



## Caring for Claygate Village

### DRAFT

### PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING held at 7.30pm on Thursday 25<sup>th</sup> March 2021 via Zoom.

Councillors: Geoff Herbert (Chairman of the Committee), Michelle Woodward, Xingang Wang, Janet Swift, Mark Sugden  
Co-opted Members: John Bamford  
In attendance: Sally Harman (Parish Clerk & RFO), 2 x members of the public

*In the absence of the Chairman at the start of the meeting under Standing Orders 10a(v) a motion was brought that Cllr Wang (Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee) take over as acting Chairman.*

The Clerk informed the committee that Cllr Sugden's had noted to her in advance of the meeting that his attendance was purely as an observer and he would participate solely in discussion of Agenda Item 12

1. **Apologies for absence**

Cllr Lessor sent her apologies in advance of the meeting.

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

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

Co-opted Member John Bamford noted that he knew the applicants for 2021/0343 and 2021/0338 and as such would not participate in discussions on those applications.

Claygate Planning Committee noted that Claygate Parish Council had committed £40,000 to the Claygate Committee Pool application 2021/0855 and had already paid out £5,000,

2.2 To received 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 (25<sup>th</sup> February 2021).**

Cllr Swift noted that she believed she was unable to verify the minutes as she was not in attendance at the meeting on the 25<sup>th</sup> February. Cllr Sugden agreed to participate in this agenda item in order to verify the minutes. The minutes were agreed.

**AP108** Chairman to sign and deliver the minutes to the Clerk.

*19h40 Cllr Herbert joined the meeting and took over as Chair from Cllr Wang.*

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. **IN**

**PROGRESS**

**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**

**AP103** Cllr Herbert to sign minutes from 28<sup>th</sup> January and drop to Clerk. **DONE**

**AP104** Cllrs to advise the Clerk if they will attend the Elmbridge Planner Users Group on Monday 8<sup>th</sup> March **DONE**

**AP105** Cllr Herbert to circulate proposed response on the National Planning Policy Framework and National Model Design Code to the Committee so members can submit any further comments or amends before it goes to the CPC on the 11<sup>th</sup> March. Clerk to add to CPC 11<sup>th</sup> March agenda. **DONE**

**AP106** Clerk to make amends to the Planning Process and Public Speaking document, circulate to Cllrs and upload to the CPC website. **DONE**

**AP107** Cllr Herbert to update the Parish Council at the 11<sup>th</sup> March meeting on the new Planning Process and Public Speaking document **DONE**

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

In addition to correspondence shared within APs and further down the agenda the Clerk had been liaising with EBC to secure extensions for Parish Council feedback on applications 2021/0349 - Consultation - Land South of 22 to 32 Holroyd Road and 2020/3519 - Consultation - The Hare And Hounds The Green until the 26<sup>th</sup> March 2020.

The Clerk informed the Committee that she had sent the updated Planning Remit and Planning Committee dates to the Head of Planning at EBC.

The Clerk also noted that she had received an email from the Firs & Fawcus Resident Association raising concerns regarding Planning Application 2021/0855. The concerns, which were circulated to the Planning Committee in advance of the meeting would be reviewed when the Committee discuss 2021/0855 under Agenda Item 7.

Finally the Clerk informed the committee that the Old Bank Bench was due to be reinstated by SCC and EBC in the agreed location by the end of April.

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

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

**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>
2021/0218	8 Langbourne Way Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0DZ	Part two/part single-storey rear/side extension, rear roof light and alterations to fenestration following demolition of existing detached garage and removal of chimney stack.	No objection, no comment
2020/3519	The Hare And Hounds The Green Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0JL	Two-storey side/rear extension, first-floor front and rear extensions including first floor dormer windows to facilitate change of use to Hotel (C1) on first floor to provide 8 ensuite rooms.	Unanimously agreed no further comment was required.

2021/0349	Land South of 22 to 32 Holroyd Road Claygate Esher Surrey	Terrace of 3 two-storey houses with associated bin stores, cycle stores, parking and landscaping following demolition of existing buildings.	<p>No objection with comment.</p> <p>CPC note that there is an Oak tree with TPO in close proximity to the proposed development site. CPC query whether a tree report should be actioned to clarify whether protection is required.</p>
2021/0342	11 Hermitage Close Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0HH	Tree Preservation Order EL:258 - Works to various trees.	<p>John Bamford declared his interest and did not participate in the discussion.</p> <p>Object.</p> <p>One of the trees T5 appears to be dead and an adjacent tree has a major dead limb. The owner of these two trees (14 Rosehill) is aware and arranging for necessary work to be done.</p> <p>The remaining trees are healthy and attractive and make a very important contribution to the street scene. They are coming into leaf. This the wrong time for major work.</p> <p>The applicant refers to adjacent trees behind 12,13 and 14 Hermitage Close and proposes matching the work done to those trees. This work was done poorly and the result has been detrimental to the health of the trees.</p> <p>The work being proposed in this application is excessive and risks causing similar damage especially if the contractor used is equally unsympathetic to the health of the trees.</p> <p>CPC oppose any reduction to the height. We would accept the reduction of the overhang and the raising of the crown provided that final pruning diameters do not exceed 70mm. The trees could benefit from removal of any dead wood.</p>
2021/0471	10 Rythe Close Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 9DD	Single-storey rear extension.	LDC no comment

