



Windlesham Parish Council

Joanna Whitfield
Clerk to the Council
Tel: 01276 471675
Email: clerk@windleshampc.gov.uk
Website: www.windleshampc.gov.uk

The Council Offices
The Avenue
Lightwater
Surrey
GU18 5RG

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF WINDLESHAM PARISH COUNCIL'S PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held on Wednesday 12th November 2025 at 11am at All Saints' Church Hall, Broadway Road, Lightwater.

Bagshot Cllrs		Lightwater Cllrs		Windlesham Cllrs	
White	P	Turner	P	Marr	P
Du-Cann	P	Stevens	P		

In attendance: Sarah Wakefield – Assistant Clerk

Cllr Malcaus-Cooper- WPC Lightwater Councillor
36 x Lightwater Residents

Cllr Stevens took the Chair

P - present A – apologies PA – part of meeting - no information

.....

PLAN/25/55	Apologies for absence No apologies.
PLAN/25/56	Declarations of interest Cllr Marr declared a pecuniary in application no. 25/1128/DTC. It was agreed to move this planning application to the end of the agenda to allow Cllr Marr to leave the meeting when this application was discussed. Cllr Marr also declared a non-pecuniary interest in application no. 25/1140/NMA. Although the council have already responded to the application, Cllr Marr wanted to note that the applicant was a member of a working party she chaired. Cllr White declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 5 as she sits on the SHBC Planning Committee.
PLAN/25/57	Public question time The following representations were made by a Lightwater Parish Councillor and tow Lightwater Residents in relation to Item 5 on the agenda:

Cllr Malcaus Cooper:

I'd like to speak on the pre-application for the proposed twenty-metre telecommunications mast described as being "on the Corbett Drive roundabout." However, the plans actually place the mast on the grass verge adjacent to the roundabout, not within the roundabout itself. This distinction is important — because it brings the structure much closer to residential properties, to the footpath used daily by pedestrians, and to a key green space that defines the entrance into the village.

We all recognise the importance of reliable digital connectivity, and the National Planning Policy Framework encourages technological development to address what's often referred to as "gigabyte poverty." However, this application isn't about *whether* we need better coverage, but *where* it is appropriate to put this kind of infrastructure.

The Surrey Heath Local Plan, currently under inspection, supports telecommunications infrastructure *in principle* — but only where it does not harm residential amenity or the character of the settlement. This proposal, in my view, does both.

Lightwater's unique identity is protected by the Lightwater Village Design Statement, which was adopted by Surrey Heath Borough Council in October 2007 as a Supplementary Planning Document. This adopted document is a material planning consideration. Its purpose is clearly stated:

"To protect and enhance the local distinctiveness of Lightwater, in respect of its built environment and landscape, through guiding new development and other changes to the environment."

Several of the Design Principles it contains are directly relevant to this proposal:

- Landscape Principle L1: "*Green and open spaces should be protected from fragmentation or incursion through further development and enhanced wherever possible.*"
- L3: "*Trees, hedges and grass verges play an important role in shaping the character of the street scene and should be protected and incorporated into new development.*"
- Built Environment Principle B1: "*New development should pay regard to the locally distinctive and valued patterns of development — including the scale and shape of buildings, boundary treatments, and landscaping.*"

Placing a twenty-metre metal mast on a grass verge that currently provides openness and greenery at one of the village's main gateways would directly conflict with these principles. The mast would stand approximately three times higher than nearby houses, dominating the skyline and fundamentally altering the character of this approach to the village.

It's also worth remembering that this parcel of land was once subject to a Charles Church covenant, intended to preserve it as amenity space for residents. While that covenant has since expired, the principle remains clear — this land was designed to remain open and undeveloped. Installing a tall industrial structure here would contradict that original intent and the community's long-standing expectations.

From a policy standpoint, the proposal also conflicts with Policy G4 – Design Principles of the Surrey Heath Local Plan, which requires that "the scale, mass and character of development be compatible with adjoining development and the surrounding area," and specifically warns against forms that are *incongruous in height or character*.

