

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

14 December 2011

Present:

Councillor G.E. Forsbrey (Chairman)
Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

I.J. Beardsmore	N. Gething	R.W. Sider
Mrs S.A. Dunn	A.J. Mitchell	S.D. Taylor
M.P.C. Francis	Ms D. Patel	Mrs S. Webb
A.E. Friday	Ms J.R. Sexton	

Apologies: Councillor A.C. Harman and Mrs C.L. Spencer

In attendance: Councillor R.L. Watts

Where Councillors are not members of the Committee but attended the meeting and addressed the Committee in relation to applications in their ward this is indicated below in relation to the relevant application.

Councillor Mrs V.J. Leighton - 10/00978/FUL, Ferris Meadow, Ferry Lane, Shepperton

310/11 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 November 2011 were approved as a correct record.

311/11 Disclosures of Personal and Prejudicial Interest

There were no disclosures.

312/11 Declarations under the Council's Planning Code

Councillor G.E. Forsbrey reported that he had received correspondence in relation to applications 10/00978/FUL – Ferris Meadow, Ferry Lane, Shepperton, 11/00531/FUL and 11/00524/HOU – Parkside Studio House, Church Street, Sunbury, 11/00844/LBC – Old Manor Farm Studio, Church Street, Sunbury, 11/00668/HOU – The Oaks, Parke Road, Sunbury but had maintained an impartial role and had not expressed any views.

Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley reported that he had received correspondence in relation to applications 10/00978/FUL – Ferris Meadow, Ferry Lane, Shepperton, 11/00531/FUL and 11/00524/HOU – Parkside Studio House, Church Street, Sunbury, 11/00844/LBC – Old Manor Farm Studio, Church Street, Sunbury, 11/00668/HOU – The Oaks, Parke Road, Sunbury but had maintained an impartial role and had not expressed any views.

PLANNING COMMITTEE 14 DECEMBER 2011 - Continued

Councillor I.J. Beardsmore reported that he had received correspondence in relation to applications 11/00531/FUL and 11/00524/HOU – Parkside Studio House, Church Street, Sunbury, 11/00844/LBC – Old Manor Farm Studio, Church Street, Sunbury, 11/00668/HOU – The Oaks, Parke Road, Sunbury but had maintained an impartial role and had not expressed any views.

Councillor Mrs S. A. Dunn reported that she had received correspondence in relation to applications 10/00978/FUL – Ferris Meadow, Ferry Lane, Shepperton, 11/00531/FUL and 11/00524/HOU – Parkside Studio House, Church Street, Sunbury, 11/00844/LBC – Old Manor Farm Studio, Church Street, Sunbury and 11/00668/HOU – The Oaks, Parke Road, Sunbury but had maintained an impartial role and had not expressed any views

Councillor M.P.C. Francis reported that he had received correspondence in relation to applications 10/00978/FUL – Ferris Meadow, Ferry Lane, Shepperton, 11/00531/FUL and 11/00524/HOU – Parkside Studio House, Church Street, Sunbury, 11/00844/LBC – Old Manor Farm Studio, Church Street, Sunbury, 11/00668/HOU – The Oaks, Parke Road, Sunbury but had maintained an impartial role and had not expressed any views.

Councillor A.E. Friday reported that he had received correspondence in relation to applications 11/00531/FUL and 11/00524/HOU – Parkside Studio House, Church Street, Sunbury and 11/00844/LBC – Old Manor Farm Studio, Church Street, Sunbury but had maintained an impartial role and had not expressed any views.

Councillor N. Gething reported that he had received correspondence in relation to applications 10/00978/FUL – Ferris Meadow, Ferry Lane, Shepperton, 11/00531/FUL and 11/00524/HOU – Parkside Studio House, Church Street, Sunbury and 11/00844/LBC – Old Manor Farm Studio, Church Street, Sunbury but had maintained an impartial role and had not expressed any views.

Councillor Ms J.R. Sexton reported that she had received correspondence in relation to application 10/00978/FUL – Ferris Meadow, Ferry Lane, Shepperton but had maintained an impartial role and had not expressed any views.

Councillor R.W. Sider reported that he had received correspondence in relation to applications 10/00978/FUL – Ferris Meadow, Ferry Lane, Shepperton, 11/00531/FUL and 11/00524/HOU – Parkside Studio House, Church Street, Sunbury, 11/00844/LBC – Old Manor Farm Studio, Church Street, Sunbury and 11/00668/HOU – The Oaks, Parke Road, Sunbury but had maintained an impartial role and had not expressed any views

Councillor S.D. Taylor reported that he had received correspondence in relation to application 10/00978/FUL – Ferris Meadow, Ferry Lane,

Shepperton but had maintained an impartial role and had not expressed any views.

