



## Caring for Claygate Village

### DRAFT MINUTES

### PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING held at 7.30pm on Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> September 2021 in Claygate Cricket Pavilion

Chairman of the Committee: Gil Bray  
Councillors: Michelle Woodward, Janet Swift, Geoff Herbert.  
Co-opted Committee Members: John Bamford, M Collon  
In attendance: Sally Harman (Parish Clerk & RFO), 1 member of the public

Before the meeting commenced the Chairman of the Planning Committee reminded attendees of the CPC Covid Policy.

**1. Apologies for absence**

Cllr Lesser & Cllr Wang sent their apologies in advance.

**2. Declarations of Interest in items on the agenda.**

2.1 To receive Declarations of Interest from Councillors on items on the agenda.

None

2.2 To note written requests for dispensations received 7 days prior to the meeting:

None

2.3 To note decisions made on any dispensation requests noted in agenda item 2.2:

None

**3 Minutes of the last meeting (12<sup>th</sup> August 2021).**

The Clerk apologised that she had left a copy of the minutes of the last meeting at home. 2 amends were noted in Section 5 and Section 16 to the spelling of Michael Collon's surname.

It was **unanimously agreed** that the amends could be made and that the Chairman could organise the signing of the minutes with the Clerk after the meeting.

**AP21** Clerk to drop minutes to Chairman to sign and return to Clerk.

**4 To report on actioning of items from previous meetings.**

**AP80** MS to request a cost from the planning consultant to provide advice on the EBC Local Plan Regulation 19 Representation originally planned for 6 weeks Jan/Feb 2021 but now delayed. AP was handed to Clerk on 17th June. **ON HOLD** EBC Local Plan delayed again.

**AP87** In addition to AP80 MS to ask the planning consultant for a cost of a meeting between her and the Planning Inspector if required during the year 21/22. **ON HOLD**

**AP5** Clerk to request EBC to formally notify CPC if a Licencing Application affects Claygate in the future. **IN PROGRESS** Clerk to chase.

**AP6** Clerk to get further clarity from EBC on a Claygate Conservation Committee for Claygate and clarify John Bamford as a possible Claygate Conservation Area Liaison. John has confirmed he is happy to act as liaison. Jon Kilner team now only him. Historically 3. They initially said we can set up CACC but we have to seek public nominations for who will sit on it. EBC checking that requirement with Legal. Clerk noted historically it was apparently set up and run by EBC with CPC representation only. Clerk asked EBC to look into the best route going forward to get a sense check

of Conservation Area in a more streamlined fashion. Clerk to investigate possibility of Claygate joining an existing committee **IN PROGRESS**

**AP16** JB and MC to review and prepare paper if thought desirable on RBK’s Consultation on Article 4 Direction suggesting the removal of permitted development rights for change of use from commercial, business and service use to residential use. **DONE** Discuss under Item 17

**AP17** Clerk to ask EBC what is happening with the proposed new nursery at the entrance to Torrington Lodge carpark and to request CPC are consulted. **OUTSTANDING**

**AP18** Clerk to get an update on 1 Caerleon Close from EBC Planning Department. Emailed 7/9. Compliance Officer Aaron Dawkins no longer works for EBC. Jane McCool taken over and will be reviewing case over next few weeks. **IN PROGRESS**

**AP19** Clerk to submit CPC response to RBK consultation **DONE**

**AP20** Clerk to add Village Design Statement to agenda for 9<sup>th</sup> Sept Planning Committee allowing time for Cllrs to review current Village Design Statement. **DONE**

**5 Planning Correspondence, Notification of Applications and Outstanding Results.**

In addition to correspondence shared within Action Points (APs) and further down the agenda the Clerk had been notified of the following.

