



Caring for Claygate Village

DRAFT MINUTES

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING held at 7.30pm on Thursday 19th May in Claygate Pavilion

Present: -

Chairman of the Committee: Gil Bray
Committee Member Councillors: Michelle Woodward, Janet Swift, Xingang Wang
Non Committee Member Councillors: Sue Grose, Geoff Herbert
Co-opted members: Michael Collon, John Bamford
In attendance: Sally Harman (Parish Clerk & RFO), 1 member of public

The Chairman welcomed newly appointed Cllr Grose. Cllr Grose introduced herself and gave some background on her professional day job and that she had lived in Claygate for 24 years and it was very much her home. The Committee noted that she had requested to speak on a number of agenda items in advance of the meeting but had no voting rights as she was not an official member of the Planning Committee.

1. **Apologies for absence**

None received

19h33 John Bamford entered the meeting.

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

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

Cllr Bray noted that he knew the owners of Planning Applications 2022/0803 29 Torrington Road and 2022/0856 37 Simmil Road and as such would not participate in those discussions.

The Clerk noted that she had a personal Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) on the agenda but as always she would not be participating in the meeting in her role. She asked that if any councillor would prefer she leave the room during the discussion of that Planning Application then they just needed to notify her when they arrive at it on the agenda.

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 (20th April 2022)**

It was **unanimously agreed** that the minutes could be approved and that the Chair could sign the minutes, witnessed by the Clerk.

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

AP49 Clerk to invite Tree Wardens to Planning meetings bi-annually and Tree Wardens to attend Planning Committees if deemed necessary going forth. **ONHOLD** Next invite June 2022.

AP63 Cllr Bray to circulate slides from Tim Naylor the Director of Strategic Planning & Infrastructure Royal Borough of Kingston, if he receives them. **OUTSTANDING.**

AP68 Clerk to ask Tree Wardens if they have any comments on John Bamford's report. **DONE** The Committee asked whether the Tree Wardens had any comment to make on application 2022/0199 6 Vale Croft, refused by the Elmbridge Tree Officer, but with no comment from the Tree Wardens. The Tree Wardens' noted that their comments on applications are always purely advisory. The

Council Tree Officer is the expert and his opinion always takes precedence over ours. On this occasion they made no comment because they thought the works requested seemed to be very similar to those applied for and granted approval in 2016. The Council Tree Officer took a different view.

AP69 Clerk to clarify the quorate rules of Cllrs of being in the room but not participating due to a personal interest, such as knowing the owner as a friend, in a discussion regarding a planning application. **DONE** Response from Anne Bott at Surreys Association of Local Councils (SALC) - If a member is recorded as present at the meeting and remains in the meeting room this makes the Council quorate regardless of their participation.

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 secured extensions from EBC Planning Department for CPC feedback until the 20th May for Planning Applications 022/0712 Vale View 28 Beaconsfield Road, 2022/0856 - 37 Simmil Road, 2022/0867 - 42 Albany Crescent and 2022/0874 - 11 Stevens Lane

The Clerk noted that Margie Richardson had written to her announcing that she was stepping down as Co-opted Tree Warden but will remain on the Tree Maintenance team. The Committee noted her huge contribution to Claygate and agreed to discuss a gesture of appreciation at the CPC full council meeting the following week.

AP70 Clerk to raise stepping down of Margie Richardson at 24th May Full Council meeting.

6. Applications and Appeals decided since last meeting.

The Clerk had circulated John Bamford's report (Appendix A) ahead of the meeting. The Committee noted the report. The Clerk informed the Committee that she has been sent a Notice of Appeal for 2021/3885 20 Station Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 9DH.

7. Clarification of rules for when Planning Applications go to EBC sub-committee and agree any action required. In particular, to review, and if possible, approve, a draft letter for the Clerk to send to the Head of Planning at Elmbridge Borough Council.

The Clerk had circulated a paper prepared by Michael Collon on EBC's Delegation of Planning Decisions (Appendix B) prior the meeting along with a proposed draft letter to go to the Head of Planning at EBC on CPC's review of the delegation of Planning decisions (Appendix C). The Committee updated Cllr Grose on the background of the issue and how the misalignment had been in place since 2019 as EBC hadn't notified CPC of changes they had approved. CPC had only recently discovered the misalignment on CPC's side but also that EBC's documentation and communications were also not consistent. The Committee debated the need to pull the CPC's Planning Remit as it was currently out of line with what EBC's rules for Planning Applications going to East Area Sub Committee, however it was noted that EBC's current documentation and website were all saying different things and as such clarity on the actual rules from EBC were first required before the CPC Planning Remit could be aligned. Cllr Bray noted that communication had been sent to residents in the April 2022 Courier to notify residents that CPC are trying to clarify the EBC Rules.

<p>It was agreed in a majority decision to send the proposed draft letter prepared by Michael Collon to the Head of Planning at EBC. 1 Cllr voted against. 1 Cllr abstained.</p>

AP71 Clerk to send letter to EBC Head of Planning.

The Chairman proposed to review the CPC Planning Remit later in the meeting under Item 16 when amends to the Planning Remit were to be discussed.

It was **agreed in a majority** decision to review the CPC Planning Remit under Item 16. 2 Cllrs abstained.

8. **Applications from Elmbridge Borough Council Weekly Lists**
(<https://www.elmbridge.gov.uk/planning>) including confirmation of comments sent to EBC: -

w/e 22nd April, 29th April, 6th April & 13th April

During the planning application section of the meeting, the meeting was halted for 2 minutes as the Clerk left room to get water for Chairman who felt unwell. The Chairman recovered and the meeting then resumed.

