

**Runnymede Borough Council****PLANNING COMMITTEE****22 June 2005 at 7.30 p.m.**

Members of the Committee present: Councillors J.M. Edwards (Chairman), D.W. Parr (Vice-Chairman), J. Broadhead, J.B. Dean, J.R. Furey, Mrs Y.P. Lay, H.W.V. Meares, Mrs J. Norman, R. Pate, B.J. Relph, Mrs M. Roberts, A.P. Tollett, J.R. Whiteley and G.B. Woodger

Members of the Committee absent: Councillor J.R. Ashmore.

113. **NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

The Group mentioned below had notified the Chief Executive Officer of their wish that the change listed below be made to the membership of the Committee. Then change was for a fixed period ending on the day after the meeting and thereafter the Councillor removed would be reappointed.

Group requesting Change	Remove from Membership	Appoint Instead
Conservative	Councillor Mrs F.M. Angell	Councillor Mrs Y. Lay

The Chief Executive Officer had given effect to these wishes in accordance with Section 16(2) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.

114. **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 25 May 2005 were approved and signed as a correct record.

115. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following interest was made under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members by the Councillor shown.

Councillor	Item	Nature of Interest
A.P. Tollett	22 Hamm Moor Lane, Addlestone (RU 05/0440)	Personal - friend of owner of nearby business.

116. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The planning applications listed below were considered by the Committee. All representations received on the applications were reported and copies were made available for inspection by Members before the meeting. Members of the public and applicants or agents spoke on the applications identified below.

**RESOLVED that -**

**the following applications be determined as indicated and any permission granted be subject to the conditions authorised.**

<u>APP. NO.</u>	<u>LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION</u>
RU 04/1050	<p><b>Wapshott Road, Bowes Road and Cornwall Way, Egham</b>  <b>Erection of 173 dwellings and one office on 10 sites around the estate (mixture of one, two, three and four bed flats and houses in 2 and 3 storey blocks) with associated access and parking and works to adjoining highways following the demolition of 108 dwellings (Transport Assessment included).</b></p> <p><b>DECISION: Subject to confirmation from the Secretary of State that he does not wish to call-in the application under the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 and subject to suitable arrangements being made to secure:</b></p> <p><b>(i) The payment of an index linked financial contribution up to the ceiling of £135,000 within the first 6 months of implementation of any part of the development, towards the consultation, design and implementation of appropriate traffic management measures on St Paul's Road, Wapshott Road and surrounding road network within the Wapshott Estate.</b></p> <p><b>(2) The dedication of land as public highway in the Wapshott Road front of Site K, in accordance with approved plans to be submitted to and approved by or on behalf of the Planning Authority.</b></p> <p><b>The Director of Technical Services be authorised to GRANT permission following consultation where appropriate with the Chairman or in his absence the Vice-Chairman of the Committee, subject to conditions.</b></p>
RU 05/0412	<p><b>Abbey Chase Nursing Home, Abbey Chase, Bridge Road, Chertsey</b>  <b>Construction of a mansard style roof extension to provide 25 bedrooms and associated facilities, together with realignment of access and flood plain compensation storage.</b></p> <p><b>DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:-</b></p> <p><b>1. The proposed extension by reason of the increased floor area, height and bulk above that of the existing building and the proposed raising of the levels of the existing access road would constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt and be detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt, and contrary to Guidance contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts (January 1995) and Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policy</b></p>

**GB1 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan  
Second Alteration April 2001.**

2. **The Planning Authority do not consider that very special circumstances have been put forward in support of the application to justify a departure to the Development Plan and the subsequent granting of planning permission, contrary to advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts (January 1995), and Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policy GB1 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**
3. **The proposed extension by reason of the increased floor area, height and bulk above that of the existing building would not be in keeping with the scale and character of the existing building. This coupled with the proposed raising of the existing levels of the access road would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the surrounding area, and the designated "Area of Landscape Importance", contrary to Policies LO4, SE4 and SE8 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policy NE8 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**
4. **The proposed development lies within the area of land liable to flood as shown on maps held by the Environment Agency. If permitted the proposed extension will increase the number of people at risk from flooding by introducing additional residents into the floodplain without an acceptable safe access onto land outside the floodplain. In addition, the proposed re-alignment to the existing access which results in an increase in levels thereby resulting in a loss of floodplain storage capacity which would increase the risk of flooding to people and property on the site and the surrounding area, contrary to Policy SE3 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policy SV2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**

(Mr Montgomery, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application).

