

MINUTES
OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

held on 18 October 2016
Present:

	Cllr G S Cundy (Chairman)	
	Cllr G G Chrystie (Vice-Chairman)	
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 September 2016 be approved and signed as a true and correct record.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Cllr G S Cundy declared a non-pecuniary interest in minute item 5a. 16/0742 20-32 Goldsworth Road arising from his position as a Council-appointed Director of Thameswey Limited, the parent company of Thameswey Energy Limited, which was mentioned as a consultee in the application. He also declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 3. Urgent Business, as Thameswey Energy was referred to in the application 14/1263 Thomson House, 68-70 Chertsey Road and Kings Court, Church Street East. The interests were such that speaking and voting were permissible.

In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct Cllr J Kingsbury also declared a non-pecuniary interest in minute item 5a. 16/0742 20-32 Goldsworth Road arising from his position as a Council-appointed Director of Thameswey Limited, the parent company of Thameswey Energy Limited, which was mentioned as a consultee in the application. He also declared a non pecuniary interest in Item 3. Urgent Business, as Thameswey Energy was referred to in the application 14/1263 Thomson House, 68-70 Chertsey Road and Kings Court, Church Street East. The interest was such that speaking was permissible.

In accordance with the Officer Procedure Rules, Peter Bryant, Head of Legal and Democratic Services, declared an interest in minute item 5a. 16/0742 20-32 Goldsworth Road arising from his position as a Council-appointed Director of the Thameswey Group of companies, including Thameswey Energy Limited, which was mentioned as a consultee in the application. He also declared an interest in Item 3. Urgent Business, as Thameswey Energy was referred to in the application 14/1263 Thomson House, 68-70 Chertsey Road and Kings Court, Church Street East. The interests were not such as to prevent him from advising the Committee.

In accordance with the Officer Procedure Rules, Douglas Spinks, Deputy Chief Executive, also declared an interest in minute item 5a. 16/0742 20-32 Goldsworth Road arising from his position as a Council appointed Director of the Thameswey group of companies including Thameswey Energy Limited, which was mentioned as a consultee in the application. He also declared an interest in reference to the Item 3. Urgent Business, as Thameswey Energy was referred to in the application 14/1263 Thomson House, 68-70 Chertsey Road and Kings Court, Church Street East. The interests were not such as to prevent him from advising the Committee.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

A matter of Urgent Business was raised by the Development Manager.

At the Planning Committee meeting of 12 January 2016, it was resolved that planning permission be granted for *Demolition of two existing office buildings - Kings Court and Thomson House - and replacement by an 8 storey building covering 9,274 m GIA of Class B1 office space with associated access, parking at basement and ground floor level and landscaping works* (Ref. 2014/1263). It was also resolved that the discharge of Condition 13 should be brought back to the Committee, this to be reviewed by an independent third party should the matter fail to be agreed between Thameswey Energy Limited and the applicant.

Condition 13 stated:

Prior to the commencement of any above ground works to construct the building hereby approved;

a) *details should be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority of how the development will be connected to CHP-generated heat, cooling and power or a District Heat Network and the necessary infrastructure will be provided for the distribution of heat and electricity for the site together with the proposed long-term management arrangements through an energy services company (ESCO). The approved scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development;*

or

b) *a feasibility study should be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority which demonstrates why the use of either centralised CHP, a network connection to CHP sources or a District Heat Network is not being proposed for some or all of the development on the grounds of viability or on the grounds that a better alternative for reducing carbon emissions is available.*

Reason:

To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and makes efficient use of resources and to comply with Policies CS21 and CS22 of the Woking Borough Core Strategy 2012

In accordance with Planning Condition 13, The Planning Department had instructed independent consultants WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff to carry out a review of the information submitted by the applicant to discharge the condition and officers were likely to be in a position to come to a view on whether the condition should be discharged within a day or two of the meeting.

However, the applicant had now served a 'deemed discharge' notice on the Council, meaning that the submitted details would be approved by default on Friday 21 October 2016 in the event the Council did not issue a decision before then.

Consequently there would not be sufficient time for a report to be produced for the Planning Committee in the normal fashion and it was therefore requested that the Committee delegate the decision on whether to discharge condition 13 to the Development Manager in consultation with the Chairman.