<u>Application Number</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Claygate Parish Council Response</u>
2022/1049	Amber House Loseberry Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 9DQ	Tree Preservation Order EL:10/10 - Crown reduce 1 x Liquid Amber.	No objection with comment. CPC don't understand the reference to the present width of 70m, and would like to suggest that a crown lift and the removal of lower stumps would be beneficial. We would also prefer a selective shortening of some of the branches identified in order to achieve an more natural looking outcome. Unanimously agreed.
2022/0848	44 Chatwood Red Lane Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0ES	Tree Preservation Order ESH:24 - Root Protection 1 x Oak.	No objection. Unanimously agreed.
2022/0712	Vale View 28 Beaconsfield Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0PW	Alterations to fenestration, rear juliet balcony and raised patio incorporating external stairs and glass balustrade.	No objection, No comment Unanimously agreed.
2022/0867	42 Albany Crescent Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0PF	Part two/part single-storey rear extension, single-storey front extension, first-floor side extension, alter roof of existing rear elevation and alterations to fenestration following removal of chimney stacks.	No Objection, No Comment Unanimously agreed.
2022/1273	8 Trystings Close Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0TF	Roof extension incorporating rooflights.	LDC. No Comment

2022/0951	Cherwell House Raleigh Drive Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 9DE	Boundary wall with railings and piers.	No Objection, No Comment Unanimously agreed.
2022/1270	Telecommunication Mast Elm Garden Nurseries Elm Farm Woodstock Lane South Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0TB	Telecommunication Notification - 2m tower extension on the existing 20m lattice tower; the relocation of 6no antennas to the tower extension, 3no to be replaced with 3no new antennas; the addition of 1no. 300mm dish, internal cabin and ancillary works thereto	This Planning Application is covered under item 15.
2022/0803	29 Torrington Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0SA	Single-storey rear extension, conversion of garage to living space with single-storey front extension and first-floor side extension and front dormer windows following removal of existing front dormer window.	Cllr Bray noted that he wouldn't be commenting as he knew the applicants. No objection with Comment The proposed application is not in keeping with the current street scene of the Close. Majority agreed. 2 Cllrs abstained.
2022/0874	11 Stevens Lane Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0TD	Part two/part single-storey side extension and front porch following partial demolition of existing house.	No Objection with Comments:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We feel the design is contrived in so far as the boundary position with No 9 is concerning and we believe is outside of design codes DN2 and CS17. - We note that the proposed porch projects beyond the current building line of Stevens lane. Comments were agreed in a majority decision. 1 Cllr abstained. Overall response of no objection with above 2 Comments was unanimously approved.
2022/0996	Fig Tree House 131 Coverts Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0LE	Single-storey storey rear extension and first-floor rear extension.	No Objection, No Comment Unanimously agreed.

2022/0958	151 Hare Lane Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0RA	Rear dormer window and front rooflights.	No objection with Comment. 'CPC notes that changes made from the previous application that was refused are not significant'. Majority agreed. 1 Cllr against. 1 Abstained.
2022/1243	Claygate House Littleworth Road Esher KT10 9PN	Confirmation of Compliance with Condition: 10a (Potential Land Contamination: Site Investigation, Method Statement and Remediation) of planning permission 2020/2095.	No Comment Unanimously agreed.
2022/0856	37 Simmil Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0RU	Part two/part single-storey side/rear extension, single-storey front extension, side/rear roof lights and alterations to fenestration following partial demolition of existing house.	Cllr Bray noted that he knew applicants and wouldn't speak. No Objection, No Comment Unanimously agreed.
2022/1247	Holy Trinity Church Church Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0JP	Claygate Village Conservation Area - Fell 1 x Cherry and Crown Lift 1 x Oak.	No objection. Unanimously agreed.
2022/1345	3 Telegraph Lane Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0DT	Hip-to-gable roof extension, rear dormer window and front rooflights.	LDC. No Comment
2022/1073	9 Lower Wood Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0EU	Conversion of garage into living space and alterations to fenestration.	No Objection, No Comment Unanimously agreed.
2022/0778	27 Crediton Way Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0EB	Two-storey side extension with rear juliet balcony, rear and side roof lights, front open porch and alterations to fenestration.	No Objection, No Comment Unanimously agreed.
2022/0686	15 Stevens Lane Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0TD	Part two/part single-storey front extension, single-storey side extension incorporating garage, rooms in the roof space, rear dormer windows, side rooflights and alterations to fenestration following	No Objection with Comment. CPC have no comment on the building development but note the comment of Claygate's Tree Wardens which is that they hope that the protective fencing for the roots of the trees adjacent to the left side of the driveway is able to fully protect the RPAs of

		partial demolition of existing dwelling.	those trees, one of which is a young cedar. AP72 Clerk to write to Head of EBC Planning Department and ask why the application is a full application rather than a householders. Majority agreed. 1 Cllr abstained.
2022/0896	4 Derwent Close Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0RF	Part two/part single-storey rear extension, first-floor side extension, front porch and bay window, conversion of garage into living space, rear roof light and alterations to fenestration following removal of chimney stack.	No Objection, No Comment Unanimously agreed.
2022/0815	11 Elm Gardens Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0JS	Part two-storey/part single-storey side/rear extension, front bay windows, front open porch, alterations to fenestration and finish, and widening of existing vehicle crossover and associated hardstanding following demolition of existing conservatory and garage.	No Objection, No Comment Unanimously agreed.
2022/0949	29 Hare Lane Claygate Esher KT10 9BT	Part two/part single-storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing rear/side projection.	No Objection, No Comment Unanimously agreed.
2022/1453	Claygate Youth Centre Elm Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0EH	Installation of CCTV.	LDC. No Comment
2022/0664	12 Oakhill Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0TG	Single-storey side extension, front porch and solar panels.	LDC. No Comment
2022/0716	83 Oaken Lane Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0RQ	Detached two-storey house, single-storey rear outbuilding, front boundary wall and entrance gates and piers following demolition of	No Objection with 2 Comments:- - CPC would assume that the Case Officer would require no occupation of the room at the bottom of the garden.

		the existing dwelling and outbuildings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The construction of the new rear outbuilding at the bottom of the garden could compromise the health and stability of T4, a mature boundary oak category B. This is an important tree, one of a line of 3 or 4 field boundary trees. It is clearly visible from Cavendish Drive. The Arboricultural Report describes the measures recommended to protect the tree. The Tree Officer needs to be satisfied that these measures will be adequate to protect the tree and will be adequately enforced.
2022/1417	Telegraph Lane SWS Telegraph Lane Claygate KT10 0DU	Prior Approval Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A: Proposed 'slim line' phase 8 monopole c/w wraparound cabinet at base, 3no. additional ancillary equipment cabinets and associated ancillary works.	<p>Objection with Comment. CPC objects to prior approval and would like to see full planning approval on the grounds of location and appearance. CPC will be writing to the applicant requesting a meeting to discuss the extent to which they have liaised with other suppliers regarding the sharing of sites and infrastructure as well as requesting their whole plan for providing 5G coverage to Claygate as opposed to simply this single installation.</p> <p>Unanimously agreed.</p>
2022/0922	Claygate House Littleworth Road Esher Surrey KT10 9PN	Confirmation of Compliance with Conditions: 9 (Waste Management Plan) and 13 (Construction Transport Management Plan) of planning permission 2020/2095.	<p>No objection with comment. We request that the construction transport management plan includes a provision that no journeys can be made using Milbourne lane on weekdays before 9am or between 3pm-4pm during school term time for the safety of children at the 2 schools.</p> <p>Majority. 1 Cllr abstained</p>

2022/1161	Claygate House Littleworth Road Esher KT10 9FP	Confirmation of Compliance with Condition: 3 (Materials Samples) of planning permission 2020/2095.	No Comment
2022/1162	Claygate House Littleworth Road Esher KT10 9PN	Confirmation of Compliance with Condition: 4 (Archaeological Investigation Scheme) of planning permission 2020/2095.	No Comment
2022/1181	17 Dalmore Avenue Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0HQ	Alterations to fenestration and installation of an air conditioning condenser.	LDC No Comment.

