

**Minutes of the Planning Committee  
1 June 2016**

**Present:**

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

Councillors:

R.O. Barratt	M.P.C. Francis	O. Rybinski
I.J. Beardsmore	N.J. Gething	R.W. Sider BEM
J.R. Boughtflower	A.T. Jones	
S.M. Doran	D. Patel	

**Apologies:** Apologies were received from Councillor S.J. Burkmar and Councillor A.C. Harman

**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 T. Evans	Land To The West Of 26 And 28 Peregrine Road, And 181 Nursery Road, (Formerly 187 Nursery Road), Sunbury
Councillor M.M. Attewell	Observed proceedings
Councillor I.T.E. Harvey	Observed proceedings

**138/16 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 May 2016 were approved as a correct record.

**139/16 Disclosures of Interest**

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

Councillor I.J. Beardsmore declared a conflict of interest in relation to application 16/00616/SCC – Waste Transfer Station, Charlton Lane Shepperton, TW17 8QA on the basis that he was a former member of the Surrey County Council Planning and Regulatory Committee which determined such items. He stated that he would not debate or vote on the item and would leave the Council Chamber for the duration of the item.

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

Councillors R.O. Barratt, D. Patel, O. Rybinski and R.W. Sider BEM reported that they had received correspondence in relation to applications 16/00179/RMA - Former Majestic House, High Street, Staines-upon-Thames and 16/00560/FUL - Land To The West Of 26, And 28 Peregrine Road, And 181 Nursery Road (Formerly 187 Nursery Road), Sunbury but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillors R.A. Smith-Ainsley and M.P.C. Francis reported that they had received correspondence in relation to applications 16/00179/RMA - Former Majestic House, High Street, Staines-upon-Thames, 16/00196/FUL - Land At Rear, Imtech House, 33 - 35 Woodthorpe Road And Part Of 37 Woodthorpe Road, Ashford, TW15 2RP, 15/01603/FUL - 111 High Street, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 4PQ, and 16/00560/FUL - Land To The West Of 26, And 28 Peregrine Road, And 181 Nursery Road (Formerly 187 Nursery Road), Sunbury but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor H.A. Thomson reported that he had received correspondence in relation to applications 16/00179/RMA - Former Majestic House, High Street, Staines-upon-Thames, 15/01603/FUL - 111 High Street, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 4PQ, and 16/00560/FUL - Land To The West Of 26, And 28 Peregrine Road, And 181 Nursery Road (Formerly 187 Nursery Road), Sunbury but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor S.M. Doran reported that she had received correspondence in relation to applications 16/00179/RMA - Former Majestic House, High Street, Staines-upon-Thames, 16/00196/FUL - Land At Rear, Imtech House, 33 - 35 Woodthorpe Road And Part Of 37 Woodthorpe Road, Ashford, TW15 2RP and 15/01603/FUL - 111 High Street, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 4PQ, but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillor N.J. Gething reported that he had received correspondence in relation to applications 16/00179/RMA - Former Majestic House, High Street, Staines-upon-Thames, 16/00196/FUL - Land At Rear, Imtech House, 33 - 35 Woodthorpe Road And Part Of 37 Woodthorpe Road, Ashford, TW15 2RP and 16/00560/FUL - Land To The West Of 26, And 28 Peregrine Road, And 181 Nursery Road (Formerly 187 Nursery Road), Sunbury but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

Councillors I.J. Beardsmore and A.T. Jones reported that had received correspondence in relation to application 16/00560/FUL - Land To The West Of 26, And 28 Peregrine Road, And 181 Nursery Road (Formerly 187 Nursery Road), Sunbury but had maintained an impartial role, had not expressed any views and had kept an open mind.

