

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
28 April 2021**

Present:

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

Councillors:

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

Apologies: Apologies were received from Councillor A.C. Harman and Councillor J. McIlroy

119/21 Minutes - 31 March 2021

The minutes of the meeting held on 31 March 2021 were approved as a correct record.

120/21 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

Councillors R.A. Smith Ainsley, R.W. Sider BEM, T. Lagden H. Harvey and R. Dunn reported that they had received correspondence in relation to application 20/01506/FUL, Sunbury Cross Ex-Services Association Club. Crossways, Sunbury, TW16 7BG but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind. Councillor B.Spoor had received a telephone call in respect of this application but also came to the meeting with an open mind.

Councillors H. Harvey and T. Lagden had received correspondence in relation to application 21/00134/FUL, 115 Feltham Hill Road, & Land at Rear of 113-127 Feltham Hill Road, Ashford but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillors R. Dunn, R.A. Smith-Ainsley, H. Harvey and T. Lagden had received correspondence in relation to application 20/00990/FUL, 59 Staines Road West, Sunbury-on-Thames, TW16 7AG but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind. Councillor B.Spoor had received a telephone call in respect of this application but also came to the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor H. Harvey advised that she had visited all three sites prior to the Committee meeting.

121/21 Planning application 20/01506/FUL - Sunbury Cross Ex-Services Association Club, Crossways, Sunbury, TW16 7BG

Description:

The demolition of the existing Sunbury Ex-Serviceman's Association Club and re-development of the site including the erection of three residential buildings of 4-storey, 6-storey and 9-storey comprising 69 flats with associated car-parking, cycle storage, landscaping and other associated works.

Reason for Refusal

The proposal is considered to constitute an overdevelopment of the site by virtue of excessive housing density, cramped layout, poor outlook for the ground floor flats, domination of car parking and hardstanding and inadequate space for landscaping. Furthermore, the applicant has failed to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that adequate car parking provision is provided on the site. The development will fail to make a positive contribution to the character of the area, will not create a strong sense of place and will provide a poor standard of amenity for future occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies EN1, H05 and CC3 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 and Section 12 (Achieving Well Designed Places) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Additional Information:

Late correspondence had been received from the applicant agreeing to pay a contribution of £140,000 to cover the cost of improving/upgrading the existing children's play area at the 'pocket park' adjoining Escot Road. However, in the absence of a payment or a completed legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the applicant had failed to comply with Policy CO3 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009.

As a consequence, the reason for refusal was to be amended and an additional reason added as follows:

Additional Reason for Refusal:

In the absence of a payment or a completed legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CO3 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 in relation to the provision of new on-site space or a financial contribution

towards new off-site provision or to improve existing sites to enhance their recreational value and capacity.

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, the Committee Manager read out a statement for the proposed development on behalf of Jay Patel from Pendleton & Assocs Ltd, the agent for the applicant, addressing the following areas of concern:

Overdevelopment and Layout

- Spelthorne's policy allows higher densities in central locations like Sunbury Cross
- Guidance advocates 340sqm of shared amenity space which is far exceeded at ground level and the three roof gardens
- There is no overshadowing of neighbouring properties
- Housing space standards are met
- Daylight and sunlight is satisfactory
- Ground level child play space is include and a financial contribution to upgrade Escot Road Park is agreed

Inadequate Car Parking

- Surrey County Council agree that the scheme meets its Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance
- Spelthorne's standards accept reduced parking in town centre locations
- A green Travel Plan is proposed including a car club enabling residents to access a car without owning one. The site is within a CPZ that will prevent overspill parking

Character of the Area

- The development will improve the character of the high-rise Sunbury local centre with high quality buildings set in landscaped grounds. The amount and heights of the buildings compare favourably with surrounding sites

Officers concurred that the following were satisfactory:

- Cycle parking
- Residential mix
- Air quality and noise
- Waste and recycling
- Inclusive access

Additionally:

- Public transport is available at Sunbury Cross
- No adverse biodiversity impact
- No objection from 12 statutory consultees
- 50% of the housing will be affordable

In response to this statement the Principal Planning Officer, advised the Committee that the site was not considered a town centre location, instead was deemed to be an edge of town site. He also advised that only some of the surrounding roads were subject to a restricted parking zone order.

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

- The development site is very close to the M3 flyover
- Noise levels would be highly intrusive
- Fixed windows with only trickle ventilation would cause problems in summer months
- High levels of pollution from the M3 could create health problems for residents

In response to Mr Parr's statement the Principal Planning Officer advised the Committee that the applicant had submitted an air and noise assessment and that the Environment Health Department gave no objections subject to mitigations.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- The application has a density of 218 dwellings per hectare which is significantly about the 40-75 per hectare for town centre developments
- Lack of greenery at ground level
- No strong sense of place due to the car parking and tarmac outside the blocks
- The amenity space and roof terraces exceed the minimum requirement
- Insufficient car parking spaces for number of units
- Lack of electric vehicle charging points
- Undesirable place to live
- Green credentials are not very satisfactory

Decision:

The application was **REFUSED**

122/21 Planning application 21/00134/FUL - 115 Feltham Hill Road, & Land at Rear of 113-127 Feltham Hill Road, Ashford

Description:

Proposed redevelopment of site for the erection of 5 no. residential units, following the demolition of existing buildings.

Additional Information:

The Planning Officer's recommendation to the Planning Committee was for the item to be deferred to enable the applicant to submit further information

following late correspondence received from the Surrey Wildlife Trust regarding bats, It was proposed to bring this application before the Planning Committee in the near future.

Decision:

The Committee agree by a consensus of decisions that this item was to be **DEFERRED**.

123/21 Planning application 20/00990/FUL - 59 Staines Road West, Sunbury-on-Thames, TW16 7AG

Description:

Proposed change of use of the upper floors to 8 No. residential flats including conversion of the existing first and second floors together with roof extension and rear extension, new bin store, bicycle store and parking.

Additional Information:

Three letters of objection had been received that were sent to the Planning Committee Members and one to the planners after the Committee updates were circulated from a resident objecting on the following grounds:

- Loss of privacy
- Previous planning history
- Concerns over contact in respect of public speaking
- The building is not in keeping with the area
- Loss of light
- Constitutes an overdevelopment
- Will set a precedent for the location

Public Speaking:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Laura Dootson, Agent for the applicant spoke for the proposed development raising the following key points:

- The application is a modest proposal
- Proposal is to only convert and extend the upper floors to make 8 good size flat
- The ground floor will remain commercial space
- The application is in line with other properties along the Parade
- The scheme provides larger quality flats with private amenity space
- Car parking is provided for each flat
- A secure bike store is provided
- There is dense screening to the boundary

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- The design of the proposed building fits in with the surrounding buildings

- There will be no loss of light to neighbouring buildings
- Floor space for each flat is more than adequate
- Electric Vehicle Points in two car park spaces, would like to see more and would want this to be included as an informative if the application is agreed
- Would like the proposed screens to side of balconies to be extended to the back of the terraces so that neighbouring properties are not overlooked

The Committee agreed by consensus that, subject to approval, an additional informative should be added as follows:

In relation to condition 4, the applicant is requested to provide all proposed parking spaces in relation to this planning permission with power supply (though feeder pillar or equivalent) to provide additional fast charge sockets.

Decision:

The application was **APPROVED**

124/21 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.

125/21 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.