

ROYAL BOROUGH OF KINGSTON UPON THAMES

SURBITON NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE

20 MARCH 2019

7:30 pm – 11:25 pm

Alexandra Ward	Councillor Mark Beynon Councillor Sam Foulder-Hughes Councillor Sharron Falchikov-Sumner
Berrylands Ward	Councillor Sushila Abraham (Chair) Councillor Anita Schaper Councillor John Sweeney
St Mark's Ward	Councillor Liz Green Councillor Diane White Councillor Yogan Yoganathan
Surbiton Hill Ward	Councillor Hilary Gander Councillor Alison Holt Councillor Malcolm Self (Vice-Chair)

Absent

PETITION - PARKING IN ST ANDREW'S SQUARE

Mr Alexander Ross presented a petition requesting a review of parking in St Andrew's Square to see if the current situation could be improved. This was supported by 52 signatures, 71% of the 73 responses.

The petition was accepted for report to a future meeting.

49. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 January 2019 were confirmed as a correct record.

50. NEIGHBOURHOOD MANAGER'S REPORT

The Committee welcomed James Geach in his new role as Neighbourhood Manager. James introduced Nguyen Hoang a new Neighbourhood Ranger and Sergeant George Alloway from the local Police team.

The Committee were updated on a number of local issues and upcoming events, in particular the range of events around the National Keep Britain Clean Week.

51. BROWN'S ROAD TMO REPORT AND CONSULTATION IN ALPHA ROAD AREA Appendix A

At the meeting on 6 November 2019 it was agreed to implement a permit parking scheme in Brown's Road, Warwick Grove, South Place, Mayberry Place and King Charles Crescent between 11:00 – 14:00, Monday to Friday.

As only 2 responses had been received supporting a Permit Parking Area (PPA) scheme in Alpha Road, Britannia Road and Middle Green Close, these roads were excluded.

In the consultation in January 2019 on the Traffic Management Order (TMO) to introduce this scheme 10 objections were received, mainly from Alpha Road residents, not opposing the scheme but raising concerns on the likely overspill of vehicles from the PPA.

Residents of Alpha Road, Britannia Road and Middle Green Close were then consulted on the possible extension of the PPA into their roads. Of the 21 responses from these roads 15 - 14 from Alpha Road - supported an extension.

In the light of responses to the consultation the recommendation was to implement the PPA with the inclusion of Alpha Road in September 2019. A further TMO will be published to bring this into effect.

Points raised by Committee concerned the response rate from consultations and the fact that when the TMO was published the differential charges for parking permits, based on emission rates, introduced in the February Budget had not been agreed. Residents were therefore responding on the basis of a flat £90 permit charge. Residents' comments concerned whether the PPA would make a difference to the majority in the area, the influence the change in permit charges might have, whether going back to consult again had been helpful. Wider points on the absence of on street charging points, more cycle lanes support of businesses to provide facilities to encourage cycling to work were raised. On this point reference was made to the debate to be held at the April Council impacts of climate change.

On the implementation of the proposed PPA it was felt that residents should be advised of the proposals to move to a permit charging scale based on emissions and requested whether or not they wished to proceed.

Resolved that

1. the objections received in response to the publication of the TMO for the Browns Road area and officer's responses, as set out in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the report, are noted;
2. in view of the proposal to move to a system of charging for parking permits based on vehicle emission levels, rather than a flat charge of £90p.a, as agreed as part of the Budget for 2019/20, residents of the Browns Road area be advised of the proposed charging scale, and pending views received on this, no action be taken on the implementation of the TMO;
3. the results of the PPA consultation in Alpha Road Britannia Road and Middle Green Close are noted and residents are consulted on a TMO for a Permit

Parking area in these roads on the same basis as the Browns Rd area (Mon-Fri 11am -2pm) the consultation to include details of the proposed emissions based charging scale for permits, subject to legal advice on the appropriate form, this to be within the TMO consultation process or by a separate letter;

4. a further report is considered on the responses from residents in the two areas on permit parking and emission based charging for permits.

For Councillors Sushila Abraham, Mark Beynon, Hilary Gander, Liz Green, Alison Holt, Anita Schaper, Malcolm Self, Sharron Falchikov-Sumner, John Sweeney, Yogan Yoganathan and Diane White.