**140/16 16/00179/RMA - Former Majestic House, High Street, Staines-upon-Thames**

**Description:**

Reserved Matters application (in respect of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) pursuant to outline planning permission granted under 09/00566/OUT and as amended under 15/00738/RVC, 15/00739/RVC, 15/00753/RVC, 15/00754/RVC, 15/00755/RVC and 15/00756/RVC for the development of the site to provide up to 39,750sqm of floor space to comprise residential (Class C3), office (Class B1a), Class C1, Class D2, Class A1, Class A2, Class A3, Class A4 and Class A5 as well as the provision of a new link road and pedestrian routes, car and cycle parking, highways and transport facilities, public open space, landscaping and other associated works. Discharge of condition no. 12 on Archaeology pursuant to outline planning permission 09/00566/OUT.

**Additional Information:**

The Assistant Head of Planning explained to the Committee that further to paragraphs 9.28 – 9.42 dealing with amenity space, the following table attached to the Committee update papers summarised the position:

<b><u>Public Open Space</u></b>		<b>1128 m<sup>2</sup></b>
<b><u>Private Amenity Space</u></b>		
<u>Policy Requirement</u>	<b>1475 m<sup>2</sup></b> (For 260 residential units)	
<u>Proposed (Balconies &amp; Terraces)</u>		<b>2375 m<sup>2</sup></b>
<u>Proposed (Communal Gardens)</u>		<b>763 m<sup>2</sup></b> 525 m <sup>2</sup> - 4 <sup>th</sup> floor 238 m <sup>2</sup> - 9 <sup>th</sup> floor (excluding green roofs)
<u>Total Private Amenity Space</u>		<b>3138 m<sup>2</sup></b>

**Item 4(a) Charter Sq. (formerly known as Majestic House) Amenity Space**

In addition, further to paragraph 9.80 in the committee report, the query regarding the management of the refuse stores on collection remained outstanding. As a result, a new condition was recommended to require further details to be submitted and approved by the Council to ensure that a

large number of refuse bins were not left obstructing the pavement. The wording of the condition was as follows:

1. Before the occupation of the first residential unit hereby permitted, full details regarding how all of the refuse stores are to be manoeuvred and stored on collection day shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The servicing of the residential part of the development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details and shall remain in operation for as long as the development is occupied.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the adjoining residential occupiers.

Furthermore in order to prevent overlooking and the potential for loss of privacy for future residents, it is considered necessary to add a condition requiring the submission of full details (including locations) of privacy screens to be installed between neighbouring residential units.

2. Before the occupation of the first residential unit hereby permitted, full details (including locations) of privacy screens to be installed between neighbouring residential units shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The construction of the residential part of the development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details and the privacy screens shall remain in situ for as long as the development is occupied.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the adjoining residential occupiers.

**Public Speaking:**

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at committee meetings, Jackie Wand-Tetley spoke against the proposed development and raised the following key points:

- Immense scale
- Excessive size and bulk
- Out of scale with surroundings
- Overdevelopment
- Design is unimaginative, ugly
- Lack of amenity space
- Distance to childrens' play area too far
- Inadequate public open space
- Air Quality concerns

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at committee meetings, Marlon Deam spoke for the proposed development and raised the following key points:

- Reduced floor-space compared with approved outline scheme
- Scheme discussed extensively with planning officers in pre-application meetings
- High quality design, complies with policy EN1

- Appropriate amount of open space provided
- Increased permeability to public realm
- Principles already established with outline scheme.

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Large buildings but follows outline approval
- Design is subjective
- Could provide larger development
- No affordable housing provided
- Proposed play area is too far away
- Open space management query

**Decision:**

The application was **approved** as set out in the report of the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy subject to the following additional conditions:

1. Before the occupation of the first residential unit hereby permitted, full details regarding how all of the refuse stores are to be maneuvered and stored on collection day shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The servicing of the residential part of the development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details and shall remain in operation for as long as the development is occupied.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the adjoining residential occupiers.

