

MINUTES
OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

held on 13 November 2018

Present:

Cllr M A Whitehand (Vice-Chair in the Chair)

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

Also Present: Cllr L Lyons

Absent: Cllr G S Cundy

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 16 October 2018 be approved and signed as a true and correct record.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor G Cundy.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In accordance with the Officer Procedure Rules, Peter Bryant, Head of Democratic and Legal Services, and Douglas Spinks, Deputy Chief Executive, both declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item No. 6b – 9-13 Poole Road & Sections of Poole Road, Goldsworth Road & Church Street West arising from their positions as Council appointed Directors of Thamesway Energy Limited (and other Thamesway Companies). The interest was such that it would not prevent the Offices from advising on that item.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of Urgent Business.

5. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT APPEALS

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. 2018/0596 - New Central Development, Guildford Road, Woking

[Note1: In accordance with the procedure for public speaking at Planning Committee, Ms. Candance Relf attended the meeting and spoke in objection to the application and Mr Rob Winkley spoke in support of the application.]

[Note 2: The Committee were advised of an amendment to Condition 13 as detailed below:

Works to construct the development hereby permitted shall only take place between the hours of 0830 and 1730 Mondays to Fridays (inclusive) and not at all on Saturdays, Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of existing New Central occupiers from noise and disturbance during the most sensitive hours during the construction period in accordance with Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016), Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2018)].

[Note 3: The Committee were advised of an amendment to informative as detailed below:

The applicant's attention would be drawn to Sections 60 and 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and the associated British Standard Code of Practice BS 5228: 1984 "Noise Control on Construction and Open Sites" (with respect to the statutory provision relating to the control of noise on construction and demolition sites). If work would be carried out outside normal working hours, (i.e. 8 am to 6 pm Monday to Friday, 8 am to 1 pm Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays) prior consent would need to be obtained from the Council's Environmental Health Service prior to commencement of works. This informative is provided without prejudice to details required pursuant to condition 04 of this notice].

The Planning Committee considered a planning application for the erection of rooftop extensions to existing apartment blocks (Blocks A, B, C, D and F) (known as Nankeville Court, Bradfield House and Cardinal Place) ranging in height from 1 to 3 storeys to provide forty three apartments, (twenty four studios, eighteen one beds, eighteen 2 beds and one three bed) together with private and communal roof terraces. Alterations to existing basement level would provide cycle and refuse/recycling storage.

Councillor Lyons, Ward Councillor, spoke in objection to the application which he thought would set an unwelcome precedent in the area. He raised some concerns which included the development impact that would affect existing residents and the direct neighbours. Whilst accepting that the original leasehold had a clause permitting for further development, it was assumed that the clause had been added to simply allow for the completion of existing works, as many residents had moved into the development before works had been completed.

Councillor Lyons focused on Policies CS11, CS12, CS17 and CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy. He believed that the proposal did not conform to these policies and asked the Committee to reflect on the detrimental impact to the residents if the proposed development would be accepted. He requested the Committee to consider the refusal of the application on the grounds of light, privacy and design.

The Chairman requested the Planning Officer to address concerns raised by the Public Speaker and Councillor Lyons.

The Planning Officer advised that in regards to the planning application 2016/0834 7 York Road, the scheme had fallen outside the boundaries of the current application. Subsequently a parking survey had been carried out to the existing residential units, this equated to 0.4 parking spaces per unit. The allocation of 20 parking spaces for the proposed forty three apartments would equate to a car parking provision of 0.4 parking spaces per unit. This had been considered to be acceptable having regard to the Woking Town Centre location of the site and permitted with Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy(2012), SPD Parking Standards (2018) and the provisions of the NPPF (2018).

In regards to affordable housing, the NPPF set out that the onus to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justified the need for a viability assessment at the application stage lay with the applicant. The weight which would be given to a viability assessment was a matter for the decision maker, having regard to all the circumstances. With this in mind, the applicant had set out the planning application without affordable housing and had supported the application with a viability appraisal to demonstrate why the development could not provide affordable housing. It had been concluded that the inputs including the viability appraisal were reasonable and that the development had been unable to provide any elements of affordable housing.