It equally fails to meet Core Policy 4 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy, which requires that all new development “*respect local distinctiveness and contribute towards the protection and enhancement of the valued character of the Borough.*”

This mast would do neither.

I would also note that there appears to have been no meaningful consultation with residents or the Parish Council at this stage. While the operator may not be obliged to consult widely at the pre-application phase, early engagement and transparency are always best practice, particularly for proposals of this scale and visual impact.

Finally, colleagues, there’s the issue of precedent. If this location is accepted, it opens the door to further applications for masts in equally sensitive or inappropriate locations, leading to cumulative harm and the gradual erosion of Lightwater’s rural and residential character.

In conclusion, Chair, while none of us dispute the need for improved telecommunications coverage, this proposal — and this location — are not appropriate. It conflicts with the Lightwater Village Design Statement (adopted 2007), Policy G4 of the Local Plan, and Core Policy 4 of the Core Strategy, and would result in demonstrable harm to the local environment and visual amenity.

I would therefore recommend that this Committee, as a statutory consultee, formally object to the proposal and request that alternative, less intrusive sites be explored — ideally using existing structures or more appropriate settings outside this sensitive residential and landscaped area.

Lightwater Resident 1:

A Lightwater resident stated his surprise to receive the letter regarding the siting of the mast due to the fact a previous application for a smaller 12 metre mast had been rejected in 2006, rejected on the grounds of height and proximity to properties. He noted that under current planning regulations, masts under 20 metres are now permitted development, although he did read that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) can object on grounds of siting and suitability.

He noted that only a small number of residents were initially informed, leaving many in the area unaware. Consequently, a few residents took the initiative to distribute flyers and organise a petition, which gathered 242 signatures. It is likely that the number of signatures could have doubled if an additional three days had been available for petitioning.

He also noted his objection are based on similar grounds to those raised by Cllr Malcaus Cooper, focusing on:

- Siting and Appearance: The proposed mast would be located on a prominent green space, reducing visual amenity enjoyed by residents. It is twice the height of nearby properties, 7 metres higher than nearest highest tree and the associated 6 cabinets (up to 2 metres high) would create visual clutter.
- Noise Impact: Low-intensity noise pollution from the equipment.
- Alternative Sites: What other sites have been considered? Why could it not be sited on the other side of Red Road? Why is the existing site not suitable?
- Protection of Green Spaces: The site is a valued green space. When it was transferred to the council (SHBC), it was subject to a covenant lasting 21

	<p>years, which expired in 2016. Despite this, residents continue to appeal to the council to maintain these areas and preserve Lightwater's character. There is concern that allowing development here could set a precedent for future masts.</p> <p><u>Lightwater Resident 2:</u></p> <p>The resident stated that he does not believe the developer is being honest about the reasons for re-siting the mast, and asked, what is the actual reason? He believes there is no physical or technical reason why a taller mast cannot be sited at the existing site on Red Road. He stated that when the formal application is submitted to SHBC, the developer must be required to clearly state the reasons for re-siting.</p> <p>Cllr Stevens thanked the members of the public for attending the meeting and for their contributions. He said that members would discuss a Parish Council response to the consultation during Item 5.</p> <p>Cllr White advised continuing with the petition to demonstrate the strength of opposition. It noted that it should be sent to both M Group and to SHBC.</p>
PLAN/25/58	<p>Exclusion of the press and public</p> <p>No Exclusions to the press and public.</p>
PLAN/25/59	<p>To consider the Consultation - Ee Ltd And Hutchison 3g Ltd Proposed Shared Replacement Electronic Communications Apparatus At Corbett Drive Roundabout, Corbett Drive, Lightwater, Surrey, GU18 5LA (ngr: 491815, 161388) – replacing site 71648 “Red Road (B311)” Members are to note that all documentation has been circulated and comments requested to ensure the deadline is met.</p> <p>Members unanimously resolved to respond to the consultation delegating authority to the Clerk in conjunction with Cllr Stevens to draft a response to include the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justification for Relocation: What is the rationale behind moving away from the Red Road site. Why is the current location no longer suitable? • Proposed Location Concerns: The suggested site appears inappropriate, being situated within a residential area. Why was this location chosen over less intrusive alternatives? For example, its siting along a trunk road would be more appropriate. • Consideration of Alternatives: Have alternative sites been explored? If so, please provide details of those sites and the reasons they were deemed unsuitable. • Community Representation: There is a clear strength of feeling among residents, evidenced by their petition. Their views must be fully considered. The petition, with 242 signatories, should carry significant weight in decision-making. • Impact on Service: The proposal appears to primarily benefit EE customers (and possibly 3G users). Please explain how this change will improve overall mobile coverage. • Previous Decisions and Planning Context: Previous rulings on similar applications should be taken into account. Please provide clarity on how this proposal aligns with planning policy and past decisions.

