

MINUTES  
OF A MEETING OF THE  
**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

held on 20 March 2018

Present:

Cllr G G Chrystie (Chairman)  
Cllr M A Whitehand (Vice-Chair)

Cllr A Azad	Cllr D Harlow
Cllr T Aziz	Cllr S Hussain
Cllr A J Boote	Cllr L M N Morales
Cllr I Eastwood	Cllr C Rana

Also Present: Councillor J Kingsbury.

**1. MINUTES**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 27 February 2018 be approved and signed as a true and correct record.

**1a. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

No apologies for absence were received.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor S Hussain declared a non-pecuniary interest in minute item 5j. TPO/0009/0050 – Land at St Johns Primary School, Victoria Road, Knaphill - arising from his nephew attending the school. The interest was such that speaking and voting were permissible.

In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor G G Chrystie declared a non-pecuniary interest in minute item 5h. 2018/0137 St Johns Ambulance Car Park, Board School Road, Woking – arising from his holding of a small number of shares in the National Grid. The interest was such that speaking and voting were permissible.

In accordance with the Officer Procedure Rules, Peter Bryant, Head of Democratic and Legal Services declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 5h. 2018/0137 St Johns Ambulance Car Park, Board School Road, Woking – arising from his position as a Council appointed Director of the Thamesway Developments Ltd. The interest was such that it would not prevent the Officer from advising on the item.

In accordance with the Officer Procedure Rules, Peter Bryant, Head of Democratic and Legal Services declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 5h. 2018/0137 St Johns Ambulance Car Park, Board School Road, Woking – arising from his holding of a small

number of shares in the National Grid. The interest was such that it would not prevent the Officer from advising on the item.

**3. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of Urgent Business.

**4. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT APPEALS**

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

**5. 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.

**5a. 2018/0049 Land South of Orchard End, Orchard Drive, Horsell**

[NOTE: The Planning Officer advised the Committee that eleven additional letters of objection had been received which mainly reiterated the comments already summarised within the representations section of the report. Additional points had been raised regarding pre-application advice, a refused application at 63 Orchard Drive and that the proposed development would set a precedent and have an adverse impact on the urban area of special residential character and conservation area]

The Committee considered a full planning application for the erection of one two-storey detached house (three-bedroom) following demolition of existing garage, including retention of one existing two storey detached house (three-bedroom) with reduced curtilage.

Councillor B Hunwicks, Ward Councillor, spoke in objection to the application and commented that the site was very cramped, on a dangerous bend and that the development would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area. Councillor B Hunwicks thought that the submitted application was almost identical (minus the garage) to the application submitted in 2016 which had been refused by the Planning Committee at that time. The Ward Councillor urged the Planning Committee to consider refusing the application due to the concerns raised above.

Regarding the pre-application advice that had been provided, the Planning Officer clarified that the siting, design and form of the planning application under consideration by the Committee was different to that submitted in 2016. The main differences noted were the cat slide roof and the separation distance of the properties, which is why the application had been recommended for approval by Officers. The Committee were reminded that any pre-application advice was provided without prejudice and did not pre-empt the decision of the Committee.

On the matter of the location of the site positioned on the bend of a road, the Planning Officer commented that the County Highways Authority had raised no objections. There would be no additional driveway access installed as the two existing crossovers would be utilised.

It was noted that policy DM11 encouraged development of garden land and that the resulting density of the proposed development was less than the indicative density set out in Policy CS10.

A number of Members thought that the proposed development was a good use of the space available and that the density was acceptable.

Some Councillors thought that the lack of a garage would encourage on street parking resulting in highway congestion and safety concerns. It was noted that a number of other properties on this road did not have garages and it was thought that the Controlled Parking Zone would prevent any overflow road parking.

Following a query it was confirmed that the parking provision had been assessed against the current Parking Standards SPD but not against the proposed Parking Standards SPD as this had not yet been agreed or adopted and as such could only be afforded very limited weight.