The Planning Officer responded to concerns regarding the daylight impact. He confirmed that the existing residential properties had been assessed by the applicant within a Daylight and Sunlight Report carried out in compliance with the Building Research Establishment (BRE). It was noted that the outcomes of the assessment had conformed to the BRE guidelines.

It was noted that the proposed housing mix provided a higher number of 1 and 2 bed units than was stated within the Policy CS11. It had been acknowledged that not every development site could deliver the complete mix of unit sizes. It was underlined that Policy CS11 operated and had been monitored Borough-wide. The proposal was considered to provide a good overall mix of dwelling types and sizes which would be considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policy CS11 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012).

It was noted that the development would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to the sum of £239,824.

Councillor Morales proposed and it was duly seconded by Councillor Boote that the application should be refused on the grounds that it was an ill considered, inappropriate overdevelopment proposal, which would have an impact to the existing neighbouring residents. Councillor Morales expressed concerns on the parking provision for the additional dwellings, stating that the Parking Standards SDP had a minimum requirement of 0.5 and one parking space per one and two bedroom units inclusive.

Councillor Boote expressed sympathy for neighbouring residents for the further development and drew attention to the adverse impact affecting the already exhausted community infrastructure within the Town Centre.

Some Councillors expressed dismay to the title deed holders of the existing apartments who had not been informed of future developments to the current structure.

Whilst acknowledging Members' frustrations, the Chairman reminded Members of the Committee to consider the planning application brought before the Committee in terms of the planning policy.

Some Members expressed concern regarding affordable housing, and it was considered that the existing and proposed development did not provide any of the 40% affordable housing requirements according to Borough's policy. The Committee heard that the applicant had submitted viability information which had been independently reviewed and it had been concluded that the scheme would not be capable of providing affordable housing.

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

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

TOTAL: 5

Against: TOTAL: 0

Present but not voting: Cllrs S Ashall, N Martin and M Whitehand (Chairman)

TOTAL: 3

The application was therefore refused.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be refused.

6b. 2018/0633 - 9 -13 Poole Road & Sections of Poole Road, Goldsworth Road & Church Street West, Woking

[Note 1: The Committee were advised of an addendum].

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a mixed-use development ranging in height to seventeen storeys, comprising GIA energy centre (flexible Sui Generis/Class B1), co-working space, two hundred and forty seven student and co-living rooms with shared kitchens and associated communal space, rooftop amenity space, in addition to associated landscaping, waste and ancillary spaces. Installation of three thermal store vessels and ancillary infrastructure structures including above ground pipework. Installation of subterranean district heating main and private wire electricity cables beneath Poole Road, Goldsworth Road and Church Street West (amended plans and description).

Councillor I Eastwood requested clarification of the flue height.

The Planning Officer confirmed that it stood at sixty five metres above ground level, as determined by the height of the building. It was noted that separate approval would need to be pursued for the CHP under the environmental regulations in regards to the flue.

Some Councillors had not been convinced that students would travel such distances to access proposed student accommodation.

The Chairman reassured Members that the proposed accommodation would not be exclusively for students. It was highlighted that the accommodation would attract a range of individuals including post graduates and small business owners.

The Planning Officer responded to a query on the potential noise generated from the CHP plant. It was noted that recommendations in respect of noise management were outlined in detail in the report.

Councillor Aziz, Ward Councillor, commented that whilst permission had been granted for the original proposed six storey building, he doubted that the proposed accommodation would be solely taken up by students.

The Chairman reiterated to Members that the proposed accommodation would not be aimed for students only.

Douglas Spinks, Deputy Chief Executive, noted to members that not more than 20% of the proposed accommodation had been intended for students. However, it would be more applicable to any other education or institution in the Borough currently or the near future. Douglas Spinks pointed out to Members that the proposed application merely sought to provide an alternate type of accommodation which had the potential to help the current housing needs within the Borough.

Councillor Ashall requested clarification on the design review of the proposed application.

Chris Dale, The Development Manager referred the Committee to paragraph 41 of the report which stated that the proposal had been amended to respond to comments of the Design Review Panel.

