

MINUTES of the meeting of the **PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 26 June 2024 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
Jeffrey Gray
Victor Lewanski
Scott Lewis
Catherine Powell
Jeremy Webster
Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
Richard Tear (Vice-Chairman)
Jonathan Hulley
Chris Farr

Apologies:

John Robini

28/24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from John Robini.

29/24 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]

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

30/24 PETITIONS [Item 3]

There were none.

31/24 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 4]

There were none.

32/24 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 5]

There were none.

33/24 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 6]

There were none.

34/24 MINERALS AND WASTE APPLICATION WA/2023/02564 - LAND AT CHIDDINGFOLD STORAGE DEPOT, CHIDDINGFOLD ROAD, DUNSFOLD, SURREY GU8 4PB [Item 7]

Officers:

David Maxwell, Senior Planning Policy Officer

Officer Introduction:

1. The Senior Planning Policy Officer introduced the report and updated sheet and provided Members with a brief overview. Members noted that land at Chiddingfold Storage Depot was situated in countryside beyond the Green Belt approximately 2.9 kilometres (km) east of Chiddingfold and around 1.7km south-west of Dunsfold on the south-west side of Chiddingfold Road. The site area included part of the adjoining woodland with the remainder of the land being occupied by buildings or laid to hard standing. Members noted further details as outlined in the published report.

Speakers:

None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. A Member of the Committee thanked officers for considering the issues raised during Members' visit to the site. The Member added that she believed the additional condition addressed the issue and provided reassurance that the road safety issues would be dealt with.
2. The Committee noted that it was legitimate for an applicant to make a retrospective application within the planning system however it was noted that, if the retrospective planning application was not granted, then enforcement action was possible.
3. The Chairman moved the recommendation which was unanimously agreed to approve.

Actions / Further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

It was agreed to permit application WA/2023/02564 subject to the conditions and informatives outlined in the report and update sheet.

35/24 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL RU.23/0474 - FORMER BROCKHURST CARE HOME, BROX ROAD, OTTERSHAW, SURREY KT16 0HQ [Item 8]

Officers:

Charlotte Parker, Development Management Team Leader

Officer Introduction:

1. The Senior Planning Policy Officer introduced the report and update sheet and provided Members with a brief overview. Members noted that the outline application for the erection of 3-4 storey building was for extra care accommodation, comprising self-contained apartments, staff and communal facilities, and associated parking. Appearance and Landscaping reserved. Members further noted that Condition 4 had been amended to include reference that it was required prior to the commencement of the development. Members noted further details as outlined in the published report.

Speakers:

2. Julie Last spoke in objection to the application and made the following points:
 - a. That she was the chair of the Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum.
 - b. That a facility of this kind was welcomed however local residents were concerned with the proposal.
 - c. That the revised design completely removed one wing of the development to remove overshadowing and overlooking issues with adjacent residents. The speaker noted that the proposal had now changed from three to four storeys and the capacity was increased by 7 units to a total of 51 units.
 - d. It was noted that local residents remained convinced that a building of these proportions in terms of scale, mass and its slab-sided flat roof design occupying the same plot position as the original outline proposal was significantly overbearing and out of character for the surrounding area.
 - e. That residents could not see how any post outline design could remedy this and transform it into a structure of landmark value and that it was exacerbated through the loss of the mature trees which removed any masking from the tallest part of the structure.
 - f. That these issues had been highlighted by many objectors.
 - g. That the four storey elevation facing Slade Road, due to include balconies and fenestration, was only 20 metres away from the two storey frontages at numbers 4 to 10 and would cause a significant overlooking issue. It was further noted that there was no scope for screening as the façade was four metres from the site boundary.
 - h. That a combination of a reduction of unit numbers, partial reinstatement of one to two floors of the removed wing, a reduction in the length of the Brox Road facade and better use of the basement areas, together with improved roof edge details to mask the flat roof façade and additional landscaping could all be considered in order to achieve a design which would better integrate the surrounding area.
 - i. That at 25 spaces, parking capacity remained an issue, and was below the parking standard due to spaces to be used for

staff. It was further noted that there was no on-street parking in the surrounding area

In regard to the Ottershaw Local Plan, a Member asked the speaker whether it included details related to restrictions to the heights of properties in the area. The speaker stated that the Local Plan was in its consultation stage and that the Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum had submitted comments on potential restrictions to property height. The speaker further stated that most of the properties in Ottershaw and surrounding areas were usually two to three storeys high.

3. On behalf of applicant / Agent, Chris Wilmshurst made the following points:
 - a. That the site had been specially selected as it met key sustainability criteria for extra care housing being in close proximity to Ottershaw Village Centre.
 - b. The site previously accommodated a care home which was demolished in 2021 and so the site was well established for the proposal and the net increase would be marginal.
 - c. The design meets all the requirements for affordable specialist housing including being wheelchair accessible throughout and can address current and future needs of its residents and being in the heart of the community will reduce reliance on cars for residents and staff.
 - d. That proposal had undergone significant changes since the original submission. This was undertaken in agreement with the planning team and the aim was to create a landmark building at the corner plot, which was a well-established design principle at such locations to act as a focal point. The alterations to the scheme also achieved a reduction in building footprint, allowing for more landscaping and drawing the building further away from neighbouring houses.
 - e. That the area was not universally two storey housing.
 - f. That the officer report concludes, subject to detailed design, a building of this height a massing could successfully be accommodated on the site. It was further noted that this was an outline application and appearance is a reserved matter, so the final design can be subject to further consideration to assure a quality design was achieved.