9. East Area Sub Committee Meeting report.

The Chairman noted that Application 2021/4037 [31 Stevens Lane] had been due for discussion at the meeting of Apr 25th but had been withdrawn. It was now due for discussion at the May 23rd meeting.

10. EBC Planning Committee Meeting Report.

Nothing for Claygate

11. Licensing Applications in Claygate.

The Clerk noted that she had not received any Licensing Application alerts. She had received an email from EBC asking for CPC's views on their statement of licensing policy and that EBC were proposing changes to their policy and they would like to hear the Committees views by 24th June 2022.

AP73 Clerk to circulate email from EBC and add to agenda for 16th June for discussion. Committee members to review and come prepared to discuss.

12. Compliance issues.

The Committee noted that there are 2 Compliance cases open with EBC: -

- 1 Caerleon Close – The Clerk had received no further update.
- 10 Cavendish Drive - Retrospective Variation of Condition 3 (Materials) of planning permission 2020/3287 (Front and side extensions) to amend the type of roof tiles has been submitted to EBC. – No decision as yet.

13. To consider the desirability, or otherwise, of CPC having an agreed interim Opinion, pending advice from CPC's Planning Consultant, on the draft Local Plan to put to Residents at the proposed Public Meeting. If such interim Opinion is felt desirable, to propose such an interim Opinion to the full CPC on Tuesday 24th May.

Cllr Bray noted that the purpose of Claygate's proposed Draft Local Plan Public Meeting was for residents and Cllrs to be able to ask the Planning Consultation Philippa Jarvis any questions. He had prepared an Interim Opinion for the Planning Committee to consider taking to the Annual Parish Council meeting on the 24th May for which the Committee reviewed and made some amends and for which a final proposed version was agreed as follows: -

- The CPC awaits advice from its consultant as to the legality and soundness of its plan. Our opinion may change in the light of this advice, when received.

- The CPC is pleased that the draft Local Plan does not propose the release of Green Belt for development.
- The CPC is concerned at the potential loss of car-parking space which will arise if existing car parks are developed without concern for parking. However, it notes that proposals for development on these sites will be subject to normal planning procedures.
- The CPC supports the plan as it stands but is concerned that it only envisages catering for 73% of the envisaged housing need and the consequences which might result from this.

It was agreed in a **majority decision** for the Draft Local Plan Interim Opinion to be brought to the Annual Meeting of the Parish Council under Item 34 . 1 Cllr abstained.

AP74 Cllr Bray, via the Clerk, to circulate the approved Interim Opinion to the Full Council ahead of the 24th May Annual meeting.

The Clerk updated the Committee on an email she had received from EBC Planning Department informing CPC that the Draft Local Plan Regulation 19 Representations period would open on the 17th June 2022 and that a CPC representative had been invited to a process explanation meeting on Wednesday 15th June 2022 between 12h30-13h30 at EBC Civic Hall. It was agreed that Cllr Bray attend on behalf of the CPC Planning Committee.

AP75 Clerk to confirm Cllr Bray to be the representative of the CPC at the EBC Draft Local Plan process meeting on the 15th June and to ask if other Committee members may attend virtually. Clerk to add download of 15th June Draft Local Plan process meeting from Cllr Bray to 16th June Planning Committee agenda.

The Clerk & Cllr Bray had been liaising with the Village Hall and Philippa Jarvis, Planning Consultant regarding availability for a Public Meeting. The Clerk noted that the maximum standing capacity of the village hall was 275 people.

It was agreed in a **majority decision** to book Philippa Jarvis and the Village Hall in for Monday 4th July at 8pm . 1 Cllr abstained.

AP76 Clerk to book Philippa Jarvis and the Village Hall for the evening of Monday 4th July.

14. To agree the appropriate means of communicating a proposed Draft Local Plan Public Meeting to residents.

It was agreed that all free media should be used to communicate the Public meeting namely Facebook, noticeboards and CPC website. The Clerk noted that she estimated the cost for a leaflet drop to 3000 households to be circa £1000.

It was agreed in a **majority decision** to support communication of the Public Meeting with a leaflet with numbers and distribution to be determined at CPC's Annual Meeting on the 24th May.

AP77 Cllr Bray to update the full council on the plans under Item 34 of the Annual CPC meeting.

15. **5G Masts including a consultation letter from Cornerstone with regards to upgrades to its existing telecommunications site located at Elm Garden Nurseries, Elm Farm, Woodstock Lane South, Claygate, KT10 0TB (NGR: 516975, 163726) and agree any action required. In particular, to review, and if possible approve, a draft letter for the Clerk to send to Cornerstone.**

The Committee reviewed Planning Application 2022/1270 Telecommunication Mast Elm Garden Nurseries Elm Farm Woodstock Lane.

It was **unanimously agreed** to submit a 'No Objection, No Comment' to Planning Application 2022/1270 Telecommunication Mast Elm Garden Nurseries Elm Farm Woodstock Lane.

In response to the consultation letter that CPC had received regarding upgrades to its existing telecommunications site located at Elm Garden Nurseries, Elm Farm, Woodstock Lane South the Clerk had circulated a proposed letter to Waldon Telecom prepared by Michael Collon (Appendix D).

It was **unanimously agreed** for the Clerk to send Waldon Telecom the letter.

AP78 Clerk to send letter to Waldon Telecom.

The Clerk had circulated a proposed letter prepared by Cllr Bray, to send to CK Hutchison Networks [UK] Ltd regarding Planning application 2022/1417 - Telegraph Lane SWS Telegraph Lane Claygate KT10 0DU [Prior Approval Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A: Proposed 'slim line' phase 8 monopole c/w wraparound cabinet at base, 3no. additional ancillary equipment cabinets and associated ancillary works.] (Appendix E)

It was **unanimously agreed** for Cllr Bray to send the letter to CK Hutchinson.

