

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
3 February 2021**

Present:

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

Councillors:

| | | |
|-------------|----------------|--------------------|
| C. Bateson | N. Islam | R.A. Smith-Ainsley |
| S.A. Dunn | R.J. Noble | J. Vinson |
| A.C. Harman | R.W. Sider BEM | |
| H. Harvey | V. Siva | |

Apologies: Councillors J. McIlroy and B.B. Spoor

21/21 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 V. Siva reported that she had received correspondence in relation to application No. 20/01312/FUL, Acacia Lodge, Rookery Road, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 1BT but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

22/21 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 06 January 2021 were approved as a correct record.

23/21 Planning application No. 20/01312/FUL - Acacia Lodge, Rookery Road, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 1BT

Description:

Demolition of existing building and development of 14 apartments including refuse storage, cycle storage, associated car parking and landscaping

Additional Information:

The Senior Planning Officer advised the Committee that:

Update to paragraph 7.3 – The Housing Delivery Test results were published on 21 January 2021. The score for Spelthorne was 50%.

Paragraph 7.68 should be revised as follows:

The current building lies on previously undeveloped land within a residential area which has been predominantly used for residential purposes. However, it is likely that the property has been constructed on Made Ground which could pose a potential risk to the sensitive end use. The Council's Pollution Control Officer has raised no objection but requested standard conditions to be imposed requiring a further investigation to be carried out to refine risks and remediation measures. Subject to these conditions, the proposal is considered acceptable in accordance with Policy EN15.

Paragraph 7.71 on the Equality Act should also include:

It is noted that the proposed development will likely have an impact on the children attending the day nursery at Roslin Nursery. The recognised impact would come from the demolition/construction works and would likely result in disturbance in the form of noise and dust, however this is something that is controlled by a different regime. The Environmental Health Department has been consulted and noted the close proximity to sensitive receptors including the nursery and recommend a condition for construction and demolition to include a Dust Management Plan to help to mitigate the impact.

Add additional condition and reason:

Condition: No demolition or construction work shall take place until, a Construction Environmental Management Plan incorporating a Demolition Method Statement, a Dust Management Plan (DMP) and a pre-demolition asbestos survey, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed methodology and mitigation measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect local air quality and help prevent statutory nuisance.

The Council has received two further letters of representation from Staines Town Society raising a number of issues which had already been addressed in the report but in addition noted the location of the bin store and parking/access adjacent to the boundary with The Rookery along with fire engine access to the rear. It was noted the parking/vehicular access is in the same position as existing. The bins store needs to be located to the front for collection and given the design and scale, are considered to have an acceptable impact on amenity. In addition, fire engine access was considered acceptable by Building Control and engines do not need to get to the rear of the property.

Public Speaking:

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

1. The volume of traffic in Rookery Road will increase significantly.
2. There will not be enough off-street parking for the proposed number of units.
3. There is no provision in the plans for any turning space for cars.
4. The current plans exceed Core Strategy Policy HO3 in respect of density.
5. The proposed northern extension to Acacia Lodge is an over development.
6. The undercroft is not in keeping with the street scene.
7. The proposed north extension reduces parking space and room that is currently used for turning.
8. Reduction in the gap between Acacia Lodge and the Rookery will reduce light and will adversely change the street scene.

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Ms Robinson (Agent for Metro Care Homes) spoke for the proposed development raising the following key points:

1. The proposal will provide 14 high quality apartments, on a brownfield site, in a sustainable location and will contribute towards the housing need in the area.
2. The design is traditional in style and materials and is set over three floors. It is set back from the road to reflect the character of the area.
3. Each apartment exceeds the Governments Nationally Described Space Standards.
4. The building will be energy efficient and will use either air source heat pumps or solar panels.
5. The building placement is similar to the existing care home.
6. The proposal will provide a large communal garden space which is over double the required amount.
7. 19 car parking spaces have been provided in accordance with the Surrey County Council standards.
8. The application site is sustainably located close to facilities and public transport links.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- The building matches other properties in the road.
- A care home on this site is no longer viable
- Two bedroomed accommodation is need within the Borough
- Two disabled parking spaces have been added to the plans since the application was first submitted

- Electric charging points are provided as well as an electric source in plan for additional charging points in the future
- Emergency vehicles can not fit under the undercroft
- Planning Policy HO5 states that developments should have a density of 55 dwellings p/hectare but this application has a density of 88 dwellings p/hectare
- Additional vehicles will be parking along Rookery Road as there is not adequate parking spaces on the plans
- Highway Agency have no concerns about the increase in traffic and parking in Rookery Road
- Residents felt that the building did not fit in with the street scene
- Could the number of 3 bed units be increased to reduce the actual number of units
- Planning Policy CC3 allows for fewer parking spaces than needed if the surrounding amenities eg shops, access to public transport are taken into consideration

Decision:

The application was **approved** subject to conditions including the additional condition referred to in the Call-Over meeting.

**24/21 Planning application No. 20/01380/HOU - 15 Stratton Road,
Sunbury On Thames, TW16 6PH**

Description:

Erection of single storey side/rear extension, garage conversion and new first floor flank window.

Additional Information:

This application was brought before the Planning Committee as the applicant is related to a Spelthorne Borough Council staff member.

Public Speaking:

There were no public speakers.

Debate:

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

Decision:

The application was **approved** subject to conditions.

**25/21 Planning application No. TPO 267/2020 - Land adj to 119 Penton
Road, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 2LL**

Description:

To seek confirmation of Tree Preservation Order 267/2020 that was served with immediate effect to protect one Plane tree and one Lime tree situation on

the highway to the front of the land adjacent to 119 Penton Road, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 2LL

Additional Information:

There was none.

Public Speaking:

There were no public speakers,

Debate:

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

Decision:

The Tree Preservation Order was confirmed without modification.

26/21 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.

27/21 Development Management Performance

Councillors Smith-Ainsley, Sider and Lagden thanked the Planning Development Manager for the report and also for the excellent service that she and her team had provided over this difficult year.

Resolved that the report of the Planning Development Manager be received and noted.