

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9 January 2002 at 7.30 p.m.

Members of the Committee present: Councillors K.J. Clark (Chairman), V.E. Barker (Vice-Chairman), Mrs F.M. Angell, Mrs. F.J. Barden, A.G. Collins, J.M. Edwards, J.R. Furey, Mrs C.Y. Jones, A.M. Moore, Mrs J Norman, A.P. Tollett, F.J. Tourlaimain, J.R. Whiteley and G.B. Woodger.

Members of the Committee absent: Councillor R. Pate

455. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Group mentioned below had notified the Chief Executive Officer of its wish that the changes listed below be made to the membership of the Committee for a fixed period ending on the day after the meeting. Thereafter the Councillors removed should be re-appointed.

Group requesting Change	Remove from Membership	Appoint Instead
Conservative	Councillor Mrs. P.I. Broadhead	Councillor J.R. Furey
Conservative	Councillor Mrs V.R.T. Lenton-Smith	Councillor G.B. Woodger

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

456. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor R. Pate.

457. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors G.B. Woodger and V. E. Barker declared an interest under the National Code of Local Government Conduct in respect of planning application RU 01/1237. As the interest was clear and substantial, Councillors Woodger and Barker withdrew from the room and took no part in the determination of the application.

Councillor V.E. Barker declared an interest in planning application RU 01/1047 under the National Code of Local Government Conduct. As the interest was not clear and substantial, Councillor Barker remained in the room and voted.

458. 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.

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

**RU 01/1047 The Coach House, Guildford Street, Chertsey
Erection of single storey garden room and enclosure of
existing covered way.
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**

- RU 01/1226** 12 Bourneside Road, Addlestone
Erection of a two storey rear extension
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.
- RU 01/1237** 10 Virginia Drive, Virginia Water
Erection of detached dwelling and detached double garage to the front of the new property with vehicular access onto Virginia Drive.
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.
- RU 01/1245** 39 Stephen Close, Egham
Erection of two storey side and rear extension and single storey side and front extensions.
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.
- RU 01/1258** 58 Station Road, Egham
Change of use of the ground floor from Class A1/A2 to research and development Offices (Class B1)
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.
- RU 01/1260** 344 Green Lane, Chertsey
Erection of garden shed in rear garden
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU 01/1282** 1 Sundon Crescent, Virginia Water
Erection of single storey side extension and re-positioning of existing garage to the front of the property.
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU 01/1287** Leacot, Green Road, Thorpe
Erection of two storey side extension following demolition of existing detached garage
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU 01/1297** Old Telephone Exchange, Longcross Road, Chertsey
Temporary siting of a portacabin for one year
DECISION: a) REFUSE for the following reasons:
- (1) The development proposed would be an undesirable expansion and intensification of the existing pattern of development in this countryside area of the Green Belt, detrimental to its character contrary to the policy for the preservation of the Metropolitan Green Belt, as defined and described in Policies PE1 and PE2 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy LO6 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft (January 2001) and Policy GB1 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.
 - (2) Undesirable Precedent (R420)
- b) the Borough Secretary and Leisure Services Officer be authorised to issue an Enforcement Notice under Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring the removal of the portacabin from the site.

Reason for Issue of Notice

The portacabin is considered unacceptable as the site lies within the Green Belt where new development is not normally permitted. The development is therefore considered contrary to Policies PE1 and PE2 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994 and Policy LO6 of the Surrey Structure Plan (Deposit Draft) January 2001 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 it represents inappropriate development, harmful to the openness of the Green Belt in this sensitive countryside area.

- c) the Borough Secretary and Leisure Services Officer be authorised to take appropriate action including carrying out any prosecution in the event that the notice, once effective, is not complied with.**

**RU 01/1300 Flat 6, 88 New Haw Road, Addlestone
Installation of two rooflights to allow loft conversion
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**

459. REVENUE ESTIMATES 2002/03

The Committee received and considered the draft Revenue Estimates for 2002/03 in respect of Planning and Highway Services.

RESOLVED that

- i) the proposed increases in fees and charges for 2002/03 as set out at Appendices 'A' and 'B' be approved to be effective from 1 April 2002 or as appropriate; and**
- ii) the draft Revenue Estimates for 2002/03 in respect of Planning and Highway Services be approved as submitted and the Corporate Management Committee be requested to make provision accordingly.**

460. DEFRA/DTLR CONSULTATION DOCUMENT – ABANDONED VEHICLES

The Committee was informed of short and long term proposals in the above mentioned Consultation Document aimed at dealing with the growing problem of abandoned vehicles which had largely arisen from the collapse in the price of scrap metal.