AP79 Cllr Bray to send letter to CK Hutchinson.

The Clerk had circulated a letter she had received from WHP Telecoms regarding a forthcoming planning submission being submitted by WHP on behalf of Cellnex for an update to existing equipment at the Esher Telephone Exchange, Hare Lane. The Committee did not discuss this letter.

16. **To discuss a residents' request to review the meaning of Item 7 of the Planning Remit and agree any amends required.**

A resident had notified CPC that the final sentence of Item 7 in the Planning remit did not make sense: "***CPC is in principle to gated developments.***"

It was **unanimously agreed** to add back the word 'opposed' into the Planning Remit as follows, 'CPC is in principle opposed to gated developments' and to have the amend approved at the full CPC meeting on the 24th May.

On the subject of Remit amends the Committee noted that a hold statement was required to both the Planning Remit and Planning Process and Public Speaking Guidelines. Both these documents reference when a Parish Council Planning Objection triggers a Planning Application

being referred to Elmbridge Borough Council's East Area Planning Sub-Committee, the rules of which were currently being clarified with EBC Planning Department as detailed in Item 7.

It was **agreed in a majority decision** to add wording to the end of Section B of the Planning Remit as follows, '*In the event that the Parish Council objects to the application, Elmbridge Borough Council will send the application to either East Area Planning Sub-Committee or Planning Committee for consideration depending on the number of objections and size of development. This clause is under review with Elmbridge Borough Council*' and to add the following wording to paragraph 6 of the Planning Process & Public Speaking document, '*Most applications are decided by EBC Planning Officers. If residents wish to have their application considered by either EBC East Area Planning Sub Committee or EBC Planning Committee, they will need at least 15 letters of representation from different addresses. Alternatively, they can speak to their Ward Borough Councillor who may be able to raise it to either the East Area Planning Subcommittee or EBC Planning Committee. Planning applications of smaller dwellings, less than 10, are heard by EBC East Area Sub Committee whilst dwellings of more than 10 are decided by the EBC Planning Committee. This clause is under review with Elmbridge Borough Council.*'.
2 Cllrs abstained.

AP80 Cllr Bray to update the full Council of the proposed amends to the Planning Remit and Planning Process and Public Speaking documents under Item 10 at the 24th May Full Council meeting.

17. Communication of key decisions to Residents including input to the Courier and the website.

The Clerk noted that the next Courier publication was due to land with residents on the 1st October,

18. Matters for information purposes only.

None

19. Date of the next meeting 16th June 2022.

Meeting closed 21h45

The reserve Councillor who may be required to attend the meeting on 16th June 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

No.	Address	Details		CPC
2022/0234	7 The Roundway KT10 ODP	Single-storey side extension to both sides and alterations to fenestration.	No Obj	Noted Observation from No 9 relating to height of proposal and proximity to the boundary
<p>EBC refused on the grounds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> of its unacceptable impact of residential amenity of no.9 The Roundway in terms of the overbearing effect due to its height and proximity to the shared boundary which fails to comply with Policy DM2, the Design and Character SPD and the revised NPPF 2021 the proposed extensions by virtue of their design, height, appearance and materials would result in a dominant and incongruous form of development which would cause unacceptable harm to the overall appearance of the host building, the locality and the street scene. This would be contrary to policies CS11, CS17, DM2, the Design and Character SPD 2012 and the Revised NPPF 2021 				
2022/0881	Claremont Place Church Road KT10 OJD	Tree Preservation Order EL03/23 - Various works to various trees.	No Obj	No comment
<p>EBC refused in part on the grounds that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 H. CHESTNUT. The maximum recommended reduction is 25% of photosynthetic leaf area. Normally equating to approximately 1.5 – 2m for a large mature tree. 3m is beyond these parameters for this tree. T3 LIME. Reducing a suppressed tree will suppress it even more and possibly shade it out completely. There doesn't appear to be a justifiable reason for the proposal. T4 OAK. Limbs don't appear to be excessively elongated that problems can be foreseen. The reduction is also too much (see T3 comment) to allow clearance from a structure. 				
2022/0447	19 Rusley Ridge KT10 OHZ	Single-storey side infill extension, extend existing garage with room above, front dormer window and alter garage door.	No Obj	No comment
<p>EBC refused on the grounds that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given its increased visibility within the surrounding area and its elevated positioning, and by reason of its scale and design, the proposal would result in significant harm to the visual amenity of the character and appearance of the site, surrounding area and street scene contrary to Policy CS17, DM2 and the revised NPPF. <p>EBC noted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is located at a higher land level compared with the street scene and the neighbouring property No. 20 to the west. Furthermore, the prominence of the site within the surrounding area is increased given the location of the public footpath which runs along to the south and the pathway which runs along the western boundary of the site from Rusley Ridge to the public footpath. In addition, the prominence of the existing building is also increased given the curved layout and orientation of dwellings within this part of the cul-de-sac. the proposed first floor level extension over the existing garage would result in a dominating appearance given the prominent location of the building and siting of the extension itself. The existing building is wide, and the proposal would increase the width of the building at first floor level to an extent which would result in harm to character and appearance. The extension would be set forward of the front building line at first floor level. The eaves height would be lower than the existing eaves height of the building which would appear awkward and poor in design terms. In addition, the design of the front dormer window would fail to respect the existing building and would appear poor in design terms given its eaves height with a larger window which would appear out of place in relation to the rest of the building. The extension would have a hipped roof that does not result in the subservience of the addition. five tree related conditions, including two pre-commencement conditions relating to additional arboricultural information, were recommended to be imposed by the Tree Officer and would have been sought had the proposal been viewed favourably in order that the proposed development would not adversely impact upon trees. 				
2022/0770	16 Gordon Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 DPQ	Single-storey rear extension part two-storey side extension and first-floor side extension following partial demolition of existing house.	No Obj	No comment
<p>EBC refused on the grounds that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a terracing effect and subsequent harm to the street scene would occur given the distance from the extension to the northern boundary of 0.95m at first floor level. The southern first floor side extension is considered to be of a very contrived design and results in an awkward relationship between the host dwelling and the first floor side extension, causing harm to the existing house, the character of the area and street scene. The ground floor side windows of No. 18 are the only source of light into the habitable room they serve. Therefore, given the proximity of the two-storey side extension to the boundary shared with No. 18 and the height of the extensions on this side would have an adverse impact upon the residential amenity in terms of light and outlook. given the projection of the patio beyond the rear wall of No. 18, the height to 0.9m, the proximity to the boundary and the lack of any screening, it is considered that this would result in an adverse impact upon the privacy of No. 18 due to the levels of overlooking which would arise. The proposed patio area has introduced some planting to the side in an attempt to provide screening to a height of 1.4m when taken from the highest level of the patio. However, this is considered to be insufficient in height and would not the 25% sightline test from side facing windows of No. 18 is taken vertically and would be breached by the proposed side extensions. 				