Abstained Councillor Sam Foulder-Hughes

52. CONSULTATION ON PARKING SCHEMES IN BEACONSFIELD ROAD Appendix B

A petition was presented at the 6 November 2018 meeting requesting consultation on the introduction of a permit parking area to address parking problems in the Beaconsfield Road area.

To gain an understanding of the on-street parking conditions, Parking Beat Surveys have been carried out in this area. These indicate that non-residents parking between 9:00am and 1:00pm does create a problem for residents in Beaconsfield, Hollyfield and Birchington roads, however there is still limited capacity available. Gordon Road has limited capacity but is busier outside daytime hours. Broomfield Road has some capacity between 1:00pm and 5:00pm and on one side of the road many properties have on street parking. Derby Road is less affected by on-street parking overall.

Residents presented a range of views – Beaconsfield is particularly affected by commuters and commercial vehicle parking and in the evening by the King Charles Centre. Residents also consider the introduction of permit parking in Browns Rd will worsen the situation. Other residents accepted there was a problem in Beaconsfield Road - there is little scope for off street parking - but were not sure that a controlled parking area was helpful and felt that any decision needed to reflect the needs of the majority.

A majority of members considered that there should be consultation in the area to find out what all residents perceptions are. A resident asked that a consultation document give as much information as possible covering permit costs and aspects of controlled parking - ie it is not a 'magic bullet'. It was agreed that Berrylands and Surbiton Hill Councillors would see the consultation document.

Resolved that

1. the results of the Parking Beat, set out in Annex 1 of the report, are noted;
2. residents are consulted on their perception of the parking situation in the road and whether they feel that a permit parking system would improve the situation

For Councillors Mark Beynon, Hilary Gander, Liz Green, Alison Holt, Sam Foulder-Hughes, Anita Schaper, Malcolm Self, Sharron Falchikov-Sumner, Yogan Yoganathan and Diane White.

Against Councillor John Sweeney

Note Councillor Sushila Abraham declared a personal interest in this item and left the room whilst it was discussed.

Reason In a professional capacity she has had dealings with one of the people who has submitted views and may be speaking on the item'

53. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Appendix C

A summary of the reasons for granting planning permission and of any relevant development plan policies is included in the report of the Assistant Director of Strategic Planning & Infrastructure on each application where permission is recommended. Permitted applications are subject to the conditions, legal agreements and informatives set out in the report and late material together with any other details on late responses to consultations or comments received since the agenda was printed, revised drawings circulated at the meeting and any recommendations, additional conditions and informatives set out below.

The application on 29 Lovelace Road, Surbiton, KT6 6NS was withdrawn.

Resolved that the following applications are permitted, deferred or refused as indicated.

53/1 36 VILLIERS AVENUE, SURBITON KT5 8BD

Demolition of existing dwellinghouse and erection of new 3 storey residential building with x 6 flats and associated bins and cycle store.

Speakers on the application

Objector	Applicant
Mr I Sedgley	Mr R Patel
	on behalf of the
Mr I Cochrane	applicant

Having considered the report and the contributions from the speakers the Committee agreed that the bin store facilities could be improved and set back further from the boundary and the detailing and scale of the windows enhanced. A concern was also raised that the rooftop space may also be a habitat for bats and an informative will be added to cover requirements if bats are discovered in the course of the site development

Permit subject to the following amended and additional conditions and Informative

Amended condition

4. Prior to occupation the following details shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter permanently retained.
 - (a) refuse storage facilities in accordance with the requirements of the Residential Design SPD, 2013 (including their location, manufacturer's specification, dimensions, colour and texture).

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance on completion of the development in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

Additional condition

15. Prior to above ground works detailed architectural drawings at the scale of 1:10/1:20 shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to show:
 - Window reveals, door reveals, overhangs, rainwater goods, balconies.The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance on completion of the development in accordance with Policy DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments including House Extensions) of the LDF Core Strategy Adopted April 2012.

Informative

1. The applicant is advised that should protected species be found as a result of future development he/she must fulfil his/her duties under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations, 2010

Voting:

For: Councillors Sushila Abraham, Mark Beynon, Hilary Gander, Liz Green, Alison Holt, Sam Foulder-Hughes, Anita Schaper, Malcolm Self, Sharron Falchikov-Sumner and John Sweeney.

