

MINUTES
OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

held on 3 June 2020
Present:

Cllr G G Chrystie (Chairman)
Cllr S Ashall (Vice-Chair)

Cllr T Aziz	Cllr L S Lyons
Cllr A J Boote	Cllr N Martin
Cllr G W Elson	Cllr L M N Morales
Cllr S Hussain	

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 12 May 2020 be approved and signed as a true and correct record.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor S Hussain declared a non-pecuniary interest in minute item 6a. 2020/0007 Spindleberry, 6 Friars Rise, Woking arising from him frequently visiting the neighbouring property which was owned by his friend. The interest was such that speaking and voting were permissible.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of Urgent Business.

5. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT APPEALS

The Committee received a report on the planning appeals lodged and the appeal decisions.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee determined the following applications subject to the conditions, informatives, reasons for refusal or authorisation of enforcement action which appear in the published report to the Committee or as detailed in these minutes.

6a. 2020/0007 Spindleberry, 6 Friars Rise, Woking

The Committee considered an application to demolish the existing dwelling's garage and first floor side extension and erect a two-storey front extension and single-storey rear extension leading onto a proposed rear patio with stairs down into its rear garden. The roof form was proposed to be altered to a flat roof with some accommodation in it. The application also proposed to re-clad the dwelling with white render, timber and grey brick. Fenestration alterations were also proposed including all windows to have black aluminium frames. The altered dwelling would result in the uplift of an additional bedroom, giving it five bedrooms.

The plot was proposed to be subdivided and a new two-storey five-bedroom flat roofed dwelling was proposed to the side of the altered existing dwelling. It would also have a rear patio with stairs down into its rear garden as well as an exterior material palette of white render, timber and grey brick. It was proposed to have a basement garage.

The Planning Officer confirmed no further written representations had been received since the report was published. The details of representations received were detailed in the report.

Councillor L Lyons, Ward Councillor, spoke in objection to the application and advised the Committee a number of people had contacted him with concerns regarding the design and size of the building particularly relating to privacy issues in regards to the elevated ground levels. Councillor L Lyons also commented that he did not think the design was in keeping with the neighbouring properties.

Cllr Lyons requested that, if the application was approved, there be a condition preventing the flat roof areas being converted for use as balconies.

Cllr L Lyons proposed and it was duly seconded by Cllr S Hussain that the application should be refused based on size, mass, bulk and design not in keeping with neighbouring properties, and contrary to CS21.

A number of Members supported the concerns that Councillor L Lyons had raised. A Member of the Committee commented that the application was an innovative design and asked that the Planning Officer clarify whether there would be significant overlooking issues. The Planning Officer confirmed that if the application was approved there would be a Condition regarding the first floor side windows and above, where it was required for them to be obscurely glazed and non-opening. Also given the elevation of the site and proposal for an outside patio area on both properties, there would be a condition regarding privacy screens to prevent overlooking to the two properties proposed and to numbers 5 & 7 Friars Rise. The Planning Officer confirmed that they were satisfied that there would not be any unacceptable overlooking issues towards neighbours.

A number of Members agreed that it was an innovative design but thought the plot required something more modest and in keeping with existing buildings.

In accordance with Standing Order 22.2, the Chairman deemed that a division should be taken on the motion above. The votes for and against refusal of the application were recorded as follows.

In favour: Cllrs S Ashall, T Aziz, A J Boote, G Elson, S Hussain, L Lyons and N Martin.

TOTAL: 7

Against: None

TOTAL: 0

Present but not voting: Cllrs G Chrystie (Chairman) and L Morales.

TOTAL: 2

The application was therefore refused.

RESOLVED that planning permission be refused for the reasons detailed in these minutes.

6b. 2020/0304 Former Ian Allen Motors, 63 - 65 High Street and Copthorne, Priors Croft, Old Woking, Woking, Surrey, GU22 9LN

[NOTE: The Planning Officer provided the members of the Committee with an update on the bat issue and advised that the applicants Ecologist had confirmed that the final bat surveys of the existing dwelling to be demolished had been undertaken, spread over two dates (1 and 2 June 2020); the results showed no bat roosts were identified and there was a low level of bat activity in the area.]

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a 48 unit 'Independent Living' extra care housing scheme in a building ranging between 1 and 4 storeys in height (plus rooftop plant enclosures), comprising 45 x one-bedroom units and 3 x two-bedroom units, with communal kitchen, living room, dining room and salon facilities, mobility scooter charging ports, staff break out areas and offices, and associated bin storage, access, 25 x parking spaces and landscaping. Associated demolition of dwelling at Copthorne, Priors Croft.

The Committee heard from the Planning Officer that the previous reason for the prior refusal of the scheme had been successfully overcome.

Councillor L Morales, Ward Councillor, thought that the applicant had worked hard to come back with an acceptable application. Councillor L Morales welcomed the changes to parking, additional obligation requiring future residents to first be assessed, and approved by, the Extra Care Panel and commented that this was a much needed facility in the area.

The majority of the Committee were happy that the previous reason for refusal had been overcome.