2. Before the occupation of the first residential unit hereby permitted, full details (including locations) of privacy screens to be installed between neighbouring residential units shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The construction of the residential part of the development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details and the privacy screens shall remain in situ for as long as the development is occupied.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the adjoining residential occupiers.

**141/16 16/00196/FUL - Land At Rear Of Imtech House, 33 - 35  
Woodthorpe Road And Part Of 37 Woodthorpe Road Ashford,  
TW15 2RP**

**Description:**

Demolition of existing commercial buildings and erection of a part 3- storey, part 4-storey residential development comprising 26 flats (7 no. 1-bed, 17 no. 2-bed and 2 no. 3-bed) together with associated parking and amenity space. Reconfiguration of existing office car park and installation of car stackers.

**Additional Information:**

The Assistant Head of Planning reported that two late letters of representation had been received and that the issues raised were covered in the Committee report.

In addition, amended plans had been received showing changes to the balconies/roof terrace at Units A5, A9 and A13 to improve the relationship with neighbouring properties.

Furthermore a late consultation response had been received from the Surrey County Council Local Lead Flood Authority (County Sustainable Drainage Officer) raising no objection, subject to the following conditions.

Conditions

Condition 2 is to be amended as follows:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and drawings:

1504 PL(2-)01 Rev. C; / 02 Rev. B; /03 Rev. B; /10 Rev. D; /11 Rev. B; /12; /13; /15 Rev. C; /19; /23; /26; /27; /28; /29 received 10 February 2016.

Amended plans 1504 PL(2-)16 Rev. G; /18 Rev. F; /24 Rev. D; /25 Rev. D received 20 May 2016

Amended plans 1504 PL(2-)21 Rev. F received 26 May 2016

Reason:- For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning

**Additional conditions (32 and 33)** to be added in relation to controlling the use of part of the roof terrace of Unit A13 and privacy screens:

Condition 32

The proposed 4<sup>th</sup> floor outdoor terrace portion to the south of the 2 no. privacy screens, as shown on approved drawing 1504 PL(2-)18 Rev. F, shall not be used as a sitting/standing out area for the associated residential Unit A13 and shall only be used for maintenance purposes.

Reason:- To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residential properties.

Condition 33

Prior to the occupation of the development, details of the proposed privacy screens to be installed on the roof terrace of Unit A13 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The privacy screens shall be installed prior to the occupation of Unit A13 in accordance with the agreed details and thereafter maintained.

Reason:- To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residential properties.

**Amended and Additional Conditions from Surrey County Council Local Lead Flood Authority:**

Amended Conditions

Condition 22 – To be replaced with the following condition

Prior to construction of the development hereby approved the following drawings need to be supplied to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

- (i) A drainage layout detailing the exact location of SUDs elements, including finished floor levels
- (ii) A fully labelled network diagram of proposed sewer size, locations, manhole details etc.) of every element of the proposed drainage system (pipes, storage areas, etc.) and how these relate to submitted calculations.
- (iii) Separate, more detailed engineering plans (including levels, detail drawings, long sections and cross sections etc.) will be needed for each of the SuDS and critical drainage elements, including the details of the methods of flow control.

Reason: - To ensure that the design fully meets the requirements of the national SuDS technical standards.

Condition 23 – To be amended

Before the commencement of the construction of the development hereby approved details of how the Sustainable Drainage System will cater for system failure or exceedance events, both on and offsite, must be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposal has fully considered flood events exceeding design capacity.

Condition 24 – To be amended

Prior to construction of the development, details of the proposed maintenance regimes for each of the Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) elements must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the drainage system is maintained throughout its life time to an acceptable standard.

Condition 25 – To be amended

Before the commencement of the construction of the development hereby approved, details of how the Sustainable Drainage System will be protected and maintained during the construction of the development shall be submitted

to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in strict accordance with those approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the construction works do not compromise the functioning of the agreed Sustainable Drainage System.

#### Condition 26 – To be amended

Prior to occupation, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the Sustainable Urban Drainage System has been constructed as per the agreed scheme.