Against: Councillor Yogan Yoganathan.

Abstained: Councillor Diane White.

53/2 63 WESTFIELD ROAD, SURBITON KT6 4EJ

Erection of single storey rear extension, enclosure of front porch, rear dormer roof extension and installation of one front rooflight to facilitate loft conversion.

Mr C Revill spoke as an objector to the application.

Having considered the report and the points made by the speaker, some of the issues fell within building control regulations and whilst this is a large extension, the plans do meet national requirements. The Committee considered there were no grounds for refusal.

Permit

Voting

For Councillors Sushila Abraham, Mark Beynon, Liz Green, Hilary Gander, Alison Holt, Anita Schaper, Malcolm Self, Sharron Falchikov-Sumner, John Sweeney and Yogan Yoganathan.

Against Councillor Sam Foulder-Hughes

Abstained: Councillor Diane White.

Note Councillor White declared a personal interest as she knows several of the objectors.

54. ENFORCEMENT ACTION: 48 MAPLE ROAD, SURBITON, KT6 4AE Appendix D

The breach of planning control was the replacement of 22 of the original timber windows with upvc windows. A retrospective planning application was refused in April 2017 and the appeal against the refusal was dismissed in March 2018.

Nos 48 Maple Road is a building of Townscape Merit (locally listed) within the St. Andrews Square Conservation Area Nos 48 and 50 are a pair of semi detached properties part of six similar victorian villas on this section of Maple Road which have the same architectural details and appearance. The majority of the windows of the front and rear elevations of the adjacent properties are traditional timber sash. The front bay windows are prominent features when viewed from the street.

In dismissing the appeal the Inspector commented that whilst an attempt had been made to replicate the profile and detail of the original timber sash windows the glazing bars appear thicker and starker than timber when viewed from the street and the detailing is not as fine as their timber equivalents

Whilst there are other examples of unpermitted uPVC windows within the conservation area, these have become immune to enforcement action due to the '4 year rule and serve to highlight the impact on the Conservation Area.

The owner had agreed to replace all 22 of the windows in 2 phases via the enforcement process within 22 months.

Authority was sought to issue enforcement notices requiring the removal of the upvc windows and frames and replacement with windows and frames that match the profile, design and materials of the pre-existing windows.

Marian Kelly, representing the owner, referred to the letter circulated to the Committee from the owner. In this she explained the circumstances which had led her to believe that it was not an error to replace the windows, including not having a notification of the building being listed as of Townscape Merit. The letter also referred to a property, similarly listed, and in a Conservation Area where upvc replacement had been permitted.

Ms Kelly referred to the replacement of some windows at the front of the adjoining no 50 with upvc, and all of the windows at the rear. These date from 2012 and so are immune from any enforcement action.

The Planning Officer referred to national regulations and the duty to preserve the Conservation Area. In a similar case last year the Committee had agreed enforcement action.

The Committee were of mixed opinions on the proposed action. Some felt that better detailing could have been achieved within the style of the upvc windows and supported the enforcement on the windows on the frontage but not the rear. A motion to take enforcement action on the front windows only was moved and seconded.

An amendment not to enforce was moved and seconded.

The amendment was carried 6:5.

The substantive motion was carried 6:5.

Resolved that no enforcement action is taken

Voting

For Councillors Mark Beynon, Liz Green, Sam Foulder-Hughes, Sharron Falchikov-Sumner, John Sweeney and Yogan Yoganathan.

Against: Councillors Sushila Abraham, Hilary Gander, Alison Holt, Malcolm Self, and Diane White

Not Voting Councillor Anita Schaper, who had been out of the room for a short time, not having heard all the discussion was unable to vote, as this is a regulatory decision.