The Clerk had circulated an invitation to the EBC Planning User Group being held on the 29<sup>th</sup> September. The meeting will deal with a variety of topics including:-

- Updates on the Planning Service post lockdown
- Community engagement
- Changes to the NPPF and legislation
- Suggestions, compliments and complaints

As requested by the Chair of CPC an information gathering meeting was scheduled for Friday 11th September between the Chairman of the CPC, Chairman of Planning Committee and Clerk with Kim Tagliarini Head of Planning and Ray Lee Strategic Director of EBC.

The Chairman of the Committee noted that he had been copied in on an email from a resident who appeared confused about EBC planning process. It was agreed that the Clerk send a link to EBC website page showing the correct planning approval process.

**AP21** Clerk to send resident link to Committee/Subcommittee Meetings and Decisions page on EBC website.

**6 Applications and Appeals decided since last meeting.**

A report from John Bamford was circulated prior to the meeting (Appendix A).

The Chairman of the Committee observed that, as regards Application 2021/1598 Foley Road, which had been refused by EBC, CPC PC had only made a No Objection, No Comment response. Similarly, as regards 2021/2063: 20 Torrington Road, which had also been refused by EBC, CPC PC had again only made a No Objection, No Comment response.

**7 Applications from Elmbridge Borough Council weekly lists, including confirmation of comments sent to EBC: -**

<u>Application Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Claygate Parish Council response</u>
2021/2766	Land North of Dove Place Holroyd Road	Confirmation of Compliance with Condition: 4 (Landscape	No comment. Unanimously agreed.

	Claygate Esher KT10 0LD	Management Plan) of planning permission 2020/1902.	
2021/2577	17 Blakeden Drive Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0JR	Single-storey front porch, first-floor side extension, alterations to fenestration and finish.	No Objection with Comment. CPC request whether an officer can action a site visit as we have concerns over the loss of light to the neighbouring property.  Majority agreed with 1 Cllr voting against.
2021/2470	1 Church Villas Church Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0JP	Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) of planning permission 2020/0154 (Extensions) to remove single-storey rear projection and amend first-floor rear extension roof line.	No Objection, No Comment.  Unanimously agreed.
2021/2707	Land adjacent to 14 Elm Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0EH	Detached two-storey building containing two flats with associated parking and bin and cycle store.	No objection with Comments:-  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Due to the Doctors Surgery and Daycentre being on this road and requiring emergency vehicle access please can a construction traffic management plan be actioned.</li> <li>- CPC question whether an updated tree report is now required given that the development site has moved.</li> <li>- CPC are concerned whether there is suitable vehicle access for households 14,15 &amp; 16. Household 14 car width is only 2.4m</li> <li>- CPC would like it to be considered if future permitted development rights be removed given the small plot size.</li> </ul> Majority agreed with 1 Cllr voting against.
2021/2551	24 The Avenue Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0RY	Front vehicular gate and vehicular access.	No objection, no Comment.  Unanimously agreed.
2021/2600	15 Stevens Lane Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0TD	Change of use of verge to residential curtilage, part two/part single- storey front extension, single-storey side extension incorporating garage with room over, rooms in the roof space,	Resident objection statement was circulated to Cllrs prior to the meeting (Appendix B) along with a statement from CPC Tree Wardens (Appendix C). It was noted that the ownership of the verge was a legal issue not a planning issue.  No Objection with Comments:-

