

DRAFT
PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
Held at 8.00pm on Thursday 7th September 2017
Committee Room, Claygate Village Hall

Present: Councillors Geoff Herbert (Chairman), Ken Huddart, John Bamford and Julian Way.

Co-opted: Tom Swift

Members of the Public: None

In attendance: Shirley Round (Parish Clerk & RFO).

1. **Apologies for absence:** Susan Harding

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

Cllr Geoff Herbert Co-ordinator of Neighbourhood Watch, Member of Claygate Flower and Village Show Committee

Cllr John Bamford Chairman of Friends of Capelfield Surgery, Trustee of Friends of Claygate Day Centre, Trustee of CVHA, Bookkeeper at Holy Name Church, Esher,

Cllr Ken Huddart Chairman of Trustees of CVHA, Presidents of CVA and Acting Chairman of the Claygate Conservation Areas Advisory Committee, Traffic Engineering Consultant, Fellow of Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation, Fellow of Institution of Engineering & Technology, Fellow of Institution of Civil Engineers.

Cllr Julian Way Undertakes care work Sans Soucie, Guildford, Member of Kingston Chess Club, Supervisor at Kingston Contact Centre. Trustee Claygate Recreation Ground Trust.

Tom Swift Resident of Hermitage Close

3. **To confirm the Minutes of the last meeting**

The Minutes of the meeting on 17th August 2017 were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

4. **To report on the actioning of items from previous Minutes and agree any further action.**

AP11 Planning Application 2017/1955 36 Rythe Road. Objection withdrawn. **DONE**

5. **To receive Planning correspondence and outstanding results and agree action if necessary**

i) Letter from Planning Department EBC re application no. 2017/1150 Little Squirrels, Ruxley Crescent informing the Parish Council that an appeal has been made to the Secretary of State against the decision of EBC to refuse this application.

ii) Letter from Planning Department EBC re application 2016/2062 retention of existing field shelters to create one structure informing the Parish Council that the application is eligible for public speaking at the East Area Planning Sub-Committee meeting on 4th September 2017.

6. **To discuss and comment on applications decided since the last meeting.**

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

7. Applications from EBC weekly lists including confirmation of comments sent to EBC

W/ending 18th August

- 7.1 2017/2560 Speer House 40-44 The Parade** – Lawful Development Certificate. Whether planning permission 2012/0023 (single storey rear extension and second floor extension (77sqm) has been lawfully implemented.
Claygate Parish Council: No comment. Unanimously agreed.
- 7.2 2017/2294 23 Langbourne Way** – Two-storey side/rear extension, single storey side extension and alternations to fenestration.
Claygate Parish Council: No objection. Unanimously agreed.

W/ending 25th August

- 7.3 2017/2705 106 Foley Road** – single-storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration.
Claygate Parish Council: No objection. Unanimously agreed.
- 7.4 2017/2636 17 Dalmore Avenue** – Lawful Development Certificate. Whether planning permission is required for a proposed rear dormer window.
Claygate Parish Council: Due to lack of sufficient measurements it is not clear to us if this falls within the parameters of an LDC. Unanimously agreed.
- 7.5 2017/2640 11 Foley Road** – Single-storey rear extension.
Claygate Parish Council: No objection. Unanimously agreed.
Cllr Bamford declared an interest and did not take part in the discussion relating to 2017/2690. Although he has no pecuniary interest in this application he is known to the residents of 15 Hermitage Close as they are near neighbours.
- 7.6 2017/2690 15 Hermitage Close** – Lawful Development Certificate: whether planning permission is required for a proposed hip-to-gable to both sides, rear dormer windows and front roof lights.
Claygate Parish Council: No comment. Unanimously agreed.

Cllr Bamford resumed discussion on the following applications.

W/ending 1st September

- 7.7 2017/2754 23 The Avenue** – Two-storey front infill extension, part two/part single storey rear extension, single storey side extension, rear dormer window, conversion of garage into living space and alterations to fenestration.
Claygate Parish Council: No objection. Unanimously agreed.
- 7.8 2017/2544 3 Chadworth Way** – Retrospective application for 2.5m high side fence.
Claygate Parish Council: No objection. Unanimously agreed.
- 7.9 2017/2784 2A Gordon Road** – First floor side and rear extension.
Claygate Parish Council: No objection. We note there is a worthy, protected tree nearby and there is no provision in the plans for protecting this tree. Also note a lack of a construction plan to cater for construction traffic at a busy junction where there is restricted parking.
Unanimously agreed.
- 7.10 2017/2627 129 Hare Lane** – Lawful Development Certificate: whether planning permission is required for a proposed single-storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration.
Claygate Parish Council: No comment. Unanimously agreed.
- 7.11 2017/2387 5 & 6 Sydney Terrace, The Green** – Roof extension incorporating rear dormer window and front roof lights to No 5 and new flat roof terrace and side parapet wall at No 6.
Claygate Parish Council: No objection. Unanimously agreed.
- 7.12 2017/2757 8 Kings Mead Park** – single-storey rear extension.
Claygate Parish Council: No objection. Unanimously agreed.
- 7.13 2017/2681 Emmanuel Hall, 49 Common Road** – Advertising consent: 1 existing non-illuminated fascia sign.
Claygate Parish Council: No objection. Unanimously agreed.

8. To discuss and agree action on Planning Appeal 2016/1567

Cllr Sugden reported on 6th September 2017 that the Planning Inspectorate had issued its decision on the above appeal. The Appeal Decision was circulated to all Councillors. The Planning Inspectorate dismissed the appeal. The appellants could appeal to the High Court for a hearing but not on the decision itself, only if they believe there is a point of planning law that has either been overlooked or misinterpreted by the Inspector. No costs were awarded for or against any party. It will be in the hands of EBC to enforce the decision.

9. To receive a report of the East Area Sub-Committee meeting.

Tom Swift attended the meeting on Monday 4th September together with several Councillors. There was only one item for Claygate 2016/2062 Land south of Common Lane/Ruxley Ridge – Retention of existing field shelters to create one structure.

There was a long debate relating to the retention of the shelters for a sick horse. There were representative speakers both for and against retention. The Elmbridge Borough Councillors were split on whether the shelter should be removed completely or whether it should be given temporary permission. On several occasions legal advice was required to clarify the points being made. Interestingly the main point hinged on the fact that permission for this shelter rested on the fact that the application cannot be personal – it has to be judged on the building not on (in this case) a horse.

The final decision was a recommendation to grant a 9 month temporary approval. The site will need to be returned to its prior condition unless the applicant successfully reapplies at the end of the temporary period. In the event that this reapplication is not successful the applicant will have 2-3 months to return the site to its prior condition.

10. To discuss and comment upon any licensing applications in Claygate.

Nothing to report.

11. To discuss and agree action on any enforcement issues

- i. 23 Woodbourne Drive: It was noted the footpath outside this property has been damaged by heavy machinery brought onto the site.

12. To discuss and agree communication of key decisions to residents

The result of the Planning Enquiry has been placed on the website.

13. Matters for Information Purposes Only.

Tom Swift raised the point that from his own personal experience he has found that Planning regulations vary from borough to borough and do not always follow Government guidelines. This can mean that applications submitted in one borough are not permissible but are granted in a neighbouring one.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee can only act on the basis of Elmbridge Borough Council guidelines and policies.

**14. To confirm the date of the next meeting and attendance of members Planning Committee:
Thursday 28th September 2017 (Apologies received in advance from Cllr Bamford)**

15. Elmbridge East Area Planning Committee:

Monday 25th September 2017 – Tom Swift to attend

The meeting closed at 9.45 pm

Chairman

Date

Appendix A

Planning Applications Decided for weeks ending 18th and 25th August & 1st September

14 Applications were decided.

These included 2 LDCs, 2 Confirmation of Compliance & 1 Variation of Conditions where there is limited scope for Planning Committee to comment or object.

Planning Committee agreed with EBC on 12 out of 14 decisions.

The Applications where we did not agree were:-

2017/1380 11 Oaken Lane

Two-storey front extension, new porch and alterations to fenestration

CPC objected in the belief that the submitted plans differed from a previous one that had been granted permission, but had lapsed.

EBC felt there were no changes to previously submitted plans as did East Area Sub-Committee and therefore granted permission.

2017/1966 Land Southwest Of Arenella, Mountview Road

Detached single storey house with basement, integral garage and new access

CPC did not object.

EBC refused permission on the grounds that the proposal would appear overly prominent and uncharacteristically cramped. Also that it would undermine the perception of openness which is a distinctive characteristic of this side of Mountview Road.

Appeals Lodge and/or Decided since last Planning Committee Meeting

One Appeal was lodged.

2017/1150 Little Squirrels Mountview Road Claygate Esher Surrey KT10 0UD

Retrospective application for front boundary screening (to a maximum of 3.4m high)

The Appellant asserts that the boundary screening does not harm or detract from the character and appearance of the area and quoted from the Officers Report that recommended permission was granted. The Appellant also quoted from NPPG to support his Appeal. He further asserted that the grounds for refusal by Sub-Committee were invalid. It was stated that over 50 plants have now been planted and that they have become established in the ground and are continuing to grow. Pictures of one of these plants were provided. The majority of plants are Jasmines that the Appellant claims can grow to 8 metres in width and between 4 and 8 metres in height.