**RU 05/0371**

**Horning, Oak End Way, Woodham  
Reserved matters application for the erection of 2 no. detached dwellings with accommodation in the roof, an integral single garage and vehicular accesses off Oak End Way.**

**DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**

(Mr Fryer, an objector, and Mr Breddal, the applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application).

**RU 05/0406**                    **Thorpe Park, Staines Road, Chertsey**  
**Section 73 applications for Variation of Condition 2**  
**of RU 02/1089 increasing the number of days the**  
**annual trade exhibition marquee(s) is erected on site**  
**from 22 to 35 days with the marquees used and**  
**open to the public increasing from 7 to 15 days**  
**(each January/March 2003-2008) and variation of**  
**Condition 4 of RU 02/1088 reducing the number of**  
**days the Heritage Centre is in use for trade**  
**exhibitions and conferences from 126 days per year**  
**to 87 days per year.**

**DECISION: GRANT variation of conditions subject**  
**to conditions.**

**RU 05/0429**                    **Halcyon, Christchurch Road, Virginia Water**  
**Erection of two-storey detached dwelling with**  
**integral garages and entrance gates and piers**  
**following demolition of existing dwelling.**

**DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**

**RU 05/0431**                    **The Chippings, 15 Brock Way, Virginia Water**  
**Construction of two dormer windows to front**  
**elevation.**

**DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**

**RU 05/0440**                    **22 Hamm Moor Lane, Addlestone**  
**Conversion of existing dwelling to form two self-**  
**contained flats (1 no. x two-bed and 1 no. x one-bed)**  
**and erection of rear dormer window and velux**  
**rooflight to front and rear roofslope (retrospective).**

**DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**

117. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - CORE POLICIES FOR CONSULTATION  
 (Ref: Minutes of Planning Committee 2 March 2005, page 7645, para. 549)

The Committee considered the draft consultation Core Strategy Policies for inclusion in the Local Development Framework (LDF).

The previously approved objectives for the draft Core Strategy had been examined in conjunction with the guidance set out in the Surrey Structure Plan and the emerging South East Plan to develop policy advice. The new LDF consultation framework required interested parties to be invited to comment on a set of options. However, although the Council would be able to set out a preferred option, it was necessary to set out alternative options also examined. Consideration of the advantages and disadvantages would help stakeholders understand the options.

To balance the guidance in the Surrey Structure Plan with that emerging in the South East Plan and enable genuine participation and involvement of the wider community and stakeholders, the Preferred Option consultation would identify where there were genuine and reasonable alternatives for consideration. The Structure Plan confirmed that development would be located in the urban area so it was unhelpful to put forward alternatives, outside the urban area, as it would unrealistically raise expectations or concerns. In this context the term Preferred Approach had been used with an appropriate supporting statement. With regard to the wider issues raised in the South East Plan, these were considered as part of the Preferred, Alternative or Rejected Options and are set out in Appendix 'A' for consultation.

The Committee had previously agreed that the preferred long term vision for the Borough, which was consistent with the Structure Plan, was one where future development was an infrastructure constrained approach concentrating development in urban areas with good access to services and public transport. The conversion of employment land for housing and building to higher density was also considered to make an important contribution to meeting future growth pressures and overall there was little enthusiasm for Green Belt releases.

