/01343/HOU - 32 Maryland Way, Sunbury On Thames, but had maintained an impartial role and had kept an open mind.

**3/16      15/01590/SCC - Grazing Land Opposite Ford Close, Kingston Road, Ashford**

**Description:**

Surrey County Council consultation for the construction of new single storey fire station with access from A308 Staines Road West, incorporating two double appliance bays, dormitories with ancillary facilities, office accommodation, operational areas and store rooms; drill tower and smoke house; proposed hard standing for training, car parking and refuelling point for appliances; associated generator and oil storage tank; retention of existing rail timber fencing on north and eastern boundary of the site and the erection of 3m high acoustic fencing on the south west and part of the northern boundaries.

**Additional Information:**

The Assistant Head of Planning informed the Committee that one late letter of objection had been received which raised concerns with the closing of two fire stations and the replacement with only one.

In addition she reported that three further letters of objection from Surrey County Council had been received which raised concerns relating to:

- Green Belt
- Flooding
- Noise
- Traffic congestion
- Loss of view of open fields

**Public Speaking:**

There was none.

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Recommendation must be on planning matters not closure of 2 existing fire stations
- Flooding concerns
- Location issues with flooding of nearby roads

- Highly vulnerable use in green belt
- Respects green belt
- Loss of green belt
- Visual improvements needed to mitigate proposal
- Have started work on site
- Loss of trees
- Eyesore
- Need substantial landscaping

**Decision:**

That Surrey County Council be informed that Spelthorne Borough Council raise **OBJECTIONS** to the proposed new fire station to be located on land south of Fordbridge Roundabout unless:

1. Flood storage capacity is increased to avoid adding to flood risk elsewhere; and
2. Sufficient landscaping is proposed to mitigate the visual impact of the proposal

Spelthorne would also comment that if permission was to be granted by SCC then the following should be satisfied:

1. Adequate protection of ecology during construction;
2. A demonstration that impact on archaeology is acceptable;
3. Acceptable in terms of highway safety to the satisfaction of the County Highway Authority.
4. Air quality measures presented in the Air Quality Assessment be controlled by condition and that Construction Environmental Management Plan and Dust Management Plan be approved prior to commencement to protect human health and prevent nuisance.
5. Ground gas mitigation of ground gas risk be approved prior to commencement and the scheme be constructed in accordance with these approved details.
6. That the following conditions be applied in relation to ground contamination:

**A) Condition:** No development shall take place until:-

- (i) A comprehensive desk-top study, carried out to identify and evaluate all potential sources and impacts of land and/or groundwater contamination relevant to the site, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- (ii) Where any such potential sources and impacts have been identified, a site investigation has been carried out to fully characterise the nature

and extent of any land and/or groundwater contamination and its implications. The site investigation shall not be commenced until the extent and methodology of the site investigation have been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

- (iii) A written method statement for the remediation of land and/or groundwater contamination affecting the site shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of remediation. The method statement shall include an implementation timetable and monitoring proposals, and a remediation verification methodology. The site shall be remediated in accordance with the approved method statement, with no deviation from the statement without the express written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To protect the amenities of future residents and the environment from the effects of potentially harmful substances in accordance with policies SP6 and EN15 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

#### NOTE

The requirements of the above Condition must be carried out in accordance with current best practice. The applicant is therefore advised to contact Spelthorne's Pollution Control team on 01784 446251 for further advice and information before any work commences. An information sheet entitled "Land Affected By Contamination: Guidance to Help Developers Meet Planning Requirements" proving guidance can also be downloaded from Spelthorne's website at [www.spelthorne.gov.uk](http://www.spelthorne.gov.uk).

**B) Condition:** Prior to the first use or occupation of the development, and on completion of the agreed contamination remediation works, a validation report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To protect the amenities of future residents and the environment from the effects of potentially harmful substances in accordance with policies SP6 and EN15 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

#### NOTE

The requirements of the above Condition must be carried out in accordance with current best practice. The applicant is therefore advised to contact Spelthorne's Pollution Control team on 01784 446251 for further advice and information before any work commences. An information sheet entitled "Land Affected By Contamination: Guidance to Help Developers Meet Planning Requirements" proving guidance can also be downloaded from Spelthorne's website at [www.spelthorne.gov.uk](http://www.spelthorne.gov.uk).

