

MINUTES
OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

held on 12 April 2023

Present:

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

Cllr A J Boote	Cllr R N Leach
Cllr J Brown	Cllr S M Oades
Cllr G T Cosnahan	Cllr T G Spenser
Cllr S Dorsett	Cllr M A Whitehand

Also Present: Councillors K Davis.

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 21 March 2023 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. 2022/0643 Garvan, Bagshot Road, Woking

[NOTE: In accordance with the procedure for public speaking at Planning Committee, Mrs Anne Moore attended the meeting and spoke in objection to the application and the applicant choose not to speak in support.]

The Committee considered an application for a proposed detached garage and retrospective vehicular access and gates to rear of site from Ivydene.

The Planning Officer advised that the Conditions for the 2019 application for Ivydene did not apply to this application. Regarding the removal of Permitted Development Rights, it was clarified that this site was not 11 Ivydene and therefore the Conditions of that site could not be tied into this application.

Councillor M Whitehand, Ward Councillor, commented that the permitted development right to build the garage was not the issue, it was the access to the garage that was causing residents concern. Thirty nine letters of objection had been received and the Member thought that the Committee should be mindful to this level of objection. Councillor M Whitehand suggested it was the long term plan of the applicant to ultimately have access across Ivydene to access Garvan and that the application should be looked at in the round. The Planning Officer advised that the conditions of Ivydene did not relate to this application and that the access across the land was a civil matter, not a planning consideration and had therefore not formed part of the Planning Officers' assessment of the application.

In reference to the Inspectors decision on the Ivydene application, the Planning Officer confirmed that this would have not been conflicted by this application.

Following a question the Planning Officer confirmed that there was not a risk of flooding on this part of the site.

Concern was raised that gas bottles may be stored in the proposed garage if it was intended to be used as a workshop. The Planning Officer advised that there was no indication that gas bottles would be stored in there and reminded the Committee that the garage could be built under Permitted Development Rights without the approval of the Committee, and therefore they could not object to what might be stored in there.

Following a question the Planning Officer advised that vehicular access had been formed for Ivydene under a previous application, however there was nothing in the Conditions that restricted this to just Ivydene and therefore it was a civil matter if the owner of Ivydene also allowed access to the proposed garage at Garvan.

Some Member queried why this application was before the Committee if it could be built without approval and under Permitted Development Rights. The Planning Officer explained that the applicant had chosen to submit the application, however if rejected they could chose to submit a Certificate of Lawfulness and build under permitted development.

Following a question, Beverly Kuchar, Head of Planning confirmed that in the event the garage was run as a business, a change of use application would need to be submitted.

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

In favour: Cllrs T Aziz, A Boote, G Cosnahan, S Dorsett, R Leach, Oades and T Spenser.

TOTAL: 7

Against: Cllr M Whitehand.

TOTAL: 1

Present but not voting: Cllrs L Morales (Chairman) and J Brown.

TOTAL: 2

The application was therefore approved.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be GRANTED.

6b. 2022/0959 Unit 2, Canada Road, Byfleet

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a detached industrial unit with mezzanine floor for Class B8 (Storage and distribution) and associated parking following demolition of existing B2 (General Industry) two storey Industrial unit.

Councillor A Boote, Ward Councillor, commented that she was very happy to see this application come forward and was happy to delegate authority to the Development Manager.

RESOLVED

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

- (i) No letters of representation being received from the current consultation period which expires on 20.04.2023; and
- (ii) Planning conditions set out in this report.

6c. 2022/0566 Ringlestone Gate House

The Committee considered an application for demolition of polytunnels and conversion of existing building into a residential dwelling, external alterations and formation of garden amenity area.

Councillor M Whitehand, Ward Councillor, queried whether the footprint of the new dwelling would be exactly the same as the existing structures. Councillor M Whitehand was concerned that over the years there had been a gradual encroachment on this site and now another dwelling on the site was originally only one dwelling. The Planning Officer confirmed that the new dwelling would remain the same size.

The Chairman queried how long the building that was proposed for conversion had been on the site. The Planning Officer confirmed that the stable building had been granted permission in 2011. There would be no uplift in the footprint of the stable building and the polytunnels would be removed and replaced with a residential garden.

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

In favour: Cllrs T Aziz, A Boote, J Brown, G Cosnahan, S Dorsett, R Leach, Oades and T Spenser.

TOTAL: 8

Against: Cllr M Whitehand.

TOTAL: 1

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

TOTAL: 1

The application was therefore approved.

RESOLVED

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

6d. 2023/0060 3 Dinsdale Close

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a two storey front extension, single storey rear extension, conversion of existing garage to habitable accommodation and porch canopies to the front and side.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be GRANTED.

6e. 2022/1025 Hillcrest, Pyle Hill

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a single storey rear extension, raising of the ridge height to form first floor accommodation, rear rooflights and a front canopy (part retrospective)

Councillor K Davis, Ward Councillor, commented that he had sympathy with the Planning Officer proposal for this application and that he thought the applicant had been naive with

what had been built on the site. That said, the Councillor suggested that common sense be applied to the application, which he did not consider out of character with the area, and had received no objections. Councillor K Davis suggested that nearby residents would be grateful for the development of this site to be completed. There were also arboricultural issues that had been raised, which the works may have affected; although Councillor K Davis commented the trees were currently still healthy.

Following a question, the Planning Officer confirmed that there was some screening to the property.

Other Members thought that the size, bulk and mass of this development were an issue and that there were no exceptional circumstances for this to be built in the green belt. Some Members also thought that if approved, this could set a precedent in the area.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be REFUSED and enforcement action authorised.

6f. 2023/0013 April Cottage, 63 Westfield Avenue

The Committee considered an application for the erection of 1.8m high fencing, pillars and sliding gate along the front boundary (Part Retrospective).

RESOLVED

That planning permission be REFUSED and enforcement action authorised.

6g. 2022/0888 Hilltop, The Ridge

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a front garden wall and erection of 2 no. electric gates - amended scheme.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be REFUSED and enforcement action authorised.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and ended at 8.30 pm

Chairman: _____

Date: _____