It would then be possible to deal with this matter properly before approval was given by default on Friday 21 October.

It was confirmed by the Development Manager that the time taken had not been due to any undue delay by the Council. As this had involved complex negotiations and consultation with external consultants it had necessarily been a lengthy process.

The Committee agreed to delegate the decision on discharge of Condition 13 to the Development Manager in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee.

4. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT APPEALS

PLA16-021

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. 16/0742 20-32 Goldsworth Road, Woking – Goldsworth Road Development Ltd

[NOTE 1: The Committee had before it an Addendum, clarifying some matters in the original report. The content is given below:

REPRESENTATIONS

Correspondence has been received from NATS (National Air Traffic Control Service) Safeguarding raising no objection.

A further representation from a member of the public has been received. It does not raise any issues which are not already addressed in the report.

PLANNING ISSUES

Transport, Highways, Accessibility & Parking

Main report paras. 81, 86 and 90:

The County Highways Authority have agreed with the applicant's conclusions in respect of the road modelling, performance of the Goldsworth Road/Church Street West mini roundabout and Travel Plans. They conclude that additions to the existing flows and their affects are likely to be relatively small, to the extent that neither a severe cumulative impact is created, nor a significant impact [caused] that requires specific limitation. The smaller traffic-related consequences of this development and other previously-consented developments (and those that maybe permitted in the future) may be limited/mitigated by highway works capable of being funded by CIL receipts from the chargeable elements of the development.

Therefore, no highways objections are raised subject to the minor revisions to recommended Conditions 12 and 13 set out below.

Flood Risk, SuDs and Drainage

Main report para. 121:

The Council’s Drainage and Flood Risk Engineer has confirmed that she is now in receipt of acceptable calculations regarding the SuDs drainage and confirms there are no objections in terms of drainage and flood risk.

Impact on Adjacent Residential Accommodation

Main report paras. 63-66:

The following three tables included in the report have had an additional column added to the right hand side.

The first column after the address assessed gives the total number of windows assessed. The next column shows the existing scenario – that is, how many of the total windows currently meet the recommended Building Research Establishment (BRE) standard.

The next column shows how many of the windows will meet the appropriate BRE recommended standard with the development in place.

The fifth column shows a ‘cumulative baseline’ scenario that is - how many of the windows would meet the BRE standards with developments at Victoria Square and the Coign Church in place, but excluding the proposal.

The additional final column shows the overall cumulative situation, that is, the number of windows that would meet BRE standards with the proposed development in place as well as developments at Victoria Square and the Coign Church.

Address	Total Windows	Existing no. windows meeting VSC Criteria	Proposed windows meeting VSC Criteria	Windows meeting VSC in ‘Cumulative Baseline’	Windows meeting VSC with Cumulative Devt
Centrium 1-81	38	24	35	24	30
1-9 Goldsworth Road	32	32	4	32	4
Victoria Square Proposal	104	-	-	65	65
1-7 Victoria Way	13	13	0	13	0
11-13 Goldsworth Road	17	9	7	7	5
Birchwood Court	49	25	28	24	28
Coign Church Proposal	104	-	-	79	91
Woking Fire Station	18	18	17	18	17
2 Guildford Road	8	0	2	0	1
1 Guildford Road	19	9	6	8	5
New Central	426	296	309	267	296
Total	828	426/620 68% comply	408/620 65.8%	537/828 64.8%	542/828 65.5%

Above Table: “Vertical Sky Component” Summary

Address	Total Rooms	Existing no. meeting NSL	Proposed no. meeting	Rooms meeting NSL in ‘Cumulative	Windows meeting NSL
---------	-------------	--------------------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------

Planning Committee 18 October 2016

		Criteria	NSL Criteria	Baseline'	with Cumulative Devt
Centrium 1-81	27	27	27	27	27
1-9 Goldsworth Road	20	20	8	20	8
Victoria Square Proposal	91	-	-	91	91
1-7 Victoria Way	12	12	12	12	12
11-13 Goldsworth Road	16	11	16	11	16
Birchwood Court	25	16	19	16	19
Coign Church Proposal	71	-	-	69	69
Woking Fire Station	16	16	16	16	16
2 Guildford Road	5	0	0	0	0
1 Guildford Road	8	6	8	5	8
New Central	282	257	276	256	276
Total	573	365/411 88.8% comply	382/411 93%	523/573 91.2%	542/573 94.6%

