

MINUTES
OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

held on 7 September 2021
Present:

Cllr L M N Morales (Chairman)
Cllr T Aziz (Vice-Chair)

Cllr A J Boote	Cllr N Martin
Cllr J Brown	Cllr C Rana
Cllr S Dorsett	Cllr D Roberts
Cllr D E Hughes	

Also Present: Councillors M A Bridgeman and I Johnson.

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 20 July 2021 be approved and signed as a true and correct record.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

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. 2020/0614 41-43 Eve Road, Woking

[NOTE: In accordance with the procedure for public speaking at Planning Committee, Ms Sharon Emery attended the meeting and spoke in objection to the application and Mr Paul Uttley spoke in support.]

The Committee considered a change of use of existing detached garage and garden land to the rear of No.41-43 Eve Road to vehicle maintenance and repair use (Use Class B2) and associated hardstanding and fencing.

Councillor T Aziz, Ward Councillor, commented that he understood the resident's concerns regarding parking and that the public speaker had raised some valid points. The Ward Councillor explained that he had called the item to the Committee for fairness and to allow them to discuss it in more detail. Councillor T Aziz commented that there had been issues with parking on Eve Road and Arnold Road for some time, but that there were now plans for a new CPZ to be installed on these roads which it was thought would solve these issues. He thought that the applicant had overcome the previous issues for refusal and once the CPZ comes into force, no business would be able to park on this road anyway.

The Planning Officer commented that the new CPZ was not in affect now and the application must be determined on the current situation. It was noted that this application would still displace existing off street parking, regardless of the CPZ. Following a question the Planning Officer explained that this application would see a loss of land a numbers 41-43 which was currently used for vehicle parking, which would put added pressure on Eve Road and Arnold Road.

Members asked for further clarification on the potential noise impact and it was explained that residential gardens directly adjoined the site, so a commercial garage would be operating immediately adjacent to these and despite the acoustic fence, there would still be an impact.

Some Members commented that the application was almost the same to that which had been previously refused by the Committee and that the reasons for refusal had not been addressed.

The Chairman questioned whether the land at 41-43 Eve Road was garden land or parking spaces. The Planning Officer confirmed that this was hardstanding and that there was a number of gated accesses on this road that allowed off street parking.

It was questioned why Surrey County Council had not objected to the application and the Planning Officer explained that they often considered the highway implications on safety grounds whereas we look at our own parking standards and take other aspects into account and on this occasions our view was contrary to theirs.

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

In favour: Cllrs A Boote, J Brown, S Dorsett, D Hughes, N Martin, C Rana and D Roberts.

TOTAL: 7

Against: None

TOTAL: 0

Present but not voting: Cllrs L Morales (Chairman) and T Aziz.

TOTAL: 2

The application was therefore refused.

RESOLVED

That Planning Permission be REFUSED.

6b. 2020/0940 75 St Johns Road, Woking

[NOTE: In accordance with the procedure for public speaking at Planning Committee, Mr Brian Denmee attended the meeting and spoke in objection to the application and the applicant/agent was unable to attend to address the Committee.]

The Committee considered the construction of a three storey block of flats comprising eight units with associated parking, refuse and amenity following the demolition of existing bungalow.

Following a question it was noted that the elevations of the proposed development were not illustrated accurately on the presentation slides, but the Officers report did refer correctly to the elevations; the north elevation would be the front and the south elevation the back. Following an additional question the Planning Officer confirmed that there was capacity on site to accommodate the parking spaces and Surrey County Council had been consulted on highway safety and had raised no objections.

Regarding the 45 degree angle rule, the Planning Officer had concluded that the application would need to demonstrate a significant fall over and above the current situation for this to be a reason for refusal. It was noted that there was a 14.5m separation distance from the closest property at number 6.

Some Members raised issues with privacy for neighbouring properties, however the Planning Officer thought this had been addressed in the conditions with glazed and non-opening windows etc. Some Members also thought that the design was not in keeping with the local area.

Councillor D Roberts commented that he had concerns around car parking and that this did not provide any visitor spaces. Councillor D Roberts thought that there were elements to commend about the application but that the bulk and mass was too large for the site.

