

These are draft minutes and are subject to approval at the next meeting.



PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
8.00pm on Thursday 10 April 2014
Village Hall Committee Room
Minutes.

Present: *Councillors:* Noel Isaacs (*Chairman*), Ken Huddart, Alex Coomes, Michael O'Brien
Co-opted Members:

Alex Coomes was not present at the start of the meeting.

1. Apologies for Absence

None

2. Declarations of Interests

Cllr Huddart declared that he is Acting-Chairman of the Claygate Conservation Areas Advisory Committee.

3. Minutes of last meeting

The minutes of 20 March 2014 were approved and signed.

4. Report of actioning of items from previous minutes

AP7- *Cllr Isaacs to speak to Enforcement-* the matter is now subject of a retrospective planning application.

5. Correspondence

5.1 Cllr Isaacs circulated the decision of the Inspectorate on **2013/3558- The Lodge Ruxley Ridge Extension** which had been refused by EBC on the grounds of insufficient amenity space. The Inspectorate has allowed the appeal, due to the proximity of the Common as usable amenity space.

5.2 All results were read out.

6. Current applications and Declarations of interest

Applications from week ending – 21/3/14

6.1 **2014/995 – 116A, Foley Road** –*Conservation Area: pine-remove one branch*

No comment

Cllr Coomes arrived at the meeting. Susan Harding sends apologies.

6.2 **2014/587 – 9, Claremont Road** –*2 rear garden structures following demolition of existing*

We object to the flat roofs as the house is in a Conservation Area and the built environment should be kept correct, but the flat roofs are not sympathetic in design and out of keeping with the Conservation Area. The nature of the proposed buildings is such that it would be easy to convert them to habitable living spaces which is out of keeping with the Conservation Area, so we therefore ask that permitted development rights be removed.

6.3 **2014/1017 – 21, Langbourne Way** – *two storey extension and single storey rear extension*

Cllr Coomes declared an interest as he is acquainted with the builder carrying out work at this address.

No comment

Applications from week ending – 28/3/14

6.4 **2014/944 – 20, Langbourne Way** – *alterations to roof space including hip to gable roof extension, rear dormer windows and three front rooflights.*

We are not objecting but note that the removal of the hip end destroys the symmetry of the building.

These are draft minutes and are subject to approval at the next meeting.

6.5 2014/1027- 45, Foley Road –*single storey front extension incorporating carport.*

No comment

6.6 2014/1114 – 88, Telegraph Lane – *LDC; whether permission is required for a proposed single storey rear extension.*

No comment

6.7 2014/0813 – 14, Beaconsfield Road – *single storey rear extension.*

Cllr Coomes declared an interest as his place of residence is in Beaconsfield Road and he is known to the applicant.

No comment

6.8 2014/0973 – Ruxley Mount, Mountview Road – *additional detached two storey house with basement incorporating garage and new access following demolition of existing garages*

We object to this proposal as it breaches the rule of the Ruxley Heights Estate that buildings should be 30' from the roadway. The 30' rule is quite clearly shown on the plan, with part of the proposed new dwelling in breach of the Ruxley Heights Estate rule.

6.9 2014/1058 – Nyumbani, Ruxley Crescent – *single storey side extension with rooms in roof space and raised terrace at rear, single storey rear infill extension and hip to gable roof extension following demolition of garages and outhouse.*

No comment

6.10 2014/0909 – 22, Ruxley Ridge – *single storey rear extension following demolition of conservatory*

No comment

6.11 2014/1062 – 23, Simmil Road – *part two/part single side/rear extension following demolition of existing side garage and rear extension.*

Cllr Coomes declared an interest as he owns a house in Simmil Road and is known to the applicant. We object to this application as it does not conform to the 1m rule.

6.12 2014/1080 – 20, Langbourne Way – *single storey rear infill extension*

We are not objecting but ask the Officer to check the 45 degree rule to number 18.

6.13 2014/1288 – 102, Hare Lane – *CCC : 6 (Landscaping) of permission 2012/2872*

No comment

6.14 2014/1162 – 21, Beaconsfield Road – *Variation of Condition 1 (Approved plans) of application 2011/6540 to allow addition of fire escape at rear.*

No comment

6.15 2014/1136 – 17, Beaconsfield Road – *front boundary wall, entrance gates and piers to maximum height of 1.8m high.*

Cllr Coomes declared an interest as he lives at 9, Beaconsfield Road and is acquainted with the applicant.

We object to this application as the proposal is not in keeping with the neighbouring properties.

6.16 2014/1196 – 5, Queen Anne Drive – *single storey rear extension following demolition of conservatory*

No comment

6.17 2014/989 – 37, Oaken Lane – *retrospective permission for a 2.1m high front boundary fence.*

We are objecting to this application as the height of the fence is too high, incongruous and out of keeping with the neighbouring properties and the soft planting of the local street scene.

