

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE31 March 2004 at 7.30 p.m.

Members of the Committee present: Councillors G.B. Woodger (Chairman), Mrs. J. Norman (Vice Chairman), Mrs. F.J. Barden, J.B. Dean, J.M. Edwards, J.R. Furey, Mrs L.M. Gillham, Miss M.N. Heath, C. Knight, H.W.V. Meares, D.W. Parr, Mrs E.E. Price, R.Pate, A.P. Tollett and J. R. Whiteley

Members of the Committee absent: None

Councillors Ms D.V. Clarke and Mrs V.A. Smallman also attended.

806. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Groups mentioned below had notified the Chief Executive Officer of their wish that the changes listed below be made to the membership of the Committee. The changes were for a fixed period ending on the day after the meeting and thereafter the Councillors removed would be reappointed.

Group requesting Change	Remove from Membership	Appoint Instead
Conservative	Councillor N. Thewlis	Councillor Miss M.N. Heath
Runnymede Independent	Councillor A. Alderson	Councillor Mrs E.E. Price

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

807. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 3 March 2004 were approved and signed as a correct record.

808. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following interests were made under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members by the Councillors shown.

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
A. P. Tollett	Fullbrook School, Selsdon Road, New Haw - application RU 04/0102	Surrey County Council appointed Governor to School
G. B. Woodger J. R. Whiteley	Still Meadow, 2 Nuns Walk, Virginia Water - application RU 04/0138	Council appointed Trustees on Cabrera Trust which owns land adjoining application site.

809. 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/or applicants/agents spoke on those applications identified below.

RESOLVED that –

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

APP. NO. LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION

**RU03/1203 Land at Pooley Green Road, Egham
Erection of 7 no x 3 bed two storey terraced houses with car parking off Pooley Green Road following the demolition of the existing garages**

DECISION: GRANT, subject to appropriate conditions.

(Mr Bowden on behalf of the applicant addressed the Committee on the above application).

(The Committee considered that special circumstances existed which warranted the grant of planning permission, namely that the scheme would tidy up a site currently subject to vandalism, provide 100% affordable housing, the dwellings would be raised above the flood plain and should not themselves flood, nor displace floodwater elsewhere as there would be voids under the buildings, and the scheme would generate a capital receipt that could be used to help finance the public park which would be a major community benefit).

**RU04/0007 44-46 Guildford Street, Chertsey
Conversion of Church into 12 self-contained flats.**

DECISION: Following the completion of a legal agreement to secure a financial contribution totalling £15,000 (£10,000 towards the Runnymede Travel Initiative and £5,000 towards improvements to open space facilities in the area) 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.

(Mr Ilbert, an objector, addressed the Committee on the above application)

**RU04/0090 The Vicarage and Surrey Grange, Vicarage Road, Egham
Redevelopment of the site for residential purposes comprising 5 no blocks (2 and a half, 3 and 3 and a half storeys high) providing a total of 40 apartments including 10 affordable units with ancillary parking and vehicular access off Vicarage Road following demolition of existing buildings.**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed development represents a cramped form of development which would damage the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area and the streetscene, and be detrimental to the residential amenities of Tower Cottage, contrary to advice in Planning Policy Guidance Note 1 : 'General Policy and Principles', Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 : 'Housing', Policy PE10 of the**

Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft, December 2002, Policies HO9 and BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and advice in Surrey Design, January 2002 and By Design.

- 2. The proposed development would be harmful to the character and townscape of the surrounding area and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the adjoining Egham Town Centre Conservation Area, contrary to advice in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 : 'Planning and the Historic Environment', Planning Policy Guidance Note 1 : 'General Policies and Principles', Policies PE10 and PE12 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policies SE4 and SE5 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft, December 2002, Policies BE2 and BE5 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001, advice in Surrey Design, January 2002 and By Design.**
- 3. It has not yet been demonstrated that the application can be made compatible with the local transportation infrastructure and therefore does not satisfy Policy MT2 of the Surrey Structure Plan, Policies DN1 and DN2 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft (December 2002) and Policy MV4 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**

RU04/0101

The Vicarage and Surrey Grange, Vicarage Road, Egham Redevelopment of the site for residential purposes comprising of 5 no blocks (2 and a half, 3 and 3 and a half storeys high) providing a total of 40 apartments including 10 affordable units with ancillary parking and vehicular access off Vicarage Road following demolition of existing buildings.

