

PLANNING COMMITTEE

- * Councillor Fiona White (Chairman)
- * Councillor Colin Cross (Vice-Chairman)

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| * Councillor Jon Askew | * Councillor Liz Hogger |
| * Councillor Christopher Barrass | * Councillor Marsha Moseley |
| Councillor David Bilbé | * Councillor Ramsey Nagaty |
| * Councillor Chris Blow | * Councillor Maddy Redpath |
| * Councillor Ruth Brothwell | * Councillor Pauline Searle |
| * Councillor Angela Goodwin | Councillor Paul Spooner |
| * Councillor Angela Gunning | |

*Present

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Paul Spooner and Councillor Graham Eyre attended as his substitute. Councillor David Bilbé was not in attendance and no substitute was in attendance on his behalf.

PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest.

PL3 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 10 August 2022 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the procedure for determining planning applications.

PL5 21/P/02394 - LAND REAR OF CHICANE AND QUINTONS, OCKHAM ROAD NORTH, EAST HORSLEY, KT24

Prior to consideration of the application, the following persons addressed the Committee in accordance with Public Speaking Procedure Rules 3(b):

- Councillor Steve Punshon (East Horsley Parish Council) (to object);
- Mr Yendle Barwise (Environment and Sustainability Manager) (West Horsley Place Trust) (to object) and;
- Mr Steven Brown (Agent Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd) (in support)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned reserved matters application pursuant to outline planning application 19/P/01541 approved 3/12/2019, for the approval of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for residential development.

The Committee received a presentation from Planning Officer, Paul Ricketts. The Committee noted that the principle of development had been established under the grant of outline planning permission 19/P/01541. It was also an allocated site within the Local Plan, Policy A38. The application site

measured 5.73 hectares and was comprised of two fields, two residential properties, a watercourse and ancient woodland which lay west of the railway embankment. The reserved matters for consideration were appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. Access to the site had already been determined at outline stage. The buildings were predominantly two storeys, some two and a half storey and three storey apartment buildings. Densities were higher to the south-east and the lowest density in the north-west corner. A meandering access drive with footpaths was set back from the road to reflect the semi-rural setting. In the south-east section there were two blocks of flats and in the mid-southern section was five self-custom build plots. To the west there were four one-bedroom bungalows and to the north was a centrally planted area within the woodland. SuDs features were located to the east of the site and running north to south was a trim trail observing the 50-metre buffer to ancient woodland. Drainage and attenuation ponds were located to the west of Stratford Brook and were designed to form landscape features to attenuate surface water flows before releasing to the wider drainage system at a controlled rate. 160 allocated parking spaces had been provided, 3 office parking spaces, 34 garage spaces and 10 visitor parking spaces which accorded with the adopted parking standards.

Block A provided affordable homes and had an attractive Arts and Crafts design of catslide roofs and gable features. Block B was three storeys high with the ridgeline decreasing in height to provide two and a half storeys. The two-storey development was a mix of brick and tile hanging, characteristic of the Surrey vernacular. Plots 68-106 contained a building at 8.3 metres high and two storey terraced plots at 78-81. Plots 39-42 show the covered open parking areas linking the dwellings. There was up to 99m² of B1a office floorspace. The proposed parameter plan had been complied with of a building 2-3 storeys in height.

In conclusion, it was the planning officer's view that the principle of development had been established under the outline planning permission and the approved Local Plan site allocation. The proposed layout had been amended following discussions with Design South-East and officers propose that the layout conforms with the outline parameter plans which would result in a well thought out layout providing usable and accessible open space through the trim trail. The proposed scale of development and densities were appropriate and in line with the approved parameter plans. The design of the scheme would create a sense of place and identity and was appropriately in character in the context of the village. The design also took satisfactory account of the amenity of future and surrounding occupiers. The proposal complied with the adopted Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan policies and the NPPF and the application was therefore recommended for approval, subject to the conditions set out in the agenda.

In response to comments made by the public speakers, the Interim Head of Planning, Dan Ledger confirmed that it was a reserved matters application which must be read in conjunction with the outline permission. The Committee cannot revisit outline measures as part of the reserved matters application. The buffer zone siting had already been agreed. Reference had been made to the requirement for additional fencing. Landscaping was already proposed to provide a natural barrier, however, if the Committee wished to consider fencing this would be permissible as an additional condition.

The Committee discussed the application and noted support for the recommendation of deer fencing, working in partnership with the West Horsley Place Trust to implement it. Concern was expressed regarding biodiversity and the schemes likely impact on wildlife. The buildings were also higher than that specified in the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan as it stated that residential development should be no more than two storeys high and there were seven buildings proposed at 2.5 metres. The design of the buildings were also not in keeping with the established character of East Horsley.

The Committee noted concerns raised regarding flooding risk and that Policy A38 of the Local Plan stated that there should be no increase in flood risk onsite. Was there also any potential to amend condition 6 of the original application, approved in 2019, to encourage the developer to go further than the minimum standards of achieving a 20% reduction in carbon emissions.

The Committee queried whether there were disabled parking spaces for those living in dwellings that had been built for wheelchair users. Clarification was also sought regarding if a PlayStation was similar to a LEAP in providing play equipment to children.

The Committee noted comments that there was no justification for refusal of the reserved matters application, given outline permission had already been granted. It was accepted that the proposal was for a significant number of dwellings, and it would therefore be difficult to achieve a design that did not look urban. However, the designs were considered to be attractive overall. The fact that some of the buildings did not comply with the parameter plan in that approximately 10 of the proposed buildings were only half a metre higher than that specified in the Neighbourhood Plan was not a sufficient reason to refuse the application. There was also sufficient landscaping providing a good amount of green space for residents as well as 40% affordable housing. No objections had been received from Surrey County Council who were the statutory authority in relation to flooding nor from the Environment Agency. The additional deer fencing proposed was also supported.