2021/0338	10 Hermitage Close Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0HH	Tree Preservation Order EL: 258 - Crown reduce 10 x Hornbeam trees by 4m.	<p>John Bamford declared his interest and did not participate in the discussion.</p> <p>Object.</p> <p>The trees are healthy, attractive and make a very important contribution to the street scene.</p> <p>It is not clear exactly what the applicant is asking permission for. The application requests a crown reduction of 4 metres whereas the site plan identifies 9 trees (including 1 behind neighbouring 11 Hermitage Close) "To be lopped", and a large area of overhanging branches "which need to be trimmed back".</p> <p>The lack of clarity in the description of the work and the detrimental effect of the poorly executed work previously done to other hornbeams in the protected group are concerning. The work proposed is excessive and could do serious harm especially if the contractor used is unsympathetic to the health of the trees.</p> <p>The trees are coming into leaf. This is not the time to do major work. We would like to see a more explicit description of the work.</p>
2021/0427	26 Foley Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0ND	Single-storey rear extension, first floor rear extension, roof extension incorporating rear dormer windows and front rooflights, garage conversion into living space, front porch, alterations to fenestration and increase in height of chimney stack.	No objection, no comment
2021/0397	27 Common Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0HG	Single-storey rear/side extension and single-storey front extension.	No objection, no comment
2021/0562	115 Hare Lane Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0QY	Single-storey rear extension, front canopy, pitched roof to replace existing flat roof over	No objection, no comment

		garage and alterations to fenestration and finish following demolition of existing rear projection.	
2021/0525	74 Common Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0HU	Single-storey side and rear extension.	No objection, no comment
2021/0668	16 Oaken Lane Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0RE	Single-storey rear extension, single-storey front infill extension, first-floor front and rear extensions, front dormer window, front and side roof lights and alterations to fenestration.	No objection, with comment CPC query whether, if the planning application is granted, that a clause should be included to ensure that the Juliet Balcony over the flat roof isn't converted to allow change of use to the flat roof ( for example, to a roof garden) without having to request full planning permission first. This would ensure neighbours are protected against any possible future loss of privacy.
2021/0592	24 The Avenue Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0RY	Part two/part single-storey side/rear extension, front extension incorporating integral garage, front porch and hardstanding.	No objection, no comment
2021/0855	Claygate Primary School Foley Road Claygate KT10 0NB	Consultation from Surrey County Council: Construction of single storey building to enclose existing swimming pool and accommodate ancillary swimming pool facilities, community room and plant store and construction of a new external decking area and access footpath. [SCC 2021/0029].	CPC declared their interest as they have agreed to contribute CIL funds towards this development and have already given £5k to support the development. It was noted that CPC aren't consultees on this planning application.  It was unanimously agreed to submit a comment only. CPC would like to note its concern over the hours of use of the pool and the impact on local residents as such.
2021/0598	Claygate Lawn Tennis Club Torrington Close Claygate Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0SB	Installation of 6 x 6.1m LED floodlights.	No objection, no comment
2021/0681	15 Kilnside Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0HS	First-floor front extension.	No objection, no comment
2021/0685	19 Ruxley Ridge Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0HZ	First-floor extension.	No objection, no comment
2021/0719	Braddick House Ruxley Crescent Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0TZ	Single-storey rear/side extension, increase roof ridge height of attached	No objection, no comment

		garage by 1.1m and partial conversion into living space following demolition of existing rear projection.	
2021/0660	Braddick House Ruxley Crescent Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0TZ	Detached single-storey outbuilding.	LDC, no comment
2021/0350	6 Hermitage Close Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0HH	Side and rear dormer windows and front and side roof lights.	LDC, no comment
2021/0658	74 Hare Lane Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0QU	Single-storey rear extension and hip-to-gable roof extension incorporating rear dormer window and front roof lights.	LDC, no comment

**AP109** Full planning application has been submitted for 6 Hermitage Close but the consultation date is before the next Planning Committee meeting on the 22<sup>nd</sup> April. Clerk to request an extension in submitting feedback to EBC.