Above Table: "No Sky Line" Summary

Address	Total Rooms	Existing no. rooms meeting APSH Criteria	Proposed no. rooms meeting APSH Criteria	Rooms meeting APSH in 'Cumulative Baseline'	Rooms meeting APSH in Cumulative Development
Centrium	4	4	4	4	4
1-9 Goldsworth Road	20	20	8	20	8
Victoria Square Proposal	91	-	-	91	73
1-7 Victoria Way	12	12	6	12	6
11-13 Goldsworth Road	10	7	4	7	4
Birchwood Court	25	25	18	25	18
Coign Church	67	-	-	67	69
Woking Fire Station	16	16	16	16	16
2 Guildford Road	5	0	5	0	5
1 Guildford Road	3	0	3	0	3
New Central	49	37	47	37	47
Total	306	121/144 84% comply	111/144 77%	279/306 91.2%	253/306 82.7%

Above Table: "Annual Probable Sunlight Hours" Summary (by room)

Note: It should be noted that the baseline figures are an assessment of the absolute existing daylight/sunlight levels. That is, they show which windows currently achieve what the BRE classes as ideal target levels. This is not a comparative analysis. For example, the BRE suggests that good daylight levels are in excess of 27% VSC in absolute (not comparative) terms. The assessment of effects then looks at a comparative study of the existing light levels against the proposed light levels with the development in place. This assessment is a two-layered approach, as the BRE guidelines look at both the absolute retained level of daylight/sunlight as well as the relative change in daylight/sunlight. In terms of the VSC form of assessment, a window can satisfy BRE criteria by either continuing to retain 27% VSC levels in absolute terms, or by experiencing a relative reduction within 20%. For example, it is therefore possible for a window that records less than 27% VSC in absolute terms to still

satisfy BRE guidelines if the relative reduction is less than 20%. Care should consequently be taken in seeking to make a comparison between columns of the tables.

CONDITIONS

Proposed amendments to recommended conditions:

12. Prior to the first occupation of the residential part(s) of the development hereby approved a Full Residential Travel Plan shall be produced from the planning application Framework Travel Plan titled "20-32 Goldsworth Road, Woking Travel Plan", dated, June 2016 reference 70002248 and produced by WSP - Parsons Brinckerhoff **and taking into account the County Highways Authority comments of 15 September 2016** shall be submitted for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority. And then the approved Full Residential Travel Plan shall be implemented, retained, maintained and developed in accordance with the approved details and to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users.

13. Prior to the first occupation of the Class B1(a) office part(s) of the development hereby approved, a Full Office Travel Plan shall be produced from the planning application Framework Travel Plan titled "20-32 Goldsworth Road, Woking Travel Plan", dated June 2016 (first issue) reference 70002248 and produced by WSP - Parsons Brinckerhoff **and taking into account the County Highways Authority comments of 15 September 2016** shall be submitted for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority. And then the approved Full Office Travel Plan shall be implemented, retained, maintained and developed in accordance with the approved details and to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users.

NOTE 2: The Committee was notified of an additional Condition to be added to the report to require flexible use of parking spaces in the development, as follows.

'The parking provision within the development shall be provided in accordance with para. 4.3.5 of the Transport Assessment (WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff ref. 70002248-2 dated June 2016). Notwithstanding this, details of the arrangements for the use of the Class B1(a) office car parking spaces outside of normal working hours and details of the management of the unassigned car parking spaces within the residential parking areas shall be submitted for further written approval of the Local Planning Authority prior to their first use. The spaces shall then be managed in accordance with such details as may be approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highways safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users.'

NOTE 3: In accordance with the procedure for public speaking at Planning Committee, Mr J M Hardiman attended the meeting and spoke in objection to the application and Mr R Winkley spoke in support.

NOTE 4: Cllr D Harlow asked if it would be in order for her to declare an interest, as she worked at Homeworth House, who had objected to the application. The Head of Legal and Democratic Services replied that under the Members Code of Conduct this was not a pecuniary interest, and therefore did not prevent Cllr Harlow from participating in the determination of the application.]

