

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 20 December 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 Present:**

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

**Apologies:**

Jeffrey Gray  
Jonathan Hulley  
Chris Farr

**80/23 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Jeffrey Gray, Jonathan Hulley and Chris Farr.

**81/23 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]**

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

**82/23 PETITIONS [Item 3]**

There were none.

**83/23 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 4]**

There were none.

**84/23 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 5]**

There were none.

**85/23 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 6]**

There were none.

**86/23 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL WA/2023/01785 - THE ABBEY SCHOOL, MENIN WAY, FARNHAM, SURREY, GU9 8DY [Item 7]**

**Officers:**

Chris Turner, Senior Planning Officer

**Officer Introduction:**

1. The Senior Planning Officer introduced the report and update sheet and provided Members with a brief overview. Members noted that the reason for the application was that the original application ref: WA/2021/02235 did not include a detailed design for the associated plant and a condition was not imposed on the permission requesting such details to be submitted. The plant was indicated to be located on the roof of the single storey element of the sports hall. The applicant had subsequently been in discussions with a neighbouring property and relocated the plant to the rear of the sports hall and submitted detailed designs of the plant, an acoustic fence to enclose the plant, a security fence to prevent access to the roofs of the sports hall and also a small amendment to car parking layout to include disabled parking. Full details could be found within the published report. The officer further highlighted that a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework was circulated to Members however noted that there were no significant changes to note in relation to the current application.

**Speakers:**

Mark Finney spoke in objection to the application and made the following comments:

1. That the new condition requiring absorptive panelling for the heat pumps was helpful but was not enough and that further consideration could be put into an alternative design and layout to avoid the pump's adverse effects.
2. That Members could add a condition that if the absorptive panelling was found to be inadequate that further steps should be taken.
3. That the sports hall was given planning permission despite objector requests to resite and that planning permission for the heat pumps was not sought.
4. That the heat pump's noise was not considered as part of the scheme's design.
5. That the report referred to BS 4142:2014 "Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound" but failed to mention key government guidance on it.
6. That the National Planning Practice Guidance and National Planning Policy Framework were clear that noise should be avoided rather than mitigated if above the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level.

Mike Cole spoke on behalf of the applicant and made the following comments:

1. That the primary reason for the application was that the original application did not include a detailed design for the associated plant

and a condition was not imposed on the permission requesting such details to be submitted.

2. The plant was indicated to be located on the roof of the single storey element of the sports hall. The applicant had subsequently been in discussions with a neighbouring property and the applicant relocated the plant to the rear of the sports hall and submitted detailed designs of the plant and included an acoustic fence to enclose the plant.
3. That there were two units installed however typically only one of the two units would run at any given time. Very infrequently both units may run at the same time.
4. That during the application, comments were raised by the Environmental Health Department requiring a further noise assessment which was undertaken at the point when enhanced data could be collected. Following the assessment, there were no technical objections received from Environmental Health on planning grounds related to noise.
5. That it had been agreed to further mitigate any noise through the provision of absorptive panelling for the inner side of the screening around the units.

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. A Member asked for clarification on the distances between the neighbouring properties and the units. Officers confirmed that the heat pumps would measure approximately 9.5m from the boundary to the west and would measure 33m from the boundary to the south. Members further noted that Environmental Health were consulted and confirmed that the assessment had assessed the potential internal noise on the closest residential property and confirmed that the expected noise was below the World Health Organisation accepted noise levels and the British Standard Levels.
2. Members noted details of Condition 24 which stated that 'within 8 weeks of the date of this permission, the detailed specification of the absorptive acoustic panelling for the inner side of the screening around the air source heat pumps hereby permitted, shall be submitted for approval in writing to the County Planning Authority. The panelling shall be installed within 4 weeks of the date of the approval of the details and in strict accordance with them and retained in perpetuity'.
3. A Member stated that she believed the noise condition could be strengthened to address the concerns raised. It was asked that the condition include a requirement that noise monitoring be undertaken at points of sensitivity and to adjust the design of the acoustic panelling to address any identified issues. Officers said that, following the installation noted within Condition 24, an additional condition could be included to require that further monitoring be carried out and that if the results were to reveal any harmful impact, in relation to noise, that further detail of additional acoustic attenuation be provided to officers, approved and then installed. It was added that, as part of the approval process, consultation with Environmental Health would be included. The officer added that any additional attenuation could only be within the current enclosure.
4. In regard to the additional condition, a Member asked that a timescale of six months be included.

5. It was agreed that the full wording of the additional condition would be shared with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman for approval.

**Actions / Further information to be provided:**

None.

**Resolved:**

The Committee agreed to GRANT planning permission ref: WA/2023/01785 subject to Conditions within the report and update sheet, and the additional condition related to noise as noted within the minutes of the meeting.

**87/23 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL'S LOCAL LIST: REQUEST FORMAL ADOPTION OF LOCAL LIST FOR THE VALIDATION OF COUNTY DEVELOPMENT AND COUNTY MATTERS PLANNING APPLICATIONS [Item 8]**

**Officers:**

Jessica Darvill, Planning Officer

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. Officers introduced the report and provided a brief summary. Members noted that the report was to advise Members of the responses in regard to the recent consultation on the proposed Local List for the Validation of Planning Applications received by Surrey County Council (the "Local List") and the amendments that have been made as a result. The Local List was prepared by the County Planning Authority to clarify what information is usually required for applications of a particular type, scale or location. Full details could be found within the published report. Members noted that the National Planning Policy Framework was recently updated however did not impact the report being considered.
2. Officers clarified that the document was for validation purposes and that further details, including those related to root protection areas and travel plans, if relevant, would be considered later on in the planning process.

**Action / Further information to be provided:**

None.

**Resolved:**

To ADOPT the Revised and Updated Local List of Validation of County Development and County Matters Planning Applications allowing for periodic reviews of this document and Officers to update technical notes, in consultation with relevant consultees, if necessary.

**88/23 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 9]**

The date of the next meeting was noted.

Meeting closed at 11:30

---

**Chairman**