Short term proposals to enhance the ability of Local Authorities to deal with abandoned vehicles more quickly and effectively included :-

- Reducing notice periods after which it would be possible for Local Authorities to remove vehicles. These would vary dependant on the value of the vehicle;
- Reducing the periods of notice after which it would be possible for the DVLA and its contractors to destroy unlicensed vehicles that had already been removed;
- Empowering local authorities to use DVLA powers to remove unlicensed vehicles. The Secretary of State had powers to appoint contractors for the removal of unlicensed vehicles. Pilot schemes were being carried out in which Local Authorities were acting as DVLA contractors in removing and impounding unlicensed vehicles;
- Enabling Local Authorities to access information on registered keepers from the DVLA data base more quickly and easily and to check 'online' whether a vehicle was licensed; and
- Promoting best practice.

Whilst acknowledging that a reduction of the notice period for removing valuable and 'no value' cars would enable Local Authorities to remove them quicker, the Committee noted that the number of vehicles to be removed would increase, and particularly those of value. This would require stricter handling and storage resulting in contractors providing more sophisticated removal equipment and larger, improved and more secure storage facilities, in addition to the need to meet more stringent environmental standards. There were also financial implications for a Local Authority like Runnymede in that additional staff would be needed to manage it. The costs of reduced notice periods could be prohibitive unless it was financed with funds from manufacturers under the End of Life Vehicles Directive which would be effective from April 2002.

Improved authority to remove and destroy dangerous vehicles immediately would secure the Local Authority's legal position although swifter removal could result in claims against the authority by vehicle owners. Members emphasised that care would have to be taken to minimise such risks.

The proposed transfer of powers from DVLA to Local Authorities for the Removal of Vehicles would result in additional costs to the Local Authority in enforcement and administration, which it would be unlikely to recoup.

Members considered it beneficial to have a system to enable Local Authorities to exchange information and best practice on dealing with abandoned vehicles.

In the long-term the Government proposed a number of initiatives aimed at tightening up the vehicle registration process, including a requirement to produce a vehicle registration document when licensing a vehicle without a standard DVLA reminder and for the registered keeper to retain responsibility for taxation and charges such as parking and speeding fines unless they could demonstrate that they had notified the DVLA that the vehicle was no longer in their possession.

The Government also wished to improve compliance with SORN. This was a system which required keepers of vehicles which were not currently licensed because they were kept off road, to sign a Statutory Off-Road Notification (SORN) which was renewed annually.

The transfer of vehicles within the motor trade was a particular difficulty and the DVLA was undertaking a pilot scheme under which dealers notify DVLA electronically that a vehicle had passed through their hands.

The Committee supported a system that would improve compliance with SORN and more easily identify current registered keepers which would make it more difficult to abandon a vehicle and, therefore, reduce the blight caused by them and the cost to Local Authorities of removing them. Tightening up transfer procedures and giving keepers of vehicles financial responsibility unless they could demonstrate that they had notified DVLA would help to tighten this system.

The Committee cautiously welcomed the proposals as an initial step towards dealing with the problem but considered that more stringent powers would be required allied with increased Government funding in order to fully deal with the problem in the long term.

Members expressed concern at the costs which would fall upon Local Authorities as a result of these proposals. If the proposals in the Consultation Document became law, a report would be made to Committee requesting an indication of the standard of service it would like to operate for abandoned vehicles together with associated costs.

RESOLVED that –

the above-mentioned comments be forwarded to the DTLR as the Borough Council's response to the Consultation Document.

461. APPEAL DECISIONS

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

<u>Site/Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
i) 252 Chertsey Lane, Staines – planning appeal regarding a 30 chalet cattery (RUOO/0088)	ALLOWED
ii) Junction of Church Road and Ongar Hill, Rowtown - appeal against refusal of prior approval for siting and appearance of a 12.5m high monopole mast and two equipment cabins (RU 01/0803).	DISMISSED

462. PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY BOROUGH TECHNICAL SERVICES OFFICER

The Committee noted a list of planning applications recently determined by the Borough Technical Services Officer under his delegated powers.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 9.07 p.m.)