Reason: To ensure the Sustainable Drainage System is built to the approved designs.

#### **New Conditions**

##### Condition 34

Prior to the commencement of the construction details of run off rates and volume calculations for the 1 in 1 year, 1 in 30 year and 1 in 100 year + 30% Climate Change storm events shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the system can cater for the above storm events as per the technical standards

##### Condition 35

Before the commencement of construction details to demonstrate that development is permitted to connect into the public sewer and agreement of the discharge rate into the surface water system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the final drainage design mitigates flood risk on or off site.

#### **Public Speaking:**

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at committee meetings, Kay Frier spoke against the proposed development and raised the following key points:

- Piling concerns
- Design out of keeping with area
- Overshadowing
- Overlooking
- Increased traffic



- Increased noise, particularly from the car stacker
- Parking shortfall and no provision for visitors
- Dense, scheme should be reduced in size

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at committee meetings, Muireann Murphy spoke for the proposed development and raised the following key points

- Discussed with officer in pre-application meeting
- Privacy is acceptable
- Shadow study demonstrates satisfactory light impact
- Character of area is mixed; design is acceptable
- Is a reduction from original scheme of 37 flats
- Highway issues are acceptable
- 1 parking space per unit provided in a sustainable location
- Will provide 26 new homes

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Good use of site
- Privacy concerns addressed
- Query over car stackers
- No affordable housing provided, possibly help to buy housing
- Overdevelopment
- Inadequate car parking

**Decision:**

The application was **approved** as set out in the report of the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy subject to the following amended and additional conditions:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and drawings:

1504 PL(2-)01 Rev. C; / 02 Rev. B; /03 Rev. B; /10 Rev. D; /11 Rev. B; /12; /13; /15 Rev. C; /19; /23; /26; /27; /28; /29 received 10 February 2016.

Amended plans 1504 PL(2-)16 Rev. G; /18 Rev. F; /24 Rev. D; /25 Rev. D received 20 May 2016

Amended plans 1504 PL(2-)21 Rev. F received 26 May 2016

Reason:- For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning

**Additional conditions (32 and 33)** to be added in relation to controlling the use of part of the roof terrace of Unit A13 and privacy screens:

Condition 32

The proposed 4<sup>th</sup> floor outdoor terrace portion to the south of the 2 no. privacy screens, as shown on approved drawing 1504 PL(2-)18 Rev. F, shall not be used as a sitting/standing out area for the associated residential Unit A13 and shall only be used for maintenance purposes.

Reason:- To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residential properties.

Condition 33

Prior to the occupation of the development, details of the proposed privacy screens to be installed on the roof terrace of Unit A13 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The privacy screens shall be installed prior to the occupation of Unit A13 in accordance with the agreed details and thereafter maintained.

Reason:- To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residential properties.

**Amended and Additional Conditions from Surrey County Council Local Lead Flood Authority:**

Amended Conditions

Condition 22 – To be replaced with the following condition

Prior to construction of the development hereby approved the following drawings need to be supplied to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

- (i) A drainage layout detailing the exact location of SUDs elements, including finished floor levels
- (ii) A fully labelled network diagram of proposed sewer size, locations, manhole details etc.) of every element of the proposed drainage system (pipes, storage areas, etc.) and how these relate to submitted calculations.
- (iii) Separate, more detailed engineering plans (including levels, detail drawings, long sections and cross sections etc.) will be needed for each of the SuDS and critical drainage elements, including the details of the methods of flow control.

Reason: - To ensure that the design fully meets the requirements of the national SuDS technical standards.

Condition 23 – To be amended

Before the commencement of the construction of the development hereby approved details of how the Sustainable Drainage System will cater for system failure or exceedance events, both on and offsite, must be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposal has fully considered flood events exceeding design capacity.

Condition 24 – To be amended

Prior to construction of the development, details of the proposed maintenance regimes for each of the Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) elements must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the drainage system is maintained throughout its life time to an acceptable standard.

