

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
4 May 2016**

Present:

Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley (Chairman)
Councillor H.A. Thomson (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

I.J. Beardsmore	N. Islam	O. Rybinski
S.J. Burkmar	A.T. Jones	R.W. Sider BEM
N.J. Gething	V.J. Leighton	

Apologies: Apologies were received from Councillor R.O. Barratt

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 B.B. Spoor	14/02213/FUL - Land To The East Of Churchill Way, Sunbury On Thames
-----------------------	--

109/16 Election of Vice-Chairman

It was proposed by Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley and seconded by Councillor V.J. Leighton and:

Resolved that Councillor H.A. Thomson be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2015/2016.

110/16 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 April 2016 were approved as a correct record.

111/16 Disclosures of Interest

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

There were none.

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

Councillor R.A. Smith Ainsley in relation to the application reported that he sat on the Customer Service Board for A2Dominion who were the applicant of the proposal but declared that this did not present a conflict of interest, that he had come to the committee with an open mind and had maintained impartiality. He stated that with the advice of the Monitoring Officer he would debate and vote on the item.

112/16 14/02213/FUL - Land To The East Of Churchill Way, Sunbury On Thames

Description:

Erection of three no. two bedroom properties with associated gardens, parking and landscaping following demolition of existing garages on site (amended application following refusal of 14/00156/FUL).

Additional Information:

The Assistant Head of Planning reported to the committee that amended plans had been received showing all three gardens having an area in excess of 60 sq. m which met the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance. It was recommended that condition 10 be altered to reflect those plans and to read as follows:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: S101 and S102A received 22/12/2014, P210 received 29/03/2016 and P201B and P202B received 22/04/2016.

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 meetings Mrs Loralie Hamkin spoke against the proposal raising the following key points:

- The proposal did not offer enough green space to accommodate rain and prevent flooding on street.
- The removal of trees would diminish the outlook of area
- The proposal would block light entering adjacent properties and make homes very dark.
- Noise disturbance during building works
- Parking provision is reduced. Commercial vehicles have nowhere to park
- Obtrusive design
- Not going to be able to see around the road due to loss of openness leading to safety concerns
- Must retain as much greenery as possible

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Laura Kavanagh spoke for the proposal raising the following key points:

- A scheme was originally submitted over a year ago.

- A2Dominion have worked with the Planning Department to try and overcome and mitigate the previous reasons for refusal.
- The site has been empty for over half a year and hasn't been used for car parking
- The proposal will be offering three affordable rented properties on site.
- A green verge will be maintained.
- One tree will be retained and trees will be replanted
- The dwellings will be of a good quality.

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Councillor B.B. Spoor spoke as Ward Councillor against the proposal raising the following key points:

- The scheme should be moved back slightly to provide more greenery.
- Sustainability of people who will have to live there is not mentioned in the report. The living conditions would be cramped.
- The houses fall below the recommended sizes for this housing association.
- Dwellings are very small in scale and will provide no private space for occupants
- The committee should consider the people who have to live in these properties.
- The 30m rule to the existing bungalows have been breached (Officer note, the distance is 13.5m)

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Size of dwellings are reasonable
- The fact there is a restriction on permitted development in the proposal is important as there is limited space
- Surrey County Council Highways Authority made no comment on road impact and therefore it would be difficult to use that as a reason for refusal.
- No objection to loss of garages
- Houses were built at a time when car ownership was low
- The proposal is a violation of the Streetscene and harms the amenity of the estate.
- Loss of parking – site was being used for parking purposes until it was fenced off/car parking displacement
- Proposal has not been amended enough compared with the refused scheme
- Building Control will deal with drainage
- Overbearing impact on no. 82
- Council is under pressure to build more homes
- Trees are of value to the amenity of the estate.
- Garage blocks can become problem areas of crime when unused.
- The scheme offers much needed affordable housing.
- Good way to use the land.

- Flooding issue is not a matter of concern as soak away will help alleviate some of the problems and there will be less hardstanding overall.
- Trees provide a lot for the environment and this area.
- Replacement trees should be the best size and species for the site
- Must have a complimentary green area for the benefit of residents.
- Younger trees create a better carbon capture

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 10 to reflect the amended plans submitted by the applicant and additional informative:

10. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: S101 and S102A received 22/12/2014, P210 received 29/03/2016 and P201B and P202B received 22/04/2016.

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

Informative

The applicant is advised that in relation to the submission of landscaping details pursuant to condition 5 above, the scheme should include tree planting of an appropriate size and species for the application site.

113/16 Committees' Thanks

It was proposed by Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley and seconded by Councillor R.W. Sider BEM to give thanks to Councillor C.M. Frazer for his work as Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee. The Chairman praised Councillor C.M. Frazer for his invaluable work at eloquently laying out the salient facts for the benefit of the public and committee members when introducing proposals.