

**Minutes of the Planning Committee  
6 January 2021**

**Present:**

Councillor T. Lagden (Chairman)  
Councillor M. Gibson (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

C. Bateson	J. McIlroy	R.A. Smith-Ainsley
S.A. Dunn	R.J. Noble	B.B. Spoor
A.C. Harman	R.W. Sider BEM	J. Vinson
H. Harvey	V. Siva	

**Apologies:**

Apologies of absence were received from 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 D. Saliagopoulos – Planning App. 20/00876/HOU, 18 Riverside Close, Staines upon Thames, TW18 2LW

**1/20 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2020 were approved as a correct record.

**2/20 Disclosures of Interest**

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

Councillor M. Gibson declared a pecuniary interest in relation to application 20/00876/HOU, 18 Riverside Close, Staines upon Thames, TW18 2LW, on the agenda, as she owned a nearby property, and left the meeting when this item was discussed.

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

Councillors R.A. Smith Ainsley, H. Harvey, B. Noble, V. Siva, J. Vinson and T. Lagden reported that they had received correspondence in relation to

application 20/00876/HOU, 18 Riverside Close, Staines upon Thames, TW18 2LW but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor R.A. Smith Ainsley reported that he had previously attended a presentation at Spelthorne Borough Council relating to application 20/00802/FUL, Car Park to Rear of Tesco, Ashford Hospital, London Road, Ashford, TW15 3AA and that he came to the meeting with an open mind.

**3/20 Planning Application No. 20/00802/FUL - Car Park to rear of Tesco, Ashford Hospital, London Road, Ashford, TW15 3AA**

**Description:**

Redevelopment of surplus hospital car park for 127 residential units comprising 122 flats and 5 terraced houses, in buildings ranging from 2 to 5 storeys in height, with associated access, parking, services, facilities and amenity land.

**Additional Information:**

The Principal Planning Officer advised the Committee that:

The applicant had agreed to increase the contribution for off-site open space improvements from £35,000 stated in the Officer's report, to £45,000. A figure of £45,000 should replace £35,000 at paragraphs 7.51, 7.145 and part 3 of Recommendation A.

The applicant had re-calculated the floorspace of Block C ground floor flat and it was 61sq m not 60 sq m and therefore complied with the technical standards.

The Council has also received one further letter of representation, which raised concerns that:

Stanwell is already overcrowded

There are already a large number of flats alongside the hospital site and traffic will be impacted

The site should be used as a primary school

Concerns over sunlight, noise and air pollution

Parking concerns

A motion to defer the planning application was proposed by Councillor M. Gibson and seconded by Councillor R.J. Noble for the following reasons:

Shortfall in open amenity space and play areas

Lack of sunlight to existing dwellings

Loss of light to existing development

Close proximity with and overlooking of surrounding developments

Parking spaces shortfall

Inadequate waste storage and collection provision

Shortfall related to separation distances to adjoining dwellings

**Decision:**

The application was **deferred** to allow the applicant time to consider the concerns of the Committee

**4/20 Planning Application No. 20/00876/HOU - 18 Riverside Close, Staines upon Thames, TW18 2LW**

Councillor M. Gibson had declared a pecuniary interest and left the meeting at this point.

**Description:**

The erection of a new boundary wall and gate at the western boundary.

**Additional Information:**

The Principal Planning Officer advised the Committee that:

The Council had received one further letter of representation which raised the following concerns:

Planning Officers had previously stated that the current garage was in the same location as the original garage which was incorrect.

The proposal impacts parking at a property opposite the site and would restrict access to a garage granted planning permission under the reference 19/01392/HOU.

The garage has narrowed the roadway and granting permission for the wall and gates would endorse the encroachment.

**Public Speaking:**

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Mr Marks spoke against the proposed application raising the following key points:

- The garage has not been built on the position of the original garage
- Encroachment on to the private road
- The new position of the garage has caused narrowing of the road and caused difficulties for owners of the Thames Side houses in respect of parking and access to their properties.
- Planning permission has previously been granted for the objector to build a new garage at his property, 77 Thames Side; if the new garage is allowed to remain at 18 Riverside Close, along with the proposed gates, post and fencing, it will not be possible to access the approved garage at 77 Thames Side.
- Granting planning permission will create further encroachment

Councillor D. Saliagopoulos spoke against the proposed application raising the following key points:

- She agreed with all the points raised by Mr Marks
- Vehicular access would become very tight if the permission was granted
- She felt that many of the local residents were against the application
- This area suffered flooding in 2014

Councillor T. Harman spoke against the proposed application raising the following key point:

- The proposed wall and gates will not positively contribute to the street scene
- There would be reduced room for car manoeuvres into the property
- The application compromises the integrity of the access road
- Encroachment onto other properties
- Negative impact on neighbourhood

A motion to **approve** the planning application was proposed by Councillor R. Smith-Ainsley and seconded by Councillor H. Harvey and was agreed by the Committee.

**Debate:**

None of the Members indicated that they wished to speak on this application.

**Decision:**

The application was **approved**.

**5/20 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.