Condition 25 – To be amended

Before the commencement of the construction of the development hereby approved, details of how the Sustainable Drainage System will be protected and maintained during the construction of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in strict accordance with those approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the construction works do not compromise the functioning of the agreed Sustainable Drainage System.

Condition 26 – To be amended

Prior to occupation, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the Sustainable Urban Drainage System has been constructed as per the agreed scheme.

Reason: To ensure the Sustainable Drainage System is built to the approved designs.

**New Conditions**

Condition 34

Prior to the commencement of the construction details of run off rates and volume calculations for the 1 in 1 year, 1 in 30 year and 1 in 100 year + 30% Climate Change storm events shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the system can cater for the above storm events as per the technical standards

Condition 35

Before the commencement of construction details to demonstrate that development is permitted to connect into the public sewer and agreement of the discharge rate into the surface water system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the final drainage design mitigates flood risk on or off site.

**142/16 15/01603/FUL - 111 High Street, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 4PQ**

**Description:**

Erection of extensions to form three storey building providing 5 no. two bed and 4 no. one bed flats above existing shops.

**Additional Information:**

The Assistant Head of Planning notified the Committee of amendments to the Planning Committee report as follows:

The executive summary second paragraph and paragraph 3.2 should read '5 no. two bed flats and 4 no. one bed flats'

Paragraph 7.10 to read 'The primary outlook from the proposed flats would be from the front and the rear of the development'.

Consultation response received from the County Highway Authority raising no objection subject to the following condition:

No development shall commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan, to include details of:

- (a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
- (b) loading and unloading of plant and materials
- (c) storage of plant and materials
- (d) provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones
- (h) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development.

Reason: The condition above is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users, and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and policy CC2 of Spelthorne Borough Council's Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document February 2009.

**Public Speaking:**

There was no public speaking.

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Visual improvement
- Acceptable design
- Car parking concerns, not in TfL Oyster Card area

**Decision:**

The application was **approved** as set out in the report of the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy subject to the following additional condition:

No development shall commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan, to include details of:

- a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
- b) loading and unloading of plant and materials
- c) storage of plant and materials
- d) provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones
  
- h) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development.

Reason: The condition above is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety, nor cause inconvenience to other highway users, and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and policy CC2 of Spelthorne Borough Council's Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document February 2009.

**143/16 16/00560/FUL - Land To The West Of 26 And 28 Peregrine Road, And 181 Nursery Road, (Formerly 187 Nursery Road), Sunbury**

**Description:**

Erection of a detached two-storey building for the purposes of special needs housing (Use Class C2) together with associated entrance gates, access, parking and landscaping.

As shown on plan nos.' L2321/03; / 04A; 07G; /10A; /11A; /13; /14A; /16 and L1774/LPA received 31 March 2016.

**Additional Information:**

The Assistant Head of Planning informed the Committee of the following amendments to the Planning History on page 93 of the report:

SP/90/543

Detached two-storey dwelling and double garage (Outline)

Approved 12/12/1990

93/0519/DET

Approval of details pursuant to outline planning permission SP/90/543 dated 12<sup>th</sup> December 1990 for the erection of a detached two storey dwelling and double garage.

Approved 10/11/1993

93/00330/OUT

Two detached dwellings each with single garages and car ports and a parking space.

Refused 21/07/1993 (on Green Belt grounds).

Furthermore the first sentence of paragraph 2.1 of the Planning Committee report needed to be updated. Planning permission was originally granted in 1990 (the approved house and garage was still 215 sq. m floorspace).

Amended site plan with tree protection fencing details has been received. The Tree Officer has raised no objection to this plan but has requested the proposed site layout plan (L2321/07G) to be superseded. The applicant has agreed to this.