The Committee considered an application for the demolition and clearance of the site at 20-32 Goldsworth Road and erection of a phased development comprising 560 residential units, 10,582 sq.m. of offices, 843 sq m of retail and gym use (A1-A4 and D2) with 395 parking spaces, public realm improvements and highway works to Goldsworth Road: - Block A to comprise ground plus 34 storeys, Block B comprising ground plus 25 and 20 storeys and Block C comprising ground plus 17, 14 and 10 storeys.

Officers gave a detailed presentation of the application, and explained how the scheme would reflect the approved Victoria Square Development. Details of the design were explained, including the references to Woking's engineering and automotive history in the mesh grid on the parking areas, and the balcony treatments reflecting car radiator grill design.

It was noted that the application had been the subject of several years' work, including two public consultations. The design was considered to be of high quality and the development as a whole made good use of a brownfield site, and would make a positive contribution to the townscape.

Officers informed the Committee that it had been confirmed that it was not viable to require an affordable housing contribution on the development. However, an overage clause had been added to ensure that, should the units be sold at a higher price than envisaged, a contribution to affordable housing would be required.

Comments from the objectors were discussed by the Committee. There were comments that the proposed development was too high to be in keeping with the character of Woking; that the buildings would overshadow neighbouring homes; that there were major traffic implications, and that waste disposal for such a large development would create problems.

Officers explained that the height of the proposed development would be in harmony with the approved Victoria Square scheme. The step-down heights of the buildings would also minimise the impact of overshadowing on neighbouring properties.

The arrangements for on site waste collection had been carefully planned and these were fully explained. There would be access and space for refuse collection vehicles to stop and turn in the basement of the development.

Officers further explained the use of the parking provided for both the commercial and residential users of the buildings. The additional condition put forward at this meeting (see NOTE 2 above) also enabled the potential use of office parking spaces by residents out of working hours to be investigated in order to ensure maximum flexibility in the use of the spaces. The provision of parking at 0.5 spaces per unit, was similar to that provided at the New Central Development, and was considered appropriate for a town centre location

The design had been subject to a rigorous checklist of requirements which it was considered to have fulfilled.

On highways issues, officers informed the Committee that detailed work on this had been done by the County Highway Authority, particularly on the impact on traffic likely to be generated through the town, and this had been found to be satisfactory.

Some Members remained unsatisfied that a proportion of affordable housing on the site could not have been required, or at least a contribution to affordable housing elsewhere.

On the new Condition on use of the commercial parking spaces by residents it was suggested that more detail should be added to define the term 'out of hours' and it was agreed this should be delegated to officers.

Members commented that there were fewer bicycle parking places than apartments, and a lack of storage inside each apartment where a bicycle could be kept. Officers commented that there were 670 cycle spaces for 560 apartments and other uses, which was considered acceptable.

There was some debate on the merits of the design. There were favourable comments on the integrated green spaces and the window design details, and the incorporation of the Lifetime Homes Standard. However, it was also considered by some Members that the provision of disabled access adapted parking spaces was too low.

Some Members commented they were pleased to see a quality high rise development as part of the gateway to Woking, and felt it would be complementary to the Victoria Square development. The thorough public consultation was also acknowledged. Others questioned that the design was of exceptional quality.

One Member commented that in his view the development would be unsustainable and only used by London commuters. He considered that to be sustainable it must include an element of affordable housing, and asked that the application be deferred, both to reconsider this and the height of the proposed main building. However, Officers commented that there were no proper grounds to refuse this on lack of affordable housing or on height. The Council's own policies supported the principle of tall building development in the town centre, to assist with fulfilling housing needs whilst protecting the Green Belt. The affordable housing viability issue had been fully explained, and the overage clause also affirmed that should any contribution be due, this could be claimed later.

Officers reiterated their view that the proposed development represented high quality regeneration of the town centre.

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

In favour: Cllrs A Azad, G G Chrystie, I Eastwood, D Harlow, S Hussain and C Rana

TOTAL: 6

Against: Cllrs T Aziz, A J Boote and L M N Morales

TOTAL: 3

Present but not voting: Cllr G S Cundy (Chairman)

TOTAL: 1

PLA16-022

RESOLVED

(i) That planning permission be granted, subject to conditions (including those additional and amended conditions detailed in these minutes and at Annex A to these minutes) and a S106 Legal Agreement,

(ii) In the event that the Development Management Policies DPD be adopted by the Council prior to the completion of the Legal Agreement, the Development Manager (or designated deputy) be delegated authority to determine whether the adoption materially alters the consideration of the application and consequently the recommendation,

and either issue the decision or refer the application back to the Planning Committee accordingly.