Councillor D Roberts proposed, and it was duly seconded by Councillor A Boote, that the application should be refused on the grounds of bulk and mass.

Some Members liked the application before them and commented that the road was already diverse and that the development would fit in fine. Some Members also commented that is the Committee were minded to overturn the Planning Officers recommendation then they should have a very solid planning reason for doing so.

The Chairman commented that although this application met our parking standards, the policy stated that visitor spaces should be encouraged however none had been included in those provided. Some Councillor thought that this was insufficient parking for eight flats, especially when you took visitors into account. The Planning Officers advised that this was quite a minor scheme contributing to the housing supply of Woking; it met the minimum parking standards and considering the low units proposed they did not think we could go back to the developer and ask for more spaces.

Some Members of the Committee thought that we should be encouraging these types of development as it was a good mix of housing that met our minimum standards and was in a location close to the town centre and the train station. Some Members of the Committee were sympathetic to the objectors, but did not think they could support the motion to refuse as it met our policies.

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 A Boote and D Roberts.

TOTAL: 2

Against: Cllrs T Aziz, J Brown, S Dorsett, D Hughes, N Martin and C Rana.

TOTAL: 6

Present but not voting: Cllrs L M N Morales (Chairman)

TOTAL: 1

The application was therefore not refused.

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, J Brown, S Dorsett, D Hughes, N Martin and C Rana.

TOTAL: 6

Against: Cllrs A Boote and D Roberts.

TOTAL: 2

Present but not voting: Cllrs L M N Morales (Chairman)

TOTAL: 1

The application was therefore approved.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions and S106 Agreement.

6c. 2021/0573 7 Waldens Park Road, Woking

The Committee considered an application for the Insertion of three roof lights to facilitate the use of the loft space as habitable accommodation.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.

6d. 2021/0401 23 Bentham Avenue, Sheerwater, Woking

The Committee considered an application for the erection of part two storey, part single storey rear extension and conversion of existing family dwelling into two flats with associated parking and amenity space.

Councillor T Aziz, Ward Councillor, had called this before the Committee as he thought the applicant had overcome the reasons for previous refusal and he disagreed with the Planning Officers recommendation to refuse the application. Councillor T Aziz commented that the applicant had reduced the number of bedrooms in the units and that he did not think this was a loss of a family home as the replacement would be two good size units. He noted that the front of the property would remain unchanged and therefore would not affect the street scene. Councillor T Aziz commented that there were a number of examples of subdivided properties in Sheerwater. There were no issues with parking and he commented that the applicant now proposed that the units had access to the private patio area and then a 75sqm shared communal area.

The Planning Officer commented that the reason for the recommended refusal related to the overbearing nature of the application and noted that this was detrimentally worse than the previous application that the Committee refused.

Many Members were surprised that this application was back before the Committee as they thought it was contrary to so many Planning Policies and that it was significantly worse than the application that was previously refused.

Councillor T Aziz proposed, and it was duly seconded by Councillor C Rana that the application be deferred. The Development Manager, Thomas James, advised the Committee that there was no reason why deferral was necessary and confirmed that there would need to be a valid reason for doing so.

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 deferral of the application were recorded as follows.

In favour: Cllrs T Aziz and C Rana.

TOTAL: 2

Against: Cllrs A Boote, J Brown, S Dorsett, D Hughes, N Martin, L Morales (Chairman) and D Roberts.

TOTAL: 7

Present but not voting: None

TOTAL: 0

The application was therefore not deferred.

Councillor T Aziz moved to refuse the application, this was not seconded.

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

In favour: Cllrs J Brown, S Dorsett, D Hughes, N Martin and D Roberts.

TOTAL: 5

Against: Cllrs T Aziz and C Rana.

TOTAL: 2

Present but not voting: Cllrs A Boote and L M N Morales (Chairman)

TOTAL: 2

The application was therefore refused.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be REFUSED.

6e. 2017/0146 29-31 Walton Road, Woking

The Committee considered an application for a demolition of existing building and erection of a 4 storey building comprising 14 apartments with associated parking (Amended Description).