The Interim Head of Place, Dan Ledger clarified in relation to queries raised by the Committee that the heights of the proposed buildings did accord with the parameter plans that were part of the outline application. Biodiversity net gain was included in the conditions set out as part of the original outline application.

Play station equipment was intended to provide exercise facilities along the trim trail. The outline application included a contribution for an off-site play space as well as the play station equipment. The fencing to be provided would also include hedgehog holes to allow movement of wildlife through them. The energy conditions would have to meet the standards already set and what is required to be met. If the scheme was changed in any way, then the building regulations would need to be complied with. The landscaping scheme proposed had been incorporated and planning officers were happy with what had been laid out. Lastly, parking spaces had to be fully accessible.

Concerns were also raised regarding the number of parking spaces provided and that it did not look very attractive. The Interim Head of Planning confirmed that some tandem parking spaces had been provided but were restricted to single dwellings. The amount of parking provided met the parking standards and was always a balancing exercise with a scheme of this size.

The Committee noted concerns raised that regarding the run-off rates of the lake located in the field which was higher up than the development proposed. The scheme also appeared out of character for the village and an overdevelopment of the site. The entrance to the site was onto a very narrow road which did not seem appropriately sized for approximately 200 cars. Despite the Council's Climate Change Emergency Declaration the scheme was still proposing to install gas-fired boilers. The bicycle storage facilities were also not big enough for electric bikes. Concerns again were re-iterated regarding the height of the buildings, the loss of wildlife and concern for three oaks located in the ancient woodland.

The Committee noted final concerns raised that the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan specified what sort of housing was required and this scheme did not meet those requirements.

The Interim Head of Place, Dan Ledger stated that the proportion of smaller houses met the housing mix requirements, and some bungalows were also introduced at outline stage. The fact that there were some 5-bed dwellings did not mean that the scheme did not comply as the housing mix had to be looked at as a whole. The Committee was advised not to refuse the application on this basis as it could not be successfully defended against. Planning officers were also unable to prevent developers from installing gas fired boilers unless national legislation changed to prohibit it. The access to and from the site was discussed as part of the outline application and cannot be changed at this stage given it was

approved. It was also confirmed that condition 9 required parking provision to be made for bicycles and that ensuring the capacity was made for e-bikes would be taken into account when discharging those conditions (7 and 8) via an informative (as detailed below).

A motion was moved and seconded to approve the application which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Chris Blow	X		
2	Ramsey Nagaty		X	
3	Graham Eyre	X		
4	Jon Askew	X		
5	Liz Hogger	X		
6	Pauline Searle	X		
7	Chris Barrass		X	
8	Angela Goodwin	X		
9	Angela Gunning	X		
10	Marsha Moseley	X		
11	Ruth Brothwell	X		
12	Maddy Redpath	X		
13	Fiona White	X		
14	Colin Cross		X	
	TOTALS	11	3	0

In conclusion, having taken account of the representations received in relation to this application, the Committee

RESOLVED to approve application 21/P/02394 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report as well as the following additional condition 11 agreed to ensure the implementation of deer fencing:

11. Prior to any work above slab level, details of the deer fencing to the west boundary adjoining the Ancient Woodland shall be submitted for approval in writing to the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be installed in full prior to occupation and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To protect the Ancient Woodland habitat.

Informatives:

1. In respect of conditions 7 and 8 the applicant is advised that details should include reference to storage of electric bikes and ensure that the provision is sufficient to accommodate such bicycles.

PL6 22/P/00170 - BONINGTON'S, OAKWOOD CLOSE, EAST HORSLEY, LEATHERHEAD, KT24 6QG

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for first floor front extension to form front gable, front porch, two storey side extension with front and rear gables, a single storey rear extension and carport, following demolition of existing garage and conservatory.

The Committee received a presentation from Planning Officer, Jody Wu. The Committee noted that the application site was comprised of a two-storey detached property with an outbuilding as a garage. It was located within the settlement boundary of Horsley and was not within the Conservation Area nor were there any heritage assets within or adjacent to the plot. The previously proposed carport was removed, and the scheme has been amended to reflect neighbours' concerns regarding that structure. The Committee noted that the supplementary late sheets contained a summary of a letter received on behalf of the objectors.

The Committee discussed the application and noted comments made that the letter submitted by the objectors was important to note given there was concern regarding what further construction might take place onsite. One recommendation was to add a condition so that permitted development rights were removed.

The Interim Head of Planning confirmed that an additional condition requesting the removal of permitted development rights would not be reasonable in this case. Planning permission would be required for the construction of a car port which could not be undertaken via permitted development rights.

A motion was moved and seconded to approve the application, which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Graham Eyre	X		
2	Pauline Searle	X		
3	Liz Hogger	X		
4	Ramsey Nagaty			X
5	Chris Blow	X		
6	Ruth Brothwell	X		
7	Colin Cross	X		
8	Angela Gunning	X		
9	Fiona White	X		
10	Chris Barrass	X		
11	Maddy Redpath	X		
12	Jon Askew	X		
13	Marsha Moseley	X		
14	Angela Goodwin	X		
	TOTALS	13	0	1

In conclusion, having taken account of the representations received in relation to this application, the Committee

RESOLVED to approve application 22/P/00170 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL7 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted and discussed the planning appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 8:15pm.

Signed

Chairman

Date