

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

held on 25 September 2018  
Present:

Cllr G S Cundy (Chairman)  
Cllr M A Whitehand (Vice-Chair)

Cllr S Ashall	Cllr I Eastwood
Cllr T Aziz	Cllr N Martin
Cllr A J Boote	Cllr L M N Morales
Cllr G G Chrystie	

**1. MINUTES**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 4 September 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**

Councillor T Aziz declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 5d. 2018/0699 Olympic Court, Marlborough Road, Woking arising from the proximity of his office to the application site. The Head of Democratic and Legal Services confirmed that this was not a formal interest under the Members' Code of Conduct (due to the distance between the office and the application site), so speaking and voting was permissible.

**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. 2017/0728 Heathside Car Park, Heathside Crescent , Woking**

[Note 1: The Planning Officer advised Members that two additional letters of objection had been received which mainly reiterated the comments already summarised in the report, including a comment on the current consultation plans to remodel the Victoria Arch and Guildford Road which may present future traffic congestion.]

[Note 2: In accordance with the procedure for public speaking at Planning Committee, Mr Michael Smith attended the meeting and spoke in objection to the application.]

[Note 3: Tony Otterson from Surrey County Council Highways was in attendance and responded to queries on technical highway matters.]

The planning application sought permission for the removal of a pitch roof and extension of a car park from three storeys six levels to six storeys twelve levels which would increase parking spaces from 479 to 793. The application included a proposed new access off White Rose Lane and alterations to existing access off Heathside Road.

At the request of the Chairman, the Planning Officer responded to a number of queries raised by the public speaker. Major concerns included highway matters and importantly road safety for pedestrians.

Tony Otterson advised Members that a capacity analysis for the development had been carried out based on traffic data provided from the previous year. The analysis was projected on the increase of traffic relating to the existing ratio of increase in parking space. Tony Otterson added that the proposed entry and exit points would cope with the increase in the volume of vehicles. In response to concerns raised on queues developing along White Rose Lane to access the car park, it was anticipated that there would be minimal queuing during peak times. The traffic assessment had concluded that the entry and exit system would be adequate and would unlikely impact on the highway. A raised entry table with tactile paving was proposed for the new access off White Rose Lane which was suggested for pedestrian safety.

Councillor Chrystie asked whether surveys had been carried out over a period of time and what types of method used. Tony Otterson stated that Surrey County Council Highways had based the assessment on an independent consultation provided to the applicant. It was noted that the scope of the Traffic Assessment would have been agreed with SCC Highways and the assessment would be based on information provided in the application.

Some Members raised concerns over potential disruption to traffic and pedestrian road safety if the proposal was granted.

Councillor Morales raised concerns on the proposed design to the car park, stating that it was not of an exceptional standard.

In view of the concerns expressed, Councillor L Morales proposed and Councillor G Chrystie duly seconded a proposal to refuse the application on the grounds of poor design and pedestrian road safety.

Douglas Spinks reminded Members on the two options available if the Members of the Committee were not minded to approve the application:

- (i) defer the application, for the following reasons:
  - highway and pedestrians safety;
  - design; and
  - air pollution
  
- (ii) to refuse the application

Douglas Spinks added that Members would be in a difficult situation in refusing the application in view of the representations by the Highway Authority, which had deemed the proposal to be acceptable after assessing the traffic analysis. Members would be placed into a difficult position if the decision was taken to move from a recommendation to approve to a recommendation to refuse the application. Douglas Spinks advised that it would be a reasonable option to defer the proposed application in view of the concerns expressed.

Further discussion ensued on the lack of exceptional design to the car park structure. Chris Dale clarified that the descriptions of developments within proposed applications would not normally include every meticulous finish. The description of the proposal was intended to alert the public on the nature of proposal to be considered. He added that the planning illustrations of the proposal were considered to be permitted once planning permission be granted.

In accordance with Standing Order 22.2 the votes for and against refusal of the application were recorded as follows:

In Favour: Cllr G Chrystie, I Eastwood, L Morales and M Whitehand

Total in favour: 4

Against: Cllrs S Ashall, T Aziz, A Boote and N Martin

Total against: 4

The application was therefore not refused.

Councillor I Eastwood proposed and Councillor S Ashall seconded a motion to defer the application. In accordance with standing Order 22.2 the votes for and against to defer the application were recorded as follows:

In Favour: Cllrs S Ashall, G Chrystie, I Eastwood, L Morales and M Whitehand

Total in favour: 5

Against: Cllrs T Aziz, A Boote and N Martin

Total against: 3

The application was therefore deferred for reasons detailed in the minutes.

RESOLVED

That the planning application be deferred.

**5b. 2018/0758 84 Park Road, Woking**

[Note1: In accordance with the procedure for public speaking at Planning Committee, Mr Richard Hennessy attended the meeting and spoke in objection to the application and Mr Simon Collins spoke in support to the application.]

The application was for the erection of three detached two storey dwellings with associated vehicular access, car parking and landscaping following demolition of an existing dwelling.

Following a reference to Brookwood Cemetery by the public speaker, the following declarations of interest were made:

In accordance with Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor G Cundy declared a non-pecuniary interest arising from his position as Council appointed Director of Brookwood Cemetery and Associated Companies. The interest was such that speaking and voting was permissible.

