

**Minutes of the Planning Committee
9 December 2025**

Present:

Councillor M. Gibson (Chair)
Councillor D.L. Geraci (Vice-Chair)

Councillors:

C. Bateson	M. Buck	P.N. Woodward
S.N. Beatty	D.C. Clarke	
M. Beecher	K.E. Rutherford	

Substitutions: Councillors S.A. Dunn

Apologies: Councillors T. Burrell, R. Chandler, K. Howkins, M.J. Lee and L. E. Nichols

In Attendance: Councillor Caplin

78/25 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2025 were approved as a correct record.

79/25 Disclosures of Interest Under the Member's Code of Conduct

There were none.

80/25 Declarations of interest under the Council's Planning Code

Councillors Gibson, Geraci, Bateson, Beatty, Beecher, Buck, Chandler, Rutherford and Woodward declared that they had received an email from the objector to Application 25/01171/HOU.

81/25 Planning application 25/01171/HOU - 14 Springfield Grove,

Sunbury-on-Thames. TW16 6NT

Description:

Erection of a part single-storey rear and part two-storey rear extension, following removal of existing single-storey extension.

Additional Information:

1. There is a typo in the Local Plan text, paragraph 1.7 should read February 2026, not 2025.
2. The first measurement in paragraph 7.10 should read 1.4m, not 1.3m.
1. The LPA acknowledge receipt of a letter sent by No. 16 to Committee Members.

Public Speaking:

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

1. The proposed extension would significantly and permanently affect their quality of life
2. Detrimental impact on the light level coming through the conservatory which would then impact on the light level within the kitchen
3. Overbearing impact of a full-width first floor structure towering over main living room
4. Loss of privacy
5. An acceptable compromise could be reached by reducing the first floor width by one metre

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

1. The extension is sympathetic in scale, form and appearance
2. The extension is in keeping with the character of the area
3. The depth of the proposed extension was reduced so that it matches No 12's first-floor extension
4. The height was also lowered so the eaves match the existing roofline
5. Officers advised that the proposed extension would not be seen as overbearing or dominant
6. Proposed extension would be less impactful on neighbouring properties than those that have been built at nos. 12 and 16
7. The Planning Officer has recommended the application for approval.

In accordance with the Council's procedure for speaking at meetings, Councillor Nichols spoke as Ward Councillor against the proposed development raising the following key points:

- 1.The proposal for the extension is a finely balanced one
- 2.Should a conservatory with a glass roof be considered the same as a brick building
- 3.The loss of light within the kitchen is unacceptable
- 4.It would have a detrimental effect on the objector's property

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- 1.A conservatory should still have the right to privacy and light
- 2.Is the breach a significant one
- 3.Is the first floor side wall made of material that blends in with existing brickwork
- 4.Extension has already been reduced by the applicant to help mitigate overlooking of the neighbouring properties
- 5.Good use of the house
- 6.The trajectory of the sun to demonstrate the light levels should be noted

Decision: The Committee **resolved** to approve the application subject to conditions as set out in Paragraph 8 of the report.

82/25 Planning Applications - Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)

The Committee considered a report that sought a decision to confirm the Article 4 Direction made on 05 March 2025 in respect of the Ashford Common, Ashford East, Ashford Town, Halliford and Sunbury West, Laleham and Shepperton Green, Riverside and Laleham, Shepperton Town, Staines South, Sunbury Common and Sunbury East Wards, having regard to the representations made.

Debate:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

1. Houses of Multiple Occupation are one of the biggest issues currently in the Borough
2. The Committee could approve an immediate Article 4 but the Council currently did not have enough evidence to present as to why this should be applied
3. Any Houses of Multiple Occupation over 6 residents would still require planning permission
4. If the Committee approved an immediate Article 4 it would likely be called in by the Secretary of State as the current evidence does not show that this is needed.
5. The preferable option would be to agree a non-immediate Article 4 and then in March 2026 the Council could request a Borough wide Article 4.

6. The making of an immediate Article 4 could result in the Council having to pay out significant compensation.

The Committee **resolved** to agree to confirm the non-immediate Article 4 Direction.

83/25 Major Planning Applications

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

The Committee **resolved** that the report of the Interim Planning Development Manager be received and noted.