

MINUTES
OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

held on 7 December 2021
Present:

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

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

Also Present: Councillors M A Bridgeman and S Hussain.

Absent: Councillor D Roberts.

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 9 November 2021 be approved and signed as a true and correct record.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor D Roberts.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor M Bridgeman declared a pecuniary interest in minute item 6d. TREE/2021/8283 Wey Cottage, 11 Church Road, Byfleet– arising from her being the applicant. The interest was such that Councillor M Bridgeman would leave the Chamber during consideration of the item.

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. 2021/0359 Buckinghams, Albert House, Albert Drive, Woking

The committee considered an application for the erection of part five storey, part four storey building containing twenty nine apartments with car parking, cycle storage, landscaping and associated works following demolition of an existing building in use as a car sales and MOT and servicing centre.

Following a question from Councillor T Aziz, Ward Councillor, the Planning Officer advised that there was a mix of six one-bedroom units and twenty three two-bedroom units; twelve of these would be affordable units with eight for rental and four for shared ownership.

Councillor T Aziz, Ward Councillor, commented that he thought that this was a much better scheme than was previously refused and the proposed set back scheme was much more acceptable.

Following a request for clarity on the amenity space, the Planning Officer explained that the two units on the ground floor would have an area of private amenity space and the others would have access to a balcony or roof terrace. There would also be a 440 sqm. area of shared amenity space to the north west of the site for the use of all residents.

Some Members were pleased to see this brownfield site proposed for development and the reduction in height of the building.

There had been a representation regarding the proposed entrance to the car park which Members sought further clarity on. The Planning Officer confirmed that SCC had been consulted on highway safety and no concerns had been raised.

The Chairman queried whether a design review had taken place for this application to consider whether the design was of exceptional quality. The Planning Officer commented that the application had not been considered by a design review panel, however the front elevation did include details which would be considered exceptional quality and it was confirmed that the inspector had not raised any issues regarding the appearance of the building.

Following a question, the Planning Officer confirmed that there was not considered to be any overlooking impact from the roof terrace.

The Chairman commented that due to the size of some of the units proposed, it was likely that these would be occupied by families. Currently there was not a landscaping scheme that included provision for children or that would prevent them from running out into the road; the Chairman questioned whether we could ensure that the amenity space was considered safe for children through the use of conditions. Following discussion on this point, it was noted that boundary treatments would be considered under condition 5 which could consider the safety of the amenity space boundary. Thomas James, Development Manager, suggested that it would be possible to amend condition 4 to allow for a suitable area children's to be provided as part of the amenity space. The Committee agreed that Planning Officers would amend condition 4 to include appropriate wording.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions, including the amendments noted in these minutes, and Section 106 Agreement.

6b. 2020/0337 Wisley Golf Club, Wisley lane, Pyrford, Woking

[NOTE: The Planning Officer provided an update in relation to the most recent letter submitted on behalf of the RHS, which was circulated to members yesterday. The Planning Officer consulted the Lead Drainage Engineer who noted that the applicants consultant had updated the original model with site specific topographic data, and used the best available data to assess the impact of the development on Flood Risk to form the baseline or existing scenario. This model demonstrated that the proposals would not increase flood risk to the surrounding area due to the proposed works. The hydrology had also been approved by the Environment Agency as suitable to be used for the proposed development. And the information from the applicant was in accordance with all relevant policy and best practice, to determine the impact of Flood Risk from the development.]

The Committee considered an application for the engineering operations to The Garden Course to include replacement drainage and irrigation system, relocation of 5th and 8th tee boxes and re-profiling of section of the bank at the River Wey along with works to the bunkers to improve drainage and playability.

Following a question, the Planning Officer explained that several the conditions required information to be provided before the commencement of works. As and when any information was received the Council's Flood and Drainage Officer would be consulted.

The Committee questioned how urgent the works were and the Planning Officer advised that he was not able to comment on this as the urgency of them was not a material planning consideration so it had not been considered as part of the application.

It was noted that the Flood and Drainage Officers were satisfied with the application as it stood, however they would be consulted throughout the process to ensure they remained satisfied.

Councillor S Dorsett, Ward Councillor, commented that he felt confident about this application and that he would be supporting it.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.

6c. 2021/0971 32 Brookwood Farm Drive, Woking

The Committee considered an application for increased ridge height of existing garage. Insertion of 1No front dormer and 1No front roof light and 1No rear roof light. Erection of side link extension.

Councillor S Hussain, Ward Councillor, spoke on the application and commented that he was speaking on behalf of his fellow Ward Councillor, Councillor D Harlow who had called this application into Committee. Councillor S Hussain commented that he did not think this application would look out of place in the area and that the applicant was just trying to find

extra space within the property. The Ward Councillor ask those Members on the Committee whether they would consider approving the application.

It was noted that this application had been refused previously and it was for the Committee to determine whether those reasons for refusal had been overcome with the application that was before them. It was the Planning Officers view that only the perception of overlooking had been overcome and that no changes had been made to the height, scale or position on the rear boundary; all of which were ground on which the application had been previously refused.

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

In favour: Cllrs T Aziz, A Boote, D Hughes & L Morales (Chairman)

TOTAL: 4

Against: None

TOTAL: 0

Present but not voting: Cllrs J Brown, S Dorsett, N Martin & C Rana.

TOTAL: 4

The application was therefore refused.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be refused.

6d. TREE/2021/8283 Wey Cottage, 11 Church Road, Byfleet

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

The Committee considered consent for a tree works application at Wey Cottage, 11 Church Road, Byfleet, West Byfleet, Surrey, KT14 7EH be Granted. The proposal for works was as follows – T1- Oak: Lateral Crown reduction by 4m over the side of neighbouring property.

RESOLVED

That consent be GRANTED for the Tree Works Application REF: TREE/2021/8283.

6e. COND/2021/0150 9-13 Poole Road, and sections of Poole Road, Goldsworth Road & Church Street West, Woking

Following the change to the Scheme of Delegations which was agreed at full Council on 2 December 2021, this application had been withdrawn from the agenda and would be determined under Officer delegated powers.

6f. COND/2021/0212 Former Ian Allen Motors, 63-65 High Street, Copthorne and Priors Croft, Old Woking, Woking

Following the change to the Scheme of Delegations which was agreed at full Council on 2 December 2021, this application had been withdrawn from the agenda and would be determined under Officer delegated powers.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and ended at 8.00 pm

Chairman: _____

Date: _____