5b. 16/0543 Linden Nursery School, Byfleet Cricket Pavilion at the Sports Ground, Parvis Road, Byfleet, West Byfleet – Mrs Linda Ikenga (New Generation Nursery)

The Committee considered an application for siting of a Portakabin in connection with children's nursery (Class D1) at Linden Nursery School, Byfleet Cricket Pavilion at the Sports Ground, Parvis Road, Byfleet, West Byfleet.

The Committee approved the application.

PLA16-022

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

5c. 16/0559 31 Oak Tree Road, Knaphill - Pinnacle PSG

The Committee considered an application for erection of two storey building providing three residential units (two one-bedroom and one four-bedroom) with associated landscaping and vehicular access following demolition of existing building (amended plans) at 31 Oak Tree Road, Knaphill.

Members generally approved this application, which they considered to show a good standard of design and a positive contribution to the street scene. They welcomed this provision of social housing and the inclusion of one unit adapted for use by the disabled. It was noted that the flats referred to as retirement properties on page 68 paragraph 8 were now not so classified.

PLA16-022

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

5d. Burnt Barn Cottage, Carhouse Lane, Horsell, Woking – Mr Dean Lamble

The Committee considered an application for erection of part two-storey, part single-storey detached replacement dwelling following demolition of existing bungalow and garage at Burnt Barn Cottage, Carhouse Lane, Horsell, Woking.

It was noted that the proposed development was within the Green Belt, and therefore Very Special Circumstances had to be identified to permit the building of a materially larger part two-storey house on the site.

In the officer's view the proposed development's Very Special Circumstances would counterbalance any harm to the Green Belt. The demolition of the bungalow and garage would reduce the spread of buildings across the site, and the siting of the house further back in the site would enhance the street scene and improve the openness of the Green Belt. Although the proposed replacement dwelling would be larger, it would be very well screened with mature trees. The size would be commensurate with other properties on Carhouse Lane.

One Member expressed serious concern about the acceptance of this proposal. Referring to the history of additions to the site – including a summer house, double garage and tennis court – she also remarked on the refusal of an application for a larger dwelling in 2007.

The Officer remarked that the permission recommended in the report would remove all permitted development on the site, to ensure that no further additions would be made without a planning application. If the removal of the double garage was taken into account the footprint of built structures on the site would increase by 46.6%, which was not thought excessive on a plot of this size in this area where the spacing between dwellings was generous.

Other Members agreed that this was a matter of judgement, but looking at the site in context the application did not seem disproportionate.

There was disagreement on this and in due course it was proposed and duly seconded that the application should be refused, on the grounds that the proposed replacement dwelling was significantly larger and represented a disproportional increase in size on the existing building, and there were no Very Special Circumstances to justify such development in the Green Belt.

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

In favour of refusal: Cllrs D Harlow and S Hussain

TOTAL: 2

Against refusal: Cllrs A Azad, T Aziz, A J Boote, G G Chrystie, I Eastwood, L M N Morales and C Rana

TOTAL: 7

Present but not voting: Cllr G S Cundy (Chairman)

TOTAL: 1

The application was therefore not refused.

PLA16-022

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

5e. 16/0235 30 Station Approach, West Byfleet – Dr M H A Sacoor

The Committee considered an application for the proposed erection of two apartments on the existing second floor flat roof and fenestration alterations at 30 Station Approach, West Byfleet.

The Committee approved the application.

PLA16-022

RESOLVED

- (i) That planning permission be granted, subject to conditions and a S106 legal agreement to secure SAMM contribution.
- (ii) In the event that the Development Management Policies DPD be adopted by the Council prior to the completion of the Legal Agreement, the Development Manager (or designated deputy) be delegated authority to determine whether the adoption materially

alters the consideration of the application and consequently the recommendation, and either issue the decision or refer the application back to the Planning Committee accordingly.

