

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
21 August 2019**

Present:

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

Councillors:

C. Barnard	T. Lagden	B.B. Spoor
S.A. Dunn	L. Nichols	J. Vinson
M. Gibson	R.J. Noble	

Apologies: Apologies were received from Councillors R. Chandler, J. McIlroy, R.W. Sider BEM and V. Siva

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 A.C. Harman - Application No. 19/00901/FUL - Staines Ex-Servicemen's Club

214/19 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 July 2019 were approved as a correct record.

215/19 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

The Chairman, Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley declared on behalf of all members in relation to item 7 as the applicant is linked to the Council, but the Committee would consider the application in the same way as any other application.

Councillors C. Barnard, H. Harvey, M. Gibson, R. Noble, and B. Spoor declared they had visited Staines ex Servicemen's Club (application 19/00901/FUL) and Councillors L. Nichols and R.A. Smith-Ainsley had received correspondence in relation to this application but they had

maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind

Councillors H. Harvey had visited the site at 51 Leacroft (application 19/00692/FUL) but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillors C. Barnard, L. Nichols and R.A. Smith-Ainsley had received correspondence on application 19/00884/FUL, 42 High Street, Shepperton and Councillor R. Noble had visited the site, but they had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

216/19 Application No. 19/00901/FUL - Staines Ex-Servicemen's Club Ltd., 6 Laleham Road, Staines upon Thames, TW18 2DX

Description:

The application proposed demolition of the existing Clubhouse building and outbuildings to allow for construction of a new ex-servicemen's club house and apartment complex comprising 14 no. apartments, with integral car and bicycle parking, refuse storage, landscaping and amenity together with altered vehicular access point from Laleham Road.

Additional Information:

The Planning Development Manager advised the Committee of an amendment to paragraph 4.1 on Page 18 of the agenda in which Staines Town Society comments should read:

“Raises an objection on design – the proposal is still much too large for the site. The building will be too blocky, high and bulky, the flat roof and materials.....”

Public Speaking:

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

- Access/egress concerns
- Traffic flow impacts
- Community feel - query whether it will provide something for benefit of residents

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

- Opportunity to regenerate an important site in Staines
- Will provide a positive enhancement to street scene
- Will re-provide self-sustaining community facility
- Will offer support for ex servicemen

- Applicants have held two public meetings
- No objections from statutory consultees
- Area has a mixed character, several examples of flat roofs
- Will reflect surrounding character and improve the appearance
- Building massing will be below that of the existing building
- Good quality materials will be used
- Provision of apartments will help with housing supply

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Councillor A.C. Harman spoke as Ward Councillor in favour of the proposed development raising the following key points:

- Building has existed since 1920
- Currently has a membership of 310
- Existing building requires extensive repairs and renovation
- Will enhance riverside location
- Will remove an unattractive building
- Access will be further away from Gresham Road
- Proposed building will be set back with a layby to open up streetscene
- Terraces and balconies will benefit from river views
- Soft landscaping is proposed
- The layout and appearance is appropriate and desirable
- Proposal provides the redevelopment of a brownfield site with a high standard of accommodation
- Help to meet housing needs
- Will provide green roofs and enhance biodiversity
- Will provide disabled parking
- Lift access to all levels
- There are a number of interesting design proposals
- Will provide additional water storage to assist with flooding

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Similar to previous application that was recommended for refusal
- Poor design and visually obtrusive
- Little regard to the character of the surroundings
- Fails to make positive impact on streetscene
- Query over whether pre-application discussions with planning officers took place?
- Concern over visual impact associated with air source pumps – no information provided
- Parking concerns
- Will provide an efficient use of land
- Good standard of housing
- Complies with planning policies
- EA concerns over flooding issues have been satisfied
- Will enhance the street scene and river views
- Para 11 of NPPF applies – will assist in housing delivery

- Is in a sustainable location
- Only four objections received
- Promotes sustainability
- Development is set back from the road and stepped in from the sides
- Improved access
- Highly desirable riverside location
- Meets local plan policies
- Is located at a dangerous junction
- It is a shame that the design is so disappointing

The Committee agreed an amendment to the motion to add an additional reason for refusal as follows:

the proposal has failed to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, that the renewable energy provision can be provided which is satisfactory in design terms.