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed development represents a cramped form of development which would damage the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area and the streetscene, and be detrimental to the residential amenities of Tower Cottage, contrary to advice in Planning Policy Guidance Note 1 : 'General Policy and Principles', Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 : 'Housing', Policy PE10 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft, December 2002, Policies HO9 and BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and advise in Surrey Design, January 2002 and By Design.**
- 2. The proposed development would be harmful to the character and townscape of the surrounding area and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the adjoining Egham Town Centre Conservation Area, contrary to advice in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 : 'Planning**

- 1465 -

and the Historic Environment', Planning Policy Guidance Note 1 : 'General Policies and Principles', Policies PE10 and PE12 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policies SE4 and SE5 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft, December 2002, Policies BE2 and BE5 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001, advice in Surrey Design, January 2002 and By Design.

3. It has not yet been demonstrated that the application can be made compatible with the local transportation infrastructure and therefore does not satisfy Policy MT2 of the Surrey Structure Plan, Policies DN1 and DN2 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft (December 2002) and Policy MV4 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.

RU04/0128

**Land at 38 and 40 Pinewood Avenue, New Haw
Erection of 8 two-storey dwellings comprising 3 no x 2-bedroom units and 5 no x 3-bedroom units with associated parking.**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by reason of its overall scale, size, bulk and massing and relationship to the existing built form would result in an unacceptable change in the character and appearance of the application site and the surrounding area and would not contribute positively to the townscape quality of the locality and would be contrary to Policies PE10 and DP6 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policies SE4 and LO2 of the emerging Surrey Structure Plan December 2002; and Policies HO9 and BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001, Surrey Design (including principle 7.3) 2002 and By Design.
2. The proposed development by reason of its scale, siting and position and location of the vehicular access in close proximity to the side boundary would create an unneighbourly form of development detrimental to the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties particularly No 38 Pinewood Avenue in terms of noise and disturbance from the vehicular access and Nos 11A, 11 and 9 Cobs Way due to the likely overbearing, overlooking and loss of outlook issues which would be contrary to Policy HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.

RU03/0237

**Great Grove Farm, Murray Road, Ottershaw
Use of buildings on the site for either residential or commercial use and building operations on the site in accordance with the submitted statutory declarations.**

DECISION:

- (1) **GRANT A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS for the following buildings and uses:**
- a) residential (Class C3) use or incidental residential use - (buildings 1, 1B, 1D, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4. and 1.8)
 - b) the erection of buildings with a nil use - (buildings 2.1 and 2.4)
 - c) livery business - (buildings 1.6A, 1.6B and 1.6C)
 - d) light industrial use (Class B1(c)) - (building 2.3)
 - e) general industrial (Class B2) use - (buildings 2.2, 2.2A, 2.2B and 2.5) and
 - f) hardstandings - (1.5, 2.1A)

- (2) **REFUSE THE CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS APPLICATION for the siting of a portacabin (building 2.2C) and the erection of a metal-clad store/garage (building 1C) and a steel-framed storage building (building 1.7) for the following reason:**

The applicant has not demonstrated that on the balance of probability the land has been used for the siting of a portacabin for more than 10 years and the buildings have not been erected for more than four years.

- (3) i) **the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to issue a Notice under Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in relation to (a) the removal of the portacabin (building 2.2C) from the site, (b) the demolition of the metal clad store/garage (building 1C), (c) a steel-framed building (building 1.7) and (d) the removal of all unauthorised open storage of materials, plant and equipment and parking of vehicles and all resulting materials, debris and rubble from the land within 4 months of the Notice being effective;**

Reasons for issuing Enforcement Notice(s)

The portacabin, the metal clad store/garage and steel-framed building and open storage of materials, plant and equipment and parking of vehicles are considered unacceptable for the following reason:

The site lies within the Green Belt where new development is not normally permitted.