Other Applications Decided:- Nothing of significance

Appeals Decided:- None

Appendix B

Amended version 21 April 2022 Prepared by Michael Collon

Elmbridge Borough Council: Delegation of Planning Decisions

1. This note considers the circumstances in which a formal objection to an application by Claygate Parish Council (“CPC”) will result in the application being referred for decision to the East Area Sub-Committee or the Planning Committee of Elmbridge Parish Council (“EBC”) rather than being decided by a Planning Officer.
2. Seven documents are involved, and the relevant extracts set out below. Some of the inconsistencies between them are important:
 - The explanatory note 15/19 put to the EBC Planning Committee on 23 July 2019 (“the Note”);
 - Appendix B to that note, adopted by the EBC Planning Committee with amendments (“Appx B”);
 - Scheme of Delegation Update Report 53/20 put to the EBC Planning Committee on 14 December 2020 (“the Update Report”);
 - EBC Constitution, Part 3, Non-executive delegation, as amended (presumably by the Monitoring Officer using the powers in Article 15 of the Constitution) (“the Constitution”);
 - EBC website in its current form (“the website”);
 - Email of 6 April 2022 from Kim Tagliarini, EBC Head of Planning Services, to Sally Harman as Clerk of CPC (“the email”);
 - Presentation by Paul Falconer, EBC Development Manager, Planning and Environmental Health, to the Elmbridge Planning Users Group, sent on 19 April 2022 (“the Presentation”).

The relevant extracts are set out below. Some of the inconsistencies between them are important.

3. Also set out are relevant extracts from the CPC Planning Committee Remit and Planning Process. They are inconsistent between themselves and will need amending once EBC have clarified the position.

Definitions

4. Different rules on delegation, and on the consequences of a CPC objection, apply to different categories of application, but the definitions are sometimes inconsistent.
5. *Major applications* are those for 10+ dwellings or 1000sqm+ non-residential floorspace: see Appx B para 8, and the website. This is taken from the statutory definition of ‘major development’.¹ Sometimes the expression *major applications* is used without the definition (e.g. Appx B paras 1 and 6, and the Constitution which copies it). In the Note and the email an abbreviated definition (“10+ homes”) is used. In the Presentation the definition is used without the term “major application”.
6. *Minor applications*. There is no statutory definition. The Constitution and the website refer to “Minor applications (1-9 dwellings or non-residential development less than 1000sqm)”. The Presentation, page 5, refers to “1-9 houses/flats, permission in principle or <1000sqm non-residential”, without the term “minor applications”. The Update Report (page 6) refers to “Minor applications (1-9 dwellings)”. However the Note refers to “Minor applications (2-9 homes)”; Appx B para 2 refers to “Applications for 2 to 9 dwellings or non-residential development less than 1000sqm” without saying that these are minor applications; and the email refers to “2 or more new homes (minor development)”. We need to clarify this; in particular, we need to be clear how applications for one new home are classified.
7. *Householder applications*. The Note states that “Unless referred by a Councillor all householder applications will be determined by officers.” The email follows this, and the website and Presentation, page 5, are to the

¹ The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, SI 2015/595, article 2(1), <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2015/595/article/2>

same effect. There is a statutory definition of “householder application”² but the expression is nowhere defined in any of the EBC documents. The term does not even appear in Appx B or in the Constitution. This makes it all the more important to clarify whether or not an application for one new dwelling is, contrary to the statutory definition, treated as a householder application rather than a minor application.

References to East Area Sub-Committee

8. Until 2019 any application, major, minor, householder, or permission in principle (PIP) to which CPC objected had to go to the East Area Sub-Committee for decision if the Planning Officer recommended allowing the application. The email says that “One of the key changes was to reduce the number of householder applications being referred to Sub Committee.”
9. *Householder applications.* In the case of householder applications this power of CPC, and the similar power of 15+ objectors, was removed without any consultation, and without informing us. The CPC website has been misleading ever since the new scheme took effect on 1 September 2019.
10. The new scheme has not been operated consistently. The Update Report, looking at the operation of the scheme on 14 December 2020, 15 months after it took effect, states (page 3):

“Under the revised scheme, householder applications can only be considered by Committee where they have been referred by a Ward Member, there is an objection from Claygate Parish Council or the application is by the Council, staff or Members. The number of householder applications has reduced, but Table 3 shows that a number were still considered by the Sub Committees. One application to East Area Sub Committee was considered due to an objection from Claygate Parish Council.”
11. It is not suggested in the Update Report that, under the new scheme, the objection to a householder application from CPC should not have resulted in that application being referred to the East Area Sub-Committee. It seems however that the scheme is now being operated as intended, so that objections by CPC are ineffective to refer a householder application to the Sub-Committee.
12. *Minor applications* Where the Planning Officer recommends allowing a minor application, a CPC objection still means that it has to go to the East Area Sub-Committee for decision. The same applies if there are 15+ objectors.
13. *Major applications* Where the Planning Officer recommends allowing a major application, a CPC objection still means that it has to go to the Planning Committee for decision. The same applies if there are 15+ objectors.
14. *Permission in principle (PIP)* was only introduced in 2017. The emails states: “Permission in Principle applications will be brought to Sub Area Planning Committees [sic].” This is a quotation from the Note, and gives the impression that all PIP applications always go to a sub-committee. However Appx B (as amended by the Planning Committee) states that it is only “Applications for Permission in Principle which are recommended for approval by Officers and there are objections from 15 or more households” which go to a sub-committee. The Constitution and the website both say the same.
15. The one document which states that if CPC objects to a PIP application it should automatically be referred to the East Area Sub-Committee is the Presentation, page 5, which states that the three Area Sub-Committees deal with applications for permission in principle (which by definition cannot be householder applications) if there is a “Claygate Parish Council objection and rec for grant”. However in 2018 there was a PIP application to which CPC objected which was decided by the Planning Officer and not referred to the East Area Sub-Committee.