**4/16 15/00676/FUL - Land Off, Hanworth Road, Sunbury On Thames**

**Description:**

Erection of new building to provide a B1c, B2 and B8 development with associated parking.

**Additional Information:**

The Assistant Head of Planning notified the Committee that the reference to acoustic fencing in condition 3 of the report of the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy would be deleted and replaced with the following additional condition:

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of the proposed acoustic fencing on the northern boundary of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The fencing as agreed shall be installed prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter maintained.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the neighbouring residential properties.

**Public Speaking:**

There was none.

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Proposal completes economic development and improvement of the site
- Costco development took account of any traffic development associated with this site
- Site has been in industrial use for years
- Concern over access onto A316; there has been an accident associated with the Costco access

**Decision:**

The application was **approved** as set out in the report of the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy subject to the following additional condition and amendments:

That the reference to acoustic fencing in condition 3 be deleted and the following additional condition be included:

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of the proposed acoustic fencing on the northern boundary of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The fencing as agreed shall be installed prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter maintained.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the neighbouring residential properties

**5/16 15/01513/FUL - Headline House, Stanwell Road, Ashford**

**Description:**

Erection of a two storey building to provide 1 no. one bed flat, 6 no. two bed flats and 1 no. three bed flats with associated parking and amenity space following demolition of the existing commercial building on the site.

**Additional Information:**

The Assistant Head of Planning explained that a total of 12 additional late letters of objection have been received. The issues included:

- The proposal would not overcome the reason for refusal on the previous scheme which was refused on overdevelopment grounds
- Unacceptable overlooking, particularly associated with the proposed balconies
- Inadequate parking

The Assistant Head of Planning recommended the following additional condition be imposed:

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, the applicant shall submit to the Local Planning Authority for approval, details of the proposed balconies to units 1.04 and 1.05 on the first floor. The details shall include a set in from the northern boundary by 1m and the erection of a 2m high screen on the northern boundary. The details as agreed shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the units and maintained.

Reason: - To safeguard the privacy of the adjoining properties in accordance with policies SP6 and EN1 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

**Public Speaking:**

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at committee meetings, John Higham spoke against the proposed development and raised the following key points:

- The proposal does not overcome the reason for refusal on the previous scheme which was refused on overdevelopment grounds
- Unacceptable overlooking, particularly associated with the proposed balconies
- Inadequate parking

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at committee meetings, Michael Wood spoke in favour of the proposed development and raised the following key points:

- Worked with the planning officers to get an acceptable scheme
- Attractive development which will enhance the character of the area
- Meets Council's parking standards
- Census showed 1.24 cars per household across the Borough
- Current use generates significantly more parking than proposal
- Supports impact on St Hilda's Church listed building opposite with similar design and use of red brick

- Would provide much needed housing in the borough

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at committee meetings, Councillor Gething spoke as ward councillor and raised the following key points:

- Welcomes residential development but needs to be proportionate
- Increase in number of bedrooms compared with refused scheme
- Overdevelopment
- Design out of keeping with street scene
- Rear balconies result in overlooking
- Parking problems

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Parking proposed meets Borough Council's Parking standards for cars and cycles
- Will replace an unattractive building
- Improvement within street scene
- Complements listed building of St Hilda's church
- Overlooking is minimal
- Balconies are now acceptable with additional condition suggested by officers
- Contrary to Surrey County Council parking standards, safety concerns
- Good design
- Parking problems, inadequate parking
- Overlooking from balconies
- Concerns over storage on balconies, would like a condition to prevent this
- Could address concerns over balcony storage in lease terms
- Vast visual improvement
- Overlooking is not a problem
- Sympathetic to listed building church
- Amenity/green space is provided

**Decision:**

The application was **approved** as set out in the report of the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy subject to the following additional condition:

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, the applicant shall submit to the Local Planning Authority for approval, details of the proposed balconies to units 1.04 and 1.05 on the first floor. The details shall include a set in from the northern boundary by 1m and the erection of a 2m high screen on the northern boundary. The details as agreed shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the units and maintained.

