

MINUTES
OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

held on 12 November 2019

Present:

Cllr G G Chrystie (Chairman)

Cllr S Ashall (Vice-Chair)

Cllr T Aziz

Cllr L S Lyons

Cllr A J Boote

Cllr N Martin

Cllr G W Elson

Cllr L M N Morales

Cllr S Hussain

Also Present: Councillors I Johnson.

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 15 October 2019 be approved and signed as a true and correct record.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In accordance with Officer Procedure Rules, the Head of Democratic and Legal Services, Peter Bryant declared a disclosable personal interest (non-pecuniary) in Item 6f. 2019/0752 5-51 Middle Walk, Woking arising from his position as a Director of the Thamesway Group of Companies, specifically as a Director of Thamesway Development Ltd. The interest was such that speaking was permissible and he was still able to advise the Committee on the application.

In accordance with Officer Procedure Rules, the Deputy Chief Executive, Douglas Spinks declared a disclosable personal interest (non-pecuniary) in Item 6f. 2019/0752 5-51 Middle Walk, Woking arising from his position as a Director of the Thamesway Group of Companies. The interest was such that speaking was permissible and he was still able to advise the Committee on the application.

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. 2019/0753 New central Development, Guildford Road, Woking

[NOTE 1: The Planning Officer advised the Committee that an addendum report had been circulated earlier in the day and copies had been tabled.]

[NOTE 2: In accordance with the procedure for public speaking at Planning Committee, Ms Candace Relf attended the meeting and spoke in objection to the application and Mr Robert Winkley spoke in support.]

The Committee considered an application for the erection of rooftop extensions to existing apartment blocks (Blocks A, B, C, D and F) (known as Nankerville Court, Bradfield House and Cardinal Place) ranging in height from 1 to 2 storeys to provide 37 x apartments (24 x studio/one-bedroom and 13 x two-bedroom) together with private and shared roof terraces. Associated alterations to existing basement level to provide cycle and refuse/recycling storage.

The present application had been submitted in an attempt to overcome the previous three reasons for refusal. The Committee were reminded that the previous grounds for refusal had been due to its excessive bulk and mass, failure to represent exceptional design quality and insufficient on-site parking provision.

Councillor L Lyons, Ward Councillor, spoke in objection to the application and commented that he sympathised with the residents that this application would directly impact on. Councillor L Lyons was disappointed with the housing mix, including the provision of zero affordable homes and also the contribution to open space, green area and recreation, which he thought was negatively affected. It was noted that this application provided for 0.5 parking spaces per apartment which Councillor L Lyons thought was unrealistic to think that people would not use cars, want to park them or use the car club as a viable alternative. Councillor L Lyons said that there was already a huge issue with parking in the surrounding roads and it was thought that this development would cause this to worsen. Councillor L Lyons also commented that he and fellow Councillors had worked hard with the applicant when the site was initially developed to achieve the stepped down approach of the current design and he felt that the proposal would completely change this making it more bulky; it would also see a loss of privacy to some residents.

A number of Committee members shared the Ward Councillor's concerns. The issue of affordable housing provision was raised a number of times and the Development Manager explained that although frustrating, due process was always followed and the viability was robustly assessed. In this case it was not considered viable. The Planning Officer noted

that a late stage viability review was proposed in the recommendations which meant that an assessment would be carried out once building works had completed to see if there was anything to recover regarding affordability provision.

Following further concerns raised by the Committee regarding the design, bulk and mass, with reference to Policy CS21, Planning Officers explained that they felt that the proposal could be justified within context. The Committee were given the example of the Victoria Square development which was not far from the application site and had been considered justifiable within that context.

Further debate ensued on these topics.

Councillor L Lyons proposed and it was duly seconded by Councillor L Morales that the application be refused on the grounds of insufficient parking, excessive bulk and mass and failure to represent exceptional design quality.

In accordance with Standing Order 22.2, the Chairman deemed that a division should be taken on the motion above. The votes for and against refusal of the application were recorded as follows.

In favour: Cllrs T Aziz, A Boote, G Chrystie (Chairman), L Lyons and L Morales

TOTAL: 5

Against: None

TOTAL: 0

Present but not voting: Cllrs S Ashall, G Elson, S Hussain and N Martin.

TOTAL: 4

The application was therefore refused.

RESOLVED

That the application be refused for the reasons detailed in the minutes above.

6b. 2019/0554 146, 148 and 150 Robin Hood Road, Knaphill, Woking

The committee considered a part retrospective full planning application for the erection of part two-storey, part single storey rear extensions plus rear dormer roof extensions and sub-divisions of 3 x dwelling houses into seven flats (3 x one-bedroom and 4 x two-bedroom) with associated parking.

Under PLAN/2018/1207 this proposal had been previously refused by the Planning Committee. It was noted that this application was refused for six reasons which were detailed in the planning history section of the report. As detailed on page 83 of the report, the Planning Authority considered that these reasons had been addressed in the current application.

Councillor S Hussain, Ward Councillor, thought that the proposal resulted in a loss of family accommodation and he was not convinced that the application did fully address the previous reasons for refusal. The Planning Officer commented that the application proposed to provide four two-bedroom flats, which were considered to be family housing.

Some concerns were raised regarding the vehicular access and the issues of the location on a sharp corner. It was noted that Surrey County Highway Authority had not raised any objections regarding this and it was also addressed in Condition 3.