Following a query, Planning Officers commented that the application was unlikely to set a precedent in the area as there were no similar sites within the vicinity. It was also noted that the application did not fall within, or sit adjacent to a conservation area.

In accordance with Standing Order 10.8, the Chairman deemed that a division should be taken on the recommendation. The votes for and against approval of the application were recorded as follows.

In favour: Cllrs T Aziz, A J Boote, I Eastwood, D Harlow, S Hussain L M N Morales and C Rana.

TOTAL: 7

Against: Cllrs A Azad and M A Whitehand.

TOTAL: 2

Present but not voting: Cllr G G Chrystie.

TOTAL: 1

The application was therefore approved.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to the recommended conditions and SAMM (TBH SPA) contribution secured by Legal Agreement.

#### **5b. 2017/1317 Byfleet Cricket Pavilion at Sports Ground, Parvis Road, Byfleet**

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a single storey detached building to provide sports facilities for the Byfleet Cricket Club.

Following a query regarding sustainable drainage solutions, the Planning Officer advised that for a building of this size it would be considered unreasonable to add a Condition regarding additional sustainable drainage solutions. It was noted that the drainage would be managed by existing systems in place on site.

Councillor A Boote, Ward Councillor, commented that she was happy to support this application as this was a well used facility.

RESOLVED

The planning permission be granted subject to the conditions.

**5c. 2017/1383 Land rear of 19-21 Woodham Waye, Woodham**

[NOTE: The Planning Officer advised the Committee that one additional letter of objection had been received which mainly raised concerns around overlooking issues.

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a two-storey detached house. Notwithstanding a chimney on its side (north) elevation the new house was proposed to have an overall width of 16.2 m, a depth of 10.1m and a height of 8.35m. It was proposed to have four bedrooms and an integral garage. The house was proposed to have a contemporary appearance which would result from a combination of its form and external materials palette. Its form would consist of three main elements. The largest of these three elements was a two-storey pitched roof element with two irregularly profiled parapet walls; a gable (with an angled wall) was proposed on its front elevation. To the side (south) of the main two-storey element would be a two-storey mono-pitched roof element. To the rear of both two-storey elements would be a single-storey flat roof element which would include a covered outdoor area. A door with a two-storey window to the side of it, a ground floor window with timber slats in front of it serving a bathroom, a garage door, a ground floor window, two first floor windows and a first floor window with timber slats in front of its lower section are proposed in the front elevation. Two ground floor windows are proposed in its side (north) elevation. A ground floor window and a two-storey window (serving the front gable) were proposed in its side (south) elevation. Two sets of sliding doors, a door, a ground floor window, four first floor windows and two projecting angled windows are proposed in its rear elevation. According to information in the submitted drawings and application form the house was proposed to have an exterior materials palette of white render, timber cladding, zinc roofing and aluminium window frames. Photovoltaic panels are also proposed on the south-facing mono-pitched roof.

The house was proposed to be set back from the street by a front garden and gravel driveway. A proposed dropped kerb at the south east corner of the site was proposed to provide access to this driveway. The property was also proposed to have an irregular-shaped rear garden. The front garden was proposed to be bounded from the street by semi-open timber fencing. The side and rear boundaries are proposed to be bounded by vegetative boundaries.

Councillor T Aziz, Ward Councillor, commented that he thought the proposed application was a good use of the land and that he liked the contemporary style.

Some Members of the Committee did not like the contemporary style and thought that the design was out of character with the other properties in the area. The Planning Officer commented that even though the design was in contrast to existing properties in the cul-de-sac, although these were all of varying styles, paragraph 59 of the NPPF stated that the Planning Authority should not try to impose architectural style or stifle innovation. The Planning Officers considered the proposed development to be sufficiently innovative in its own right to merit permission. It was also noted that Condition 3 stated that materials must be submitted and approved before the commencement of the development

Following further discussion it was agreed that an additional informative be added regarding the design as detailed below;

‘In discharging condition 3 (materials) the applicant is advised to avoid the use of bright white render as this is unlikely to be supported by the Local Planning Authority in this context.’

