



Caring for Claygate Village

DRAFT

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING held at 7.30pm on Thursday 8th October 2020 via Zoom.

Councillors: Geoff Herbert (Chairman of the Committee), Xingang Wang, Michelle Woodward, Jo Lesser, Mark Sugden, Janet Swift
Co-opted: John Bamford,
In attendance: Sally Harman (Parish Clerk & RFO), 5 members of the public

1. **Apologies for absence**

None received.

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

2.1 To receive declarations of interest from Councillors on items on the agenda.

Cllr Sugden, Cllr Herbert and Cllr Lesser stated they knew of one member of the public in the meeting.

2.2 To receive written requests for dispensation for disclosable pecuniary interests (if any):

None

2.3 To grant any requests for dispensation as appropriate:

None

3. **Minutes of the last meeting (10th September 2020).**

The Minutes of the meeting on the 10th September 2020 were agreed with no amends.

AP65 Cllr Herbert to sign minutes and give to Clerk.

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

AP34 Clerk to contact EBC, Kingston & SCC requesting what development is legitimate and approved along Woodstock South lane and what development has not been approved and if not, what was happening to rectify. 1 The Oaks is managed by SCC and they confirmed that a refurbishment has been authorised but no additional dwellings beyond the existing 16 had been approved or are in progress. SCC carry out regular site surveys. Kingston are not responsible for any of the land along Woodstock Lane South. Their accountability falls the other side of the A3. There are 3 further traveller plots adjacent to 1 Oaks Traveller Site which all have legal approval and are owned privately by individuals. It was noted that one of these plots looked to have breached its legal agreement. **DONE** Clerk has emailed details of suspected breach to Claygate's Elmbridge Borough Cllrs. Cllr Mary Marshall confirmed she will investigate.

AP52 Clerk to notify EBC on decision to reinstate bench outside Old Bank, Hare lane. **ONGOING** Clerk notified EBC who instructed her to notify GPS. GPS confirmed they will action, but progress has halted. Clerk to continue chasing.

AP49 GH to prepare a proposed response to the changes to the current planning system consultation (Deadline 1st October) to bring to the next full Parish Council meeting on the 17th September for review and approval. **DONE**

19h36 Cllr Woodward joined the meeting.

AP50 Clerk to circulate response from Planning Consultant. **DONE**

AP51 GH and JB to prepare 1 page on the National Planning Consultations and send to MS before the October Courier copy deadline. **DONE**

AP53 Clerk to notify Paul Falconer at EBC on attendees of EBC Planning Committee workshop. **DONE**

AP54 To add agenda point to next Planning Committee for Cllrs attending to provide an update to the Committee on content of EBC Planning Committee workshop. **DONE**

AP55 Clerk to extend invite to other Parish Cllrs outside the Planning Committee to EBC Planning Committee workshop. **DONE**

AP56 Clerk to write to the Head of Tree Planning at EBC copying in EBC Cllrs requesting that the CPC's very experienced Tree Wardens are consulted on important tree applications going forth.

DONE Russell Gibbons confirmed that he had had to make one or two quick decisions recently due to holidays and EBC needed to get the decision out, so they did not expire on a Conservation Area decision. He confirmed that he would try to ensure the EBC team continue to allow for the 28 day informal period for representations to come in going forth. Note CPC are only informal representations because tree work notifications (in a conservation area but not protected by a tree preservation order) are only notifications and in the legislation, they do not have any type of period for receiving representations.

AP57 Clerk to contact Tree Wardens and ask if they would like comment directly on 2020/1927. **DONE**

AP58 Clerk to write to EBC Planning and EBC Councillors highlighting the CPC Planning Committees strong concerns regarding the Station house development (application no. 2019/2381) and requesting that CPC receives visibility of a Traffic Management plan before construction commences as well as confirmation of who will be overseeing the adherence to this Traffic Management plan at EBC. **DONE** Nathalie Lynch at EBC Planning confirmed as part of the grant of permission, a condition has been imposed requiring a Construction Transport Management Plan to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development commences.