Members queried whether it had now been demonstrated that the risk of surface water flooding would not increase. The Planning Officer advised that as the application site was not within a surface water flood risk area and the existing hardstanding to the front of the terrace was shown to be removed, it was not considered that the development would have any significant adverse surface water flood risk/drainage implications.

Condition 2 referenced the hard and soft landscaping to the front of the property. Members asked that this Condition be updated to confirm that the dropped kerb must be removed at the front of the property as this would no longer be permitted as a parking area. It was agreed that Planning Officers would update this Condition.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to the recommended Conditions and amended Condition 2 and SAMM (TBHSPA) contribution secured by Legal Agreement.

6c. 2019/0946 Land Adjacent to 19 Evelyn Close, Woking

The Committee considered an application for the proposed retention of the existing house within a reduced curtilage and the erection of 1 x two-storey three bedroom detached house and dropped kerb.

The Committee commented that they were disappointed with the inspectorates' appeal decision and although the proposal was identical to that considered under PLAN/2018/116, it left them with little ground to refuse the application.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to planning conditions and the signing of a section 106 Legal Agreement to secure a Thames Basin Heath SAMMS contribution.

6d. 2019/0879 33 Lockwood Path, Sheerwater, Woking

The Committee considered an application for the sub-division of a single dwelling to create two flats (2 x two-bedroom) following erection of a two-storey side extension, a two-storey/single-storey rear extension, a single-storey front extension, a front bin store and a rear cycle store as well as widening of an existing driveway; following demolition of existing extensions.

RESOLVED

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

6e. 2019/0834 Tamarisk, Golf Club Road, Woking

The Committee considered an application for the proposed demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of two five bedroom detached houses with associated works.

RESOLVED

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

6f. 2019/0752 5-51 Middle Walk, Woking

The Committee considered an application for the creation of an additional storey above the east wing to provide 7 x one-bedroom flats and conversion of 1 x three-bedroom maisonette to 1 x one-bedroom flat, the addition of green roofs to the east and west wings and green walls to the north and south elevations and insertion of an external staircase.

Councillor L Morales raised concern that Condition 6 referred to planting seasons and was worried that this may lead to gaps in the green wall which would not be addressed until the following season. It was also thought that reference to seasonal planting was more relevant to trees than plants. In light of these comments the Planning Officer proposed that Condition 6 be removed and Condition 7 be updated to address these concerns. The Committee supported this proposal and delegated authority to the Development Manager to make the relevant changes to Condition 7.

In accordance with Standing Order 22.2, the Chairman deemed that a division should be taken on the motion above. The votes for and against approval of the application were recorded as follows.

In favour: Cllrs S Ashall, T Aziz, A Boote, G Elson, S Hussain, N Martin and L Morales.

TOTAL: 7

Against: Cllr L Lyons.

TOTAL: 1

Present but not voting: Cllr G Chrystie

TOTAL: 1

The application was therefore approved.

RESOLVED

- (i) That planning permission be granted subject to conditions and Section 106 agreement; and
- (ii) Condition 6 be removed and authority be delegated to the Development Manager to amend condition 7 to include replanting details.

6g. 2019/0923 Fairoaks Airport, Chobham, Surrey

The Committee considered a formal consultation from Runnymede Borough Council for Hybrid application comprising: a) Full application for means of site accesses (including alterations to existing accesses and a new road junction onto the A320); (b) Outline application (all matters reserved) for the phased development of the site for up to 1,000 residential units (C3) and elderly care (C2); and, a total of 65,004sqm* of non-residential floor space, comprising employment (B1, B2, B8), education (D1), retail (A1-A5), leisure and community (D1/2) and a hotel (C1); and a strategic parkland and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) with associated car park. The change of use of Blister Hanger (aviation maintenance store*), Gamekeeper's Cottage (agricultural to equestrian), 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 building, open space and landscaping, visitor centre, associated vehicular and other access routes and related highways works.

The Committee did not think that the amendments to the application had overcome their reasons for objection previously. It was considered that the reasons for objection last time still stood, as detailed on page 171 of the Officers' report. Councillor S Ashall requested that an additional objection be added regarding the reduction in public open space. It was agreed that bullet point 3 on page 171 could be expanded to include these concerns.

RESOLVED

That Woking Borough Council objects on the basis that it had not been demonstrated that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on key infrastructure and facilities within the Borough.

6h. 2019/0925 Fairoaks Airport, Chobham, Surrey

The Committee considered a formal consultation from Surrey Heath Borough Council for Hybrid application comprising: a) Full application for means of site accesses (including alterations to existing accesses and a new road junction onto the A320); (b) Outline application (all matters reserved) for the phased development of the site for up to 1,000 residential units (C3) and elderly care (C2); and, a total of 65,004sqm* of non-residential floor space, comprising employment (B1, B2, B8), education (D1), retail (A1-A5), leisure and community (D1/2) and a hotel (C1); and a strategic parkland and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) with associated car park. The change of use of Blister Hanger (aviation maintenance store*), Gamekeeper's Cottage (agricultural to equestrian), 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 building, open space and landscaping, visitor centre, associated vehicular and other access routes and related highways works.

The Committee did not think that the amendments to the application had overcome their reasons for objection previously. It was considered that the reasons for objection last time still stood, as detailed on page 185 of the Officers' report. Councillor S Ashall requested that an additional objection be added regarding the reduction in public open space. It was agreed that bullet point 3 on page 185 could be expanded to include these concerns.

RESOLVED

That Woking Borough Council objects on the basis that it had not been demonstrated that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on key infrastructure and facilities within the Borough.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and ended at 9.10 pm

Chairman: _____

Date: _____