

MINUTES of the meeting of the **PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 25 October 2023 at Council Chamber, Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 8EF.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

Members:

Ernest Mallett MBE
Jeffrey Gray
Victor Lewanski
Scott Lewis
Catherine Powell
Jeremy Webster
Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
John Robini
Richard Tear (Vice-Chairman)
Jonathan Hulley

63/23 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

None received.

64/23 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]

The Minutes were approved as an accurate record of the previous meeting.

65/23 PETITIONS [Item 3]

There were none.

66/23 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 4]

There were none.

67/23 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 5]

There were none.

68/23 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 6]

There were none.

69/23 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL SU/23/0326/PCM - FORMER PINEHURST CARE HOME, 141 PARK ROAD, CAMBERLEY, SURREY GU15 2LL [Item 7]

Officers:

Charlotte Parker, Principal Planning Officer
James Lehane, Principal Transport Development Planning Officer

Officer Introduction:

1. The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report and provided Members with a brief overview. Members noted an numbering error within the update sheet published on 24 October 2023. Members noted that the report was for an outline application for erection of part 1,2,3 and 4-storey building for extra care accommodation, comprising self-contained apartments, staff and communal facilities, and associated parking. Appearance and Landscaping reserved. Full details of the application could be found within the report

Speakers:

Carol Bell, Senior Development Manager, spoke on behalf of the applicant and made the following comments:

2. That the statement was in support of the application by Adult Social Care and Land and Property.
3. That the site was part of the programme of extra care projects being delivered by the council to address the critical gaps in provision of affordable housing for older people who require accommodation with care and support.
4. That the programme would offer a higher level of care than traditional sheltered housing and includes help with personal care, meals and other daily activities. communal facilities would also encourage residents to participate in a range of social and leisure activities.
5. That residents in extra care facilities were less likely to develop conditions that require intensive healthcare solutions.
6. That the Pinehurst site was specifically selected for extra care housing as it met key sustainability criteria. The design proposed would also meet requirements for affordable specialist housing including being wheelchair accessible throughout with adaptable accommodation to meet current and future needs of residents.
7. That being located in the heart of the community would reduce reliance of cars.
8. That a manager would be on site at all times and be available in an emergency.
9. That the latest sustainable energy measures would be installed to minimise heat loss and lower energy bills for residents.
10. That residents would be encouraged to use smart technology for their daily needs.
11. That the programme would contribute to the council's target set in 2020 to deliver 725 new homes for older adults in need of care and support by 2023. The programme also aimed to deliver against the council's net zero targets for 2023 and supported the community vision for Surrey.

Points of clarification raised by Members

12. The Chairman asked for clarification that the intention was for 60 units and that the local council would have nomination rights. Further to this, the Member asked whether the 60 units would go towards the affordable housing target of the borough council. The speaker confirmed that this was correct.

The Local Member, Trefor Hogg, made the following comments:

13. The Member recognised that there was a considerable need in Surrey Heath for specialised housing and that it was within easy reach of the town centre.
14. That he had a particular privacy concern that the building would be much taller than the nearest properties.
15. That a principle had already been set for four storey properties in the area.
16. Raised a concern regarding the impact on parking in the area.
17. Stated that he wanted to review the pedestrian safety measures in place when available.
18. Stated that the development was needed and appropriate provided that the privacy, parking and pedestrian safety issues were addressed.

Points of clarification raised by Members

19. In regard to parking, a Member noted a derelict building on the other side of Park Street and a busy local GP Surgery nearby and asked whether there was a master parking plan for the area. The Local Member said that the redundant properties on Park Street were in the process of moving towards demolition and so would become available for development opportunities. It was also noted that the surgery was considering opportunities to expand.
20. A Member asked whether the Local Member felt there was a need to a Traffic Construction Management Plan. The Local Member said that Park Street was not a particularly busy road but was an arterial road within Camberley and was part of a bus route.

Key points raised during the discussion:

21. In regard to parking, the Principal Transport Development Planning Officer explained that a parking accumulation assessment had been provided to demonstrate that the site would be able to accommodate the expected level of parking demand and so the County Highways Authority were satisfied that there was not likely to be a significant risk of overspill.
22. In regard to construction management, the Principal Transport Development Planning Officer said that a recommendation had been included within the Highways Authority response to include a full construction transport management plan.
23. In regard to pedestrian safety, the Principal Transport Development Planning Officer noted that there were two pedestrian accesses and one vehicle access which was in line with current policies. It was also added that, due to the existing permitted use, the scale of the site and the amount of likely traffic and pedestrian movement, the ability of the Highways Authority to require an additional crossing over the road, from a safety perspective, was limited.
24. In regard to the new access, Members noted that, subject to the technical approvals process, the Highways Authority had requested that a pedestrian priority crossing was provided to allow the existing continuous footway to be preserved as well as possible.
25. The Chairman said that, in his view, details in regard to a pedestrian crossing were beyond the remit of the committee.
26. In regard to privacy, the Principal Planning Officer stated that, when considering the reserve matters, there was scope to move some of the

windows and balconies and introduce measures to reduce any overlooking.

27. A Member asked for detail on the assessment carried out on the new entrance to the site due to the proximity to the railway bridge and issues related to the railway crossing. The Principal Transport Development Planning Officer explained that the applicant had provided drawings to consider the visibility from the access junction, which was considered to be successfully demonstrated, and that the Highways Authority would seek to conclude the final version of the junction during reserve matters and the technical approval process.
28. Members noted that the Highways Authority had been provided with tracking to show that the right vehicle types would be able to access and egress.
29. In regard to pedestrian infrastructure, the Principal Transport Development Planning Officer said that the preference was to have a fully continuous pedestrian footway.
30. Members noted that it was officers' opinion that the applicant had provided sufficient evidence that there would not be a material detriment to highways safety in the location.
31. Members noted details related to tree removal.
32. A Member said that he felt there was an opportunity to increase the height of the building.
33. The Chairman asked that the recommendation be amended to allow the committee to consider the reserve matters committee when appropriate.
34. In regard to paragraph two of the recommendation, the Chairman said that he believed it should state that the committee be briefed, rather than take further consideration, in the event that the legal agreement(s) had not been reached to the satisfaction of officers within 6 months of the date of this resolution.
35. The Chairman moved the amended recommendation which was unanimously agreed.

Actions / Further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

That, subject to Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 1992, the Committee resolved that:

- (1) Outline planning permission is granted for application ref: SU/23/0326/PCM subject to the satisfactory completion of legal agreement(s) to secure mitigation to offset the impact of the development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and subject to the conditions listed; and
- (2) That Members are provided with a briefing if the necessary legal agreement(s) have not been reached to the satisfaction of officers within 6 months of the date of this resolution.
- (3) The reserve matters return to the Planning and Regulatory Committee for consideration.

70/23 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 8]

The date of the next meeting was noted.

Meeting closed at 11.20 am

Chairman