Decision:

The application was **refused**, as recommended in the Planning Committee report, for the following reasons:

The proposal would, by reason of design, scale, density and location, represent an overdevelopment of the site, and would appear visually obtrusive and out of character with the surrounding street scene. Furthermore, the proposed Laleham Road elevation, would, by reason of its poor quality design, have a negative, adverse impact and fail to make a positive contribution to the surrounding area. Additionally, the proposal has failed to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, that the renewable energy provision can be provided which is satisfactory in design terms. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to Policies EN1, HO5 and CC1 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009, the Supplementary Planning Document on the Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development 2011 and the NPPF 2019.

217/19 Application No. 19/00692/FUL - 51 Leacroft, Staines upon Thames, TW18 4PB

Description:

This application proposed the replacement of the existing dwelling with three storey apartment building comprising 6 no. one-bedroom units and 3 no. two-bedroom units, alterations to the existing outbuilding, and associated car parking, landscaping and amenity space (amended description)

Additional Information:

The Planning Development Manager updated the Committee as follows:

The proposal should read:

“Replacement of existing dwelling with three storey apartment building comprising 6 3 no. one-bedroom units and 3-6 no. two-bedroom units,

alterations to the existing outbuilding, and associated car parking, landscaping and amenity space (amended description).”

This should also be corrected in the Executive Summary and para. 3.2 of the report.

Para. 3.3 should refer to a reduction of three bedrooms, not six.

Para 7.23 - a total of 13 not 12 parking spaces would be required and consequently there is a shortfall of three spaces instead of two against the Parking Standards SPG.

Paragraph 7.23 referred to above should be amended as follows: “The proposal consists of ~~a high proportion of one-bedroom small~~ dwellings and the site is situated in a sustainable location with good access to public transport from Staines railway station and frequent bus services from Kingston Road.”

The Planning Development Manager confirmed that notwithstanding these corrections, the proposal continued to be acceptable.

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council’s procedure for speaking at meetings, Hayley Baumgart spoke against the proposed development raising the following key points:

- Previous objection letters to withdrawn planning application should be taken into account
- Overcrowded for plot size
- Loss of light/overshadowing
- Loss of privacy
- Overlooking from side windows
- Lack of parking/inadequate on-street parking
- Proposed building is much bigger than the existing
- More bats exist than referred to in the submitted statement
- Design not in character with other properties in area

In accordance with the Council’s procedure for speaking at meetings, Ian Phillips spoke for the proposed development raising the following key points:

- No overdevelopment or demonstrable harm associated with proposal
- Optimises use of brownfield site
- No adverse impact on protected on tree
- Meets required space standards
- Satisfactory relationships with surrounding buildings
- Is acceptable in streetscene

- Higher density development already present in the locality – Orchard House opposite has only 10 parking spaces
- Parking in sustainable location in close proximity to town and station

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Amended application has addressed concerns about protected tree and impact on adjacent property
- Complies with our policies
- Have to accept as more housing needs to be provided

Decision: The application was **approved** as recommended, subject to conditions as set out in the Planning report.

218/19 Application No. 19/00884/FUL - 42 High Street, Shepperton, TW17 9AU

Description:

The application proposed a change of use from offices/bank to a mixed use of commercial units at ground floor level and to 3 no. residential flats above on first floor with balconies, erection of new second floor with 3 no. flats with balconies, erection of part single storey, part two storey rear extension and new windows and doors including new access to front and demolition of chimney stacks.

