

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

held on 15 January 2019

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 11 December 2018 be approved and signed as a true and correct record.

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest.

**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. 2018/1087 - Kings Head Lane Recreation Ground, Byfleet**

The Planning Committee considered an application for the erection of a storage container.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

**6b. 2018/0078 - Land Rear of No. 1a Rydens Parade, Rydens Way, Old Woking**

The Committee considered a full planning application for the erection of a detached single storey garage following demolition of the existing garage.

[Note 1: The Planning Officer advised the Committee on an update to Condition 2 as detailed below:

Proposed revised wording for Condition 2 (Materials).

The materials used in the external finishes of the development hereby permitted would be those specified in emails from the applicant dated 09/01/2019, including Ibstock 'West Hoathly' medium multi-stock bricks with anthracite grey garage door and window, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and thereafter retained in accordance with the agreed details unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

Following a query regarding representations received alleging that the proposed garage would encroach onto land not owned by the applicant. The Planning Officer advised the Committee that although land ownership is not a material planning consideration, he had been satisfied that the proposed development would take place within land owned controlled by the applicant and the correct Land Ownership Certificate had been signed.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

**6c. 2018/0968 - 7 Tanglewood Close, Pyrford**

The application had been withdrawn from the Agenda.

**6d. 2018/0624 - 1-3 High Street, Knaphill, Woking**

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a three storey building comprising of 3 retail (A1) units at ground floor and 8 self-contained flats (1 bed) at first and second floor with associated parking, landscaping, bin and cycle storage following demolition of existing building.

Members described the site as one of the original pre-Victorian buildings still in existence in the area. It had been argued that the building site should be retained as it had been part of the local heritage in the Knaphill area.

Discussions ensued on the importance of conserving the historic building which was believed to be making a positive contribution to the character of the village.

Following a query the Planning Officer confirmed that the application before the Committee had been amended since the previously refused application 2017/1036. Amendments included the increasing to the eaves and ridge height, introduction of a projecting gable to the east side elevation and alterations to finishing materials, fenestration and roof form.

Councillor Aziz spoke in support of the application stating the importance of sustainability of the proposal.

Councillor Whitehand, Ward Councillor, prompted members to be mindful of the location site and increased negative environmental impact to the area as well as the importance of retaining local heritage.

Douglas Spinks cautioned and reminded Members that the principal consideration before the Committee was not the loss of the existing building in itself, but whether the proposal would make a positive contribution to the street scene in the area or not given the context of the existing building generally being a positive feature in a prominent location.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be refused.

**6e. 2018/1019 - 153 Hawthorn Road, Woking**

**6f. 2018/1026 - 155 Hawthorn Road, Woking**

The Planning Committee considered two retrospective planning application Nos. 2018/1019 and 2018/1026 for a two storey side and rear addition and two storey rear extension following demolition of the existing rear conservatory with car parking space at rear.

Councillor Ashall Ward Councillor, commented that the footprint, front elevation and the roof line had already been established to be acceptable, and questioned whether the Committee felt what was being requested for in addition to whatever had already been approved had been more harmful to the officers suggestions.

Following a query the Planning Officer explained that the application was, in fact, larger than a scheme which had been refused at Planning Committee in March 2017 under planning application 2016/1324 on the basis of height, bulk and mass. It had been suggested that subsequent application 2017/1078 which had been approved was now being used to substantiate a fall-back position for a scheme which accentuated concerns raised in the initial refusal. The fall-back position, however was a substantially smaller scheme with relief offered in way of a single story side and rear additions which reduced the overall bulk and mass of the scheme. The proposal now sought to revert back and extend on a scheme which had been found to be bulky and have a detrimental impact to neighbour amenities.

Some Members felt the previous approved scheme blended in much better than the proposed scheme and found difficulty in understanding the reasoning of the new proposed scheme.

Councillor Aziz was surprised that the application before the Committee had been recommended for refusal, commenting that the proposal had been previously granted with the footprint in the current proposal remaining unchanged. The Planning Officer reiterated on the increased bulk and mass of the proposal which had not been presented in the previous proposal which had been approved.

The Planning Development Team Leader reminded Committee Members to be mindful of practising consistency whilst considering applications brought before the Committee. Members drew attention to the Planning Officer's comments on bulk and mass, which were clearly not addressed in the proposed application. It had been noted that the mass and bulk had been increased by a further 16% of the approved scheme.