6.18 2014/1115 – 17, Oaken Lane – *front porch.*

We are not objecting, but ask the Officer to check the front building line.

7. Report of the East Area Sub Committee

Cllr Isaacs attended the meeting on 31 March 2014 and circulated the report:-

These are draft minutes and are subject to approval at the next meeting.

2013/4697 – Rowan Preparatory School

Part single/part two storey front and side extension, two storey infill extension, two storey rear extension, new external staircase to provide additional teaching accommodation and various internal alterations, in addition alterations to the front of the school to incorporate two new pedestrian entrances.

At the opening of the meeting the relevant history of planning applications for the site were read out:

2002/1315 – Detached 3 storey preparatory school following the demolition of existing school buildings – Granted, condition 12 of this permission stated that pupil numbers shall not exceed 200.

2007/2668 – Original planning application 2002/1315 to extend time limit for 3 years.

2010/3029 – To extend the time limit for 3 years

Objector Mr Sambrook

Representing the objectors was first to speak, the notes were as follows:

- They were surprised that SCC raised no objections.
- There are issues with traffic, pollution, and pedestrian safety.
- With the school access being opposite a local primary school, which has increased its numbers over the last few years there has been a corresponding increase in traffic and the associated fumes polluting the air which are unhealthy.
- In a local survey in the morning at drop off time 450 vehicles were counted which goes against MOV7 – servicing facilities, as these vehicles constrict access down the road to single lane traffic.
- The traffic plan drawn up for the school is unrealistic as 80% of the pupils are from outside Claygate.
- There is a problem with loss of privacy as when the coaches are parked by the school, their height means that the passengers have views into all the rooms at the front of the houses.
- The coaches when parked up should be required to turn their engines off due to the fumes created from the diesel engines.
- Much has changed over the time since the original application in 2002, due to the expansion of the nearby primary school.

Applicant Mrs Clark

Representing the school:

She spoke of the type of schooling given and how since its start in 1936, it first started on this site in 1947 with an extension in 1996 thus enabling further aspects of enhanced education. It was stated that further growth is now required and that due to waiting lists they want to increase their intake from 156 to 200, increasing the number by 44 and this would make 20% of children coming from Claygate.

Cllr Herbert – Borough Cllr for Claygate and on EA Planning Committee

Stated that he would like to go for a refusal, we have to look to the further community as a whole. There are several areas of concern; these concern the closeness to their neighbours and the environmental impact on the area.

Cllr Coomes - Borough Cllr for Claygate and on EA Planning Committee

Also stated he would like to go for a refusal. He has lived in the area for 40 years and is aware of the boundaries and does not believe the site can cope with the enhanced quantity of pupils. There is a problem with traffic and at drop off and pick up and this will only get worse. There is also the problem with the coaches transporting the children for their off-site games. He foresees all the problems associated with traffic congestion getting worse. A motion was put forward that that the application should be deferred and put back to SCC for a full in depth report as the Transport Plan was weak.

Cllr Marshall – Borough Cllr for Claygate

Cllr Marshall was allowed to speak independently as she is neither a member of this committee or standing in for another Cllr.

Also stated she would like to go for a refusal. Last week she went on a site visit and on Friday morning monitored the traffic over a two hour period at drop off. She experienced the fumes and disruption caused by traffic congestion, which ended in grid lock at times. Over time since the initial application in 2002, Claygate Primary has expanded to its current 450 intake. Rowan has less than 8% of its pupils from Claygate and feels that with the proposed expansion that it time for it to relocate. Currently staff from the school park in the local surrounding roads as there is no on-site parking provision. On the day of the traffic survey was done only 4 pupils were seen walking to school and that the cars had only one child in each, thus showing that no car sharing or other practices were in operation.

The meeting was then opened to the rest of the Councillors present. There was an opening statement by the Chair that this council will struggle to refuse the planning application as they have already been given permission as far back as 2002 for expansion to 200 pupils. If the council went to refuse they could face a hefty fine.

The following points were brought up:

- No traffic control noticed in the area such as double yellow lines.

These are draft minutes and are subject to approval at the next meeting.