Additional Information:

The Planning and Development Manager provided the following further information for the Committee on the changes to this application compared with the previous approved scheme:

- Distance from FFL to top of railings on rear balconies – 1.3m (compared with the approved 1.6m to top of glazing on rear balconies).
- Height of new first floor windows to rear and side increased by approximately 10cm.
- Windows on first and second floor rear elevations are higher by approximately 40cm/50cm, with dormers being increased in height by approximately 20cm to allow this increase.
- Rear ground floor service door to rear is reduced in size to a single door.
- Commercial ground floor windows increased in size and altered design.

She also advised that an additional Condition was proposed to be added if the application were approved:

“The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless and until at least two of the available parking spaces are provided with a fast charge socket (current minimum requirements - 7 kw Mode 3 with Type 2 connector - 230v AC 32 Amp single phase dedicated supply) for the charging of electric vehicle in accordance with a scheme to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.”

Reason

In order that the development makes suitable provision for sustainable travel in accordance with the objectives of chapter 9 “Promoting Sustainable Transport” of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies CC2 and CC3 of Spelthorne Borough Council’s Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document February 2009.

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council’s procedure for speaking at meetings, Andrea Koskela spoke against the proposed development raising the following key points:

- Concern over removal of obscure glazing balconies
- Low railing would be hazardous for children who could climb over them
- Loss of privacy
- Loss of residential amenity concerns over larger windows
- obscure glazing was originally proposed by applicant to safeguard privacy and amenity of adjoining properties
- NPPF does not justify the current proposal
- Construction concerns
- Concern over removal of chimneys

In accordance with the Council’s public speaking procedures, the Chairman read out a statement against the proposal on behalf of R.W. Sider BEM, who had called-in the application but was not able to attend the meeting. His statement raised the following key points:

- Rear and flank balconies will overlook residential properties and cause loss of privacy
- Enlarged windows on shop fronts not acceptable
- No parking for commercial units

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Scheme has a current approval for change use and flats
- Privacy no longer safeguarded
- Obscure glazing should be conditioned

- Railings do not improve streetscene
- Concern about increased size of windows
- Shopfronts old fashioned not attractive to businesses
- Application complies with our planning policies
- No renewable energy proposed
- Query over whether the railings meet safety tests

The Committee agreed to an amendment to the motion to grant the application, by the addition of the standard renewable energy condition, if approval was given.

Decision:

The recommendation to approve was overturned and the application **refused** planning permission for the following reason:

The proposed development, by reason of the balconies and railings to the rear, would have an unacceptable and significant harmful impact in terms of loss of privacy on the neighbouring dwellings to the east in Broadlands Avenue, contrary to policy EN1b) of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009.

**219/19 Application No. 19/01031/FUL - West Wing, Council Offices,
Knowle Green, Staines upon Thames, TW18 1XB**

Description:

The application sought alterations to the roof including extensions to the existing dormer windows.

Additional Information:

There was none.

There were no public speakers for this item.

During the debate, Councillor Nichols raised a query over who the applicant is. Officers confirmed that the applicant is Knowle Green Estates Limited and reference to Spelthorne Borough Council as the applicant on the report was an error.

Decision

The application was **approved**, subject to conditions, as recommended in the Planning Committee report.

220/19 Application No. 19/00933/FUL - Greeno Centre and Shepperton Recreation Ground, 45 Glebeland Gardens, Shepperton, TW17 9DH

The Planning Development Manager advised the Committee that information in the report referring to Common Land was incorrect and that the piece of land referred to actually had Village Green status.

Decision

The Committee agreed to **defer** consideration of the application to its next meeting to enable the corrections to be made to the report following advice from Legal.

221/19 Spelthorne Borough Council Housing Delivery Test Action Plan

The Planning Development Manager explained that the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) required Spelthorne to produce a Housing Delivery Test Action Plan because our housing delivery over the previous three years has been less than 95% of the housing requirement.

She advised that Cabinet had adopted the Plan at its meeting on 17 July 2019.

Resolved to note the Housing Delivery Test Action Plan.

222/19 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.

223/19 Urgent Items

There were none.