In accordance with the Officer Procedure Rules, Peter Bryant, Head of Democratic and Legal Services, and Douglas Spinks, Deputy Chief Executive, declared a non-pecuniary interest arising from their positions as Council appointed Directors of Woking Necropolis and Mausoleum Limited, Brookwood Park Limited and Brookwood Cemetery Limited. The interest was such that speaking was permissible.

The Chairman asked the Planning Officer to address the concerns raised by the public speaker in regards to street scene, access to Ivy Lane, and the visual character of the proposed dwellings.

The Planning Officer advised Members on the access to Ivy Lane, reminding them of the need to be mindful of the Tree Protection Plan which had been issued. On a matter of hardstanding raised, the Planning Officer referred the Members to Condition 6 of the report which stated that prior to any facing 'hard' landscape works would be permitted, full details and/or samples of the facing materials would have to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

Councillor Ashall took opportunity to relay some comments to the Committee which had been received from Councillor Bittleston, Ward Councillor. Councillor Bittleston had expressed disappointment that the proposal was for large five bedroom dwellings rather than high quality two bedroom apartments. Concerns had also been expressed over the access from Ivy Lane.

Councillor Ashall commented that overall he was supportive of the application.

Following debate on the application and the recommendation before the Committee, the votes for and against approval of the application were recorded as follows in accordance with Standing Order 22.2:

In Favour: Cllrs S Ashall, T Aziz, A Boote, G Chrystie, I Eastwood,  
N Martin and L Morales.

Total in favour: 7

Against: Cllr M Whitehand

Total against: 1

The application was therefore approved.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to recommended conditions and SAMM contribution secured by a S106 Legal Agreement.

**5c. 2018/0657 Pippins, 4 Mount Close, Hook Heath, Woking**

The Committee considered a full planning application for the demolition of an existing four bedroom dwelling to be replaced by the erection of a five bedroom dwelling.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to recommended conditions.

**5d. 2018/0699 Olympic Court, Marlborough Road, Woking**

The Committee considered a full planning application for the proposal of a new roof with accommodation to create two one bedroom flats.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions and SAMM contribution secured by S106 Legal Agreement.

**5e. 2018/0429 Garlands, 29a Park Road, Woking**

The Planning Committee consider an application for the erection of a two storey detached dwelling with a replacement five bed dwelling including an integral garage which would be built in a traditional style, following the demolition of the existing bungalow.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to recommended conditions.

**5f. 2018/0759 109 Walton Road, Woking**

The Committee considered an application for the subdivision of an existing four bedroom dwelling into two one bedroom flats and a one three bedroom flat with associated erection

of part two storey, part single storey rear extension, single storey outbuilding and external alterations.

Councillor Aziz, Ward Councillor asked after the provision for parking and community space proposed for the additional dwellings. The Planning Officer acknowledged the Councils SDP (Supplementary Planning Document) Parking Standards which indicated that a minimum parking provision of 0.5 parking spaces per 1 bedroom/flat resulted in the provision of one car park space. It was added that no additional parking provision had been proposed in the proposal.

In regards to amenity space, a communal amenity space would be accessible to all residents. The ground floor unit would gain direct access to the rear amenity space from a rear door whereas the front ground floor unit and first floor unit would access via the side gate.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to recommended conditions and securing a S106 Agreement.

**5g. 2018/0515 4 Anchor Crescent, Knaphill**

The Committee considered an application for the proposed change of use of a first floor retail space to four socially rented residential units including three one-bed and one studio with additional first floor fenestration.

Councillor Chrystie requested clarification on the CIL reported in the proposal. The Planning Officer advised Members that the applicant had initially submitted a Social Housing exemption form (CIL Form 2). The applicant had since withdrawn the exemption form and CIL would now be payable to the amount of £31,036.69.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to recommended conditions and securing a S106 Agreement.

**5h. 2018/0739 23 Bullock Crescent, Woking**

The planning proposal was for a retrospective planning application for change of use of open amenity land to a private residential garden space and the erection of a 1.85m high fence.

Councillor Morales, Ward Councillor, commented on the application and raised concerns on the already limited open amenity space within the area which was extensively used by the resident children. Removing the proposed area would further limit the open amenity space. Councillor Morales was minded to support the recommendation to refuse the application on the grounds that the development represented an unacceptable impact on the character of Bullock Crescent and the wider Moor Lane development. This was by way of the close board timber fencing having resulted in the loss of a prominent area of open amenity land which had reduced the landscape qualities, reduced the sense of openness and made the area appear overdeveloped. The development was therefore contrary to Section 12 of the NPPF, Policy CS21 of the Core Strategy and Woking Design SPD (2015).

In accordance with the recommendation before them, the Members of the Committee

RESOLVED

- That (i) retrospective planning permission be refused; and
- (ii) the Head of Democratic and Legal Services be instructed to issue an Enforcement Notice under Section 172 of The Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) in respect of the above land requiring the remedy of the breach of planning control to be achieved through the removal of the close board timber fencing within two months of the Enforcement Notice taking effect.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and ended at 9.05 pm

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

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