Members continued discussions on the design of the proposals and considered that the development was of an unexceptional standard. It was thought that there had been no significant changes made to the design since the previous proposal.

Some of Members of the Committee indicated that they were not minded to support the application and deemed the proposal to be unacceptable. Councillor Morales proposed and it was duly seconded by Councillor Boote that the application should be refused on the grounds of mass and bulk, poor design and insufficient parking.

Some Councillors noted that safety precautions had been addressed in the report. The Planning Officer advised that safety for occupants was not a planning matter and that the applicant would be responsible to follow necessary safety policies.

Douglas Spinks emphasised that the proposal had not been drawn up to provide a conventional housing proposition and sought instead to address a gap in the market that would help towards the building, sustaining and maintaining of a sustainability community. It was further stressed that the applicant had set an indication that not more than 20% of the units would be occupied by students and that Thamesway would ensure that occupation was carefully managed to help in meeting the overall housing needs of the borough.

Douglas Spinks also cautioned the Committee that refusing the application on design grounds would put the Local Planning Authority in a difficult position, as Members had been advised that the proposal had been the subject of a design review panel following

which significant improvements had been made. It was noted that, whilst individual Members might disagree with the proposed style, the Committee would find itself in a difficult position in the event of an appeal against refusal.

Peter Bryant, Head of Legal Services, advised Members that, as Planning Committee Members, they had to be mindful in considering and determining the planning application of the material considerations of the proposal before them.

Following the debate, and in accordance with Standing Order 22.2, the votes for and against refusal of the application were recorded as follows:

In Favour: Cllrs T Aziz, A Boote, N Martin and L Morales

TOTAL: 4

Against: Cllrs S Ashall, C Chrystie and I Eastwood

TOTAL: 3

Present but not voting: Cllr M Whitehand (Chairman)

TOTAL: 1

The application was therefore refused.

RESOVLED

That the planning application be refused.

6c. 2018/0886 - Compton, Sutton Green Road, Sutton Green, Woking

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a four-bedroom chalet bungalow following demolition of an existing three-bedroom bungalow.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions and legal agreement.

6d. 2018/0781 - 100 Inkerman Road, Knaphill, Woking

The Committee considered an application which sought planning permission for the erection of a four-bedroom end of terrace dwelling following demolition of an existing attached garage.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions and legal agreement.

6e. 2018/8308 - 23 Hollybank, Allen House Park, Hook Heath, Woking

The Committee considered an application submitted by a local Councillor to reduce three trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order.

RESOLVED

That a permit be granted for the reduction of the three trees.

6f. 2018/0948 - 5 Trentham Crescent, Old Woking

The Committee considered an application which sought planning permission to replace the existing white uPVC framed windows on the front and rear elevations with black uPVC framed windows.

Councillor Eastwood, Ward Councillor, had called in the application to the Planning Committee for consideration by the Committee Members.

Following a question regarding planning permission for the replacement of windows, the Development Manager confirmed that planning permission would need to be sought under the Planning Policy for the replacement of a different colour to the existing windows.

Some Members thought that the proposed change of colour of UPVC from white to black would not have a significant impact to the current street scene and welcomed the proposal.

Councillor G Chrystie warned Members on consistency of considering proposals brought forward to the Committee. He suggested that the proposal did not comply with the Borough's Policies and would not create a positive impact to the current street scene.

In view of the debate and in accordance with Standing Order 22.2 the Chairman deemed that a vote should be taken. The votes for and against approval of the application were recorded as follows:

In favour: Cllrs T Aziz, A J Boote, I Eastwood and L Morales

TOTAL: 4

Against: Cllrs G Chrystie and N Martin

TOTAL: 2

Present but not voting: Cllrs S Ashall and M A Whitehand (Chairman)

TOTAL: 2

The application was therefore approved.

RESOLVED

That (i) planning permission be granted; and

(ii) a draft list of Conditions and Informative to be agreed by the Development Manager.

6g. 2018/0959 - High Gardens, Hook Heath, Woking

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a metal gate and brick walling/pillars at the entrance to a private cul-de-sac.

RESOLVED

That the planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and ended at 9.37 pm

Chairman: _____

Date: _____