² “ ‘householder application’ means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse.”: Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, SI 2015/595, article 2(1), <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2015/595/article/2>

Next Steps

16. Before the CPC Planning Committee can decide what changes to make to the Planning Remit and Planning Process documents on its website, a number of points need to be clarified:
 - What is a “minor application”? Is it 1-9 new dwellings/homes, as in the Constitution, website, Presentation and Update Report, or 2-9 dwellings/homes, as in the Note, Appx B and email? And if the latter, is an application for one new dwelling treated as a householder application, contrary to the statutory definition (see footnote 2 above)?
 - It is clear from the Update Report that, at least until December 2020, the revised scheme was operated so that an objection from CPC to a householder application still resulted in the application being referred to East Area Sub-Committee. Does this still apply? And if not, is there any reason why it should not, given that such objections are very rare?
 - All documents state that PIP applications go to the Sub-Committee if there are 15+ objections, but only the Presentation suggests that this is what happens if only CPC objects; and this is not what happened in 2018. There is no logical reason why in the case of minor applications cases are referred to the East Area Sub-Committee if there are 15+ objections or a CPC objection, while PIP applications are referred if there are 15+ objections but not if there is an objection from CPC. The law governing mandatory consultation of Parish Councils is the same apart from the timing.³ It therefore seems logical that a PIP application to which CPC objects should automatically go to the Sub-Committee.

17. A draft letter for the Clerk to send to Kim Tagliarini is attached for approval by the Committee.

³ See Art 5M of the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017, SI 2017/402, inserted by Art 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) (Amendment) Order 2017, SI 2017/1309; and compare with the general rule in Art 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, SI 2015/595. For PIP applications, representations are required within 14 days, for other applications within 21 days. Apart from this the provisions are identical.

Scheme of Delegation: Papers put to EBC Planning Committee, 23 July 2019

Extract from item 15/19 Explanatory Note

The revision to the Scheme of Delegation would result in the following changes:

- Unless referred by a Councillor all householder applications will be determined by officers. There will be no objection letter trigger for householder applications.
- Minor applications (2-9 homes) with 15 or more objection letters will trigger referral to Area Sub Committee.
- Removes the requirement for minor applications with more than 40 letters of objection to be referred to Planning Committee. The decision stays with Sub Committee.
- Major applications (10+ homes) with 20⁴ or more objection letters will trigger referral to Planning Committee. It will not go to Sub Committee first.
- *New* Permission in Principle applications will be brought to Sub Area Planning Committees.
- ANY APPLICATION CAN STILL BE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE BY A MEMBER. This will not change.

Extract from Appendix B, the Proposed Scheme of Delegation as amended and agreed by the Planning Committee on 23 July 2019

All Development Control Decisions as clarified below * are delegated to the Strategic Director responsible for Services except in the following circumstances:

Decisions Referred to the Area Planning Sub-Committees

1. All applications (except Major) 'referred' to a Sub-Committee by a Ward Member for the Ward within which the application is situated shall be done on a conditional basis. Referrals shall be submitted within 28 days of validation.
2. Applications for 2 to 9 dwellings or non-residential development less than 1000sqm which are recommended for approval by Officers and there are objections from 15 or more households or from Claygate Parish Council (if a petition, or an objection letter is received from an organisation such as a residents' association, political party or conservation area advisory committee each shall be treated in the same way as an objection from 1 household).
3. Applications for Permission in Principle which are recommended for approval by Officers and there are objections from 15⁵ or more households.
4. All applications submitted by or on behalf of Members, the Council or Officers of the Council.
5. All enforcement action that, following consultation, has been 'referred' to a Sub-Committee by a Ward Member for the Ward within which the application is situated.

Decisions referred to the Planning Committee

6. Major applications 'referred' to the Planning Committee by a Ward Member for the Ward within which the application is situated, which shall be done on a conditional basis. Referrals shall be submitted within 28 days of validation.
7. Any two Members of the Planning Committee may refer an application from an Area Planning Sub-Committee to the Planning Committee provided that they have been present for the complete consideration of that application at the Area Planning Sub-Committee meeting.
8. Major applications (10+ dwellings or 1000sqm+ non-residential floorspace) which are recommended for approval by Officers where there are objections from 15⁶ or more households or from Claygate Parish Council (if a petition, or an objection letter is received from an organisation such as a residents' association, political party or conservation area advisory committee each shall be treated in the same way as an objection from 1 household).
9. All departures from the Development Plan required to be referred to the Secretary of State.

⁴ Amended by the Committee to 15, and amendments accordingly made to paras 3 and 8 of App B.

⁵ 20 in the original draft, amended to 15 by the Committee.

⁶ Ibid.

***For the avoidance of doubt, this includes enforcement action, lawful development certificates, and Section 106 Agreements on applications to be determined by the Strategic Director of Services.**

Extract from EBC Constitution, Part 3, page 35

Non-Executive Delegations

Planning

All Development Control Decisions as clarified below * are delegated to the Strategic Director responsible for Services except in the following circumstances:

Decisions Referred to the Area Planning Sub-Committees

1. All applications (except Major) 'referred' to a Sub-Committee by a Ward Member for the Ward within which the application is situated shall be done on a conditional basis. Referrals shall be submitted within 28 days of registration.
2. Minor Applications or non-residential development less than 1000sqm which are recommended for approval by Officers and there are objections from 15 or more households or from Claygate Parish Council (if a petition, or an objection letter is received from an organisation such as a residents' association, political party or conservation area advisory committee each shall be treated in the same way as an objection from 1 household).
3. Applications for Permission in Principle which are recommended for approval by Officers and there are objections from 15 or more households.
4. All applications submitted by or on behalf of Members, the Council or Officers of the Council.
5. All enforcement action that, following consultation, has been 'referred' to a Sub-Committee by a Ward Member for the Ward within which the application is situated.

Decisions Referred to the Planning Committee

6. Major applications 'referred' to the Planning Committee by a Ward Member for the Ward within which the application is situated, which shall be done on a conditional basis. Referrals shall be submitted within 28 days of registration.
7. Any two Members of the Planning Committee may refer an application from an Area Planning Sub-Committee to the Planning Committee provided that they have been present for the complete consideration of that application at the Area Planning Sub-Committee meeting.
8. Major applications (10+ dwellings or 1000sqm+ non-residential floorspace) which are recommended for approval by Officers where there are objections from 15 or more households or from Claygate Parish Council (if a petition, or an objection letter is received from an organisation such as a residents' association, political party or conservation area advisory committee each shall be treated in the same way as an objection from 1 household).
9. All departures from the Development Plan required to be referred to the Secretary of State.

