

MINUTES
OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

held on 16 April 2024

Present:

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

Cllr G Cosnahan	Cllr C Martin
Cllr S Dorsett	Cllr S Oades
Cllr S Greentree	Cllr T Spenser
Cllr D Jordan	

Absent: Councillors S Mukherjee

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Swati Mukherjee.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 19 March 2024 be approved and signed as a true and correct record.

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. 2023/0985 McLaren Technology Centre

[NOTE 1: The Planning Officer reported an Addendum to the report as detailed below;

Additional information (at this time the requested Construction Environment Management Plan) has been submitted prior to a decision and is with the relevant consultee.

Therefore, it is requested that: Delegated Authority be given to the Head of Planning or Authorised Officer to amend relevant conditions as necessary; namely rewording from “Prior to commencement” to “In accordance with ...” where necessary if the recommendation below is accepted.

Therefore: It is recommended that the application be referred to the Secretary of State with the recommendation that the Local Planning Authority be minded to: Grant Planning Permission subject to the relevant conditions as detailed in the report.]

[NOTE 2: In accordance with the procedure for public speaking at Planning Committee, Ms Sophia Goodhead spoke in support of the application.]

The Committee considered an application for replacement and additional car parking spaces, cycle parking, associated internal access road, earthworks and re-contouring of the open parkland, hard and soft landscape works, re-surfacing of existing access road, along with new and replacement CCTV columns, access control totems, signage, low level security fencing and security barrier systems.

RESOLVED

That the application would be referred to the Secretary of State with the recommendation that the Local Planning Authority were minded to GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions.

6b. 2024/0054 Gifford, Guilford Lane

[NOTE: In accordance with the procedure for public speaking at Planning Committee, Ms Tina Clapham spoke in objection to the application. There was no registered speaker in support.]

The Committee considered a section 73 application to vary Condition 2 (approved plans), Condition 7 (removal of 'permitted development' rights for gates and enclosures) and Condition 8 (landscaping) of planning permission PLAN/2019/0403 (Proposed construction of 2no. detached two storey dwellings (each with 5no. bedrooms) with accommodation within the roof space with dormer windows following demolition of existing property, retention of existing access and associated hard surfacing) to allow for a new vehicular access and separate drive to Plot 1 and to allow the provision of gates for both vehicular accesses.

Some Members queried whether enforcement action would be necessary if this application was refused. The Planning Officer confirmed that the applicant would be expected to revert back to the previous approved scheme and if not, enforcement action would be taken.

Discussion ensued around the two trees that had been removed by the applicant and whether they were given permission to do so. The Planning Officer explained that legislation allowed for dangerous trees to be removed subject to prior notification to the Local Authority; in this situation the Arboricultural Officer had visited the trees and confirmed that they were dead and could be removed.

Some Members considered the four trees that would replace the two lost trees, would be sufficient to mitigate the affect this application would have on the character of the area. The Planning Officer commented that the impact on the existing trees would be fundamental and that the recommendation for refusal was based on the affect it would have on the character of the area. In response to a follow on comment, the Planning Officer stated that the fact all other dwellings had an individual access, a joint access to these properties would not be considered out of character.

It was question whether a condition could be added that confirmed the newly planted hedge must be allowed to grow to a certain height. The Planning Officer commented that the issue was not just the height of the hedge, but the density also. The view of the Planning Officer was that allowing this application would negatively affect the character of the area.

A fellow Councillor read out the statement of Councillor L Rice, who had called this application in to the Planning Committee for consideration but was unable to attend the meeting. In the statement Councillor L Rice said that he thought the issues regarding the trees had been largely addressed and that he thought the replacement trees would mitigate the loss of amenity from the felled trees.

The Planning Officer commented that just because a number of changes had been made to the site already, that did not mean that the application should be approved, as it did go against the original application. The proposed changes would make the site substantially different.

Some Councillors commented that the width of the drive in the application was enormous, and the gates were out of character with the area; the loss of trees was also regretful.

Councillor T Aziz proposed that the application be approved. This motion was not supported by a seconder.

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

In favour: Cllrs G Cosnahan, S Dorsett, C Martin, S Oades and T Spenser.

TOTAL: 5

Against: Cllr T Aziz.

TOTAL: 1

Present but not voting: Cllrs S Greentree, D Jordan and L M N Morales (Chairman).

TOTAL: 3

The application was therefore refused.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be REFUSED.

6c. 2023/0980 65-79 Westfield Avenue, Westfield

[NOTE: The Planning Officer reported an update on the recommendation as the SAMM tariff had been updated since the report was written, as detailed below;

That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning (or their authorised deputy) to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- (i) Prior submission of Great Crested Newt presence/likely absence survey work confirming an absence of Great Crested Newts from the site, or any Great Crested Newt compensation or mitigation measures (if required) being secured via planning condition(s) (and subject to no objections being raised by Surrey Wildlife Trust Ecology Planning Advice Service);
- (ii) Planning conditions set out in the report (plus any additional condition(s) which may be required for Great Crested Newt compensation or mitigation measures); and
- (iii) Prior completion of an Undertaking of the Chief Executive of Woking Borough Council to secure the SAMM (TBH SPA) contribution of £12,246.]

The Committee considered an application for Erection of 9no. part-two, part-three storey dwellings with 2no. detached car port buildings, parking courts, cycle stores and new vehicular accesses.

Following a question about the design of the flat roofs and whether they were in conflict with the street scene, the Planning Officer explained that the design of these had been assessed and the conclusion was that the design would lesson the visual impact of bulk and mass on the street scene. For this reason, the Planning Officer had considered the design acceptable.

The Hoe Valley Neighbourhood Forum had made representation that they were worried about the impact on the Great Crested Newts and their potential to migrate to the site. It was noted that the conditions relating to the newts had not yet been added, but if they were found on site these conditions would be added to ensure that mitigation measures were in place.

Many Members thought that the street scene was currently a mess and would be much improved by this application.

RESOLVED

That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning (or their authorised deputy) to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- (i) Prior submission of Great Crested Newt presence/likely absence survey work confirming an absence of Great Crested Newts from the site, or any Great Crested Newt compensation or mitigation measures (if required) being secured via planning condition(s) (and subject to no objections being raised by Surrey Wildlife Trust Ecology Planning Advice Service);
- (ii) Planning conditions set out in the report (plus any additional condition(s) which may be required for Great Crested Newt compensation or mitigation measures); and
- (iii) Prior completion of an Undertaking of the Chief Executive of Woking Borough Council to secure the SAMM (TBH SPA) contribution of £12,246.

7. VOTE OF THANKS

Councillor L Morales would become the Mayor of Woking in 2024-25, so would no longer sit on the Committee. On behalf of the Planning Committee, Councillor S Dorsett thanked Councillor L Morales for her chairmanship over the last three years.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and ended at 8.20 pm

Chairman: _____

Date: _____