Members noted that the rooms were self-contained and included all the facilities needed for residents to serve their own purposes. There would also be a community area which included facilities that all residents can share.

A Member asked for detail on the max number of units possible over 3 storeys. The speaker explained that 50 units was the minimum number which could taken on and that standards were rigid with regard to the size of the units. It noted that it would not be possible to include 51 units over three storeys.

A Member asked if a lower number of units would be accommodated if the remaining units would be included within another scheme. The speaker

explained that units could not automatically be added to other sites due to constraints.

Members noted that the original site included two storeys with a plant room above.

Members noted that consultation with local residents included online consultation and evening and daytime meetings.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. A Member of the committee stated that the application was a corner site on a main road and included a builders yard on one side and commercial unit on the other. Further to this, the Member stated that building land was not readily available in the south-east for the council to achieve its objectives for extra care and so developments need to include additional storeys.
2. A Member asked whether any weight could be put on the emerging local plan. The officer stated that it was too early to give any weight to the emerging local plan however weight has been given to the Runnymede Borough Council design documents which identifies Ottershaw as a residential area.
3. Members discussed the number of units possible and noted that the proposal would include up to 51 units.
4. A member stated that they were generally in support of the application due to a severe need for this type of accommodation however stated that she was disappointed that the rendering generated showed no windows and due to the trees, which would not be retained. Members noted that trees which were due to be removed as noted within the report.
5. Officers confirmed that it was possible for the application to return to the committee for consideration on further details.
6. A Member stated that he was concerned with the overbearing nature of four storeys and felt that three storeys would fit in better in the local area. In regard to consultation with residents, the Member stated that planning officers should have opened dialogue with residents to see what they would support and be in line with the emerging local plan.
7. Officers reminded Members that their role was to consider the application as submitted and in line with policy.
8. A Member stated that the need for the building was well-made and that he accepted that the four-storey element was a way to reach the target number of units. It was added that the Member felt that the application should return to the committee for consideration on final details.
9. Members noted that tree planting was proposed to replace the trees lost.
10. A Member stressed the importance of considering views from the public consultation and that he would struggle to support the proposal unless the number of units was reduced to the number included within

the initial proposal. The Chairman added that the committee could only consider what had been submitted.

11. The Chairman stated that the extra care units were for the local population and that there was limited land available, and so the council needed to make the best use of the land available.
12. The Chairman moved the recommendation which received eight votes in support, two votes in objection and zero abstentions.

Actions / Further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

Pursuant to Regulation 3 of The Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, the Committee resolves to grant outline planning permission for application ref: RU.23/0474, subject to the completion of legal agreement to secure payments (SANG and SAMM) to mitigate the impact of the development of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and subject to the recommended planning conditions noted in the published report and update sheet.

That Condition 4 be amended to include reference that it is required prior to the commencement of the development.

36/24 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL EP23/00633/CMA - LAND AT THE FORMER AURIOL JUNIOR SCHOOL PLAYING FIELD AND LAND AT 2ND CUDDINGTON (ROWE HALL), OFF SALISBURY ROAD, WORCESTER PARK, KT4 7DD. [Item 9]

Officers:

Dawn Horton-Baker, Development Management Team Leader

Officer Introduction:

The Senior Planning Policy Officer introduced the report and updated sheet and provided Members with a brief overview. It was noted that the application was for the outline application for the erection of a part 1 and part 3 storey building for Extra Care Accommodation, comprising self-contained apartments, staff and communal facilities, and associated car parking (Class C2); the re-provision of a revised Scouts Hut curtilage including a new amenity area (Class F2); and a new access from Salisbury Road. Appearance and landscaping reserved (amended plans). Members noted further details as outlined in the published report.

Speakers:

1. On behalf of the applicant / Agent, Chris Wilmshurst made the following points:

- a. That the site, being 1.54 hectares, was one of the largest selected as suitable for accommodating extra care housing and would deliver up to 93 units and is the first scheme in the Epsom and Ewell borough.
- b. That it comprised of a former school playing field and the grounds of the Second Cuddington Scout.
- c. Detailed discussion had been had with the Scout Group in regard to the scout land. The land was reorganised to facilitate the development and the Scout Group supported the proposal and consider the changes would improve opportunities for the use of the land.
- d. That the former school playing field had not been used for over 15 years and had become overgrown.
- e. That pre-application discussions had taken place with Sport England and, due to the loss of the playing field, the council had reached an agreement to offset the loss with a financial contribution of over £100,000 to fund local sporting facilities.
- f. That the proposal would offset 93 homes against Surrey's target to deliver 725 homes for adults in need of care and support.