**RESOLVED**

That planning permission be granted subject to the additional informative noted above and the conditions set out in the report.

**5d. 2017/1050 11-17 Chertsey Road, Woking**

[NOTE: The Planning Officer advised the Committee of an update to Condition 4 as detailed below;

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, details of the proposed waste and recycling storage and management arrangements for the development, including a secure enclosure, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details as may be agreed shall then be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved and retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development hereby approved.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and to ensure the appropriate provision of infrastructure in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Woking Core Strategy 2012.]

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a third, fourth and fifth floor extension to create two additional floors comprising 6x flats (5x one bed & 1x two bed). The proposal also includes rear extensions at first and second floor level and alterations to the external finishes of the existing building. Existing plant on the rear elevation would be contained within an enclosure.

**RESOLVED**

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and Section 106 Agreement to secure SAMM contribution.

**5e. 2017/0866 30 Lambourne Crescent, Sheerwater, Woking**

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a two storey side extension to the existing property and the sub-division of the property into two self-contained two bedroom flats. A new vehicular crossover onto Lambourne Crescent and the provision of four parking spaces to the frontage was also proposed.

Councillor T Aziz, Ward Councillor, commented that he was supportive of the application as the flats were of a good size and adequate parking had been provided.

**RESOLVED**

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and Section 106 Agreement to secure SAMM contribution.

**5f. 2018/0103 Wheelers Barn, Warren Lane, Pyrford**

[NOTE: The Planning Officer advised the Committee of an update to Condition 4 as detailed below;

The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the following external materials unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

**Brick:** Wienerberger Renaissance Multi Brick

**Tile:** Milford Roof Tiles – Milford Heather (Handmade Clay Tiles)

**Timber:** Untreated green oak posts, head beams and knee braces for jointed and pegged oak frame.

Back and side fill with untreated softwood 4x2 studs and softwood featheredge weatherboards.

Weatherboards to be painted with black/dark grey water-based acrylic barn paint to match colour of existing adjacent barn.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate appearance within the rural setting and to preserve the setting of the adjacent Listed barn in accordance with Policies CS20 and CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM20 of the Development Management Policies DPD (DMP DPD) (2016), Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012), Policy BE1 of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan (2016 - 2027) and SPG 'Heritage of Woking (2000)'.]

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a detached building to provide alternative roosting for bats (to allow for restoration of the roof of the adjacent listed barn), storage of agricultural materials and tools and temporary parking of vehicles.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to the recommended conditions

**5g. 2018/0104 Wheelers Barn, Warren Lane, Pyrford**

[NOTE: The Planning Officer advised the Committee of an update to Condition 3 as detailed below;

The following external materials shall be used in the repair and restoration of the barn unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

**Tile:** Milford Roof Tiles – Milford Heather (Handmade Clay Tiles)

**Weatherboards:** Untreated softwood featheredge weatherboards – to repair and match existing where damaged.

**Paint/Stain:** Weatherboards to be painted with black/dark grey water-based acrylic barn paint to match colour of existing barn.

**Rainwater goods:** To match existing: new half-round deep flow black plastic gutter and downpipes with side rafter brackets.

**Brick: Wienerberger Renaissance Multi Brick.**

Reason: To preserve the special architectural and heritage interest of the listed building in accordance with Policy CS20 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM20 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016), Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Heritage of Woking (2000)' and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).]

The Committee considered a Listed Building Consent application for the restoration of barn, including repairs to roof, replacement weatherboarding and restoration of brick plinth and barn doors.

RESOLVED

That the Listed Building Consent be granted subject to the recommended conditions.

**5h. 2018/0137 St John Ambulance Car Park, Board School Road, Woking**

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a single storey electrical substation to the north-west corner of existing car park, including associated ground works to provide the incoming and outgoing electric feeds across the site.

Councillor T Aziz, Ward Councillor, asked for confirmation regarding the construction method statement and timings so that the development would not impact on Board School Road, which was often very busy. The Planning Officer advised that Condition 3 covered some aspects of this, however it would be unsuitable to impose further Conditions due to the small scale of the scheme and due to the fact that it was located on an existing tarmac site that would accommodate any construction equipment.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to the recommended conditions.