The Preferred Approach Spatial Policies 1 to 4 set out guidance that translated the approved key objectives relating to Sustainable Development, Economic Development, Social Development and Environmental Protection and are shown in Appendix 'A'. The preferred housing approach (Strategic Policies 5-6), together with alternative or rejected options, are shown in Appendix 'A'. However, in light of the need to twin track the policy approach to reflect the approved Surrey Structure Plan and the emerging SEP, two parallel policy approaches were proposed for housing provision.

Strategic Housing Policy 5 regarding housing provision to 2016 was set within the context of the Structure Plan and would apply until the South East Plan was adopted. Strategic Housing Policy 6 regarding housing provision to 2026 was based upon emerging SEP guidance and would replace Policy 5. The consultation on the District based housing distributions as part of the South East Plan would take place in the autumn. This timescale would coincide with the next consultation stage of the LDF. A notification letter would be produced and circulated to community groups and organisations in June/July, providing some guidance on the process and forewarning them of the dual consultation, so that they could plan their meetings to discuss the draft documents during the 6-8 week consultation period in September/October 2005.

The main elements of the housing options for both Policies 5 and 6 were:-

- |                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| Preferred Approach Option | - redevelopment of urban sites only  |
| Alternative Option 1      | - redevelopment of urban sites with phased release of reserve sites to meet shortfall.                                 |
| Rejected Option 2         | - Redevelopment of urban sites with phased release of reserve sites and green field urban extension to meet shortfall. |
| Rejected Option 3         | - New settlement in the Green Belt.  |

A LDF Workshop comprising representatives of statutory bodies, agencies and local organisations had been held on 28 April 2005 at the Hythe Centre, Egham and the Committee noted details of the discussions.

**RECOMMEND that -**

- i) the Core Strategy set out in Appendix 'A' be approved for the purposes of consultation; and**
- ii) the comments received during the consultation be reported back to the Committee in due course.**

118. WARRENHUST, WEST DRIVE, VIRGINIA WATER - ENFORCEMENT

The Committee considered authorisation of enforcement action in respect of a dwellinghouse which was being constructed without compliance with plans approved under planning permission RU 01/1394, particularly in relation to size and positioning of the building.

The base of the building was level with natural ground level at the eastern flank part of the site, not set below that level by one metre as shown on the approved plans and required by Condition 11 of RU 01/1394.

The basement was either taller than approved, or not excavated far enough into the ground, which resulted in the rest of the building starting approximately one metre higher than approved, on the same line as natural ground level, rather than one metre below it. Consequently, the building was

not only 45cm higher than approved in terms of its height from base to ridge, but was also located approximately one metre above the approved level.

The distance from the east flank elevation to the nearest boundary fence line within the hedgerow was 8.90m instead of the approved 10.10m and consequently the building was 1.20m closer to South Drive than approved.

Finally, it was noted that the outbuilding containing services and the like, located along the boundary with South Drive, was larger than shown on the approved plans.

The Committee considered two issues; firstly whether the proposed works would result in an increase in floor area greater than 30% of the original dwelling (as at 1986), and secondly whether harm was caused to the Green Belt and/or local setting in more 'direct' visual terms.

The Committee took into account previous planning decisions in respect of the property. Members noted that the development at the site was significantly larger than the approved plans, both in terms of dimensions and its floor area, but also noted that in the past the Council had been generous in allowing development significantly larger than the 30% maximum increase on the original development as at 1986, as recommended as the limit in Policy GB6. The consecutive decisions to grant permission for large schemes had to be viewed in the context of the evolution of the use of GB6, the interpretation of which had altered over time to reflect appeal decisions and case law.

Although the 30% limit had not always been adhered to in light of changing material considerations over recent years, which had variously been considered to comprise special circumstances, a consistent approach had clearly been taken regarding the protection of the open nature of the Green Belt and the character of the area through limiting the height and mass of any approved schemes.

