

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
13 November 2019**

Present:

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

Councillors:

C.F. Barnard	S.A. Dunn	L. E. Nichols
A. Brar	M. Gibson	R.W. Sider BEM
S. Buttar	T. Lagden	V. Siva
R. Chandler	J. McIlroy	B.B. Spoor

Apologies: Apologies were received from Councillor J. Vinson

In Attendance:

Councillors who are not members of the Committee, but attended the meeting were Councillor M.M Attewell and Councillor J.R. Sexton. County Councillor Tim Evans was also in attendance to speak on Item 4.

292/19 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 October 2019 were approved as a correct record.

293/19 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

Councillors R.A. Smith Ainsley, H. Harvey, C. Barnard, A. Brar, S. Buttar, R. Chandler, S. Dunn, M. Gibson, L.E. Nichols, R.W. Sider BEM, V. Siva and B. Spoor reported that they had received correspondence in relation to application **19/01022/OUT Bugle Nurseries, Upper Halliford Road, Shepperton, TW17 8SN**, but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillors H. Harvey, C. Barnard, R. Chandler, S. Dunn, L.E. Nichols, R.W. Sider BEM and B. Spoor reported that they had visited the site in relation to application **19/01022/OUT Bugle Nurseries, Upper Halliford Road, Shepperton, TW17 8SN**, but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillors H. Harvey, S. Dunn and L.E. Nichols reported that they had met with the Applicant in relation to application **19/01022/OUT Bugle Nurseries, Upper Halliford Road, Shepperton, TW17 8SN**, but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillors R.A. Smith Ainsley declared for all Members the attendance of a recent Officers Briefing in relation to application **19/01022/OUT Bugle Nurseries, Upper Halliford Road, Shepperton, TW17 8SN**, but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

No further declarations were made.

294/19 Application No. 19/01022/OUT - Bugle Nurseries, Upper Halliford Road, Shepperton, TW17 8SN.

Description:

This planning application sought the demolition of existing buildings and structures to be followed by the redevelopment of the site for a residential-led development comprising up to 43 residential homes, a 62-bed care home, provision of open space, and other associated works.

Additional Information:

The Planning Development Manager provided the following updates:

1. A letter has been received from the agent responding to the committee report:

- They clarify a few points about the scale, building line and public open space for the development
- They have requested that their Parameters Plan relating to proposed building heights (drawing no. D1002-P1) is withdrawn from the application.

[Officer comment: this removes the height limit of the buildings]

- Reference is made to the Council's recently published Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment, the proposed emerging Local Plan, and the Local Plan Preferred Options Rejected Site Analysis.

[Officer comment: this is not considered relevant to the consideration of this planning application]

- The letter also refers to the applicant's considerations put forward in favour of the development (their case for 'very special circumstances').

[Officer comment: these are already covered in the report]

2. 1 additional petition-style support card has been received.

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, James Good spoke (2 minutes) 'For' the proposed development raising the following key points:

- Is a reduced development since the refused scheme
- Provision of permanent public space to the rear of the site
- Does not refer to Green Belt Local Plan assessment
- Removal of industrial eyesore.
- Community benefits
- Housing need

In accordance with the Council's Public Speaking procedures, Surrey County Councillor Tim Evans spoke (1 minute) 'For' the application raising the following comments:

- Provides much needed affordable housing
- A pedestrian crossing is provided
- Proposal has local community support
- Recommendation is mean spirited
- The Committee should not be pressurised by the Planning Department into reusing the application

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Query over how the site is classed as strongly performing
- Will improve the green belt and provide significant benefits for the community
- Will provide much needed 50% affordable housing
- Will provide a play space
- No objection from the County Highway Authority
- No flooding objection
- No objection from the police
- Green belt objections
- Could provide much taller buildings
- Impact on the openness of the green belt
- Will provide a care home
- Very special circumstances apply
- Large green belt development approved at Shepperton Studios
- Will provide a large area of open space to the west
- There has been no contact by the applicant with the Group Head of Neighbourhood Services, for some 18 months, regarding the open space
- There is no requirement for additional public open space in this area does not meet CIL regulations

- Complies with policy EN8
- Considered to comply with policy EN2
- Replacement planting proposed
- Very thorough and balanced report but differ in opinion in overall recommendation
- Is an eyesore and downtrodden site
- Pedestrian crossing is proposed on Upper Halliford Road (Officer note: this was not required by Surrey Highway Authority)
- Attractive scheme but is only an outline proposal
- Would set a precedent for development on Green Belt land
- Every planning application should be considered on its merits
- Contrary to NPPF green belt objective of preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another
- Concern over where the development will be built
- Waste transfer site would be removed
- Complaints over existing use, removal dirty, smelly, noisy activities
- Residents support the proposal
- Roof pitches can provide accommodation

Decision:

The Application was **Refused** as recommended in the Planning Committee Report.

295/19 Application No. 16/00547/FUL - The Grange, Glenthorne, 33 Rookery Road, Staines upon Thames, TW18 1BT

Description:

This application sought the demolition of the existing vacant buildings on site and the erection of a building over 3 floors to provide 19 flats with parking and amenity space.

Additional Information:

The Planning Development Manager provided the following updates:

Further condition to be added at the request of the Tree Officer:

Condition:- Prior to the commencement of works an updated Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to address the amended car park layout plan. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and maintained as approved.

Reason:- To protect the trees and their amenity value at the rear of the site

Further condition to be added at the request of the Environment Agency:

Condition:- Finished flood levels are set no lower than 250 millimetres above ground level.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants.

Burges Way has been misspelt in the report as Burgess Way in the Executive Summary Page 52 and in 7.10 and 7.13 on Pages 59 and 60.

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Patricia Carrick-Allen spoke '**Against**' the proposed development raising the following key points:

- Loss of facility for mentally ill patients; it was a haven for the mentally ill (speaker was a patient there)
- The facility has been relocated too far from Spelthorne

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- The mental health facility has been re-provided in Chertsey
- Surrey CC has been making cost savings
- Development is within the urban area and is a previously developed site
- Complies with amenity space requirements
- Complies with access requirements
- Lack of affordable housing provision – concern over viability assessment
- Is an overdevelopment of the site

Decision:

The Application was **Approved**, subject to prior completion of an S106 agreement, as recommended in the Planning Committee Report.

296/19 Application No. 19/00796/FUL - Forum House, 14 Thames Street, Staines upon Thames, TW18 4UD.

Description:

This planning application sought permission for the building to provide 9 additional residential dwellings by the erection of 2 stories on the existing roof following the removal of the existing roof structure. The proposal provides 4 parking spaces. No outside amenity space is provided, apart from balconies.

Additional Information:

There was none.

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Geoffrey Nicholson spoke '**Against**' the proposed development raising the following key points:

- Lack of refuse and recycling bins
- Lack of disabled parking

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Kay Collins spoke '**For**' the proposed development raising the following key points:

- Will bring development and an active use to the site
- Close to excellent facilities
- Design to be in keeping with adjacent flats (the same architect was used)
- The development has been reduced in size

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Pleas balconies are to be provided
- Urban design is acceptable
- Query over parking provision
- Query over lift provision
- Query over refuse provision
- Public open space concerns
- Lack of affordable housing
- Area of high pollution

Decision:

The Application was **Approved** as recommended in the Planning Committee Report.

297/19 Urgent Items

There were none.