8. **East Area Sub Committee Meeting report.**  
Nothing to report.
9. **EBC Planning Committee Meeting report**  
Nothing to report.
10. **Licensing Applications in Claygate.**  
Nothing to report.
11. **Compliance issues**  
2014/4954 1 Caerleon Close - No further update at this time.
12. **To review & agree whether a supporting statement will be made to the Alliance of Elmbridge Residents and Civic Forum.**  
The Clerk circulated the feedback from SALC to the committee ahead of the meeting on the subject of supporting organisations such as the Alliance of Elmbridge Residents and Civic Forum. It advised that a Parish Council should demonstrate that at all times it is acting with integrity and without bias to anyone affected by its decisions. A Parish Council should not in any circumstances be political.  

It was **unanimously agreed** that no response from CPC was required to the request for a supporting statement from the Alliance of Elmbridge Residents and Civic Forum.
13. **To review and agree whether the addition of re-consultations should be added to Item 7 on the agenda going forth.**  
Cllr Swift raised whether the focus of the Planning Committee should no longer be small works and refocused on new builds and projects such as the EBC local plan. There was some discussion over whether this was right for Claygate.

**AP110** Cllr Swift to put a proposal for changing the focus of the Planning Committee away from small works within Claygate to focusing on new builds and projects such as the EBC local plan to the Chairman.

**AP110** Clerk to add review of the focus of the Planning Committee to the next Planning Committee meeting on the 22<sup>nd</sup> April.

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

No further updates at this time.

**15. RBK Local Plan & Hook Park Development Status and any action arising.**

No further updates at this time.

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

No further updates at this time.

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

Nothing to note

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

John Bamford updated the Committee on the outcome of the Elmbridge Planning Users Group citing 3 main take outs:-

- Site visits are now very different - Case officers from EBC are solely relying on photos for interior of buildings.
- An amend to the planning alert system is planned for April 2021 – The limit for alert is to be extended beyond 500m rule extended and allow filtering.
- Design codes – The change will allow a lot more flexibility.

The Clerk noted that an Easter Egg tree was to be positioned on The Green from Saturday 27<sup>th</sup> March for 1 month.

**19. Date of the next meeting 22nd April 2021**

**Meeting closed: - 20h57**

**Reserve may be required for the next meeting: -Cllr Sugden**

**Signed:**

**Dated:**

**Appendix A**  
**Report on Planning Applications Decided since the Last Planning Meeting**

**Applications Refused by Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC)**

2019/3204      27 The Roundway Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 ODP

Additional attached two-storey house with increase in vehicular access following demolition of existing garage and porch.

The proposed dwelling would, by reason of its design and siting in relation to the size and shape of the plot, result in a cramped form of development detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and street scene contrary to Policies CS17 & DM2, the Design & Character SPD and the NPPF.

The proposal would fail to provide adequate internal or external space for the future occupiers, thus harm living conditions of future occupiers contrary to Policy DM10, the Design and Character SPD, the NPPF and the Nationally Described Space Standards.

The Officer's report also noted

1. The proposed car parking spaces would fall slightly short of the Parking SPD 2020 that requires car parking spaces to be slightly larger at 5m x 2.5m.
2. The National Design Guide sets out ten characteristics for good design namely: context, identity, built form, movement, nature, public spaces, uses, homes and buildings, resources and lifespan.
3. In comparison with the dismissed appeal application (2006/2933) this scheme reduces the rear garden space from 11.5m to 6.5m and removes the rear dormer window. The inspector on dismissing the appeal raised concerns that the proposed rear garden would be very small at 26m<sup>2</sup> and its awkward shape would severely limit its usefulness. Also, the uncharacteristic narrowing of the building towards the rear would create the impression of a cramped development. The built form and small rear garden space remains the same for this application.

**Other Noteworthy Applications Decided:-**

None

**Appeals Lodged**

None

**Appeals Decided**

2020/2467      2 Foxwarren Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 OLB

Single-storey side and rear extensions and front porch.

Appeal was Dismissed

The Planning Inspector assessed

1. The proposed development would involve a high brick boundary treatment along a large portion of the side boundary fronting the highway that would be a dominant feature to this side elevation harmfully jarring with its secondary character and highly visible in the streetscene. It would also be discordant with the existing modest boundary treatment in this area.
2. The length and height of the proposed extension, even with the stepped plan, would result in a dominant addition relative to the host dwelling, and would harmfully erode the pleasant modest domestic scale and appearance of the existing dwelling
3. It would not result in an extension which is sympathetic to the original house nor in keeping with the character of the local area
4. The proposed development would provide the benefit of increased accommodation to allow a family member to move in. However, in general, **planning is concerned with land use in the public interest.**



2020/1727 Harecroft Raleigh Drive Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 9DE

Detached garage

Appeal was Dismissed

The Planning Inspector assessed

1. That the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on flood risk.
2. The Environment Agency has indicated that the garage would be within 8 metres of a main river. Due to the proposal's proximity to the river, they would be unlikely to grant a flood risk activity permit for the proposal as it would restrict essential maintenance and emergency access to the watercourse. However, the EA's permitting regime sits outside of the planning system and the relevant permit would need to be assessed outside of this appeal.

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