5f. 16/0858 Land to the rear of 29 Eve Road, Woking – Mr Tabraz Mazhar

The Committee considered a retrospective application for proposed retention of single-storey building used as ancillary office space on land to the rear of 29 Eve Road, Woking.

The Committee approved the application.

PLA16-022

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

5g. 16/0874 21 Lane End Drive, Knaphill – Certificate of Lawfulness application – Mr Steve Musselwhite

[NOTE: The Development Manager informed the Committee that the applicant had fulfilled all the necessary criteria for the Certificate of Lawfulness and it was therefore necessary for the Committee to approve this application. There was however a planning application for this site as the next item on the agenda.]

The Committee considered an application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed single-storey rear and side extensions, conversion of loft space into habitable accommodation, erection of rear dormer window and conversion of garage into habitable accommodation at 21 Lane End Drive, Knaphill.

PLA16-022

RESOLVED

That a Certificate of Lawfulness be granted.

5h. 16/0873 21 Lane End Drive, Knaphill - Mr Steve Musselwhite

The Committee considered an application for the proposed erection of a two-storey front extension and single-storey side and rear extensions plus enlargement of first floor side-facing windows at 21 Lane End Drive, Knaphill.

Officers noted that permitting a front extension was unusual, but in this case the style of the proposed two-storey front extension reflected several other front gable features in neighbouring dwellings. The configuration of the house on the site also made this kind of extension acceptable in this case. The extensions proposed would increase the size of the property considerably, but would result in a more balanced and attractive appearance in the street scene. The single-storey back and side elements would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring dwellings.

Some Members were of the opinion that the number of extensions on this property seemed disproportionate. There had been three extensions already, and this application added three further elements, making this a very large house on the site. It was considered to be out of scale with other properties in the area, and there were also concerns about parking.

Officers commented that in a site outside the Green Belt the increase in size of a property was not an issue, so no size comparison with the original house on the site had been included. The area of amenity space provided was acceptable. The proposed new

extensions would not additionally affect neighbouring properties, and the Committee Members could only consider the extensions proposed in the application before them in determining it. However it was proposed that an informative could be added to the report to indicate that the Planning Committee would be unlikely to view favourably further applications for additional extensions on this site. The Committee agreed to this.

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

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

TOTAL: 6

Against: Cllrs D Harlow, S Hussain and C Rana

TOTAL: 3

Present but not voting: Cllr G S Cundy (Chairman)

TOTAL: 1

PLA16-022

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions and the additional informative detailed in these minutes.

5i. 16/0853 Compton, Sutton Green Road, Sutton Green – Mr Michael Wade

The Committee considered an application for the proposed erection of a replacement dwelling and detached double garage with home office, formation of new vehicular access and associated works, following demolition of existing dwelling and detached garage at Compton, Sutton Green Road, Sutton Green.

The Committee was informed that the change of vehicular access and removal of the garage had been deleted from the application, and only the changes to the dwelling were now proposed. This effectively removed two of the reasons for refusal given in the report, regarding the size of the proposed outbuilding originally proposed and the impact on two mature oak trees of the new vehicular access and driveway.

The officer reported that the proposed increase in the size of the replacement dwelling was over the 20-40% usually considered acceptable in the Green Belt. In this case the footprint would be increased by 38%, the floor space by 70%, the volume by 80% and the height by 47%. The applicant had stated that the Very Special Circumstances were the improved design and energy efficiency of the proposed new dwelling, and the ability of the applicant to extend the existing property under permitted development rights. The applicant also quoted supposed discrepancies in Council decisions on other replacement dwellings in the Green Belt where considerably larger replacement buildings had been permitted.

Officers did not regard these as Very Special Circumstances and considered that the increased height and bulk of the building would affect the openness of the Green Belt. Good design and energy efficiency could not be regarded as Very Special Circumstances. Examples of other large buildings approved could not be taken as a precedent, as each application now had to be assessed against the most recent Development Policy DM13. There were no such examples of large replacement dwellings in the immediate neighbourhood of this application.

In this case therefore it was considered that Very Special Circumstances had not been proved and the recommendation was therefore to refuse the application.

Members expressed some sympathy with the applicant. The property in question had not been extended in the past and was a very modest building in an extensive plot. The design of the proposed replacement dwelling was regarded as sympathetic, and was not considered as harmful to the Conservation Area. Several Members gave the opinion that it would make a positive addition to the street scene and be more in keeping with nearby dwellings. It would not be materially larger so as to do harm to the Green Belt.