To date, an application to confirm compliance with this condition has not been submitted. Once an application has been received, Surrey County Council as the Highway Authority would be consulted for their views/comments on the Construction Transport Management Plan. The condition requires the approved details in the Construction Transport Management Plan to be followed. Any breach of a planning condition would need to be reported to the EBC Planning Compliance team so that this can be investigated.

AP59 Cllr Lessor to send photos of The Parade shopping area on a Saturday to the Clerk so the Clerk can include in her communication to EBC to demonstrate the extent of pedestrian and vehicle traffic prior to any construction taking place at Station house (application 2019/2381). **DONE**

AP60 Cllr Herbert to ask Claremont Cars if they are aware of the Station House development and its approval. **DONE** Claremont cars are now working remotely so as things stand the development would not affect them.

AP61 Clerk to write to Tracey Hulse, EBC, to confirm when the next meeting on the EBC Licensing committee will take place. **DONE** To be discussed under Item 10

AP62 Clerk to contact Simon Luke at EBC Compliance team to request an update. **DONE** To be discussed under Item 11.

AP63 Cllr Sugden to send proposed responses to the National Planning Consultations prepared by local resident groups in Cobham and Oxshott to the Clerk to circulate to Cllrs. **DONE** To be discussed under Items 12,13 & 14.

AP64 South Waste Consultation Plan to be circulated to the committee and added to the agenda for discussion at the next CPC meeting on the 17th September. **DONE** To be discussed under Item 16

The Chairman requested a Motion under Standing Order, Rules of Debate 1 a) to move to item 7 2020/2095 Claygate House on the agenda. The meeting would then revert to standing order. This was agreed unanimously.

19h50 3 members of the public joined the meeting.

7. 2020/2095 Claygate House

2 local residents submitted an objection statement for this meeting which was circulated by the Clerk prior to the meeting. They object to development on the grounds of over-dense development, overlooking neighbouring property, flood risk and excessive increase in traffic on Littleworth Road. A further local resident also submitted an objection statement for this meeting which was circulated by the Clerk prior to the meeting. The objection is on the grounds of over-dense development, design, landscaping, parking, infrastructure.

Cllr Sugden, Cllr Herbert and Cllr Lesser all declared that they knew one of the residents.

A local resident spoke. He cited the development was over-dense. The original plan for this site was to convert the Claygate House Office block into 59 flats (2018/0291), increased to 67 in 2018/3259. A subsequent application (2018/3782) added an extra storey to the main block, giving a total of 82 residential units. In 2019 (2019/2134), permission was granted to demolish the Pavilion block and replace it with a new block of 39 flats and to add 11 town houses at the south end of the site. As there were originally to be only 9 flats in the Pavilion block, this represented a net increase of 41 units over previous plans.

The current application apparently reduces the number of flats in the replacement Pavilion building to 13 but replaces the 11 town houses with a 4 storey block of 49 flats at the south end of the site. This represents a net increase of 53 units (65%) over application 2018/3782. No consideration appears to have been given to the impact on local services (especially schools and doctors) of such a large development. There would appear to be insufficient foul drainage capacity for the latest proposals, as para 5.13 of the Flood Risk Assessment indicates that local Thames Water sewers could accommodate 124 dwellings on the site; the proposed development brings the total to 135 units.

The second reason for his objection was that the proposed South Block's upper story windows look directly into the garden of "Harecroft", Raleigh Drive. This is unacceptable and there are too many such windows for them all to be fitted with obscuring glass.

Thirdly he cited flood risk and drainage. The proposed South Block would be located in the part of the site most vulnerable to flooding. Paras 3.16-19 of the Flood Risk Assessment make it clear that, while the proposed South Block flats would be unlikely to flood, at times of serious flooding of The Rythe occupants would have to wade through flood water to reach refuge areas at the northern end of the site. Para 3.9 admits that the most vulnerable flats would not meet the minimum freeboard requirement in a worst case climate change flood scenario. He wanted it noted that Surrey County Council are not satisfied with the proposed surface water drainage arrangements. He supported the provision of an improved grid for the Rythe culvert. He asked that, should the application be permitted, the site management company be required to 24/7 monitoring of the culvert entry grid, as was done by the previous tenants, Dairy Crest, supported by an Environment Agency camera.