		rear dormer windows, front and side rooflights, alterations to fenestration and new boundary fence following partial demolition of existing house.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CPC request an updated comprehensive arboriculture report. The plan suggests tree removal.</li> <li>- CPC are concerned over road safety as the proposed fence on the verge could cause line of sight issues.</li> <li>- CPC are concerned over easement of the verge.</li> </ul> <p>Unanimously agreed.</p>
2021/2670	18 Vale Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0NJ	Part two/part single-storey rear extension following demolition of existing rear projection.	<p>No Objection, No Comment.</p> <p>Unanimously agreed.</p>
2021/2825	12 Derwent Close Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0RF	Single-storey rear infill extension.	<p>No Objection, No Comment.</p> <p>Unanimously agreed.</p>
2021/2629	8 Raymond Way Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0EY	Single-storey rear extension, first-floor rear infill extension and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing projection and partial demolition of existing outbuilding.	<p>No Objection, No Comment.</p> <p>Unanimously agreed.</p>
2021/2711	5 Homestead Gardens Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0QF	Conversion of garage into living space, increase in height of existing front projection and front porch extension.	<p>No Objection, No comment.</p> <p>Unanimously agreed.</p>
2021/2668	4 Littleworth Road Esher Surrey KT10 9FP	Widening of existing vehicular access to create a two-way vehicular access.	<p>No Objection, No comment</p> <p>Unanimously agreed.</p>
2021/3077	10 Cavendish Drive Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0QE	Non-Material Amendment to planning permission 2020/3287 to change roof design from gable to hip.	<p>No Objection, No Comment</p> <p>Unanimously agreed.</p>
2021/2810	1 Applegarth Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0ED	Single-storey rear extension to existing garage, increase in height and conversion of existing garage, single-storey side extension incorporating integral	<p>No Objection, No Comment</p> <p>Unanimously agreed.</p>

		garage and alterations to fenestration.	
--	--	---	--

**8. East Area Sub Committee Meeting report.**

2 planning applications for Claygate were discussed at the East Area Subcommittee: -  
2021/0669 - Claygate Recreation Ground Pavilion, Dalmore Avenue was granted.

2021/0988 – 31 Stevens Lane, Claygate, Esher was refused planning permission, contrary to the Officer’s recommendation.

**9. EBC Planning Committee Meeting Report.**

Nothing to note.

**10. Licensing Applications in Claygate.**

The Committee noted that EBC had now started licensing meetings again. Nothing to note for Claygate

**11. Compliance issues.**

The Clerk noted that there was nothing further to add apart from what had already been covered in AP18.

**12 Elmbridge Local Plan Status and any action arising.**

No further update at this time. The Chairman of the CPC noted that the Design plan was due from EBC early next year.

**13. Torrington Lodge Car Park - EBC Potential Residential Housing Project**

No further update at this time.

**14. Village Design Statement – Discussion on whether to revisit/review.**

It was **unanimously agreed** that the Village Design Statement did not need to be reviewed at this time and the matter would be reconsidered in 6 months time.

**AP19** Chairman to raise question of whether CPC can feed into EBC design codes at their meeting on the 10<sup>th</sup> September.

Cllr Swift asked why not all Cllrs were invited to 10<sup>th</sup> September meeting with EBC Head of Planning and EBC Head of Strategy. The Clerk and Chairman of CPC noted it was not a Parish Council meeting, or a decision-making one. It was simply a meeting to gather information on both planning and HT&E issues and any updates received would be communicated to Cllrs via their respective Committee meetings. Cllr Swift confirmed she was happy with this as an explanation and did not wish to pursue the matter further.

**AP20** Clerk to check with Anne Bott whether information gathering meetings can be held with third parties such as EBC without all Cllrs having to attend.

**15. Discuss and consider a response to Elmbridge’s Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) sites (closed 10<sup>th</sup> September).**

The Clerk had circulated a link to the SANG consultation on EBC website prior to the meeting.

**AP21** Chairman of CPC and Chair of Planning Committee to raise at meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> September with Kim T what SANG sites are in Claygate and bring back to Planning Committee on the 7<sup>th</sup> October.

16. **Chessington World of Adventures: Planning application to RBK.**

It was **unanimously agreed** no action was required.

17. **Discuss and consider a response, if required, to the Consultation on Article 4 Direction to remove permitted development rights for change of use from commercial, business and service use to residential use from Kingston Council (closes 1st October).**

It was **unanimously agreed** no action was required.

18. **Communication of key decisions to residents including input to the Courier and the website.**

It was **unanimously agreed** that Cllr Bray would draft a few articles for the Courier on relevant issues since May 2021.