These developments are therefore considered contrary to Policies PE1 and PE2 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994 and Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan (Deposit Draft) December 2002 and Policy GB1 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and the advice in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 : 'Green Belts' as they represent inappropriate development harmful to the openness of the Green Belt in this sensitive countryside area and no very special circumstances have been submitted to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt caused by these inappropriate developments.

- ii) **the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to take appropriate action including carrying out any prosecution in the event that the Notice, once effective, is not complied with.**

- (4) **THE APPLICANT IS INVITED TO SUBMIT RETROSPECTIVE PLANNING APPLICATIONS to regularise the existing uses of buildings 2.1 and 2.4.**

RU03/1327

**Trumps Farm Landfill Site, Kitsmead Lane, Lyne
Discharge of planning condition 10 of RU03/0200 in respect of details of monitoring of dust, particulates, bio aerosols and odour.**

DECISION: Subject to -

- i) **the guidance of the Composting Association being followed as good practice, as contained in the publications 'A Guide to in-vessel Composting' and 'Standardised Protocol for the Sampling and Enumeration of Airborne Micro-organisms at Composting Facilities'; and**
- ii) **the reception of greenwaste and storage of final product being covered and undertaken on a hard standing and covered over to minimise the effects of temperature and weather, therefore reducing the possibility of odour being emitted;**

the County Council be informed that NO OBJECTIONS are raised to the discharge of Condition 10 (Programme for the Monitoring of Dust, Particulates and Odour) on the basis of the amended and amplified details.

RU03/1405

**Tesco, 117 Station Road, Addlestone
Installation of car wash facility**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. **The proposed development by reason of its design, height, forward projection beyond the existing petrol filling station and position in close proximity to the boundaries of the site would result in a cramped and prominent form of development involving the loss of landscaping which would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area contrary to Policies PE10, DP9 and DP18 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002, and Policies TC1, LE1 and BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**
2. **The proposed development by reason of its design, height and position in close proximity to boundaries would result in a significant loss of amenity to neighbouring residential properties surrounding the site, particularly No 6 Church Mews, in terms of loss of outlook, unacceptable noise and disturbance contrary to advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 24 : Planning and Noise (September 1994) and Policies EN1, MT2, MT6, DP9 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policies SE1 and DN2 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002 and Policies LE1 and MV4 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**

RU03/1457

**303-307 Woodham Lane, New Haw
Erection of a first floor extension and change of use of existing first floor office premises to form 3 self-contained flats**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reason:

The proposed extension by reason of its size, height, form and mass would be an unneighbourly form of development resulting in overshadowing and loss of light to neighbouring residential properties particularly Nos. 305A and 303A Woodham Lane detrimental to their residential amenities and contrary to Policy HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan (Second Alteration) April 2001.

(A motion to grant permission was lost)

RU03/1463

**Land at Temple Gardens, Staines
Fell 5 trees and pruning of 13 other additional trees**

DECISION: GRANT, subject to conditions.

(Mr Adams, an objector, addressed the Committee on the above application).

RU04/0022

**13 and 15 Eastworth Road, Chertsey
Change of use of residential home to guesthouse accommodation with associated parking to the rear (retrospective)**

DECISION: GRANT, subject to conditions.

(Mrs Thompson, an objector, addressed the Committee on the above application).

RU04/0102

**Fullbrook School, Selsdon Road, New Haw
Erection of a two-storey classroom extension**

DECISION: GRANT, subject to conditions.

RU04/0138

**Still Meadow, 2 Nuns Walk, Virginia Water
Erection of detached two-storey dwelling plus basement and roofspace accommodation and with attached triple garage to the front, following demolition of existing dwelling and garage (revised plans received 24.2.04)**

DECISION: GRANT, subject to conditions.

RU04/0140

**Headcount Field Marketing, Kestrel Court, Pound Road, Chertsey
Installation of satellite dish to roof of building and retention of generator within car park within existing plant area**

DECISION: GRANT, subject to conditions.

RU04/0153

**68 London Street, Chertsey
External and internal alterations including new window openings, roof windows and internal partitions**

DECISION: GRANT Listed Building Consent, subject to conditions.