***For the avoidance of doubt, this includes enforcement action, lawful development certificates, and Section 106 Agreements on applications to be determined by the Strategic Director of Services.**

Extract from EBC website <https://www.elmbridge.gov.uk/planning/search-comment-participate/committee-subcommittee-meetings-and-decisions/>

Area planning sub-committee

The sub-committee will decide the following planning applications:

- All applications (except major) 'referred' to a sub-committee by a ward member for the ward within which the application is situated shall be done on a conditional basis giving a planning reason. Referrals shall be submitted within 28 days of registration.
- Minor applications (1-9 dwellings or non-residential development less than 1000sqm) which are recommended for approval by officers and there are objections from 15 or more households or from Claygate Parish Council (if a petition, or an objection letter is received from an organisation such as a residents' association, political party or conservation area advisory committee each shall be treated in the same way as an objection from 1 household).

- Applications for permission in principle which are recommended for approval by officers and there are objections from 15 or more households.
- All applications submitted by or on behalf of members, the council or officers of the council.
- Householder applications will only be decided by sub-committee if referred by a ward councillor as set out above or if they are on behalf of members, the council or officers of the council.

Planning Committee

The Planning Committee will decide the following planning applications:

- Major applications 'referred' to the Planning Committee by a ward member for the ward within which the application is situated giving a planning reason. Referrals shall be submitted within 28 days of registration.
- Any two members of the Planning Committee have referred an application from an area planning sub-committee to the Planning Committee provided that they have been present for the complete consideration of that application at the area planning sub-Committee meeting.
- Major applications (10+ dwellings or 1000sqm+ non-residential floorspace) which are recommended for approval by officers where there are objections from 15 or more households or from Claygate Parish Council (if a petition, or an objection letter is received from an organisation such as a residents' association, political party or conservation area advisory committee each shall be treated in the same way as an objection from 1 household).
- All departures from the Development Plan required to be referred to the Secretary of State.

Extract from email from Kim Tagliarini to Sally Harman, 6 April 2022

The revision to the Scheme of Delegation were as follows:

1. Unless referred by a Councillor all householder applications will be determined by officers. There will be no objection letter trigger for householder applications.
2. Minor applications (2-9 homes) with 15 or more objection letters will trigger referral to Area Sub Committee.
3. Removes the requirement for minor applications with more than 40 letters of objection to be referred to Planning Committee. The decision stays with Sub Committee.
4. Major applications (10+ homes) with 20 or more objection letters will trigger referral to Planning Committee. It will not go to Sub Committee first.
5. Permission in Principle applications will be brought to Sub Area Planning Committees.
6. All applications can be referred to committee by a member. This was amended in Dec 2020 when a 28 day cap was added to this criteria.

One of the key changes was to reduce the number of householder applications being referred to Sub Committee. Sub Committee scrutiny would be reserved for application of 2 or more new homes (minor development) or commercial development. As such the threshold for objection letters for household applications were removed, this included the threshold of an objection from the Claygate Parish Council. Ward members can still refer contentious householder applications to sub committee but the automatic trigger has been removed.

Extract from the Presentation to the Elmbridge Planning Users Group, page 5

Scheme of Delegation

3 Area Planning Sub Committees:

– Householder applications:

- only if referred by Ward Cllr within 28 days.
- Therefore 15 objections or more doesn't result in going to Committee

– 1-9 houses/flats, permission in principle or <1000sqm non-residential:

- if 15 objections or more, and rec for grant
- Ward Councillor referral, can be either recommendation
- Claygate Parish Council objection and rec for grant

- Application by the Council, staff or Members

- Not LDCs, Conditions, Prior Approvals

Extract from CPC Planning Remit

Relationship with the Planning Authority [Elmbridge Borough Council]

1. CPC has no power to grant, or refuse, an Application for planning permission. These powers reside with EBC.
2. CPC is a statutory consultee for all Applications made for properties in Claygate to EBC. As such, it has the right to have its views considered by EBC.

In the event that the Parish Council objects to the application, Elmbridge Borough Council will send the application to either East Area Planning Sub-Committee or Planning Committee for consideration depending on the number of objections and size of development.

Extract from CPC Planning Process

Most applications are decided by EBC Planning Officers. If residents wish to have their application considered by either EBC East Area Planning Sub Committee or EBC Planning Committee, they will need at least 15 letters of representation from different addresses. Alternatively, they can speak to their Ward Borough Councillor who may be able to raise it to either the East Area Planning Subcommittee or EBC Planning Committee. Planning applications of smaller dwellings, less than 10, are heard by EBC East Area Sub Committee whilst dwellings of more than 10 are decided by the EBC Planning Committee.

Appendix C

Draft letter to Kim Tagliarini, Head of Planning, Elmbridge Borough Council

Dear Kim,

Delegation of Planning Decisions

Many thanks again for your email of 6 April which was considered at the Planning Committee meeting on May 19th. They have also, as you suggested, looked at: the Note which was considered by EBC Planning Committee on 23 June 2019; the Scheme of Delegation in Appendix B to that note which, as amended, was adopted at that meeting; and at the Update Report considered by the EBC Planning Committee on 20 December 2020. Additionally, they looked at the passages in the EBC Constitution and in the EBC website governing the scheme of delegation, and at the presentation which Paul Falconer circulated to the Elmbridge Planning Users Group on 19 April.

As you know, we have been aware for some time that our website includes an explanation of the scheme of delegation which does not reflect current practice, partly because we were not aware of the changes made in 2019. We now have to put this right, but before we can, there are a number of matters which are still not clear to us and which the Planning Committee have asked me to put to you.

Minor applications and householder applications

The Scheme provides that minor applications to which the Parish Council, or 15+ residents, object will automatically still go to the East Area Sub-Committee. If this is no longer true of householder applications, it is important to know the boundary between minor and householder applications. Your email, and the June 2019 Note and Appendix B, define a minor application as 2-9 dwellings/homes, whereas the Update Report, EBC Constitution and website, and presentation give it as 1-9 dwellings/homes. It seems to us, following the statutory definition of 'householder application', that even one new dwelling would be a minor application, so that an objection from the Parish Council would automatically result in a reference to the East Area Sub-Committee. Is that how EBC sees it?

References of householder applications

The Update Report, looking at the operation of the 2019 scheme, says “One application to East Area Sub Committee was considered due to an objection from Claygate Parish Council”. There is no suggestion that this was an error, but it does seem to be contrary to the intention of the Scheme, and is certainly contrary to what you say in your email. Are we right in assuming that an objection to a householder application will not in fact automatically result in a reference to the East Area Sub-Committee?