The drawing numbers listed on Page 1 of the committee report is to be amended as follows:-

As shown on plan nos.' L2321/03; / 04A; /10A; /11A; /13; /14A; /16 and L1774/LPA received 31 March 2016, and amended plan no. DPA-69400-01 Rev. B received 27 May 2016.

### **Public Speaking:**

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at committee meetings, Sati Panesar spoke for the proposed development and raised the following key points:

- Overwhelming need for the facility, one built at School Walk in Sunbury
- Need overrides marginal harm to the Green Belt
- Site is brownfield land
- Planning permission not required for six people living together and this is for two more.
- Complies with policy H04 which required special housing needs
- Issues relating to design, trees amenity space all acceptable
- No objections from statutory consultees or neighbours
- Very special circumstances exist
- Similar scheme approved in Green Belt in Windlesham due to very special circumstances

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at committee meetings, Councillor Evans spoke as Ward Councillor for the proposed development and raised the following key points:

- There was a need for the facility
- Close to existing roads
- Appropriate use and provides a very special circumstance
- Would not relax Green Belt policy but very special circumstances exist
- Permission could be conditioned
- No precedent would be made which would weaken the greenbelt policy

### **Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Much larger than approved scheme
- Not visible
- House already approved on Green Belt
- Is a “hairline” decision
- Developments are not located in urban area as not viable
- Need exists but is it exceptional need?
- Historically an agricultural use on site, could build a large barn (Officer note: this is not the case)
- Increased size of plot, loss of Green Belt
- No alternative site search undertaken

**Decision:**

The application was **refused** as set out in the report of the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy for the following reason:

1. The proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt for which no very special circumstances have been demonstrated including no evidence why the facility cannot be provided in the urban area. It will result in the site having a more urban character, will diminish the openness and harm the visual amenities of the Green Belt, and conflict with three of the five purposes of Green Belts. It is therefore contrary to Policy GB1 of the Spelthorne Borough Local Plan 2001 and Section 9 (Protecting Green Belt Land) of the Government's National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

**144/16 16/00616/SCC - Waste Transfer Station, Charlton Lane, Shepperton, TW17 8QA**

In accordance with Standing Order 28.1, it was moved by Councillor H.A. Thomson and seconded by Councillor N. Gething for the Suspension of Standing Orders that the Committee, having sat continuously for three hours, should continue to conclude the remaining business.

**Resolved** that the Committee continue to sit to complete the business on the agenda.

**Description:**

Surrey County Council consultation for the access, loading and exit of vehicles with waste for export from the existing Recyclables Bulking Facility, by SITA, between the hours of 6pm and 8pm (to extend the use of the site for an additional two hours) Monday to Saturday until 31 December 2017.

**Additional Information:**

The Assistant Head of Planning informed the Committee that one late letter of representation had been received which raised the following issues:

- The applicant has not informed the County of its change of name and publishing a notice about a company using its old name is of 'no effect'.
- Letters were not sent out to people who objected to the original application, unlike the information set out in Surrey's Statement of Community involvement, therefore is not surprised that nobody has written in to object.

**Public Speaking:**

There was none.

**Debate:**

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Poor neighbour notification
- One third of lorries will be using the site between 6pm and 8pm
- More stringent conditions required
- Impact on residential amenity
- Should be on a trial basis of 3/6 months
- Concern over lorries parking in the streets around the Borough where there are no controls
- It is obvious that these extra hours would have been needed and this should have been recognised when the original planning application was considered.

**Decision:**

That Surrey County Council be advised that this authority raises no objection in principle to the proposal, subject to the following:

- A condition be imposed restricting the number of HGVs to a maximum of 3 per hour;
- A condition be imposed restricting the additional hours to a period of 18 months or whenever the gasification building is commissioned, whichever is the sooner; and
- The applicant makes all reasonable efforts to minimise operations during the amended hours.

**145/16 Standard 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 Head of Planning and Housing Strategy.

**Resolved** that the report of the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy be received and noted.