

MINUTES
OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

held on 29 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

Also Present: Councillors I Johnson.

Absent: Councillors N Martin.

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 8 September 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

In accordance with the Officer Procedure Rules, Douglas Spinks, Deputy Chief Executive, declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 6f. COND/2020/0064 - Sheerwater Estate, Albert Drive, Woking and 6g. COND/2019/0139 - Sheerwater Estate, Albert Drive, Woking arising from his position as a Council appointed Director of Thamesway Group Companies. The interest was such that it would not prevent the Officer from advising on these items.

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. 2019/1063 - Tamarix, 153 Old Woking Road, Woking

[NOTE: In accordance with the procedure for public speaking at Planning Committee, Mr Andrew Grimshaw attended the meeting and spoke in objection to the application and Mr Ray Freeland spoke in support.]

The Committee considered an application which sought permission to demolish the existing dwelling and detached garage, to erect a building containing five flats with associated parking and amenity space, and to relocate the vehicular access to Lincoln Drive. The scheme had been amended during the course of the application in order to reduce the impact to the Lincoln Drive street scene and to the protected trees fronting Old Woking Road. As part of this the originally proposed seven flats had been reduced to five, the footprint of the proposed building reduced, and the proposed access arrangements reconfigured.

Following a query from the Chairman the Planning Officer confirmed that seventy eight objections had been received to the original scheme and a further forty seven objections following the amendments. One representation of support had been received.

Councillor G Elson, Ward Councillor, supported many of the concerns raised by residents including the inadequate off-street parking provision. Councillor G Elson commented that he did not think enough weight had been given to the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan policies B1, B2 and B3.

Councillor L Morales queried whether, if the application was approved by the Committee, a condition could be added which required the third floor windows in the rear extension to be obscure glazed to prevent overlooking. Planning Officers Confirmed that this condition would be acceptable if deemed necessary by the Committee. Members agreed that this condition would be added if the application was approved.

Some Members commented that they liked the design, as it was not immediately obvious that it was a block of flats and that it looked like one dwelling which was in keeping with the street scene. Members noted that the application building was smaller than the nursing home on the neighbouring plot and for that reason thought that the concerns regarding any overbearing affect or bulk and mass, were not founded and that the development would be in keeping with the character of the area.

Members thought that it was a positive change that the entrance had been moved to the side and the Highway Authority had raised no objection to this.

Members noted that the smaller flats provided in this development would give residents in Pyrford the opportunity to downsize if they wished to.

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

In favour: Cllrs S Ashall, T Aziz, A Boote, S Hussain and L Morales.

TOTAL: 5

Against: Cllr Elson

TOTAL: 1

Present but not voting: Cllrs G Chrystie and L Lyons.

TOTAL: 2

The application was therefore approved.

RESOLVED that planning permission be granted subject to conditions, the additional condition noted in these minutes and Section 106 legal agreement.

6b. 2020/0509 - AIM Aviation Henshalls, Abott Close, Woking

The Committee considered an application for a change of use from Class B1/B2 (Business / General Industrial) to Class B8 (Storage or distribution) and alterations to the external appearance of the building and service yards, including new fencing (amended plans and additional info rec'd 19.08.2020).

Councillor A Boote, Ward Councillor, spoke in support of the application and commented that this would be good for the economy in the current climate. The location was ideal and she was pleased to see a progressive application that had included parking for electric vehicles and cycle storage.

RESOLVED that planning permission be granted subject to recommended conditions.

6c. 2019/0900 - 5A The Broadway, Woking

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a four storey building comprising five self-contained flats (four x one-bedroom and one x two-bedroom) and a ground floor commercial unit for flexible A1 (retail) and B1(a) (office) use with associated refuse bin and cycle storage.

Councillor T Aziz, Ward Councillor, disagreed with the Planning Officers proposal to refuse this application and thought that this site needed to be developed as it had been vacant for a very long time. He noted that he did have sympathy for the residents in the flats at the rear of the plot, who would be affected by loss of light.

Following some questions from Members, the Planning Officer advised that the site had been vacant for decades and thought that originally a chapel was located on the site. At the time the building at the rear was converted into flats, the site was vacant. The Planning Officer explained that the lower two floors of the building at the rear would be severely impacted by the loss of light and many of these rooms were single aspect living spaces.

Some Members liked the modifications that had been made by the applicant regarding the stepping up at the back; however it was noted that despite the amendments and reductions on the proposed scheme, which had been reduced and amended as much as possible at

the rear, there would still be a detrimental impact upon some ground floor flats at the rear of the proposed development.

Some Members commented that it was obvious from the street scene that there should be something on the vacant site and that this development would considerably improve the visual impact in this conservation area.

Some Members commented that despite the attraction of the design, the Committee should support the Officers recommendation to refuse as the significant loss of daylight to the flats at the rear of the site would go against Planning Policy.