- Looking at Point 28 – this relates to the Travel Plan. It needs to be tightened up and be made a formal condition as the current one does not go far enough.
- Terms of condition 4 – relating to the Travel Plan, the Council would have to be satisfied and SCC as the current one is not robust enough. This should involve more discussion with SCC so that they can consider this condition enforceable.
- Point 18 – relating to saved policy COM4, relating to traffic generation, accessibility, stopping and parking arrangements. All issues in this are relevant. Coaches should be required to turn off engines whilst waiting to reduce pollution. The action plan all depends on the travel plan coordinator and who is going to manage the plan. It is all very vague and needs to go back to SCC.
- Ask SCC to re-consider the traffic condition on this application, it needs to be referred back to them.
- Before Cllr Marshall did the traffic survey she contacted SCC and was routed through many departments in trying to locate a representative and have them help monitor and see the problem for themselves, unfortunately there was no positive outcome. In doing this exercise, it was found there is a recently created department for school safety.
- The question was raised as to how the EA be assured that ensure the school does not exceed 200 pupils. The answer was that an informative of 200 maximum means that the school gives the council recorded pupil numbers from time to time. This has worked at another private school in the Elmbridge area.
- The question was raised on how the travel could be enforced and the consideration of expansion to 200 should be reconsidered as since the original application was over 10 years ago and not only has the local primary school expanded but the cars attending the schools have not only expanded in number but also in size. The motion was put that this application be deferred for SCC to come back with detailed comments on the travel Plan and identify the shortfalls in these plans, also that they comment on the survey handed to the EA at 4pm the of day of the meeting. SCC must word their response in such a way that it gives the committee the power of enforcement should there be a lapse. This was unanimously passed by the committee.

It was noted that, although CPC made comment about the application, the Officer's report did not reflect these comments. Because of this omission, CPC has been criticized by local residents for not submitting comments. It was agreed to write to the Head of Planning to ask why our comments were not included when they had been submitted. We had correctly reflected the views of local people but had been ignored.

AP8 The Clerk to action.

8. Licensing Applications

None

9. Enforcement

As the fence at 37 Oaken Lane is now a planning application, there is nothing outstanding.

10. Barwell Farm

Monitoring is continuing, the only change being that the damaged shed has been moved.

11. Matters for information only

Cllr Isaacs attended the EBC Planning Users group and has circulated a report (appendix 1). They will now be held every 6 months. She will circulate the dates.

It was noted that in future, applicants will have to submit only one set of plans. All the plans will be in PDF on the EBC website and only A3 hardcopy will be supplied.

12. Date of next meetings

CPC Planning Meeting

Thursday 1 May 2014–Youth Club

Elmbridge Sub-Committee

Tuesday 7.45pm 22 Apr 2014 - MO

Public Hearing & Public Inquiries

These are draft minutes and are subject to approval at the next meeting.

Outstanding Written Representations

.....ChairmanDate

APPENDIX 1.

PLANNING USER GROUP MEETING @ EBC 9 APRIL

Karen Fossett - Head of Planning
Mark Behrend – Planning Policy Manager
Ann Biggs - Development Manager

A notification was given that Paul Faulkner will be joining shortly as the new Principal Planning Officer for EBC.

EBC are updating the planning process especially at the validation level where plans can fail as they do not meet the validation requirements.

EBC are proposing to start a new quarterly newsletter for the users of planning to keep them informed and up to date with the new policy decisions coming through.

Community Infrastructure Levy:

There was an update on CIL on the 24 February, the key criteria being:

- Self-build and residential extensions will be exempt from CIL. They will need to send in an exemption form to EBC before commencement of work on site. If work has already been started then it is too late to send this form. When exemption is used there will be a charge placed on the property and if it is sold within 3 years then the exemption on CIL will have to be paid.
- There will be an option for charging authorities to accept payments in kind through the provision of on or off site infrastructure.
- A vacancy test will be available, this being 6 months out of 12 months, currently it is 3 years and the exemption will be on new floor space over the existing.
- There will be a provision for phasing the levy payments for more complex developments.

Spending CIL:

Within the local infrastructure spending boards:

- 25% of CIL will be given to each settlement, Claygate being different in that there is already a means in place for direct payments to be given.
- There will be a first meeting in June to decide the strategy for spending the EBC 75% of CIL payments. And agree a spending programme.
- The 123 list has recently been published. There cannot be a double spend allocation and the section 106 list has to be separate from the CIL list. There has to be clarity between the 106 and CIL spend.

Development Management Plan:

EBC is currently going through the representations in preparation for submission in May to the Inspectorate. Anyone who has submitted a response will get a letter of when the submission will go ahead.

These are draft minutes and are subject to approval at the next meeting.

Settlement ID Plan:

EBC is reviewing the plans as they were required to collect more information and a new consultation will happen in November. They are anticipating an early 2015 submission.

Development Management:

Ann Biggs has been the Development Manager since November 2013 and has previously worked her way through many of the planning departments in EBC.

Ann has seen many of the changes coming through recently and is currently dealing with the changes involved with retail to residential and Prior Notifications (PN's) for domestic extensions.

Currently there are two large developments on the Horizon:

- Chipping Farm at Cobham – there is a proposal to build 500 houses and a new school.
- Rydens School – the proposal here is for housing to enable a replacement school.

Her department wants to be able to give better information and advice for developments. They are looking at the percentage base for housing development on green belt (this relates to the existing properties sited within and near Greenbelt and their related expansion in size from their current form).

There is a programme to train staff and councillors on the environmental impact of flooding.

Work is currently being done in the Registry Department to reduce the invalidity base of the planning applications currently received.