Reason: - To safeguard the privacy of the adjoining properties in accordance with policies SP6 and EN1 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

**6/16 15/01352/FUL - Venture House, 42 - 54 London Road, Staines-upon-Thames**

**Description:**

Removal of surface level car park and erection of a two-storey block of 6 flats (4 no. 1-bed and 2 no. 2-bed) together with associated amenity space.

**Additional Information:**

The Assistant Head of Planning informed the Committee that no objection had been received in relation to the refuse details.

She recommended that condition 2 be amended (to reflect an amended plan which has been received) to the following:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and drawings:

A00-(00) received 12 October 2015.

A00-07 received 29 October 2015.

A00-02 Rev. D; /03 Rev. D; /04 Rev. E; /05 Rev. E; /06 Rev. E received 01 December 2015

A00-01 Rev. D received 24 December 2015

Reason:- For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning

**Public Speaking:**

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at committee meetings, Michelle Ulisse spoke against the proposed development and raised the following key points:

- Loss of privacy
- Screening required but does not want overshadowing to garden
- Approval has already been given to convert Venture House to residential use
- More green space is needed on the site

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at committee meetings, Alexander Webster spoke in favour of the proposed development and raised the following key points

- Pre-applications with officers have taken place
- Planning document have been submitted to show compliance with planning policies taking into consideration flood risk, waste, and design.
- No loss of light
- The development is of a modest scale
- Very energy efficient building



- Meets/exceeds Council's SPD
- Makes use of a brownfield site in a sustainable location

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- An informative should be added to condition 8 to ensure that the density, species and location of landscaping has special regard to the dwellings at the rear
- Inadequate car parking

**Decision:**

The application was **approved** as set out in the report of the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy subject to the following amendment to condition 2 and additional informative to condition 8:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and drawings:

A00-(00) received 12 October 2015.

A00-07 received 29 October 2015.

A00-02 Rev. D; /03 Rev. D; /04 Rev. E; /05 Rev. E; /06 Rev. E received 01 December 2015

A00-01 Rev. D received 24 December 2015

Reason:- For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.

Additional informative to condition 8:

The applicant is advised that in the design of the landscaping under condition 8, special regard should be had to providing planting with an appropriate density, species and positioning to avoid causing undue shading to the residential properties in Sidney Road.

**7/16      15/01343/HOU - 32 Maryland Way, Sunbury On Thames**

**Description:**

Erection of a two storey rear extension.

**Additional Information:**

There was none.

**Public Speaking:**

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at committee meetings, Paul Newberry spoke against the proposed development and raised the following key points:

- Conflicts with policy EN1
- Unacceptable impact on adjoining properties
- Overbearing
- Obtrusive
- Loss of light/overshadowing
- Noise disruption due to building works on site
- 34 Maryland Way has side windows unlike appeal scheme in the area
- Plans are incorrect
- Business use taking place at the property
- Human Rights Act concerns – impact on elderly neighbour

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at committee meetings, Peter Bonner spoke in favour of the proposed development and raised the following key points

- Amended scheme to overcome loss of light concerns including slopping roof
- Scheme adheres to planning policies
- Will not cause distress to neighbour
- Plans are in-keeping with local area
- No intention to cause distress to elderly neighbour

The Chairman read out a letter on behalf of Councillor A.E. Friday who was unable to attend the meeting but had called-in the item. The letter raised the following key points:

- anxiety that if the structure was erected it would be overbearing and overshadow other properties the area
- proposal has caused great alarm and distress to one very elderly resident who lives next door, aged 101
- building work disruption and reduced privacy as a result of the application

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Applicant will proceed in a good neighbourly way
- Not a breach of Human rights
- No impact on street scene
- Compliant with planning policy
- Other similar extensions nearby
- A condition should be imposed relating to hours of construction

**Decision:**

The application was **approved** as set out in the report of the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy subject to the following additional condition:

*External works associated with the construction of the development hereby approved shall only take place during the following times:*

*8am to 6pm Monday to Friday*

*8am to 1pm on Saturdays*

*No working on Sundays, public holidays or bank holidays.*

Reason - To protect the amenity of the neighbouring residential properties.

**8/16 Standard 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 Head of Planning and Housing Strategy.

**Resolved** that the report of the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy be received and noted.