Discussions continued and the Deputy Chief Executive Douglas Spinks, reminded Members of the various applications submitted to LPA (Local Planning Authority) by the applicant, explaining that the first application submitted had been refused on grounds of bulk and mass. The second application submitted had included reduced bulk and mass and had been approved. The application under consideration was larger than the application previously refused. The Committee had been warned on not being consistent if the current application was deemed to be acceptable in view of the previous refusal.

Following a query on the drainage scheme, the Planning Officer explained that the drainage report had been recently submitted to the Drainage Officer and that a response was awaited.

Peter Bryant, Head of Democratic and Legal Services cautioned the Committee on difficulties if Members were to approve the application without knowing that the drainage proposals had been acceptable. Whilst acknowledging different views of Members, he advised the Committee to either refuse the application without the meaningful outcome of the drainage report submitted or to defer the application being minded to approve the proposal at a subsequent Committee meeting assuming the drainage report had been considered to be acceptable by the Council's Drainage Officers.

Councillor Morales proposed and it was duly seconded by Councillor Ashall that the application be deferred.

In view of the debate and in accordance to Standing Order 22.2, the votes for and against deferring the application were recorded as follows:

In favour: Cllrs S Ashall, I Eastwood, N Martin and L Morales

TOTAL: 4

Against: Cllrs G Chrystie and M Whitehand

TOTAL: 2

Present but noting voting: Cllrs T Aziz, A Boote and G Cundy (Chairman)

TOTAL: 3

The proposal to defer the application was therefore carried by four votes in favour and two against.

RESOLVED

- That
- (i) planning application No. 2018/1019 be deferred pending a response on a drainage report submitted; and
  - (ii) planning application No. 2018/2026 be deferred pending a response on a drainage report submitted.

**6g. 2018/1175 - Fairoaks Airport, Chobham &**

**6h. 2018/1172 - Fairoaks Airport, Chobham**

The Planning Committee considered two applications Nos. 2018/1175 and 2018/1172 for the formal consultation received from Surrey Heath and Runnymede Borough Councils for a hybrid full application comprising of site accesses (including alterations to existing accesses and a new road junction onto the A320), an outline application for the phased development of the site for up to 1,000 residential units (C3) and elderly care (C2); and, a total of 62,675sqm of non-residential floorspace, Leisure and community (D1/D2) and a hotel (C1), including a strategic parkland and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) with associated car park. The change of use of Blister Hanger (aviation to equestrian), The Pillbox (aviation to D1), Gamekeeper's Cottage the retention of Woking Lodge (C3) and the retention of the Kennels (Sui Generis) and the phased demolition of all other existing buildings. Provision of supporting infrastructure, helipad and associated facilities, re-provision of existing equestrian buildings, open space and landscaping, visitor centre, associated vehicular and other access routes.

The Chairman had been of the opinion that Woking Borough Council should object to the proposed application on the basis that it had not been demonstrated and the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on key infrastructure and facilities within the Borough.

The Chairman suggested the following advice should be conveyed to Surrey Heath and Runnymede Borough Councils in that Woking Borough Council:-

- Had not been satisfied that there was a robust 'Very Special Circumstances' case to justify the strong presumption against development of this nature within the Green Belt.
- Had not been satisfied as to the impacts of the development on the local highways network.
- Had not been satisfied as to the impacts of the development on schools and other community infrastructure facilities.
- Had not been satisfied as to the impacts of the development on the noise environment and air quality.
- Had not been satisfied as to the impacts of the development in respect of flooding and drainage issue particularly with regard to the A320 access area.
- Had not been satisfied that the proposal is compatible with maintaining the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas.
- Had concerns about the impact on the Horsell Common and the local ecology.

Committee Members raised concerns on the detrimental impact the proposal would have on the Borough of Woking and spoke in objection to the application.

Members also highlighted on the overbearing impact to the infrastructure, reflecting the capacity of schools, GP surgeries and highways.

Councillor Eastwood proposed and it was duly seconded by Councillor Boote that the application be objected to.

RESOLVED

- That
- (i) Surrey Heath and Runnymede Borough Councils be advised of Woking Borough Councils objections to the formal consultation as set in application No. 2018/1175; and
  - (ii) Surrey Heath and Runnymede Borough Councils be advised of Woking Borough Councils objections to the formal consultation as set in application No. 2018/1172.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and ended at 8.43 pm

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

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