MINUTES

OF A MEETING OF THE

PLANNING COMMITTEE

held on 8 September 2020 Present:

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

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

Absent: Councillors N Martin.

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 21 July 2020 be approved and signed as a true and correct record.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor N Martin.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

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. 2020/0681 Triangle of land between Guildford Road, Victoria Road and Station approach; and
- 6b. 2020/0543 Triangle of land between Guildford Road, Victoria Road and Station approach

[NOTE: It was agreed that item 6a. 2020/0681 Triangle of Land between Guildford Road, Victoria Road and Station Approach and Item 6b. 2020/0543 Triangle of Land between Guildford Road, Victoria Road and Station Approach would be considered together by the Committee as they were for the same site]

The Committee considered an application for the erection of site hoarding around the proposal site (PLAN 2020/0681) and an application for Advertisement Consent to display non-illuminated advertisements on site hoarding (PLAN 2020/0681).

Councillor L Lyons, Ward Councillor, spoke on the item and wanted to clarify for members of the public that this application did not relate to how the site would be developed in the future and that it solely related to the hoardings. Councillor L Lyons was concerned about the parking bays being taken out of use and queried whether it was necessary to bring the hoardings out over to cover these. The Ward Councillor was also eager that this site did not become an eyesore and queried quite how long the hoardings would need to be in place for.

Mr Spinks confirmed that the reason the hoardings needed to come out as far as the car parking spaces was for public safety reasons; in order to demolish the buildings safely this space would be needed. The intention was that the island site, that remained after this demolition work, would be developed for housing once the new Victoria Arch was installed; it was known that the timings for this programme would be 2022/2023 so it was known that the hoarding would not be a short term installation and that they would need to remain for a number of years to keep the site safe and secure.

Following a query from Councillor L Lyons it was confirmed that it would not be possible to return the parking bays into use after the demolition had taken place. This was due to the fact that it was the intention to use the area as part of a works compound linked to the works for the improved A320 and the Victoria Arch.

Some concerns were raised regarding the blind corner near the pedestrian crossing close to the site and the potential that the hoardings could be distracting for motorists. Douglas Spinks commented that the design of the hoardings before the Committee were illustrative and that the detailed design would be drawn up in consultation with the County Transportation Authority to ensure that it was not distracting to road users. Douglas Spinks would feedback the comments to Louisa Calam, Project Manager for the Housing Infrastructure Fund works.

Following a suggestion to only grant temporary permission for the hoardings to ensure they were not in place for longer than needed, Douglas Spinks commented that he did not think this was necessary as the Council was keen to deliver the housing on the site as quickly as possible. The Council would act responsibly and keep the hoardings in a good condition for the minimal length of time necessary.

The Committee acknowledged the need for the hoardings in order to secure the site safely during demolition and thereafter until the use of the site for construction purposes was over.

RESOLVED that

- For PLAN 2020/0681 Triangle of Land between Guildford Road, Victoria Road and Station Approach Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions; and
- ii) For PLAN 2020/0543 Triangle of Land between Guildford Road, Victoria Road and Station Approach Advertisement Consent be granted.

6c. 2020/0523 Mark House, Aviary Road

This application had been withdrawn from the agenda.

6d. 2020/0378 Heath Lodge, Prey Heath Road

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a first floor extension to the west flank of the property.

The Committee heard that although this was a very small addition to the property, it was in the Green Belt area and had been extended extensively before.

Councillor S Ashall, Ward Councillor, commented that this was only a very small addition to the property. He referred to Policy DM13 which stated that although normally residential development would be considered inappropriate in Green Belt, there were some exemptions, including if the extension or alteration of existing dwelling was not disproportionate. Councillor S Ashall commented that this extension would be a zero increase in the footprint of the property and only a 2.2% increase in the volume. The Ward Councillor commented that the Committee should take into account that this application was in a residential area within the Green Belt and that the proposed application fitted in with the existing street scene.

Some Members commented that although this was a small extension they did not think the green belt policy should be ignored. Councillor S Ashall confirmed that he did not want for the Green Belt rules to be ignored, but argued that Policy DM13 allowed the Committee discretion on determining this application.

The Planning Officer commented that the previous extension had been considered disproportionate, so the additional extension proposed in the application could not be considered proportionate.

Some Members thought that this would set a precedent and suggest that the Council's policies could be ignored.

Councillor S Ashall moved and it was duly seconded by Councillor S Hussain to approve the application on the grounds that the proposed extension was not a disproportionate increase and would not cause material harm or impact to the green belt.

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 S Ashall, T Aziz, S Hussain and L Lyons.

TOTAL: 4

Against: Cllrs A Boote, G Chrystie (Chairman), G Elson and L Morales.

TOTAL: 4

Present but not voting: None

TOTAL: 0

In accordance with Standing Order 22.5 the Chairman exercised his casting vote against the motion, and the application was therefore not approved.

Councillor S Ashall requested a named vote on the recommendation to refuse the application set out in the Planning Officers report.

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

In favour: Cllrs A Boote, G Chrystie, G Elson, S Hussain, L Lyons and L

Morales.

TOTAL: 6

Against: Cllrs S Ashall and T Aziz.

TOTAL: 2

Present but not voting: None

TOTAL: 0

RESOLVED that planning permission be refused.

6e. 2019/1214 30 Winern Glebe

The Committee considered an application which sought to remove Condition 3 of PLAN/2004/1192 (Demolish existing garage and construct new garage with shared access with No 32) so as to regularise the habitable use of the detached garage/annexe as opposed to the parking or vehicles ancillary and incidental to the dwelling house restricted by Condition 3 of PLAN/2004/1192. A single storey rear addition on the garage is also sought to be retained.

Councillor A Boote, Ward Councillor, commented that it was clear that this building had breached the condition of the initial application and that she was happy for enforcement action to go ahead.

Planning Committee 8 September 2020

Following a suggestion from Members regarding retention of the windows in the building, the Planning Officer commented that retention of the windows could leave the building use open for abuse in the future. The Planning Officer suggested it was necessary for this condition to remain. The Committee endorsed the suggestion to remove the windows.

RESOLVED that planning permission be REFUSED and authorise formal enforcement proceedings.

6f. 2019/0324 Woodhambury House, 491 Woodham Lane

The Committee considered an application for the erection of raised decking, a spa comprising a small swimming pool and Jacuzzi, and a boundary fence, all to the west side of the existing dwelling. The development had already been carried out and the application was retrospective.

Arboricultural Officer had requested further information to be able to inform the effect on the Tree Protection Order; there was a possibility that the situation of the decking could harm the roots of the tree.

Councillor T Aziz, Ward Councillor, supported the Planning Officer recommendation as he had received a number of complaints from residents and there was clear overlooking issue with the neighbouring property. The Chairman commented upon likely noise disturbance caused by spa machinery and spa occupants and the Planning Officer stated that noise measurement opinion had not been undertaken. Members endorsed the view that noise could likely adversely affect the neighbouring house.

RESOLVED that planning permission be refused and authorise enforcement proceedings.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm and ended at 8.20 pm		
Chairman:	Date:	