His finally reason for objection was traffic movement. He believes the TRICS data used in the Transport Statement to model vehicle movements for the existing office block is misleading. The TRICS data is based on averaged data for different classes of building in different areas. The results quoted suggest that the residential development will generate significantly less vehicle movements than the original office block. He suggested this may be misleading, as the office block was not fully occupied for some years before being sold, with many empty parking spaces visible around it during the working day. The vehicle movements for the office block should have been calculated on the number of employees actually based on the site, or the area of office space actually occupied by employees. In addition, the number of parking spaces the visitors have only been stated as 10. He believes it will be likely that visitor parking will overflow at peak weekend times into Littleworth Road, a practice regarded as unacceptable by the Transport Statement. It is also likely that the vast majority of the 196 residents parking spaces will be in use; and was sceptical of the analysis that

concludes these spaces will only generate a maximum of 28 peak hour vehicle movements (Transport Statement para 5.20).

Cllrs noted that if more than 15 households object the application it goes to the main EBC Planning Committee. In this instance the latest Claygate house planning application has received 34 resident objections so far.

It was unanimously agreed that an objection should be submitted by CPC.
--

20h05 1 Member of the public & Cllr Wang joined the meeting.

It was agreed to object based on planning policy: -

- There is significant flood risk. The fact that Surrey County Council are not satisfied with the proposed surface water drainage arrangements very much supports this view.
- Overlooking and breach of Privacy. The development clearly overlooks neighbouring properties on Raleigh drive.
- Parking. There is insufficient parking and this will inevitably lead to spill out on to Littleworth Road creating a scenario at odds with Transport Policy.
- The Traffic Plan submitted by SCC is questionable and numbers of prior traffic to the underutilised office block should not be a reasonable enough assessment to set base figures on. It is asserted that the impact of forecasted traffic flow has been miscalculated.
- The development is not consistent with the Design and Character Guide laid out in the existing Local Plan.

It was also noted that the CPC should highlight that there is no commentary on telecommunications in the planning applications and that it appears that the Secure by Design has been set at the lowest grade possible.

AP66 Cllr Sugden to send the Clerk full planning policy details to submit with the objection.

AP67 Cllr Sugden and Cllr Herbert to approve the submission from the Clerk prior to sending.

5. Planning correspondence, notification of applications and outstanding results.

No further correspondence has been received over and above the 2020/2095 objection statements the Clerk has already circulated and various other documents circulated in support of other agenda items and which will be discussed in their relevant sections.

20h30 3 members of the public left the meeting.

6. Applications and Appeals decided since last meeting.

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

2020/0780 23 Telegraph lane, First Floor front extension , roof canopy over entrance door, increase size of existing rear dormer window, front roof lights, solar panels, increase parapet wall on existing flat roof by 0.15m and alterations to fenestration appeal was received by the Clerk and circulated to councillors.

20h35 1 member of the public left the meeting.

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>
2020/2067	22 The Avenue Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0RY	Single-storey rear extension.	No comment
2020/2059	123 Hare Lane Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0RA	Tree Preservation Order EL: 12/02 - Remove 1 x Horse Chestnut (T1).	No objection. Please note that although we have no objection to the tree being removed, we would strongly recommend that a suitably large replacement is planted of a species that will grow to be eventually of a similar size. There is plenty of space for this in the garden on land bordering the car park to the east of the existing tree.
2020/2070	42A The Roundway Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0DW	Retrospective application for a single-storey rear extension.	Cllr Sugden declared he has met with next door neighbour and advised them to speak to EBC. Cllr Wang highlighted that 25 objections had been received on this planning application. On closer review there was significant duplication of addresses and several submissions outside of Claygate. <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;">It was agreed in a majority vote to not make a comment on this application</div>
2020/2095	Claygate House Littleworth Road Esher Surrey KT10 9PN	Development comprising 62 flats with associated parking and landscaping following demolition of existing buildings.	Object. Detail already covered off earlier in meeting
2020/2125	15 Blakeden Drive Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0JR	Single-storey rear extension, single-storey front extension and alterations to fenestration.	No Comment.
2020/2168	110 Foley Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0NB	Tree Preservation order EL: 09/40 - Reduce lateral limb of 1 x Scots Pine by 2m.	This is an important tree in the street scene with an attractive shape. It forms part of a prominent group. It would be a pity to radically change its shape or size. Although a photo is included with the application it is still unclear as to which limb is being referred to. Clarification is needed. AP68 Clerk to seek clarification from EBC Tree department.
2020/2093	36 Rythe Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 9DF	Two-storey side/rear extension following demolition of existing garage.	No Objection