RU04/0207

**15 Station Road North, Egham
Change of use of property from a retail use (Class A1) to a hot food takeaway (Class A3) use with staff flat above**

DECISION: GRANT, subject to conditions.

810. SERVICE PLAN 2003/04 - QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE
(Ref: Minutes of Planning Committee September 2003, page 670, para 326)

Members were notified of progress with the Planning Service Plan in the third quarter of 2003/04. The Plan served as a basis for monitoring and review of the Committee's objectives as drawn from a variety of sources and set out details of timescales, potential barriers and additional resource requirements as well as corrective action where it was required to improve performance. The opportunity was also taken to approve a number of new targets, derived from the Leader's Position Statement 2004/05, which would be incorporated in the Service Plan for the forthcoming municipal year. The Committee was pleased with progress made and agreed the deletion of certain targets which had been completed.

A new BVPI was to be introduced from 1 April 2004 and this would be the subject of a report to a future meeting to agree a proposed local target.

RESOLVED that -

- i) the targets highlighted in Appendix 'A', drawn from the new Leader's Position Statement, be included within the Service Plan for 2004/05;**
- ii) relevant targets which had been completed be discharged and deleted from the Service Plan; and**

- iii) the new BVPI be the subject of a further report in order to set the proposed local target for inclusion in 2004/05 Service Plan.**

811. PUBLIC SPEAKING AT PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Committee reviewed the operation of public speaking at Planning Committee.

Since the introduction of public speaking in May 2003, 22 meetings of the Planning Committee had been held and public speaking had taken place at 18 of these. Although public speaking had undoubtedly prolonged the meetings of this Committee, the process had been manageable.

The right to speak publicly had been implemented in connection with 60 applications. 39 applicants or their agents, and 44 objectors had spoken. Of those applications upon which public speaking had taken place, 17 Officer recommendations had been overturned, 11 of which had been refused against an Officers recommendation to grant permission. Whilst a number of these refusals had been taken to appeal, many remained undecided and therefore it was too early to be able to report the decisions upon them. At this stage, it was noted that public speaking had impacted on the decision making process, and was welcomed and supported by the public.

The Committee considered that the arrangements for public speaking had worked well and had assisted Members in their determination of planning applications.

A Motion was moved that public speaking be prohibited in respect of i) Certificates of Lawfulness as these were decided on legal fact and ii) consultations on applications from SCC and adjoining boroughs on the basis that Runnymede was not the determining authority but only a Consultee and that representations should more appropriately be made to the determining Authority.

In response to this Motion, an Amendment was moved and subsequently carried that the prohibition should only apply to Certificates of Lawfulness and that public speaking should be allowed on Consultations as the views expressed by public speakers was of value to Members in the formulation of their response to such Consultations.

With regard to Standing Order 39.21 Members considered that applicants should indicate their wish to speak either in response to a public speaker or an Officer recommendation to refuse permission by 7.15pm on the evening. This would facilitate more easily the organisation of speakers in advance.

The amendments would be considered by Corporate Management Committee as part of the new Constitution and would be introduced in the new Municipal Year.

RESOLVED that -

- i) the Corporate Management Committee be advised that the relevant Standing Orders should be amended in order to:**
- a) prohibit public speaking on applications for Certificates of Lawfulness; and**
 - b) require applicants to register their intention to speak (either when the application is recommended for refusal or where objectors have registered to speak) before 19.15 hours on the day of the Committee meeting;**
- ii) the operation and effect of public speaking continue to be monitored and reviewed in March 2005.**

812. APPEAL DECISIONS

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

<u>Site/Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
a) Upper Childown, Accommodation Road, Longcross - planning appeal regarding demolition of existing staff cottage and construction of new cottage to match style of existing house (03/0494).	DISMISSED
b) Fir Trees, Spring Woods, Virginia Water - planning appeal regarding erection of a single storey rear conservatory (03/0439).	DISMISSED
c) 22 Crown Road, Virginia Water - planning appeal regarding erection of a rear conservatory (03/1007).	ALLOWED

813. 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 noted.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 10.33pm)