RESOLVED

That planning permission be GRANTED subject to:

- i) the prior completion of a S106 Legal Agreement to secure:
 - a. an affordable housing contribution of £278,519 and overage clause;
 - b. the required SAMM financial contribution (currently £7,959 and any increase which may be required if the agreement is signed after 31 March 2022); and

- ii) the originally recommended planning conditions (1-22 including update to condition 3 to include revised floor plans)

6f. 2021/0492 Little Cairns, St Pauls Road, Woking

The Committee considered an application for the erection of new attached garage following demolition of existing garage. Formation of side-facing first floor level windows (part-retrospective) (further amended plans rec'd 29.07.2021 and further amended description 29.07.2021).

Councillor I Johnson, Ward Councillor, attended the meeting to speak on the item and explained that he had originally called it before the committee due to concerns around overdevelopment. Since doing so the Planning Officer has clarified a number of points for him and he thought the report made it clear that this was not overdevelopment and that conditions 4 and 5 were very helpful. He commended the Planning Officers for such a clear report on the application.

The Chairman commented that condition 6 was reassuring as the new building must be used as a garage.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the recommended conditions.

6g. 2021/0695 Four Oaks, Carlton Road, Woking

The Committee considered an application for a single storey rear extension, front porch and first floor side dormer.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be GRANTED.

6h. TREE/2021/8273 Wey Cottage, 11 Church Road, Woking

[NOTE: Councillor M Bridgeman left the chamber for the duration of this item as she was the applicant.]

The Committee considered an application to fell (remove) a T1 Oak at Wey Cottage, 11 Church Road, Byfleet, KT14 7EH.

It was noted that there were three applications running for this same tree from the same applicant; two were before the Committee and a third which requested a lateral reduction was still being considered by Officers.

Following a comment from Councillor A Boote, Dave Frye explained that Oak Processionary Moth (OPM) was present in the tree, but this was only seen as significant reason for refusal when the infestation was significant. OPM could cause skin irritations and the owner of the tree would need to advise the forestry commission regarding help on how to remove the pest. Councillor A Boote thanked the Officer for all the help he had provided to the applicant and queried whether the Council could force the owner of the tree to carry out the required work. Dave Frye advised the only way would be for the Council to

do the work themselves and they would only be able to do this if it posed a significant risk to people or property.

Councillor C Rana asked it to be noted that he abstained on the agree resolution.

RESOLVED

That consent be refused for the tree works application REF. TREE/2021/8273.

6i. TREE/2021/8274 Wey Cottage, 11 Church Road

[NOTE: Councillor M Bridgeman left the chamber for the duration of this item as she was the applicant.]

The Committee considered an application to crown reduce by 6m a T1 Oak at Wey Cottage, 11 Church Road, Byfleet, KT14 7EH.

RESOLVED

That consent be refused for the tree works application REF. TREE/2021/8274.

6j. COND21/0144 Former Ian Allen Motors, Woking

[NOTE: The Planning Officer advised that an update had been circulated ahead of the meeting.]

The Committee considered approval of details pursuant to conditions 14 (a-e incl.) (sustainable transport matters), 21 (remediation validation report), 24 (flood warning and management), 27 (SuDS maintenance and management), 28 (SuDS verification report) and 35 (screening to Hale Lodge from the roof terrace) of PLAN/2020/0304 dated 10.06.2020 (Erection of a forty eight unit 'Independent Living' extra care housing scheme in a building ranging between 1 and 4 storeys in height (plus rooftop plant enclosures), comprising forty five one-bedroom units and three 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, twenty five parking spaces and landscaping.

RESOLVED that

- i) details submitted be APPROVED pursuant to:
 - Condition 14 - Sustainable transport matters;
 - Condition 24 – Flood warning and management;
 - Condition 27 - SuDS maintenance and management;
 - Condition 28 - SuDS verification report; and
 - Condition 35 - Screening to Hale Lodge from the roof terrace; and
- i) Delegated powers be given to the Development Manager (and, in their absence, to the Deputy Development Manager) to approve details pursuant to condition 21, subject to a positive consultation response first being received from the relevant WBC technical consultee (stated in brackets): Condition 21 - Remediation validation report (Contaminated Land Officer)

Planning Committee 7 September 2021

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and ended at 9.05 pm

Chairman: _____

Date: _____