19. **Matters for information purposes only.**

None

20 **Date of the next meeting 7<sup>th</sup> October 2021**

Meeting Closed: 20h50

Reserve may be required for the next meeting: -

Cllr Marques

Signed:

Dated:

## Appendix A

### Report on Planning Applications Decided since the Last Planning Meeting

#### Applications Refused by Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC) excluding LDCs

2021/1598 65 Foley Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0LY Part two/part single-storey side/rear extension, front porch, bin and cycle stores and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing garage.

EBC assessed that

- “the proposed 1.5m high bin/cycle units would breach the front building line and introduce an incongruous form of development in the street scene”
- “the single storey side garage with rooms in the roof space appears as a separate entity and does not integrate with the existing house”
- “these elements fail to be sympathetic to or protect and enhance the appearance of the area or the host property. As such, it is considered that there would be an adverse impact on the visual amenities of the streetscene, the character of the area and Conservation area” contrary to policy DM2, DM12 CS17, CS11 and the NPPF 2021.

2021/0988 31 Stevens Lane Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0TD

Two-storey detached house, pair of two-storey semi-detached houses with rear and side dormer windows, associated parking and landscaping. AND Conversion of garage into living space, alterations to fenestration and front portico to existing house.

East Area Planning Subcommittee (EAPS) refused on the grounds that that

- The proposed development, by reason of its siting, contrived design and the quantity of the built form in the front garden of the plot, would be out of keeping and incongruous with the prevailing character and setting of the area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policies CS11, CS17 and DM2 and the revised NPPF 2021.
- The proposed development, by reason of the loss of trees, including a semi-mature Oak tree, that make a significant contribution to the character and amenity of the area and the lack of suitable replacement, would be contrary to policy DM6 and the revised NPPF 2021.

The Report submitted to EAPS included the following comments

- “The proposed development would result in 4 residential units occupying the site giving a density below the minimum density requirement of 30dph set out in policy CS17. The proposed development represents an opportunity to increase the density of development at an existing site and make a more efficient use of the site. It is therefore considered on balance that the proposed density would be acceptable as it would provide dwellings at the front of the site at a density that would make efficient use of the land whilst maintaining a more spacious setting for the dwelling to be retained.”
- “... the character of Stevens Lane is quite varied with no predominant building style, features or materials. As such it is considered that the proposed development would fit in within the street scene and would add further difference and points of interest within the street.”
- “It has not been indicated on the plans that the proposed development would include an electric charging point serving each of the dwellings which is a requirement of policy DM7 and the Parking SPD 2020. Neither has a proposed cycle store for each unit been shown on the plans. However, both the electric charging points and the cycle stores can be secured through appropriate planning conditions.”
- “... the proposal would result in the loss of a number of trees on site. However, it is noted that the applicant is proposing to plant replacement trees on land within their ownership to

the north of the application site. In principle this is considered to be an acceptable way of replacing the trees to be removed but further details would be required regarding species and if other means of improving biodiversity both onsite and offsite can be incorporated as such if permission is granted it is suggested a condition to secure these details and their implementation is included.”

2021/2336      Bridle Road Claygate Surrey KT10 0ET

Prior Approval Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A: Proposed 5G telecoms installation: 18m high ‘slim line’ Phase 8 H3G street pole c/w wrap around cabinet and 3no. cabinets coloured - green.

EBC refused on the grounds that

- “The proposed development would result in an incongruous form of development which would significantly detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area due to the visual clutter that would arise”
- “the proposal would be overly prominent by reason of its size, scale, spread and appearance in relation to the existing adjacent built form (typically single and two story houses) which it would significantly exceed in height”

The Officer’s Report included the following comments

- “Whilst views of the proposed 18m street pole would be mostly shielded by trees when travelling north along Stevens Lane, there would be a lack of tree cover to obscure views of the scheme when viewed from Bridle Road as well as when travelling in a southerly direction on Stevens Lane. Furthermore, a number of trees which do provide the limited levels of screening are in fact deciduous, resulting in significant views of the proposal being available for extended periods throughout the year.”
- “The defining character of the application site, despite the presence of an existing 8m wooden pole, is that of a green open space which provides positive visual amenity to the area, with an absence of development other than limited street furniture in the form of a post box and a lamp post. “
- “Due to the requirements of the revised NPPF, The Local Planning Authority is unable to take into account impacts on wildlife, trees, property values, demand for 5G and the improvements it would provide or noise impacts of the development.”
- “The Local Planning Authority is required to assess the proposed development and cannot require the applicant to submit an application for an alternative location.”