RESOLVED that authority be delegated to the Development Manager (or their authorised deputy) to Grant planning permission subject to:

- (i) Submission of bat survey work confirming an absence of bat roosts from the existing building to be demolished, or any bat roosting compensation or mitigation measures (if required) being secured via planning condition or Undertaking of the Chief Executive of Woking Borough Council;
- (ii) Planning conditions set out in the report; and
- (iii) Undertaking of the Chief Executive of Woking Borough Council to secure:
 - SAMM (TBH SPA) contribution of £25,908;
 - 100% social rented housing(i.e. x48 units);
 - Future residents to first be assessed, and approved by, the Extra Care Panel as requiring this type of accommodation, environment and support. Approved residents may reside together with their spouse, partner or companion as appropriate; and
 - Any bat roosting compensation or mitigation measures (if required following survey work of building to be demolished).

6c. 2018/1169 29 Eve Road, Woking

The Committee considered an application for the change of use and subdivision of the existing building (A1, A2 and ancillary office use) to form 8x self-contained flats (7x one bed and 1x studio) and erection of a second floor roof extension, two storey rear extension and first floor rear extension following demolition of parts of existing building. The proposal included the formation of a roof terrace, balconies and new window and door openings, alterations to external finishes and associated bin storage, landscaping and cycle storage.

The Committee heard from the Planning Officer that the previous reasons for the prior refusal of scheme had not been overcome and that this was considered an unacceptable form of development. This was in regard to the poor standard of accommodation, overbearing effect to neighbours/ loss of light, height and massing with a detrimental impact on the local area, unacceptable flood risk, the development did not reflect local need made up solely of one bedroom units, the loss of commercial units and the lack of a legal agreement to secure a SAMM contribution.

Councillor T Aziz, Ward Councillor, spoke in support of the application and commented that he thought that the applicant had overcome the previous reasons for refusal and disagreed with the Planning Officer's conclusion of the application.

The Planning Officer offered clarification on the points of the application that they deemed unacceptable. The Planning Officer highlighted the particularly small obscured and possibly sealed windows in at least two of the bedrooms in the development, these were not conventional windows and considered an extremely poor standard of accommodation. Regarding the flood risk the Planning Officer advised that the Council's own Drainage and Flood Risk Engineer had been heavily involved with the application and did not consider the mitigating proposals to be sufficient. Regarding the character, Eve Road was characterised with 2 storey dwellings and the bulk and massing would be unacceptable. The applicant had not provided any additional information regarding the loss of the existing commercial space or the view that one bedroom apartments did not reflect local need; therefore had not addressed or overcome the previous reasons for refusal.

Councillor T Aziz proposed and it was duly seconded by Councillor A Boote, that the application be approved on the grounds that the previous reasons for refusal had been overcome by the applicant and that it was an acceptable form of development.

Thomas James, Development Manager, reminded the Committee that this application had been refused by the Planning Committee in 2016 and that in the Planning Officer's opinion the application before them tonight was of more harm than the 2016 application and had not overcome the reasons for refusal. The Development Manager advised Members that they must consider the application that was in front of them and not propose amendments that would overcome any of the issues. The reasons for refusal were strong and defensible.

Some Members of the Committee did not consider the sole mix of one-bedroom apartments to be an issue and considered that there was a need for these in the area and that a number of other applications had been approved made up of a similar mix. A number of Committee Members did consider the flood risk to be a major issue and agreed that the Committee should accept the expert advice of the Council's Drainage and Flood Risk Engineer.

In accordance with Standing Order 22.2, the Chairman deemed that a division should be taken on the motion above. The votes for and against approval of the application were recorded as follows.

In favour: Cllrs T Aziz, A J Boote and S Hussain.

TOTAL: 3

Against: Cllrs S Ashall, G Elson, L Lyons, N Martin and L Morales.

TOTAL: 5

Present but not voting: Cllrs G Chrystie (Chairman).

TOTAL: 1

The application was therefore not approved.

The Committee then agreed that the application should be refused, as recommended by the Planning Officer.

Councillor T Aziz asked that his opposition to refusal be recorded in the minutes.

RESOLVED that planning permission be refused.

6d. 2020/0135 Belfairs, Pond Road, Woking

[NOTE: The Planning Officer advised the Committee that two additional letters of objection had been received which mainly reiterated the comments already summarised within the representations section of the report.]

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a pair of semi-detached dwellings and a detached garage together with alterations to vehicular access and parking arrangements following demolition of an existing bungalow and garage. (Resubmission of PLAN/2019/0292)

Councillor S Ashall, Ward Councillor, expressed his disappointment that this application was before the Committee again. Although the appeal was dismissed, the Planning Inspector had upheld a number of points, mainly those that related to the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Plan. Councillor S Ashall felt that refusal by the Planning Committee last year was the correct decision, but following the judgment by the Planning Inspector it would be considered unreasonable for the Committee to now refuse the application. Councillor S Ashall felt that this application would fundamentally change the character of the area and would set a precedent for the future.

Councillor S Ashall asked for a named vote on the recommendation to approve the application.