	It was also agreed to attach the public questions raised during the meeting to the letter.
PLAN/25/60	To consider planning applications and planning appeals received prior to this meeting:

	Bagshot Applications		
25/1064/DTC	<p>175 London Road, Bagshot, Surrey, GU19 5DH Submission of details pursuant to condition 23 (updated single bat emergence, great crested newt and reptile surveys) of planning permission 19/0695/FFU [granted on appeal 3284097 for the demolish existing dwelling and outbuilding and erect a two storey building with accommodation in the roof to provide 2 two bedroom and 2 four bedroom (duplex) apartments, a two storey three bedroom house and two pairs of semi detached two storey four bedroom houses with accommodation in the roofs with associated garages/car parking, revised access onto London Road and landscaping].</p> <p>Members noted the Planning Committee had already responded to this application, however encouraged SHBC to consider subsequent recommendations from Surrey Wildlife Trust for further measures to meet the requirements of condition 23.</p>	Details to comply	27 th November 2025
	Lightwater Applications		
25/1147/FFU	<p>53 Curley Hill Road, Lightwater, Surrey, GU18 5YH Installation of a juliette balcony to rear, sedum roof, and roof lights to front dormer with fenestration changes.</p> <p>No Objection</p>	FPA	28 th November 2025
	Windlesham Applications		
25/1137/FFU	<p>Oakwood, Chertsey Road, Windlesham, Surrey, GU20 6HY Erection of an earth-sheltered structure following demolition of existing pool house and swimming pool.</p> <p>Objection for the following reasons: A related application, to which WPC objected, was recently refused on 2 October 2025 (25/0951/FFU). This application differs from the previous one in that it excludes the provision of two padel courts and</p>	FPA	27 th November 2025