2021/2063      20 Torrington Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0SA

Part hip-to-gable roof extension, rear dormer window and front roof light.

EBC assessed that

- “... there is a noticeable absence of part hip-to-gable roof structures such as the one proposed under the current application. The proposed roof form would therefore be considered to be an incongruous form of development that results in harm to the character of the area and street scene. Additionally, it is considered that the resultant roof structure would negatively impact the appearance of the host dwelling.”
- “The proposed rear dormer would extend across nearly the full width of the gable ended aspect of the roof extension which would therefore dominate the roof plane with a large flat roof, contrary to the guidance of the HECG.”
- “... larger rear dormer windows do feature in the area. However, the application site is considered to be a prominent location on the corner of Torrington Road and Meadow Road. Therefore, the dormer and part hip-to-gable extension would be highly visible from a number of positions along Torrington and Meadow Road. It is therefore important that any works to the roof which take place minimise the impact to the host dwelling, the character of the area and the street scene, which the current scheme does not.”



**Other Noteworthy Applications Decided:-**

None

**Appeals Decided**

None

**No CIL is payable in respect of Planning Applications decided since the last meeting**

## Appendix B

Re Planning Application number: 2021/2600 Application address: 15 Stevens Lane, Claygate, Esher, KT10 OTD My written statement to CPC Planning Committee is the same as below to EBC.

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED] Comment type: You object to the planning application Date of comment: 28 Aug 2021

Comment: I object to the planning application to take the Bridle Road green verge community space into a private garden. I strongly object to this loss of a village amenity which is visually attractive to the area. The loss of this long grass verge with well-established trees that is a wonderful habitat for potentially rare flora and fauna which might be removed and lost by these proposals. There is no ecological or arboricultural report included in the application.

I do hope the Claygate Parish Council planning committee will also consider the above and object to this application too.

[REDACTED]

## Appendix C

Application number: 2021/2600

Application address: 15 Stevens Lane, Claygate. KT10PTD

This application is primarily concerned with an extension to be built on the left side of the existing house, ie the side facing Bridle Road. The application also proposes to enclose a large proportion of the verge along Bridle Road.

Our interest as Tree Wardens for the Claygate PC is the impact this enclosure will have on the trees in the verge, and the effect this will then have on the contribution made by these trees and the verge to the amenity of the area.

The public will have enjoyed this wide verge for a long period of time and the verge enhances the entrance to Bridle Road from Stevens Lane, covered as it is in spring with fritillaries and other flowering bulbs. The trees in the verge add to the attractiveness and biodiversity of the area.

As regards the trees. The site plan is not clear about which tree is which, they are not numbered and there is no Tree Survey. It is therefore very difficult to work out exactly what is proposed as regards the trees. I have used the measurement given on the site plan to try to identify each tree.

On the verge, close to the junction with Stevens Lane there is a large and beautiful tulip tree (300) which would be outside the proposed enclosure.

Comment: Care should be taken that the new fencing works do not damage the roots.

Behind this sycamore there is a healthy and attractive cedar (200) which makes a significant contribution to the street scene. Under the proposals this tree would be enclosed.

Comment: This tree should be protected.

Behind this there is another cedar just within the existing property (350 described as a fir tree) which would be removed in the application.

No comment.

Further along the verge there is another tree (200, possibly a variety of hawthorn) which is now in the verge but would be enclosed by the new fence. It is healthy and well shaped and has a lot of berries on it. It is a good source of nectar and bird food and it is important that it is retained.

No comment.