2020/2157	11 Coverts Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0JY	Part two/part single-storey rear extension, single-storey front bay, new porch canopy, first-floor side dormer, roof extension incorporating rear dormer windows and additional fenestration on side elevations.	No Comment
2020/1727	Harecroft Raleigh Drive Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 9DE	Detached garage.	No Comment
2020/2033	30 St Leonards Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0EL	Single-storey rear extension, rear elevation to render, side garage and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing conservatory.	No Comment
2020/2248	1 Sydney Cottages The Green Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0JQ	Claygate Village Conservation Area - Crown reduce 1 x Strawberry Tree by 2metres and remove lateral branches.	No objection. Thinning the branches maybe more appropriate.
2020/2209	Vale Farm Cottage Vale Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0NN	Part two/part single-storey rear extension, conversion of garage into living space, first-floor front extension, front canopy, entrance gates and piers to a height of 1.8m and alterations to fenestration.	Cllr Sugden declared he knew the owner and would not participate in the debate on this application. No Comment.
2020/2300	15 Elm Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0EH	Single-storey side/rear extension, front porch, and alterations to finish following demolition of existing side projection and outbuilding.	No Comment.
2020/2313	35 The Roundway Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0DP	Single-storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing rear conservatory.	No Comment
2020/2327	6 Meadow Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0RZ	Single-storey side/rear extension, hip-to-gable roof extension incorporating rear dormer window and front roof lights and replacement front porch following demolition of existing garage.	Cllr Sugden declared he knew the owner and as such would not comment on the application. No objection however it was requested that the 45 degree rules still applies due to a parapet on the proposed extension.
2020/2275	The Lodge 33 Raleigh Drive	Part two/part single-storey side/rear extension and alterations to fenestration	No Comment

	Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 9DE	following partial demolition of existing house.	
2020/2266	8 Foley Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0ND	Single-storey side/rear extension, side/rear dormer, side roof light and alterations to fenestration following partial demolition of existing house including garage.	No objection however please may it be noted that there hasn't been a 300mm gap for guttering and the planning application suggests a build right up to the boundary.
2020/2314	5 Ruxley Ridge Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0HZ	Detached garage and alterations to driveway.	John Bamford declared he knew the owner and would not be commenting. No Comment

8. East Area Sub Committee Meeting report.

No applications for Claygate.

9. EBC Planning Committee Meeting report

Cllr Herbert, Cllr Sugden, Cllr Swift, Cllr Lesser and John Bamford all attended the EBC Planning User Group workshop. The Clerk circulated the presentation to the Committee post this workshop.

10. Licensing Applications in Claygate.

The Clerk received a response from Andrew Martin, Principal Office for Food & Safety at EBC with regards to the Street Trading Application for The Dough Shack. He stated that unfortunately, street trading is not a statutory function of the council, and as a consequence he was afraid that the matter had not been prioritised due to the demands of dealing with the current COVID situation and the need to focus on different priorities. He advised that the decision had yet to be made with regards to the issuing of a street trading consent for this operator. However, in relation to the Claygate site, it appears that the applicant is trading from private land and not the public highway and therefore the requirements of a street trading consent and the controls it can introduce is not applicable in this circumstance.

11. Compliance issues

2014/4954 1 Caerleon Close – No further update at this time.

42a The Roundway – Clerk received a response from Simon Luke, Planning Compliance Office EBC. The work has been completed and shed is removed. They have now closed the case.

Cllr Herbert flagged that another shed had arrived at the front on a neighbouring property.

AP69 Cllr Herbert to clarify the house/flat number and monitor for the time being.

12. To provide an update on the response submitted by the Parish Council to the government's 'Changes to the Current Planning Policy' consultation (Closed 1st October)

Clerk submitted a response on behalf of CPC on the 1st October.

