

MINUTES
OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

held on 16 July 2024

Present:

Cllr L Lyons (Chair)
Cllr G Cosnahan (Vice-Chair)

Cllr A Javaid	Cllr C Martin
Cllr D Jordan	Cllr T Spenser
Cllr R Leach	Cllr M Sullivan

Also Present: Councillor S Greentree.

Absent: Councillors S Mukherjee and P Pandher.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S Mukherjee and P Pandher.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor T Spenser declared a pecuniary interest in minute item 6a. 2023/1003 18 Beaconsfield Road, Kingfield arising from a personal connection through the application. The interest was such that speaking and voting was not permissible and Councillor T Spenser would leave the chamber during consideration of the application.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 4 June 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. 2023/1003 18 Beaconsfield Road, Kingfield

[NOTE 1: Councillor T Spenser left the Chamber for the duration of the item.]

[NOTE 2: In accordance with the procedure for public speaking at Planning Committee, Ms Helen Wyss attended the meeting and spoke in objection to the application.]

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of existing dwelling and detached garage and erection of two semi-detached two-storey dwellings with associated landscaping and refuse and cycle storage.

Some Members wanted reassurance regarding the off-street parking and also that the windows facing the neighbouring properties would be obscured. The Planning Officer advised the Committee that the parking provision for the application exceeded the minimum standards. The Planning Officer also confirmed that the side windows would be obscure glazed and with restricted opening.

Following a question about the loss of daylight in the kitchen, the Planning Officer explained that some rooms did not hold the same level of protection for access to light. On assessment, it was considered that the kitchen at number 16 was used solely for the cooking of food, and not for dining, given the layout. The definition of habitable room in this instance was any rooms used or intended to be used for sleeping or living which were not solely used for cooking purposes. Taking this all into account the Planning Officer considered the development to be acceptable in terms of its relationship with the neighbouring property and would not have a significant impact.

A member of the Committee questioned what would happen if the resident at number 16 changed the layout of their property and the kitchen became a habitable room. The Planning Officer advised that the Committee that they could only consider the application as it was in front of them and could not consider any future layout changes to the property.

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

In favour: Cllrs G Cosnahan, A Javaid, R Leach, L Lyons (Chairman), C Martin and M Sullivan.

TOTAL: 6

Against: None

TOTAL: 0

Present but not voting: Cllr D Jordan.

TOTAL: 1

The application was therefore approved.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions and Section 106 Legal Agreement.

6b. 2024/0078 3 Blackmore Crescent, Sheerwater

The Committee considered an application for the proposed change of use of amenity land to provide access and creation of hardstanding from the existing dropped kerb to driveway.

RESOLVED

That the planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.

6c. 2024/0193 21 Oak Tree Road, Knaphill

The Committee considered an application for retrospective Variation of Condition 1 (Approved Plans) of PLAN/2023/0792 (Retrospective Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) of PLAN/2022/0547 (Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement dwelling)) to increase the height of the single storey rear element, increase the height of the two-storey front projection and alterations to fenestration.

Following a question from the Committee on the direct impact of this application on the neighbouring property, the Planning Officer explained that it was the overbearing impact due to the height of the rear element of the application. The Planning Officer clarified that the height variance from the approved application was 0.3 metres, which was significantly higher than what was proposed.

Some Members commented that the rear extension was now further away from the adjoining property and questioned whether this made any difference on the overbearing impact. The Planning Officer commented that some of the extension was stepped back, but the part that was a concern in regards to overbearance was the part closest to the neighbouring property which had been built at an increased height.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be REFUSED and formal enforcement proceedings be authorised.

6d. 2024/0033 266 Albert Drive, Sheerwater

[NOTE: The Planning Officer advised the Committee of an update to the table in paragraph 6 of the report. The internal floor space measurements had been used, rather than the external measurements; this did not alter the Planning Officers assessment of the application and the recommendation.]

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a two storey dwelling with single storey front and rear projections following the demolition of the existing dwelling and garage (amended description).

The Planning Officer advised the Committee that the replacement dwelling was considerably larger than the existing dwelling and would be closer to the boundary. There

had been no examples of similar extensions locally that should be considered as part of this application. The Planning Officer explained that their concerns did not include loss of daylight or the proportionality of the plot. The issue was the overbearing impact and sense of enclosure the application would have on the neighbouring property and the proximity to the side boundary.

Councillor A Javaid, Ward Councillor, thought that the application suited the size of the plot, which was very large.

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

In favour: Cllrs G Cosnahan, D Jordan, R Leach, L Lyons (Chairman), C Martin, T Spenser and M Sullivan.

TOTAL: 7

Against: Cllr A Javaid.

TOTAL: 1

Present but not voting: None.

TOTAL: 0

The application was therefore refused.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be REFUSED.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and ended at 8.00 pm

Chairman: _____

Date: _____