**5i. 2018/0050 29 Silver Birch Close, Woodham, Woking**

The Committee considered an application which sought retrospective planning permission for the retention of treehouse to rear of rear garden.

Following a query it was confirmed that it was the newly constructed first floor section of the tree house that was subject to enforcement.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be refused and authorise formal enforcement proceedings.

**5j. TPO/0009/2017 Land at St Johns Primary School, Victoria Road, Knaphill**

[NOTE: The Planning Officer advised the Committee that two additional letters of objection had been received which mainly reiterated the comments already summarised within the report.]

The Committee considered a recommendation for a Tree Preservation Order to be confirmed following the receipt of one letter of objection to the making of the Order. The

Tree Preservation Order protected a mature Sweet Chestnut tree of approximately 18m in height at St Johns Primary School, Victoria Road, Knaphill, Surrey, GU21 2AS.

The majority of Members were supportive of health and safety concerns that had been raised by the school regarding the sweet chestnut tree. These included an uneven surface due to roots, a slippery surface due to the large shaded canopy and the considerable chestnut and leaf fall in autumn. It was considered that all of the concerns listed impacted on the children's safety when playing near this tree.

Some Members requested further information regarding the protection of sweet chestnut trees to allow them to make an informed decision. The Planning Officers commented that they felt that all the necessary information was included in the report. One Member thought that the tree should be protected due to the rarity of a sweet chestnut tree of this age, its high public amenity and educational value and how it contributed to pollution reduction.

Councillor S Hussain proposed and it was duly seconded that the Tree Protection Order not be confirmed.

In accordance with Standing Order 10.8, the Chairman deemed that a division should be taken on the motion above. The votes for and against not confirming the Tree Protection Order were recorded as follows.

In favour: Cllrs T Aziz, D Harlow, S Hussain, C Rana and M A Whitehand.

TOTAL: 5

Against: L M N Morales

TOTAL: 1

Present but not voting: Cllrs A J Boote, G G Chrystie and I Eastwood.

TOTAL: 3

The Tree Protection Order was therefore not confirmed.

RESOLVED

That the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) not be confirmed.

#### **5k. TPO/0012/2017 Land at Brushfield Way, Knaphill**

The Committee considered a recommendation for a Tree Preservation Order to be confirmed following the receipt of two letters of objection to the making of the Order. The Tree Preservation Order protects 11 trees including 1 Cedar, 1 Plane and 9 Limes which varied in both age and height on Land at Brushfield way, Knaphill, Woking, Surrey.

The Committee noted that some of the trees had been heavily pollarded.

It was noted that some Councillors had been contacted by local residents regarding their concerns relating to some of the trees; particularly the proximity of some trees to properties.

It was proposed that the Committee take the decision on the Tree Protection Orders for each tree individually.

The Committee were unanimous in their agreement to confirm the Tree Protection Order for T8, T9, T10 and T11.

The Committee were unanimous in their agreement to not confirm the Tree Protection Order for T1, T2, T4, T 5 and T7.

The Committee were unanimous in their agreement to confirm the Tree Protection Order for T6.

In accordance with Standing Order 10.8, the Chairman deemed that a division should be taken on the confirmation for Tree Protection Order on T3. The votes for and against confirmation for Tree Protection Order were recorded as follows.

In favour: Cllrs T Aziz, A J Boote, G G Chrystie, I Eastwood and L M N Morales.

TOTAL: 5

Against: Cllrs S D Harlow, Hussain, C Rana and M A Whitehand.

TOTAL: 4

The Tree Protection Order was therefore confirmed.

RESOLVED

That the Tree Preservation Order be partially confirmed, as detailed below;

The Tree Preservation Order was confirmed in respect of trees – T3, T6, T8, T9, T10 and T11;

The Tree Preservation Order was not confirmed in respect of trees – T1, T2, T4, T5 and T7.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and ended at 9.55 pm

Chairman: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_