Permission in Principle

Appendix B (as amended by the EBC Planning Committee) states that it is only “Applications for Permission in Principle which are recommended for approval by Officers and there are objections from 15 or more households” which go to a sub-committee. The Constitution and the website both say the same. None of these refer to objections by Claygate Parish Council. However the presentation, page 5, states that the three Area Sub-Committees deal with applications for permission in principle if there is a “Claygate Parish Council objection and rec for grant”.

It would be perverse if in the case of minor applications cases are referred to the East Area Sub-Committee if there are 15+ objections or a Claygate Parish Council objection, while PIP applications are referred if there are 15+ objections but not if there is a Parish Council objection. Are we right in thinking that the Presentation is correct, and that a Parish Council objection to a PIP application will automatically result in a reference to the East Area Sub-Committee?

Many thanks for your help in resolving these questions, so that we can make the correct changes to our website.

Appendix D

Draft letter from the Clerk to Peter Maynard of Waldon Telecom

Peter Maynard Esq

Waldon Telecom,

Rosemount House

Rosemount Avenue,

West Byfleet,

Surrey

KT14 6LB

Your ref: PM / CTIL 142477 21

NN May 2022

Dear Mr Maynard,

PROPOSED BASE STATION UPGRADE AT CTIL 142477 21 & ELM GARDEN NURSERIES, ELM FARM, WOODSTOCK LANE SOUTH, CLAYGATE, KT10 0TB (NGR: 516975, 163726)

Thank you for your letter of 21 April 2022, which was considered by the Planning Committee of Claygate Parish Council on 19 May 2022.

In your letter you inform the Parish Council that Cornerstone are considering an application to extend the telecom mast at Elm Garden Nurseries, and you ask us to let you have any comments we have within 14 days.

Before replying to you on this particular point, allow me, if you will, to rehearse some of the history of this issue.

You may recall having sent the Parish Council a letter, under the same reference and in almost identical terms, on 4 October 2021. In that letter you outlined the proposal to extend the mast, you asked whether we had any comments, and you said: "we commit to allow at least 14 days before an application is submitted to the Local Planning Authority. This 14-day period starts from the date at the top of this letter." In fact you submitted your Prior Notification Application to Elmbridge Borough Council the same day, 4 October 2021 (No 2021/3464). However you withdrew that application on 12 October 2021. In my reply of 8 November 2021 I explained that in the circumstances the Planning Committee thought it inappropriate to reply to the consultation.

Your latest letter of 21 April 2022 concludes: "We look forward to receiving any comments you may have on the proposal within 14 days of the date of this letter." Again you submitted your Prior Notification Application the same day, 21 April 2022 (No 2022/1270).

We find it hard to square this history with the idea that you genuinely want to engage with us, but are assuming, for the time being, that you do, especially since the Planning Committee has been trying for some months to engage with 5G suppliers with the same aims as those you state in your letter, namely to:-

- promote shared infrastructure
- maximise opportunities to consolidate the number of base stations
- significantly reduce the environmental impact of network development.

Thus, while we have already submitted to Elmbridge Borough Council our comments on your Application 2022/1270, we would welcome a meeting with you to discuss these matters for the whole of our village, not just for the single base station upgrade you are proposing at Elm Garden Nurseries. In particular, we would like to learn more about how the industry might propose to use masts, roof-top devices and small cells in combination to provide the village with effective 5G coverage with minimum hardware. If you are indeed, as you say in your letter, "committed to consultation with communities for mobile telecommunications proposals", I look forward to hearing from you with proposals for such a meeting.

Yours sincerely,

Sally Harman
Clerk to the Parish Council and Responsible Financial Officer

Appendix E

FROM:

Gil BRAY
c/o The Clerk
Claygate Parish Council
Claygate Village Hall
Church Road
Claygate
Surrey
KT10 0JP

TO:

Mr T Gallivan
c/o CK Hutchison Networks [UK] Ltd
Great Bingham's Mead
Reading
Berks
RG1 8DJ

and...

Mr T Gallivan
Dot Surveying Ltd
14 Inverleith Place
Edinburgh
EH3 5PZ

May 20th 2022

Dear Mr Gallivan

Re: Elmbridge Borough Council Planning Application 2022/1417 - Telegraph Lane SWS Telegraph Lane Claygate KT10 0DU [Prior Approval Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A: Proposed 'slim line' phase 8 monopole c/w wraparound cabinet at base, 3no. additional ancillary equipment cabinets and associated ancillary works.]

I write to you as Agent for CK Hutchison Networks [UK] Ltd in the above matter in my capacity as Chairman of the Planning Committee of Claygate Parish Council.

The Planning Committee considered your application at its last meeting on May 19th and, as you may know by now, responded to Elmbridge Borough Council as follows: -

Objection with Comment.

CPC objects to Prior Approval and would like to see full planning approval on the grounds of location and appearance. CPC will be writing to the applicant requesting a meeting to discuss the extent to which they have liaised with other suppliers regarding the sharing of sites and infrastructure as well as requesting their whole plan for providing 5G coverage to Claygate as opposed to simply this single installation.

Be that as it may, the Planning Committee has, for some months now, been seeking to engage with all the 5G providers in order to address the promotion of shared infrastructure and maximise opportunities to consolidate the number of base stations, with the overall goal of minimizing the environmental impact of the provision of 5G.

During the course of this effort, we have made contact with Paul Sinclair of Three [Paul.Sinclair@three.co.uk – whom, I imagine, you may well know] asking him for a meeting with Three/Hutchison to discuss these and other matters. To date, we have not heard back from him in this regard, though, as the result of the above application, you will understand that I shall be writing to him again shortly.

In similar vein, the main purpose of this letter is to ask you for a meeting with Hutchison where we would ask you/ them to talk with us about:-

- the extent to which you have liaised/are liaising with other suppliers as regards the sharing of sites and infrastructure
- your whole plan for providing 5G coverage to our village [ie showing us how many masts, roof top installations and small cells you intend, with others, to deploy], as opposed to simply this single installation.

I, and the Claygate Parish Council Planning Committee, look forward to hearing from you at your early convenience. In that regard, I would ask you to reply to me at gil.bray@claygateparishcouncil.gov.uk with a copy to our Clerk at clerk@claygateparishcouncil.gov.uk

Yours sincerely,

Gil BRAY
Chairman: Claygate Parish Council Planning Committee