The Development Manager cautioned the Committee that if they agreed to this application on the basis of the new dwelling not being 'materially larger' than the existing dwelling it would set a precedent. This might lead to the challenging of decisions on what was regarded as 'materially larger' in other Green Belt applications. However, if it was the decision of the Committee to approve this application he asked that the addition of suitable conditions should be delegated to officers. This was agreed.

A motion to approve the application on the grounds that, with regard to the size and context of the well-screened plot, and the location within it of the proposed new dwelling, this was not materially larger so as to damage the openness of the Green Belt or harm the Conservation Area.

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

In favour of approval: Cllrs A Azad, T Aziz, I Eastwood, D Harlow, S Hussain, C Rana

TOTAL: 6

Against approval: None

TOTAL: 0

Present but not voting: Cllrs A J Boote, G G Chrystie, G S Cundy (Chairman) and L M N Morales

TOTAL: 4

PLA16-022

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted, subject to Conditions delegated to the Development Manager, on the grounds that, with regard to the size and context of the well-screened plot, and the location within it of the proposed new dwelling, this was not materially larger so as to damage the openness of the Green Belt or harm the Conservation Area.

5j. 16/0766 A J Akehurst and Son, Maybury Hill, Woking – Mr Z Arif

The Committee considered an application for construction of a three-storey building containing six flats following demolition of the existing building at A J Akehurst and Son, Maybury Hill, Woking.

It was noted that there was existing permission for two semi-detached dwellings on this site.

Some Members gave the opinion that this was an acceptable application, and that the three-storey building would not be incongruous on the site. The smaller units would be welcomed in the area as they were more likely to be affordable. They considered that there were approved applications which were precedents

Others agreed with the officers' conclusions in the report, finding the proposed development overbearing, with major potential effects on the amenity of neighbouring residents in loss of light and privacy. The proposed 3 metre high wall was regarded as intimidating and the design inelegant and out of keeping with the Victorian buildings in the vicinity. The Chairman considered the report gave a substantial list of reasons for refusal. The small and inaccessible amenity space and the inadequate bin storage and lack of on site parking were also mentioned as examples of poor design.

However it was proposed and duly seconded that the application be approved.

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

In favour of approval: Cllrs A Azad, T Aziz and S Hussain

TOTAL: 3

Against approval: Cllrs A J Boote, G G Chrystie, G S Cundy (Chairman), I Eastwood, D Harlow, L M N Morales, C Rana

TOTAL: 7

Present but not voting: None

TOTAL: 0

The application was therefore not approved.

PLA16-022

RESOLVED

That planning permission be refused for the reasons stated in the report.

5k. Enforcement Report - Unauthorised operational development – Erection of a Garden Shed in the rear garden of 18 Mint Walk, Woking

[NOTE: Cllr Kingsbury left the meeting before this item.]

The Committee considered an Enforcement Report on unauthorised operational development in the erection of a Garden Shed in the rear garden of 18 Mint Walk, Woking.

It was noted that this site was within the Goldsworth Park development area, where because of the density of the built area, Permitted Development Rights had been withdrawn to preserve the amenity of those living there. The shed in question was visible from the street, and occupied much of the amenity space of the host dwelling. It was of overbearing appearance and appeared incongruous in the street scene. Committee Members expressed some sympathy for householders who wanted to have sheds, and were informed that a more modest shed might have been accepted if an application had been submitted, but an outbuilding of this height and size was not acceptable. In conversations with officers this had been made clear to the home owner.

The Committee agreed to the Enforcement action proposed.

PLA16-022

RESOLVED

That

- (i) That an Enforcement Notice be issued in respect of the above land requiring the removal of the unauthorised wooden shed in the rear garden. Removal of all materials from the site including all associated paraphernalia within one month of the notice taking place.
- (ii) That the Head of Legal Services be instructed to issue an Enforcement Notice under Section 172 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as amended, and officers be authorised in the event of non-compliance to prosecute under Section 179 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 or appropriate power and/or take direct action under Section 178 in the event of non-compliance with the Notice.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and ended at 10.30 pm

Chairman: _____

Date: _____