

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 26 January 2022 at Surrey County Council, Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 8EF.

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

**Members Present:**

Tim Hall (Chairman)  
Ernest Mallett MBE  
Penny Rivers  
Jonathan Hulley  
Victor Lewanski  
David Lewis  
Scott Lewis  
Catherine Powell  
Richard Tear  
Jeremy Webster (Vice-Chairman)

**Apologies:**

Jeffrey Gray

**1/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Jeffrey Gray.

**2/22 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]**

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

**3/22 PETITIONS [Item 3]**

There were none.

**4/22 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 4]**

There were none.

**5/22 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 5]**

There were none.

**6/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 6]**

There were none.

**7/22 MINERALS/WASTE EP21/00223/CMA - LAND AT THE CHALK PIT, COLLEGE ROAD, EPSOM, SURREY KT17 4JA [Item 7]**

The Chairman noted that this application had been deferred.

**8/22 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL MO/2021/1912 - LAND AT HEADLEY COURT, HEADLEY ROAD, LEATHERHEAD, SURREY KT18 6JW [Item 8]**

**Officers:**

Stephen Jenkins, Planning Development Manager  
 Caroline Smith, Planning Group Manager  
 Helen Forbes, Senior Lawyer  
 Sonia Sharp, Senior Highways and Planning Solicitor  
 Chris Turner, Senior Planning Officer

**Speakers:**

None.

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Senior Planning Officer introduced the report and provided a brief summary. Members noted a correction to the report which was that Condition 6 and Condition 7 should reference 'Condition 5' and not 'Condition 1'. Members were provided with an overview of the photographs and plans included within the meeting's agenda.
2. The Committee noted that the applicant was Surrey County Council.
3. A Member asked for clarification on why there was a pile of rubble shown within the site photographs. Officers confirmed that the rubble was not relevant to the application.
4. Members discussed Condition 2 which stated '*The development to which this permission relates shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission*'. Members raised concerns that the condition was unnecessary as works were already ongoing on site and therefore the permission would begin following the committee's approval for a period of six months. Following a short discussion, Legal officers at the meeting advised that they believed that, as the application was temporary, rather than permanent, there was no requirement for Condition 2 in line with Planning legislation. Planning officers also agreed that there was no requirement for Condition 2 and that it could be removed. The Committee unanimously agreed to remove Condition 2 from the report.

**Resolved:**

That Pursuant to Regulation 3 of the Town and Country PLANNING General Regulations 1992, application number ref: MO/2021/1912 be PERMITTED subject to the conditions from page 103 of the agenda (excluding Condition 2) and the update sheet.

**9/22 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL WA/2021/02235 - THE ABBEY SCHOOL, MENIN WAY, FARNHAM, SURREY GU9 8DY [Item 9]**

**Officers:**

Stephen Jenkins, Planning Development Manager  
Caroline Smith, Planning Group Manager  
Helen Forbes, Senior Lawyer  
Sonia Sharp, Senior Highways and Planning Solicitor  
Chris Turner, Senior Planning Officer

**Speakers:**

Barry Kitcherside, the agent of a local resident, spoke for three minutes and made the following comments:

1. That he, and his client, Linda Mills, had no generic concerns with the application and supported it.
2. That it was disappointing that officers had not yet reached a solution to the issue related to the new sports hall and the property named Ambulo.
3. That there was a need for a detailed impact assessment which considered the proximity of the new sports hall and the property Ambulo.
4. That his client would experience a loss of openness, outlook and privacy with the erection of the new sports hall.
5. That he was not suggesting that the application be refused but rather revised to amend the location of the new sports hall.
6. That, although it was not referenced in the application, there was concern that the new sports hall would also be used by unrelated third parties. In the event of this, it was asked that consideration be put into the impact on the local residents.

The applicant's agent, Mike Cole, spoke for three minutes in response and made the following comments:

1. That the applicant supported the officer recommendation.
2. That a public consultation was undertaken and pre-application discussions were entered into with officers when devising the scheme. Further discussions took place during consideration of the application to ensure any objections were considered and addressed.
3. That no objections were received by statutory consultees.
4. That additional work beyond the original submission was undertaken to demonstrate that no harm would come to the property Ambulo and others.
5. That Block F, the sports hall, had been designed to be policy compliant.
6. The applicant had accepted restrictive conditions which included the nature of Block F's use and associated hours, and that there would be no community access to the hall and no flood lighting was proposed on the hard play area.

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Senior Planning Officer introduced the report, and the update sheet, and provided a brief summary. Members were also provided with an overview of the site's plans and photographs which were also included within the meeting's agenda.

2. A Member asked whether any other locations were considered for the location of Block F on the site. The Senior Planning Officer explained that, to his knowledge, no other locations were considered however where a scheme was submitted that is policy compliant then it is difficult to request a redesign. A Member stated that they felt there should be more flexibility to address the local resident's concerns as the application was submitted by Surrey County Council.
3. Following a short discussion on the hours of operation and use of Block F, Members noted that the applicant had not specifically requested that the sports hall be also used by the community. If the school wished to amend this going forward then a further application for 'change of use' would need to be submitted.
4. A Member of the committee requested a condition be included within the report which restricted hours of construction on the site. Officers read out the following condition which the Member accepted and agreed to be included. The condition read: *'In carrying out the development hereby permitted, no construction activities shall take place except between the hours of 0800 to 1800 Monday to Friday and 0800 to 1300 on Saturdays. There shall be no working on Sunday, Bank, National or Public Holidays.'*
5. A Member further requested a condition be included within the report which restricted the hours of HGV movements during the core and adjacent school's operating hours. Officers read out the following condition which the Member accepted and agreed to be included. The condition read: *'there shall be no HGV movements to or from the site will be able to take place between the core school and adjacent school's operating hours of 07:15 to 09:20 and 14:45 to 15:25. Furthermore, the contractor will not permit any goods vehicles associated with construction to be laid up and waiting on roads in the vicinity of the School. This includes Menin Way, Tilford Road, Longley Road and the B3001 Waverley Lane during these times.'*
6. A Member highlighted that there was an urgency for Special educational needs and disability services which the school would offer.
7. A Member stated that a site visit to the site could have been beneficial.
8. The Chairman moved to vote on the officer recommendation which included the additional conditions within the update sheet and two new conditions outlined within these minutes (Paragraphs 4 and 5). The committee voted unanimously for the officer recommendation.

**Resolved:**

The committee agreed to Permit subject to the conditions from page 136 of the agenda, the update sheet and the two conditions within paragraphs 4 and 5 of these minutes.

**10/22 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 10]**

The date of the next meeting was noted.

Meeting closed at 11.40 am

---

**Chairman**