Councillor Mrs S. Webb reported that she had received correspondence in relation to applications 11/00531/FUL and 11/00524/HOU – Parkside Studio House, Church Street, Sunbury and 11/00844/LBC – Old Manor Farm Studio, Church Street, Sunbury but had maintained an impartial role and had not expressed any views.

313/11 Planning Applications Determined

The planning applications listed below were considered by the Committee together with the recommendations contained in the written report of the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy.

All written representations received on the applications were made available for inspection by Members of the Committee prior to the start of the meeting. Planning Officers reported on any additional letters of representation and any other information received after the written report was prepared, as indicated below under the relevant application.

RESOLVED that the following planning applications be determined as indicated below:

ITEM 1.

Application	Address
10/00978/FUL	Ferris Meadow, Ferry Lane, Shepperton

Description:

Erection of a water ski cable tow facility, ancillary club house and store.
Creation of new access and associated car park.

Additional information:

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that a copy of a letter from the applicant's agent, which was sent directly to Members, had been received. He noted that the applicant's reference to permitted development rights was incorrect. Permission would be required for the erection of a 3m high fence.

Public Speaker:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for public speaking at Committees, Mrs Praetorius spoke against the proposal. The key issues raised related to:

- Noise and disturbance in Green Belt
- Effect on wildlife
- Insufficient parking provision which will compromise openness of Green Belt

PLANNING COMMITTEE 14 DECEMBER 2011 - Continued

Jane Wunderlich spoke in support of the proposal. The key issues raised related to:

- The amended scheme has addressed all the issues previously raised by the Inspector
- The Inspector did not consider noise to be an issue. There is no recognised method of assessing this type of noise and it would not be at a level to cause a problem and justify refusal of the application.
- 2 metre high fence allowed under permitted development

The ward councillor, Councillor Mrs V.J. Leighton, spoke against the proposal. The key issues raised related to:

- Impact on Site of Nature Conservation Importance
- Noise at boundary would create a disturbance to nearby residents
- Insufficient parking provision

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Noise
- Adequacy of parking and its impact on openness of green belt
- Impact on openness of green belt by 3 metre high fence
- Impact on wildlife
- Viability of scheme

Decision:

REFUSE the application for the following reason:

The submitted Environmental Noise Survey and Noise Impact Assessment Report dated 18 October 2011 confirms that the proposed scheme will increase noise above the background noise levels at the nearest noise sensitive premises. It is considered that noise generated by the development would cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbouring residential properties. The proposed 3m high acoustic fence is not considered to represent a satisfactory mitigation measure because of its visual impact and the effect on the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Policy EN11 of the Council's Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009.

ITEM 2.

Application	Address
11/00531/FUL	Parkside Studio House, Church Street, Sunbury

Description:

Erection of one no. 4 bedroom detached house, alterations to an existing garage and existing dwelling, conversion of Old Manor Farm Studio to two no. 2 bedroom mews style houses, demolition of parts of Old Manor Farm Studio

and other existing outbuildings and structures, landscaping and infrastructure works.

Additional information:

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that an amended floor plan had been received showing omission of an external chimney breast.

He also advised that Condition 10 of 11/00531/FUL should be amended to refer to plan No 09E and that Condition 3 should be amended by replacing "each tree or tree group to be retained" with "*the trees indicated for retention in the submitted Arboricultural report (excluding T19)*"

A further letter of objection had been received from a local resident. The points raised which were not already referred to in Section 5 of the report related to:

- Bay window in proposed house will result in overlooking
- Design of dormer windows insensitive
- Retention of two first floor windows not justified
- Materials should be specified at this stage.
- Mews houses have inadequate internal space
- Concern about location of bin area

Public Speaker:

In accordance with the Councils procedure for public speaking at meetings Geoff Adams spoke against the proposal. The key issues raised related to:

- Overdevelopment in Conservation area
- Impact on Conservation area and Listed Buildings
- Overlooking
- Loss of mature trees
- Poor design

Nicola Forster spoke in support of the proposal. The issues raised related to:

- Scheme has sought to address previous reasons for refusal
- Compliant with Council's Design SPD
- Parking increased on site to reduce impact on street
- Preserves the character and appearance of Conservation area
- It has the support of all consultees including the Council's historic buildings advisor

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Impact on Conservation area
- Overdevelopment
- Loss of garden land
- Problems caused by traffic in Church Street
- Design of new house
- Less concern about conversion of Manor Farm Studio

Decision:

Recommendation overturned and application **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

The introduction of a new detached dwelling and conversion of Manor Farm Studio, together with the access road, parking, traffic, and means of enclosure associated with the proposal, would detract and harm the open and spacious character of this part of Church Street and would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. As such it is contrary to policy EN6 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies DPD (Feb 2009)

ITEM 3.