The site was a prominent one, placed upon a corner plot and at an elevated position in relation to its surroundings. The height and overall mass of any development therefore needed to be carefully controlled, as the harm caused to the visual amenities of the Green Belt and to the character of the local area and street scene was potentially highly significant. The building as constructed was considered excessive and unacceptable.

The breaches were not limited to one aspect of the works and were fundamental to the construction of the house. In addition, the planning conditions attached to the approved plans could not come into effect until that scheme was built. If the current unauthorised development was left in place, no control would exist through conditions regarding outbuildings, materials, landscaping, etc.

In light of the above, the Committee considered that only the full removal of the building would remedy the harm caused to the openness and visual amenities of the Green Belt, and to the harm caused to the character of the area by the development. Any alternative proposals by the developer to rectify the breach would be considered if they were put forward.

The Human Rights considerations associated with this case were noted.

**RESOLVED that -**

- i) the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to issue Enforcement Notice(s) under Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring the demolition of the unauthorised detached dwellinghouse situated at Warrenhurst and the full removal from the site of any resultant debris and/or building materials;**
- ii) the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to take appropriate action in carrying out necessary works or prosecutions under Sections 178 and 179 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in the event that these Notice(s) once effective are not complied with.**

**Reason for Issuing the Notice**

**The unauthorised dwellinghouse constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt resulting in a substantial increase in**

**floor area and building height and mass over and above the size of the dwelling in May 1986 and a harmful impact on the openness of the Green Belt, and the character of the local area and street scene, contrary to the advice contained in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: 'Green Belts', Policies PE1 and PE2 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policies GB1 and GB6 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001. Furthermore, very special circumstances have not been put forward which would outweigh the harm to the Green Belt as identified.**

#### 119. APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted that the Planning Inspectorate had recently determined the appeals mentioned below.

Site/Development	Decision
a) London Road, Sunningdale - planning appeal regarding installation of 12m high telegraph pole communications mast with ancillary equipment housing.	DISMISSED
b) Amberwood and Lone Pine, Christchurch Road, Virginia Water - enforcement appeal regarding erection of close boarded fences.	DISMISSED, NOTICE UPHELD SUBJECT TO VARIATION
c) Barons Wood, West Drive, Virginia Water - planning appeal regarding alterations to garage roof to form staff accommodation.	DISMISSED
d) R/O Holly Tree Public House, 25 High Street, Addlestone - planning appeal regarding erection of 2 storey, part single storey building containing 16 bedrooms with en-suite bathrooms, reception area with staff facilities and stores all for use as bed and breakfast accommodation in conjunction with public house.	DISMISSED
e) Byfleet Road, New Haw - planning appeal regarding a 12.5m telecommunications column with 3 equipment cabinets at base.	DISMISSED
f) 1 Woodham Lane, New Haw - planning appeal regarding demolition of existing building and erection of nine 2 bed flats and one 1 bed flat, creation of amenity space with additional planting and creation of block paved parking area and internal garages.	DISMISSED
g) White Ladies, Portnall Drive, Wentworth – planning appeal regarding addition of retractable swimming pool cover.	DISMISSED
h) 16 Addlestone Park, Addlestone - planning appeal regarding conversion of Flat 7 to provide 2 flats comprising of one 1 bed unit and one 2 bed unit	ALLOWED
i) Lyne Road Paddock, off Lyne Road, Trumps Green, Virginia Water - planning appeal regarding installation of a 20m high tower to accommodate six antennas with transmission dish and ground based equipment cabin.	ALLOWED

j)	4 Mowbray Crescent, Egham - planning appeal regarding two storey side extension.	ALLOWED
k)	7 Oakhill Road, Addlestone – planning appeal regarding rebuild of garage and provide a dressing room to existing bedroom.	ALLOWED
l)	Land adj 2 Rickman Crescent, Addlestone – planning appeal regarding pair of semi-detached houses with parking spaces.	ALLOWED

120. PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES

A list of planning applications recently determined by the Director of Technical Services under his delegated powers was received and noted.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 9.29pm)