55. COMMUNITY GRANTS PROGRAMME

Appendix E

The sources of funding available in 2019/20 were detailed and the Committee was asked to agree its arrangements for the allocation of grants. Funding is available from:

- **Neighbourhood Community grants** (maximum £3,000 per application) - £20,000 per Neighbourhood for projects/activities/services to benefit communities. Guidance is set out at Annex 1.
- **Borough-wide Community Grants** (maximum £3,000 per application) - £20,000 across the Borough – applications must be for activities available to people across the Borough. Guidance is set out in Annex 1.
- **Councillor Ward Funding** - £2,000 per Councillor – Guidance is set out in Annex 2. The options proposed are
 - i. retaining the existing Councillor Ward Funding scheme.
 - ii. pooling the Neighbourhood's entire Councillor Ward Funding budget so that it can be allocated as additional funding for Neighbourhood Community Grants.
 - iii. pooling the Neighbourhood's Councillor Ward Funding budget so that it can be allocated to larger versions of the type of projects currently supported by Councillor Ward Funding
- **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)** – this is a charge on new development in the Borough, which must be spent on infrastructure needed to support development, such as, transport, social and green infrastructure. The amount available in each Neighbourhood is based on the amount of development in the Neighbourhood area. It is not available year on year. As at February 2019, Surbiton's CIL is £75,901. Guidance is set out at Annex 3.

Discussion centred mainly on the options for pooling the Councillor Ward Funding budget. There were differing views on options ii and iii. It was felt that option iii could limit flexibility on awarding small amounts. A separate vote was taken on this and on whether or not a cap should be applied to the amount of CIL funding groups can apply for per project each year due to the allocation being limited.

Resolved that

1. the Neighbourhood Community Grants budget, as set out in Key Point B, is noted, the Committee will be asked to review applications and agree allocations for these grants throughout the year until the fund has been exhausted;
2. the Borough-wide Community Grants budget as set out in Key Point C; is noted
3. the Neighbourhood's entire Councillor Ward Funding budget is pooled so that it can be allocated to larger versions of the type of projects that are currently supported by Councillor Ward Funding, given the larger value these allocations will be subject to these projects being reported to the Committee for approval.;
4. the opportunities available for further grant funding and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts, as set out in paragraphs 10-21 of the report, are noted and the Committee will be asked to consider any future bids that are made for these funds; and

5. no cap is applied to the amount of CIL funding that can be allocated to individual projects each year as set out in paragraph 14.

Voting

Recommendations 1, 2 and 4 – Unanimous

Recommendation 3

For Councillors Sushila Abraham, Liz Green, Hilary Gander, Alison Holt, Sam Foulder-Hughes, Anita Schaper, Malcolm Self, John Sweeney, Yogan Yoganathan and Diane White.

Against Councillors Mark Beynon and Sharron Falchikov-Sumner

Recommendation 5

For Councillors Sushila Abraham, Mark Beynon, Liz Green, Alison Holt, Anita Schaper, Malcolm Self, Sharron Falchikov-Sumner. John Sweeney, Yogan Yoganathan and Diane White.

Against Councillor Sam Foulder-Hughes

Abstained Councillor Hilary Gander

56. NEIGHBOURHOOD WORKING ARRANGEMENTS

Appendix F

A review of the Council's governance in Summer/Autumn 2018 led to the adoption at the December Council meeting of a range of changes to and the adoption of a range of changes in governance arrangements. These included changes to the role of and functions of Neighbourhood Committees giving scope for changes to working arrangements. The Committee discussed

- Whether or not to appoint a Sub Committee to consider planning and related issues
- The membership of the sub committee
- Whether or not to introduce a guillotine and at what time. The guillotine would not apply to Planning Sub Committees.

10 Neighbourhood meetings have been programmed for 19/20 which would give the ability to separate Planning applications from other business. The views of the Committee were that it was preferable to continue with a mix of business, the increased number of meetings gives scope for smoother programming of items and potentially shorter meetings. A guillotine to end meetings at 10:30 could therefore be introduced, some guidelines on how this would operate would need to be in place.

Resolved that

1. the 10 meetings programmed for 2019/20 continue to cover a mix of neighbourhood business and planning applications;
2. a 10:30 pm 'guillotine' to be applied to meetings of the Committee (subject to the ability of the Committee to waive the guillotine by resolution when necessary)

Voting

For Councillors Sushila Abraham, Liz Green, Alison Holt, Malcolm Self, and Diane White.

Against Councillors Mark Beynon, Hilary Gander, Anita Schaper, Sharron Falchikov-Sumner and John Sweeney.

Abstained Councillor Yogan Yoganathan

Signed.....Date.....
Chair