Application	Address
11/00844/LBC	Old Manor Farm Studio, Church Street, Sunbury

Description:

Conversion of Old Manor Farm Studio to two no. 2 bed mews style houses, demolition of modern additions to Old Manor Farm Studio and associated works, demolition of two outbuildings and alterations to existing garage.

Additional information:

There was none.

Public Speaker:

In accordance with the Councils procedure for public speaking at meetings Geoff Adams spoke against the proposal. The key issues raised related to:

- Impact on Conservation area and Listed Buildings
- Poor design
- Loss of privacy
- Access and parking issues

Nicola Forster spoke in support of the proposal. The issues raised related to:

- Scheme has sought to address previous reasons for refusal
- It has the support of all consultees including the Council's historic buildings advisor
- Parking increased on site to reduce impact on street
- Preserves the character and appearance of Conservation area

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Impact on Conservation area
- Character of building not preserved

Decision:

Recommendation overturned and application **REFUSED** for the following reason:

The proposed conversion of Old Manor Farm Studio does not have sufficient regard to the historic status of the building and would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. As such it is contrary to policies EN5 and EN6 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies DPD (Feb 2009)

ITEM 4.

Application	Address
11/00524/HOU	Parkside Studio House, Church Street, Sunbury

Description:

External alterations to existing dwelling.

Additional information:

There was none reported.

Public Speaker:

In accordance with the Councils procedure for public speaking at meetings Ms Forster spoke in support of the proposal. The key issues raised related to:

- Proposal is for a very minor form of development which has no impact on Conservation area.
- It is separate from the other proposals on the site.
- Removal of flat roof lean to with improved design

Decision:

GRANT subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy.

ITEM 5.

Application	Address
11/00305/FUL	1 st Sunbury Scouts and Guides Hall and School House, School Walk. Sunbury

Description:

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a new scouts and guides headquarters hall with ancillary offices, together with 2 no. semi-detached 3-bedroom houses with associated parking and integral garages.

Additional information:

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that a letter had been received from the applicant's solicitors confirming details of the title to the property.

Amended plans had been received showing the reduction in the pitch of the roof to the proposed dwellings and changes to the internal layout of the first floor to provide a bathroom in the rear elevation closest to Lyndhurst Avenue

He also advised that Condition 13 should be changed by inserting "and ensuite to master bedroom" after "eastern elevations" in second line and that in Condition 2, the plan numbers referred to change to L111 received 07.12.11 and L002 received on 14.12.11

Public Speaker:

There were no public speakers on this item.

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

During the debate the following key issues were raised:

- Recognition of benefit to community in providing new accommodation for the scouts
- Design sympathetic to area
- Adequacy of vehicular access to site
- Impact on public footpath

Decision:

GRANT subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy and amended conditions as follows:

Condition 2 – plan numbers referred to change to L111 received 07.12.11 and L002 received on 14.12.11

Condition 13 to be changed by inserting "and ensuite to master bedroom" after "eastern elevations" in second line.

ITEM 6.

Application	Address
<u>11/00668/HOU</u>	The Oaks, Parke Road, Sunbury

Description:

Retention of balcony railings on existing roof (as built).

Additional information:

There was none reported.

Public Speaker:

In accordance with the Council's procedure for public speaking at meetings Brian Bone spoke against the proposal. The key issues raised related to:

- Concern about the future use of the balcony
- Overlooking
- Appearance of railings

Herbert Carpenter spoke in support of proposal. The issues raised related to:

- Non compliance with original approval had been due to his misunderstanding
- Concern that removal of section of railing would affect waterproof quality of roof.

Decision:

GRANT subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy and the following additional condition.

Within 4 months of the date of this decision the railings shall be painted green, in accordance with details of the precise shade to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The railings shall be retained in that colour thereafter.

Reason: To improve the appearance of the railings.

314/11 **Planning Appeals**

The Chairman informed the Committee that if any Member had any detailed queries regarding the report on Appeals lodged and decisions received since the last meeting, they should contact the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy.

RESOLVED that the report of the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy be received and noted.

315/11 **Decisions taken against officer recommendation**

The planning officer updated the Committee on the 6 month review from 1 April 2011 to 30 September 2011, of decisions taken against officer recommendations.

It was reported that an appeal had now been lodged on the refusal at Casa Mia, Coolgardie Road, Ashford.

RESOLVED that the report of the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy be received and noted.