

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

Present:

Councillor M. Gibson (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

C. Bateson	H. Harvey	R.W. Sider BEM
J.T.F. Doran	N. Islam	R.A. Smith-Ainsley
S.A. Dunn	J. McIlroy	B.B. Spoor
A.C. Harman	R.J. Noble	J. Vinson

Apologies: Apologies were received from Councillor T. Lagden

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 R. Dunn (Sunbury Common Ward) – Planning Application No. 20/00736/FUL, 96 Cavendish Road, Sunbury on Thames, TW16 7PL

58/21 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 03 February 2021 were approved as a true and accurate record.

59/21 Disclosures of Interest

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

Cllr Robert Noble declared a pecuniary interest in relation to planning application No. 20/01544/FUL, 58 Thames Meadow, Shepperton, TW17 8LT, in that he and his wife were the applicants. He declared that he would leave the meeting before this item was discussed and would not be voting on this item.

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

Councillors S. Doran, S. Dunn, M. Gibson, H. Harvey, R. Noble, R. Sider, R.A. Smith-Ainsley, B. Spoor and J. Vinson had all received correspondence in relation to application No. **20/00736/FUL** – 96 Cavendish Road, Sunbury On

Thames, TW16 7PL but had not commented and had kept an open mind. Councillor H. Harvey also reported that she had visited the application site.

Councillors S. Doran, R. Sider, R.A. Smith-Ainsley, B. Spoor and J. Vinson had all received correspondence in relation to planning application No. **20/01544/FUL**, 58 Thames Meadow, Shepperton, TW17 8LT, but had not commented and had kept an open mind. Councillor H. Harvey stated that she had visited the site and had kept an open mind. Councillor Sider also reported that he was a colleague of the applicant but kept an open mind.

60/21 Planning Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

The Chairman drew the Committee's attention to the glossary of terms and abbreviations that has been added to the agenda pack.

61/21 Planning application No. 20/00736/FUL - 96 Cavendish Road, Sunbury On Thames TW16 7PL

Description:

The erection of a two-storey detached building comprising 2 x 1 bedroom flats.

Additional Information:

The application had been called in by Councillor R. Dunn as a result of concerns relating to overlooking and loss of privacy, parking provision, loss of light and flooding.

The Principal Planning Officer advised the Committee that:

The Council had received three further letters of representation which raised the following concerns:

- i) If the minibus, owned by the occupiers of a neighbouring property, is parked in the parking space adjoining the site, it would overhang the proposed site entrance. Photographs have also been submitted to support this suggestion,
- ii) Any overspill parking would take place in Cavendish Road,
- iii) There were concerns over the vehicle tracking plan,
- iv) There would be a loss of sunlight and overshadowing,
- v) The use of the private road, and

- vi) The is currently only one other flatted development in the surrounding area.

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Mr P. Coulter submitted a prepared statement against the proposed development, that was read out by the Committee Manager, raising the following key points:

- i) The positioning of the entry points clashes with the current parking at Bracken Close
- ii) The car parking spaces does not meet the council requirement and the surrounding roads are already suffering from congestion from parked cars.
- iii) The vehicle tracking diagram provided does not take into account multiple vehicles using the space.
- iv) Delivery and emergency services will have trouble accessing the site.
- v) The development will cause loss of light to neighbouring properties.
- vi) The distance front to back between the existing and new properties does not meet the minimum amount needed by legislation.
- vii) There is a history of anti-social behaviour in a two flat property in the surrounding area.

Councillor R. Dunn spoke against the proposed application raising the following key points:

- i) The purposed application does not fit in with the existing street scene
- ii) It would cause major problems to the existing residents who already live in a restricted environment
- iii) Loss of light and existing properties being overlooked
- iv) During construction there would be limited access to the close and would therefore cause existing residents problems in parking near their home
- v) Digging up the road to provide utilities to the site would cause major disruption to the area
- vi) The application site is near Feltham Brook that poses a risk of flooding

vii) A2 Dominion are the owners of the private road

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- There is currently a shortage of housing land and this site is classified as brown fill
- Surrey County Council has not raised any concerns regarding this development and the surrounding roads.
- Emergency vehicles would have trouble accessing the site
- If two cars met on the road leading to the development, they could not pass
- Neighbourhood services are happy with the application in respect of refuse collection
- In the neighbouring property, the only area affected by the loss of light is a stairwell
- The distance between the two neighbouring properties meets the requirements on the 1st floor level but not on the ground floor level
- The parking provision proposed falls short of Spelthorne B.C's own parking requirements
- A2 Dominion have not given formal agreement to the developer to access the property over their land

Decision:

The approval was **NOT APPROVED**

A motion was put before the committee to refuse the proposed development by reason of its access arrangements. In addition the development would result in a poor and cramped standard of layout which would not pay regard to the character of the surrounding area, contrary to policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document, February 2009.

Decision:

The application was **REFUSED**

62/21 Planning application No. 20/01544/FUL - 58 Thames Meadow, Shepperton, TW17 8LT

Councillor R. Noble left the meeting at 7.33pm

Description:

Erection of a dwelling house (use class C3) with associated car parking and landscaping following removal of existing 'summer accommodation'.

Additional Information:

The application was brought before the Planning Committee as the applicant is a Spelthorne Borough Council Councillor.

Officers had been copied into a document sent to Councillors which included photographs and showed the clearing which has taken place to the site since the applicants took ownership.

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Ms H. Lowe, Agent acting for the applicant, spoke for the proposed development raising the following key points:

- i) Although the site was originally built for recreational purposes, many of the surrounding properties have gained residential status,
- ii) The application seeks to replace the existing caravan and outbuildings that have been on the site for many years and should therefore be considered permanent,
- iii) Although the site lies within the Green Belt, because the buildings have been on the site for so long, it should be considered previously developed land per the NPPF,
- iv) The proposed dwelling would only have a slightly larger footprint than the existing dwellings and would not compromise the openness of the site,
- v) The site has been significantly improved by the applicant through the years,
- vi) Although the proposed site is in a flood zone, it would be raised to ensure flood resilience and maintain flood storage capacity, and would not lead to any additional risk of flooding elsewhere,
- vii) The Officer's report confirms that the design of the property was acceptable and that it complies with the Plotlands Policy and Policy EN8, and
- viii) The development complies with parking and sustainability criteria.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- The site does not benefit from permanent residential use
- The caravan currently on the site is not considered permanent as it has wheels and a tow bar attached
- The Environment Agency have objected on flooding grounds as it is against policy to introduce additional households into a flood plain.
- Previous applications for this site have been refused

- The caravan and outbuildings currently on the site are not attractive
- Thames Meadow has never been flooded and the Residents Association have flood resilience plans in place
- Applicants have regenerated and enhanced the green nature of the site which has encouraged wildlife
- If the application had been submitted by a non-Council associated resident it would have been refused
- The site is not previously developed land
- The application site is green belt land and therefore should not be built on
- By consolidating all the small temporary buildings on the site into one, it would increase the openness of the site
- The development would not impact on neighbouring properties.

A recorded vote was requested

For the motion: Cllrs C. Bateson, J. Doran, S. Dunn, M. Gibson, T. Harman, H. Harvey, N. Islam, J. McIlroy, R. Smith-Ainsley, B. Spoor and J. Vinson

Against the motion: Councillor R. W. Sider BEM

Decision:

The application was **REFUSED**

63/21 Future Major Planning Applications

The Planning Development Manager presented a report outlining the major applications that may be brought before the Planning Committee for determination.

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

64/21 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.