AP70 Clerk to upload responses to 'Changes to Current Planning Policy' to website.

13. To review a draft response to the Government's Planning for the Future White Paper and determine its finalisation and submission process (Closes 29th October).

The Clerk circulated the planning consultants feedback prior to the meeting. Cllr Herbert and John Bamford confirmed that they had worked up a first draft of the submission from the CPC.

Cllr Herbert confirmed he has attended the SSALC meeting on the White Paper early in the day. The conclusion from SSALC was that there was more missing from the white paper than included in it.

It was noted that EBC had published their submission to the public.

AP71 Clerk to circulate SSALC meeting slides and video to the committee.

AP72 Cllr Sugden and Cllr Herbert to finalise the CPC submission by the 16th October and circulate to Cllrs for review. Clerk to then submit final response by the 29th October.

14. **To determine if the Parish Council should input to the Government’s Consultation ‘Transparency and Competition A Call for Evidence on Data and Control’ and if so, draft a response, determine its finalisation and submission process (Closes 30th October).**

It was **unanimously** agreed to not submit a response to the Government’s Consultation ‘Transparency and Competition A Call for Evidence on Data and Control’.

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

The Clerk circulated a link to the EBC Cabinet meeting prior to the Committee. It was noted that the Planning Committee should expect a draft Local plan this side of Christmas.

16. **To determine if there is a need to submit comments on the South London Waster Plan and its sustainability appraisal and if so to prepare a submission on behalf of the Parish Council (Closes 22nd October).**

CPC had submitted prior comments. The site has been removed.

It was **unanimously agreed** that CPC will not submit a further comment.

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

It was noted that a last minute special Courier addition maybe required if a draft EBC Local Plan is published by EBC before Christmas.

18. **Matters for information purposes only.**

Hook Park Development - Consultation by the developer (between now and 17th October) about proposals for Hook Park development on the entire site of land around and including Chessington Equestrian Centre. The consultation is by the owning company so will only be used by them for what we assume will be a future submission for potential inclusion in the Kingston Local Plan. Neither RBK nor the developer have contacted the Parish Council.

AP73 Clerk to circulate the link, www.hookpark.co.uk, to Cllrs for review.

Oak Tree, Church Road – This tree has now been felled despite CPC objection. Russell Gibbons, Senior Tree Officer EBC said that the applicant managed to supply enough information to demonstrate the Oak very likely causing serious soil volume fluctuations towards the front of the house. They were some of the largest variations in level monitoring (changes in soil level) he’s seen in his career. If the information was substandard or did not heavily support tree root related subsidence from the Oak the Council could refuse the application. However, with the strong evidence demonstrating beyond reasonable doubt the tree was influencing the clay soil volume, the Council would likely be made liable for any future costs of repair to the house including underpinning.

AP74 Clerk to request via EBC whether the resident is planting a replacement.

16. **To confirm the date of the next meeting and attendance of members of Planning Committee: Thursday 5th November 2020, 19h30 via Zoom**
The meeting closed at 9h34

Chairman:

Dated:

Reserve for the next meeting: Cllr Jo Collen

Appendix A

Report on Planning Applications Decided since the Last Planning Meeting

No Applications Refused by Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC)

Other Noteworthy Applications Decided included: -

2020/1338 Magpie Manor Church Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0JP

Conversion of garage in to living space, 1.8m high rear decking/railing with 1.8m side obscure screening, alterations to fenestration and front/rear roof lights following removal of existing roof lights.

Amended Plans were submitted subsequent to Claygate Parish Council's review of this Application that were designed to address concerns about privacy.

EBC noted that "the decking is set adjacent to the middle part of the 'The Checked House's' garden amenity space, allowing direct views from the decking into this neighbour's garden and their side windows. While this impact on amenity is in part limited due to the thickness of the hedge, considering that the hedge is not protected, the amended plans received has screening to be installed on to the decking at a height of 1.8m. This is considered sufficient to obscure any views into the neighbouring garden. The screening is considered on balance to sufficiently protect the privacy of the occupiers of 'The Checked House'."

Appeals Lodged & Decided

No Appeals were lodged or decided

No CIL is due on Planning Applications decided since the last Planning Meeting