In accordance with Standing Order 22.2, the Chairman deemed that a division should be taken on the recommendation to approve. The votes for and against approval of the application were recorded as follows.

In favour: Cllrs T Aziz, A J Boote, G Elson, S Hussain, L Lyons, N Martin and L Morales.

TOTAL: 7

Against: None.

TOTAL: 0

Present but not voting: Cllrs S Ashall and G Chrystie (Chairman).

TOTAL: 2

The application was therefore approved.

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions and S106 Legal Agreement.

6e. 2020/0024 16 Lovelace Drive, Pyrford, Woking

[NOTE 1: The Planning Officer advised the Committee that one additional letter of objection had been received from a neighbouring property on Lovelace Drive, which mainly reiterated the comments already summarised within the representations section of the report. One material issue raised was in regard to the impact of the first floor side elevation on the neighbouring property.]

[NOTE 2: An error was flagged up in the report under paragraph 21, which should have read 'Furthermore, it is apparent that the impact on the neighbouring dwelling at N. 19 Lovelace Drive would **not** be significant considering the substantially completed extension on this dwelling addressed in the main body of the report.']

The Committee considered an application that sought permission to erect a replacement detached 3-bedroom two storey dwelling following removal of the existing bungalow on Lovelace Drive.

Councillor G Elson, Ward Councillor, had received a number of representations from residents regarding the height, bulk, position and massing of the application, which appeared to have not overcome the previous reasons for refusal.

Councillor G Elson proposed and it was duly seconded by Councillor S Ashall that the application be refused on the ground that it was contrary to CS21

In accordance with Standing Order 22.2, the Chairman deemed that a division should be taken on the motion above. The votes for and against refusal of the application were recorded as follows.

In favour: Cllrs S Ashall and G Elson.

TOTAL: 2

Against: Cllr S T Aziz, A J Boote, S Hussain, L Lyons, N Martin and L Morales.

TOTAL: 6

Present but not voting: Cllrs G Chrystie (Chairman).

TOTAL: 1

The application was therefore not refused.

The Committee then agreed that the application should be approved, as recommended by the Planning Officer.

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions and S106 Legal Agreement.

6f. 2020/0036 164 Goldsworth Road, Woking

The Committee considered an application for a first floor extension and two storey rear extension to facilitate change of use from residential bungalow into 4No flats (1 x two-bedroom and 3 x One-bedroom) together with the proposed widening and repositioning of the existing vehicular crossover.

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions and S106 Legal Agreement.

6g. 2020/0180 109 High Street, Horsell, Woking

[NOTE: An error on the presentation slides was flagged up on page 265 of the report. The title on the slide should read '109 High Street, Horsell' rather than '109 High Street, Old Woking'.]

The Committee considered an application for the erection of an ancillary storage unit to the A1 unit following the demolition of 4 garages.

Some Members raised concern regarding the wording of condition 4 which would restrict the use of the ancillary storage unit to 'No.109 High Street, Horsell' and could not be used by other units i.e. leasing to neighbouring units. Thomas James, Development Manager, confirmed that this was the case.

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions.

6h. 2020/0038 59 Connaught Road, Woking

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a detached garage/workshop outbuilding in the rear garden. It would have a depth of 10.75m, width of 6.74m and pitched roof with additional accommodation in the roof space for home office use and overall height of 5.5m.

Councillor S Ashall, Ward Councillor, had asked for this application to be referred to the Planning Committee.

Following a query from the Chairman the Planning Officer confirmed that the applicant would use the outbuilding to store vehicles as part of a hobby, not as a commercial business.

Following a query the Planning Officer advised that under permitted development you can install outbuilding of up to 50% of the curtilage of the main property, however these outbuildings can be no higher than 2.5 meters within 2 metres of the boundary and single storey. This application far exceeded what was permitted under permitted development.

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be refused.

6i. 2020/0402 Lynton House, Station Approach, Woking

[NOTE 1: The Planning Officer advised the Committee that since the report had been written three further consultee responses had been received – County Highway Authority, Council Senior Environmental Health Officer and Surrey Wildlife Trust. None had raised any concerns although the County Highway Authority had asked for an opportunity to review the demolition transport plan when the contractor was appointed.]

[NOTE 2: Applicant had submitted a tree survey stating there were three low quality trees to the north of site that may need to be removed. This was forwarded to the Council Arboricultural Officer and no concerns were raised regarding the potential loss of the trees.]

The Committee considered an application that sought Prior Approval for the demolition of Lynton House under the provisions of, Class B (demolition of buildings) Part 11, Article 3, Schedule 2 of *The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015* (as amended). The application was received on 11th May 2020 and the Local Planning Authority (LPA) had 28 days in which to make a decision as to whether the prior approval of the authority would be required as to the method of demolition and any proposed restoration of the site. If the LPA failed to make a determination within the 28 day period then the applicant would be entitled to proceed with the demolition.

RESOLVED that prior approval is not required.

Planning Committee 3 June 2020

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and ended at 9.50 pm

Chairman: _____

Date: _____