

MINUTES of the meeting of the **PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 25 March 2021 at Remote.

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

Members Present:

Tim Hall (Chairman)
Saj Hussain
Mrs Mary Angell
Bernie Muir
Andrew Povey
Mr Keith Taylor
Mrs Rose Thorn
Stephen Cooksey
Ernest Mallett MBE
Mr Tim Evans

Apologies:

Penny Rivers

1/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Penny Rivers.

2/21 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]

The Committee agreed to amend paragraph 1 to includes the following wording (in bold) "Additional representations, **already covered within the officer update sheet**, are attached to these minutes as Annexes 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14."

Subject to the above amendment, the Minutes were approved as an accurate record of the previous meeting.

3/21 PETITIONS [Item 3]

There were none.

4/21 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 4]

There were none.

5/21 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 5]

There were none.

6/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 6]

Dr Povey declared a non-pecuniary interest because he was a trustee of Surrey Hills Society.

7/21 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL WO/2020/1090 - SHAW FAMILY CENTRE, CHOBHAM ROAD, WOKING, SURREY GU21 4AS [Item 9]

Officers:

Dawn Horton-Baker, Senior Planning Officer
 Abigail Solway, Transport Development Planning Officer
 Caroline Smith, Interim Planning Group Manager
 Stephen Jenkins, Interim Planning Development Manager
 Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Lawyer
 Joss Butler, Committee Manager

Speakers:

Ian Johnson made representations in objection to the application. The following key points were made:

- That there would be a negative impact on near-by residential properties
- That the application involved the loss of mature trees and hedging and that there was insufficient space to provide replacement screening.
- That the design statement and access statement did not provide realistic outcomes and that local residents would not appreciate a 13ft wall being built.
- That the ecological statement stated that the intent was to retain existing trees and important landscaping features and that the justification for the removal of trees was weak.
- That the application noted the sustainability and connectivity of the site however the Brewery Road Car Park was not taken into account when considering parking spaces at the Shaw Centre.
- That the current proposals needed to be more respectable to neighbours and the ecological impact.
- That Members should defer the application.

Alex Aughterson made representations in objection to the application. The following key points were made:

- That the placement of the new building would see the loss of garden space frequently used by families visiting the centre.
- That trees around the garden were set to be removed which would lead to reduced garden space.
- That residents agreed that a redevelopment was necessary however concerns raised in the consultation period had not impacted any planning decisions.
- That staff should be encouraged to use public transport to allow for additional parking spaces for visitors.
- That residents were concerned that the family centre would not be centred around families.

Issy Aughterson made representations in objection to the application. The following key points were made:

- That residents had the impression that the consultation had not allowed residents to meaningfully engage with the plans.
- That Planning officers had been informed that Statement of Community Involvement brochures were not delivered to residents.
- That the impression from residents was that there was little flexibility to amend the plans following consultation.
- That consideration should be deferred to allow time for sufficient consideration of the consultation feedback.

The applicant's agent, Sarah Isherwood, spoke to the Committee in response to the public speakers' comments. The following key points were made:

- That the Shaw Centres primary function was to allow looked after children to meet with family and extended family in safe and comfortable circumstances.
- That it was important for looked after children to meet with family to support their emotional and cultural identity.
- That the buildings were no longer fit for purpose and inefficient to operate and maintain.
- Noted technical details of the application proposal.
- Stated that the increase in space would allow for foster carers to wait in a comfortable area while their looked after children were visiting family.
- Highlighted that the existing building on Chobham Road would not be changed and would continue to provide a service.
- That no concerns on heritage grounds had been raised by officers.
- That redevelopment would increase the energy efficiency of the building.
- That Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Council Highways Team had raised no objections to the proposed entrance on Chobham Road.
- Noted that no technical objections had been received.

The Local Member, Colin Kemp, spoke for three minutes. The following key points were made:

- Supported the work and need for regeneration on site to allow for continued work by the service.
- Accepted that the application met planning regulations however felt the impact on local residents had not been taken into account.
- That more discussion were needed with Woking Borough Council regarding the side access. Woking Borough Council had asked Surrey County Council to adopt the road for some time.
- The location of the building would make it difficult to place some mature trees along the boundary.
- That more information was needed on the number of parking spaces compared to staff on site.
- Proposed to defer consideration of the application to allow more time to consider its details and impact on local residents.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Senior Planning Officer introduced the report and provided a brief overview of the plans and aerials included in the agenda. Members noted details related to the boundaries, parking and elevation of the site.
2. Members asked for clarification on whether local residents were consulted on the application and why some felt that had not been engaged. Officers explained that some residents had likely confused the council's non-statutory pre-application engagement with the statutory requirement in terms of publicity and that this was carried out.
3. Members raised concerns related to the number of trees being removed from the site. Officers shared a landscaping plan which provided further detail of the proposals and trees along the site's boundary. Members noted that sapling trees had been selected for the short term in order to provide softening of the building on the boundary. It was further noted that fencing had been proposed to be implemented across the full boundary of the site.
4. Officers highlighted that the Historic Buildings Officer had not raised any objections to the material of the building.
5. Members noted that the current access was on a private road owned by Woking Borough Council. The road was very narrow with parked vehicles along its full length which would make it dangerous to pull out near the junction. Members further noted that it was not clear whether Woking Borough Council wanted the road to be adopted and that an adoption process would be very lengthy.
6. Members asked whether it was possible to retain the trees along the boundary which were proposed to be removed. Officers explained that the current trees were not worthy of retention and that officers had to access the application as submitted. Any changes to proposals would require considerable resiting.
7. The Committee noted that the garden would be replaced by smaller gardens and asked for further details on the reason. Officers explained that it was not within the Committee's remit to consider the use of gardening on site.
8. A Member of the Committee felt that the application was an excellent use of the site and agreed that there was a need for small secure green areas when the service carried out its purpose. The Member also stated that the level of car parking was necessary to allow for use of the site by staff.
9. A Member stated that they were concerned that the Committee was considering details of the application which was not within its remit.
10. Saj Hussain moved a motion for deferral, seconded by Andrew Povey, to 1. allow officers to further investigate Member concerns related to whether the existing access could continue to be used to allow for more space on site and 2. allow for a proper consultation with local residents to be conducted.
11. A Member of the committee stated that they believed the reasons for deferral were unreasonable and weak.
12. The motion for deferral was put to a vote and received three votes for, seven votes against and no abstentions. Therefore the motion for deferral was lost.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting from 12:00pm – 12:05pm

13. The Chairman summarised the debate and listed key concerns before moving the recommendation. A vote was taken and Members unanimously voted for the application.
14. Before voting, all Members confirmed that they were present and heard the full debate.

Actions / further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

That, pursuant to Regulation 3 of the Town and County Planning General Regulations 1992, planning application ref: WO/2020/1090 be permitted subject to the conditions from page 161.

8/21 MINERALS/WASTE SP20/00513/SCRVC - CHARLTON LANE WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY, CHARLTON SHEPPERTON, SURREY TW17 8QA [Item 7]

Officers:

Duncan Evans, Senior Planning Officer
 Caroline Smith, Interim Planning Group Manager
 Stephen Jenkins, Interim Planning Development Manager
 Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Lawyer
 Joss Butler, Committee Manager

Speakers:

None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Senior Planning Officer introduced the report and provided a brief summary. Members noted that the application was for the development of the Charlton Lane Eco Park without compliance with Condition 4 of planning permission ref: SP16/01220/SCC dated 23 September 2016 in order to amend the hours for the Recyclables Bulking Facility so Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) may enter the application site gates and to park within the site boundary. Members noted that the application did not propose changes to the number of HGVs accessing the site.
2. A Member explained that residents had previously raised concerns as HGVs were parking outside the site in order to wait for site opening which was interfering with traffic. Amending the site open times was suggested to allow HGVs to wait inside the site however some residents were now concerned that this was cause HGVs to wait outside the site even earlier.
3. A Member asked whether a condition could be set with the HGV contractors to state that if they did not comply with conditions related to parking before entering the site then their contract would be impacted. Officers explained that the applicant had a routine strategy with the operator of the HGVs and that if it was breached then the

Planning Enforcement Team would investigate. Members further noted that statutory elements were also afforded to boroughs and districts for statutory nuisance which allowed for enforcement of particular actions.

4. Officers highlighted that the number of HGVs which could enter the site was restricted to seven.
5. The Committee further noted that the site was not operational until 7:30am and therefore there was no need for HGVs to enter the site earlier than necessary other than to address the traffic issue.
6. Members asked whether it was possible to implement a trial period for the changes in case of any unexpected consequences. Officers went on to explain that this was a Section 73 application which sought to vary the hours of operation on a specific area of the site and therefore a trial period was not possible.
7. The Chairman summarised the debate before moving the recommendation. There were nine votes for, one vote against and no abstentions. Therefore the application was permitted.
8. Before voting, all Members confirmed that they were present and heard the full debate.

Actions / further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

The Committee voted to permit application SP20/00513/SCRVC subject to the conditions from page 65.

9/21 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSAL EL/2020/3112 - 10 FORMER ASHLEY ROAD, WALTON ON THAMES, SURREY KT12 1HU [Item 8]

Officers:

Stephanie King, Planning Officer
 Tim Dukes, Senior Planning Development Planning Officer
 Caroline Smith, Interim Planning Group Manager
 Stephen Jenkins, Interim Planning Development Manager
 Nancy El-Shatoury, Principal Lawyer
 Joss Butler, Committee Manager

Speakers:

None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Case officer introduced the report and update sheet and provided a brief summary. Members noted that the application was for the development of a new Children's Home and No Wrong Door Facility with associated parking, access and landscaping.
2. The Chairman moved the recommendation which unanimously voted for the recommendation and therefore the application was permitted.
3. Before voting, all Members confirmed that they were present and heard the full debate.

Actions / further information to be provided:

None.

Resolved:

That, pursuant to Regulation 3 of the Town and County Planning General Regulations 1992, planning application ref: EL/2020/3112 be permitted subject to the following conditions from page 116 and the update sheet.

10/21 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 10]

The date of the next meeting was noted.

Meeting closed at 12.52 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank