

**These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.**

Elmbridge Borough Council

South Area Planning Sub-Committee

Report of a meeting held on 20 May 2019

Members of the Committee:

- \* Mrs. D.M. Mitchell (Chairman)
- \* B.J.F. Cheyne (Vice-Chairman)

*	J.W. Browne	*	D.J. Lewis
*	Mrs. H.C. Butler	*	Mrs. V. Macleod
*	O.T. Chappell	*	Mrs. C. Sood
*	P.M. Harman	*	A. Tilling

\* Denotes attendance

1/19 Appointment of Chairman and Vice-Chairman

The Sub-Committee appointed Mrs. D.M. Mitchell and B.J.F. Cheyne as Chairman and Vice-Chairman respectively, for the Municipal Year 2019/20.

2/19 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

Matters of report to the Planning Committee

3/19 Planning Applications

(Link to Council Priorities: P6)

RESOLVED that the applications set out below be determined as indicated, in accordance with authority delegated to the Sub-Committee:

(a) 2018/2316 - Land Northeast of 70 to 79 Berkeley Court, Weybridge

One late letter of objection and seven additional letters of support had been received.

The Sub-Committee was addressed by Mr. J. Pullinger, an objector and Mr. R. Hutton, the agent.

Permit with the conditions and informatives as outlined in the agenda, subject to the receipt of a satisfactory legal agreement securing the financial contribution in relation to affordable housing within within three months of the Sub-Committee's resolution.

**These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.**

In addition, the Sub-Committee agreed that should a satisfactory legal agreement not be completed within three months of the Sub-Committee's resolution, delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning Services to refuse the application for the following reason:

**1. In the absence of a completed legal agreement, the proposed development fails to secure the necessary contribution towards the affordable housing contrary to the requirements of Policy CS21 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and the Developer Contributions SPD 2012.**

- (b) 2018/3358 - Land adjacent to 21/21A Castleview Road, Weybridge

This planning application was withdrawn by the Planning Officers prior to the commencement of the meeting and was not considered at the meeting. The planning application was to be considered at a future meeting of the Sub-Committee.

- (c) 2019/0312 - 154 Portsmouth Road, Cobham

Three late letters of objection had been received.

The Sub-Committee was addressed by Mr. D. Bellchamber, an objector and Mr. A. Mahendru, the applicant.

The Sub-Committee, having reviewed the relevant material considerations, concluded that due to its appearance, specifically the large display windows, the increased size of the building and the external materials used, the development would be out of keeping with the surrounding area and detrimental to the visual amenities of the existing street scene. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee resolved to

Refuse permission, contrary to the Officer's recommendation for the following reason

**1. Due to its appearance, particularly the large display windows, the increased size of the building and the external materials used, the proposed development would be out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area and detrimental to the visual amenities of the existing street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.**

**These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.**

(d) 2019/0386 - St Catherines, Thames Street, Weybridge

One late letter of objection had been received.

The Sub-Committee was addressed by Mr. N. Shattock, an objector and Mr. R. Harper the agent.

The Sub-Committee, having reviewed the relevant material considerations concluded that the development, due to its height and massing would have a harmful impact on the character of the area. In addition, due to the loss of good quality trees and existing soft landscaping, the proposal would fail to enhance the existing landscape. Finally, due to the lack of turning point within the rear parking area there is a need to reverse from the parking spaces to the under-croft access road, resulting in hazardous manoeuvring in order to leave the site in forward gear. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee resolved to

Refuse permission, contrary to the Officer's recommendation, for the following reasons

**1. Due to its height and massing, the proposed development would be out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.**

**2. The layout of the access and parking area would result in hazardous manoeuvring due to the lack of turning point within the proposed rear parking area which would result in a need to reverse from the parking spaces to the under-croft access road in order to leave the site in forward gear. As such, the proposal is contrary to the requirements of Policy DM7 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.**

**3. Due to the loss of trees and green spaces around the building, which are considered to provide high landscape contribution towards the character of the area, the proposal fails to enhance and integrate into its surroundings. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM6 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015.**

[Subsequent to the meeting it was identified that as the original recommendation included a reason for refusal in connection with the lack of legal agreement securing the affordable housing as this had not been considered as part of the resolution to refuse the proposal, this application was to be referred back to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee for further consideration.]