Some Members thought it was unfortunate that the building at the rear had been developed whilst the site was vacant. Following a query, the Planning Officer advised that although that development was carried out under permitted development rights the Committee must give it the same weight when considering the impact the proposed development would have on these flats. The development was completely lawful and was carried out as a prior approval application under permitted development.

The Planning Officer commented that the Committee should consider whether or not any positive aspects of the development overcame any harm to the building at the rear.

Following a query from Committee Members, Thomas James commented that given the constrained nature of the site there could be grounds for the Committee to ask for a Construction Management Plan if the application was approved. Councillor L Morales proposed and Councillor S Hussain duly seconded the motion to add a condition regarding a Construction Management Plan should the application be approved; the Committee agreed.

Following a query raised regarding the rights of taxis to continue to park near the site once construction was underway (if approved) the Planning Officer confirmed that this was not a planning matter.

Councillor T Aziz proposed, and it was duly seconded by Councillor L Lyons that the application should be approved.

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 Boote, G Chrystie, S Hussain and L Lyons.

TOTAL: 5

Against: Cllr Elson

TOTAL: 1

Present but not voting: Cllrs S Ashall and L Morales.

TOTAL: 2

The application was therefore approved.

RESOLVED that the planning application be granted (and delegated authority be given to the Development Manager to draft appropriate conditions and the additional condition noted in these minutes.)

6d. 2020/0523 - Mark House, Aviary Road, Woking

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a part single and part two storey rear extension following the demolition of existing rear conservatory. Alterations to the main roof to include a rear dormer and two roof lights to the rear and three. Roof lights to the front to facilitate the conversion of the loft into habitable accommodation.

Councillor G Elson, Ward Councillor, commented that these works would result in a significant loss of daylight to the neighbouring property Kingswood and would be overbearing. The Planning Officer commented that there was already loss of light in the lounge at Kingswood, but the opinion of the Planning Authority was that this was not significant.

Following a query it was noted that the front roof lights did have approval under a previous extant consent.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there was no increase in the height of the roof ridgeline, just a small protrusion to the right, which did not protrude further than the existing dwelling.

The Chairman commented that he considered this a significant amendment to a property in a conservation area. Some Members commented that the original design of some of the houses in the street scene had already been lost due to alterations and that this extension matched enough to fit in. The Planning Officer had commented in his report that the application had been assessed against its impact on the character of the existing dwelling and of the surrounding Conservation Area and that it was considered to result in adequately subservient features with no material harm on the character of the property of the surrounding Conservation Area

Councillor G Elson requested a named vote on determination of the application.

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

In favour: Cllrs S Ashall, T Aziz, A Boote, S Hussain, L Lyons and Morales.

TOTAL: 6

Against: None.

TOTAL: 0

Present but not voting: Cllrs G Chrystie and G Elson.

TOTAL: 2

The application was therefore approved.

RESOLVED that planning permission be granted.

6e. 2020/0510 - 86 Walton Road, Woking

The Committee considered an application for a front canopy with roller shutters for a temporary period of 3 years.

Councillor M Ali, Ward Councillor, spoke in support of the application and commented that he thought that it would improve the appearance of the area rather than have a detrimental impact on it. Councillor M Ali noted that there were other shops along the road that had canopy/shutters installed and that he thought allowing the same at 86 Walton Road would protect the shops produce whilst also containing any mess/rubbish outside of the shop front.

The Planning Officer commented that the canopy/shutters installed on the shop opposite had been granted before the current Core Strategy Policies were in place. The Planning Officer also commented that due to the openness of this site, with the courtyard adjacent, any canopy/shutter would be more prominent and would have more of an effect on the street scene. Referencing the pictures of the site, where the produce was spilling outside the front area, the Planning Officer's opinion was that a canopy/shutter would do nothing to remedy this.

Douglas Spinks commented that in light of the discussion, it would be sensible for the Committee to defer this application as it was important that Members had the correct information regarding the boundaries of this property as the images appeared to show some produce may be encroaching on the highway boundary.

RESOLVED that the application be deferred to a future meeting.

6f. COND/2020/0064 - Sheerwater Estate, Albert Drive, Woking

The Committee considered a conditions application which sought approval of details pursuant to Conditions 63 (protection of residential dwellings from noise) and 64 (acoustic performance of party walls/ceilings to prevent noise transfer between uses) of planning permission PLAN/2018/0337.

RESOLVED that the details submitted be approved.

6g. COND/2019/0139 - Sheerwater Estate, Albert Drive, Woking

The Committee considered a conditions application which sought approval of details pursuant to Condition 52 of planning permission PLAN/2018/0337 relating to energy efficiency and water consumption.

RESOLVED that the details submitted be approved.

7. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of item 8 in view of the nature of the proceedings that, if members of the press and public were present during this item, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A, to the Local Government Act 1972.

Paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

8. LEGAL ADVICE ON FUTURE APPEAL

RESOLVED That the recommendations set out in the Part II minutes be agreed.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and ended at 10.50 pm

Chairman: _____

Date: _____