2. The Local Member, Eber Kington, made the following points:

- a. That he welcomed the proposal as a contribution to the development of a modern adult social care for residents.
- b. That the site was predominantly a residential area, comprising of a mix of bungalows, two storey houses and some three storey houses and apartment blocks.
- c. That he was pleased that the four-storey block had been removed from the proposal.
- d. That the concept of extra care housing among residential homes would develop a residential and social mix which will enhance the community and provide much-needed housing units.
- e. That the application site is lined with trees which will provide privacy for the surrounding properties and residents of the development. The Local Member added that he was pleased with the limited tree loss.
- f. Noted that the development would result in a loss of 42.61 habitat units and would not provide a biodiversity net-gain. The Local Member added that he appreciated that offsite provisions had been proposed to offset this however the land identified was not in the local area. The Local Member asked the committee to investigate whether local land was available.
- g. In regard to paragraph 85 of the report and condition 22, which references the Worcester Park area, the Local Member said that the area should be referred to as Cuddington and Auriol.
- h. Asked the committee to review the wording of Condition 22 to make it more specific so the playing field mitigation scheme be undertaken in consultation with Epsom and Ewell Borough Council and take account of the borough council's Playing Pitch Strategy (August 2021) and the emerging local plan.

The Local Member asked that, in regard to Condition 22, Epsom and Ewell Borough Council be included as a decision maker and that, if mitigation works

could not be identified from existing recreation facilities in Epsom and Ewell, that the £100,000 funding agreed with Sports England be used to fund other bids, such as from schools, in the local area. Officers stated that the decision could only be made by Surrey County Council as the Local Planning Authority. In regard to the £100,000 sum referenced in the report, officers added that the condition included within the report was not tying the specific sum of £100,000 in but was instead reference to the mitigation package for local playing facilities. The officer added that the final cost could be more or less the referenced figure.

In regard to Condition 22, The Local Member asked that Members of the Committee agree an informative to consult Epsom and Ewell Borough Council. The Chairman proposed an informative to inform Epsom and Ewell Borough Council and the Local Member of the application when relevant, which was agreed.

In regard to Condition 22 and the reference to Worcester Park, Officers advised that the location be replaced with 'local area' in order to prevent restrictions on location.

Members noted that local transport links was limited in the area.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chairman moved the recommendation, including the conditions outlined within the published report and update sheet, and the informatives outlined within the published report and agreed within these minutes, which received unanimous support.

Actions / Further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

That, pursuant to Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 1992, outline planning application ref: EP23/00633/CMA be approved, subject to planning conditions outlined within the published report and update sheet.

37/24 REVIEW OF THE CHANGES TO THE CODE OF BEST PRACTICE PLANNING AND STANDING ORDERS [Item 10]

Officers:

Caroline Smith, Planning Group Manager

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. Officers introduced the report and explained that the Planning Advisory Service undertook a review of the Planning and Regulatory Committee (P&R) in 2023. The recommendations of the review were reported to the July meeting, with the recommended changes to the Code of Best Practice Planning and Part 4 of the Standing Orders considered by this committee on 27 September 2023. These were then approved by

the Council on 10 October 2023 and have been implemented for subsequent P&R meetings. It was agreed that the P&R committee would review the operation of the changes after six months to see how they worked. Officers stated that observations had shown that the committee had run better overall and that feedback from officers, Members and applicants was overwhelmingly positive.

2. Officers proposed that the running order of speakers was unchanged but that the number of public speakers was increased to four as outlined in the report. This is a maximum of four speakers for a proposal, and four against.
3. Officers proposed that the speaking time for Local Members was increased from three minutes to five minutes as outlined in the report.
4. It was noted that the recommended was to retain the changes to the Code of Best Practice Planning and the Standing Orders as adopted by Council on 10 October 2023 but with amendments to the number of public speakers and the time allotted for the local member, and to ask Council to formerly amend these elements at the meeting on 9 July 2024.

Actions / Further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

The Committee agreed to retain the changes to the Code of Best Practice Planning and the Standing Orders as adopted by Council on 10 October 2023 but with amendments to the number of public speakers and the time allotted for the local member, and to ask Council to formerly amend these elements at the meeting on 9 July 2024.

38/24 CONSTITUTION REVIEW - PLANNING ENFORCEMENT AND DELEGATED AUTHORITY [Item 11]

Officers:

Sian Saadeh, Planning Development Manager

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. Officers introduced the report and set out the proposed changes to the Constitution to give further delegated authority to relevant managers within the Planning Group in relation to Enforcement matters and to increase resilience in the delegated sign off process for planning applications. It is also proposed to remove some redundant elements in the existing Constitution. Full details were provided within the published report.

Actions / Further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

The Committee noted the proposed changes and agreed that these are presented to full Council for agreement.

39/24 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 12]

The date of the next meeting was noted.

Meeting closed at 12.25 pm

Chairman