	<p>hardstanding. In our view, the revised proposal would still constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt with no “very special circumstances”.</p> <p><u>Extension of main dwelling:</u> The applicant maintains that the games room should be treated as an extension of the main dwelling itself (CI 5.6 of the Planning Statement). However, in the Officer’s Report (CI 6.4.4) for the previous application 25/0951/FFU, the officer explicitly states that as the pool house/pool are located approximately 45m from the main dwelling with substantial landscaping in between, “for the purposes of the assessment on the Green Belt, it would not be considered adjunct to the main dwelling”. Therefore, the exemption for alterations/extensions which do not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building (s154(c) NPPF 2024) does not apply. WPC made this point in their objection to application 25/0951/FFU and maintain this view.</p> <p><u>Extension of pool area:</u> If the proposals are to be treated as an extension or alteration to the current pool area (as opposed to the main house itself), in our view they constitute a disproportionate addition and therefore do not qualify for exemption. The Planning Statement states (cl 5.4) that the pool room (to be demolished) has a modest GIA of 44m² and a volume of 250m³. The dimensions of the proposed new Play Zone are considerably larger, namely a GIA of 346m² and a volume of 1384m³.</p> <p>It is also stated in the Planning Statement (CI 5.4) that the applicant has recently applied to extend the pool house by up to 30%, although this application does not yet appear on SHBC’s planning portal. This seems to contradict this application to demolish the pool house. We request that SHBC clarify the applicant’s intentions in this respect.</p> <p><u>Replacement of buildings:</u> The exemption for the replacement of buildings does not seem to apply as the new buildings will be for a different use and, as noted above, materially larger than the ones being replaced (s154(d) NPPF 2024).</p> <p><u>Engineering operations:</u> The Officer’s report and the decision for the previous application (25/0951/FFU), state that the exemption for engineering operation (s154(h)(ii) NPPF 2024) cannot be relied on due to the spatial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Although the proposal has been modified, significant elements of it remain, in particular the</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>substantial semi-subterranean building, new slopes and retaining walls.</p> <p>Drainage: As noted in the decision for application 25/0951/FFU, a drainage scheme is required to demonstrate that the development would not result in flooding.</p> <p>Condition regarding use: If approved, a condition should be applied to ensure that the structure is not used as separate residential accommodation. At no time should it be sold, sub-let or rented out independently of the main dwelling or used commercially.</p>		
25/1138/ADV	<p>Heathpark Wood, Heathpark Drive, Windlesham, Surrey</p> <p>Installation of 2 No. Monolith Signs (large), 8 No. Monolith Signs (small), 4 No. Rigid Flags, 3 No. Two Post Mounted Leader boards, 1 No. Gable Mounted Sign (to be located to southern elevation of Community Building to be used as Sales Centre on a temporary basis), 2 No. Two Post Mounted Site Plan Signs, Dimensions and 1 No. Wall Mounted Plaque sign (to front elevation of show home at Plot 116).</p> <p>No Objection with the following Comment: It is understood that the signs will be displayed for a temporary period and are required for a maximum of 3 years. Members request that this is conditioned and that all the signs will be non-illuminated.</p>	Advert	28 th November 2025
25/0957/ADV	<p>Windlesham South Service Station, London Road, Windlesham, Surrey, GU20 6PJ</p> <p>Application for advertisement consent for the erection of two illuminated small format digital display units.</p> <p>Appeal Ref: APP/D3640/H/25/3374981</p> <p>It is unclear why the appellant is appealing as the application was approved. It is possible that the appeal relates to one or more of the conditions. Members understand that WPC's original objection will be forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate and have no further comments.</p>	Appeal	4 th December 2025
25/1120/FFU	<p>Oaklands, Snows Paddock, Windlesham, Surrey, GU20 6LH</p> <p>Erection of ground floor infill extension, ground floor side/rear extension and conversion of loft to habitable accommodation with addition of dormers and roof lights.</p> <p>Objection for the following reasons:</p>	FPA	3 rd December 2025

	<p>Members are concerned that the proposed development may affect a neighbouring property, Timbertops, due to its proximity to the boundary, and request that SHBC take this into consideration.</p> <p>They also ask that SHBC assess whether the additional built form at first-floor level could have an adverse impact on Timbertops' right to light. The plans include new windows facing Timbertops at ground-floor level and within the proposed loft accommodation, including a dormer.</p> <p>It is further noted that a neighbour has submitted an objection to the application.</p>		
25/1140/NMA	<p>The Ferns, Woodlands Lane, Windlesham, Surrey, GU20 6AS Application under s96a for a non material amendment to application ref.23/0486/FFU granted at appeal ref.APP/D3640/W/24/3341569) 25 November 2024, to allow for a change to the wording of condition 3.</p> <p>This application was approved on 30 October 2025. It alters the trigger for condition 3, permitting some works to commence whilst the drainage solutions are finalised.</p> <p><i>Cllr Marr left the meeting at 11:58</i></p>	NMA	
25/1128/DTC	<p>Pound Meadow, Pound Lane, Windlesham, Surrey, GU20 6BP Submission of details to comply with condition 6 (air brick) attached to planning permission 25/0649/LLB for the Listed Building Consent for repairs to the structural timber frame of the listed building.</p> <p>No Objection</p>	Details to Comply	

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 11:59