

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE7 November 2007 at 7.30 pm

Members of the

Committee present: Councillors G.B. Woodger (Chairman), D.W. Parr (Vice-Chairman), Mrs. F.M. Angell, J.R. Ashmore, Mrs F.J. Barden, J. Broadhead, J.M. Edwards, J.R. Furey, Mrs E. Gill, D.R. Hamilton, Mrs. Y.P. Lay, Mrs J. Norman, Mrs M. Roberts, and P.B. Tuley.

Members of the

Committee absent: Councillor M.T. Kusneraitis

327. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Group mentioned below had notified the Chief Executive of their wish that the change listed below be made to the membership of the Committee. The 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 C. Knight	Councillor D.R. Hamilton

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

328. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 17 October 2007 were approved and signed as a correct record.

329. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor M.T. Kusneraitis.

330. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following Councillors declared personal and prejudicial interests under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members.

Councillor	Item	Nature of Interest
J.R. Furey	Land at Hamm Moor Lane, Addlestone (RU.07/0885)	Business connection
P.B. Tuley	Brox End Nursery, Brox Lane, Ottershaw (RU.07/0895)	Business connection
Mrs. J. Norman	Glebe House, Christchurch Road, Virginia Water (RU.07/1015)	Patient at former practice of applicant

331. 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. Agents/applicants and members of the public 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.

APP. NO.	LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION
RU 07/0885	<p>Land at Hamm Moor Lane, Addlestone Redevelopment of the site in the form of 14 x 3 bedroom, 2 storey high dwellings and 3,625 sqm of three storey (B1) office buildings with vehicular access off Shakespeare Road and Hamm Moor Lane with associated car parking and landscaping, following the demolition of existing buildings.</p>

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed development, by reason of the siting, mass, bulk, height and scale of the buildings, lack of mix of dwelling sizes, lack of integration between elements of the scheme, areas of hardstanding, and inadequate green space around the buildings for amenity space and landscaping, would have a cramped, overbearing and over-dominating appearance, resulting in an overdevelopment of the site. The scheme does not relate to or integrate with the surrounding area and fails to improve the character and quality of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved Policies BE2 and HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001, saved Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, By Design and Surrey Design, and Planning Policy Statement (PPS1) : ‘Delivering Sustainable Development’ and Planning Policy Statement (PPS3) : ‘Housing’.**
- 2. The proposal, by reason of the height, mass, bulk, scale and design of the buildings, and lack of adequate space between buildings and boundaries, would have an overbearing impact, particularly in relation to the Hamm Moor Lane frontage, detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The design of the scheme is inappropriate in its context, and does not create a distinctive character that relates well to, or improves the character and quality of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved Policies BE2 and HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001, saved Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, By**

- 484 -

Design and Surrey Design, and Planning Policy Statement (PPS1) : 'Delivering Sustainable Development' and Planning Policy Statement (PPS3) : 'Housing'.

- 3. The proposed development, by reason of the siting, continuous built form and proximity of the buildings to the front boundary with lack of appropriate landscaped setting, will be visually harmful and will not enhance the open character and appearance of the Wey Navigation Conservation Area contrary to saved Policies BE4 and R9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001, and saved Policies SE5 and SE10 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and PPG15 : 'Planning and the Historic Environment'.**
- 4. The proposal by reason of the nature of the traffic generation and the provision of family residential units would result in impact on the local infrastructure. The applicant has not demonstrated that this impact has been addressed through the provision of a completed planning obligation. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved Policy DN1, of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004.**
- 5. In the absence of a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and given the housing land supply situation in the Borough it is considered that residential development on the site would be premature at this time and does not pass the Sequential test. The site lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3a shown on maps held by the Environment Agency and the proposed development would result in a loss of flood plain storage and increase in flooding elsewhere, contrary to saved Policy SV2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001, Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk' and Planning Policy Statement 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development.**
- 6. The applicant has failed to demonstrate any acceptable mitigation measures to alleviate the existing land contamination and ground water contamination contrary to the advice contained within Planning Policy Statement 23 Planning and Pollution Control.**

RU.07/0895

**Brox End Nursery, Brox Lane, Ottershaw
Outline application for residential development
(maximum 48 dwellings) and new access to Brox Lane
with all matters except access reserved.**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

- 1. The site is identified as safeguarded housing land in saved Policy HO6 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001. The Borough has a five year supply of land, and a further ten year supply, in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing. The early release of this safeguarded site would lead to an over-provision of housing beyond that required by the principles underpinning saved Policy HO6 of the Local Plan and saved Policy LO6 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and would undermine the regulation of the supply of housing land, pending the assessment of future housing sites in the Borough as part of the Local Development Framework process in line with the requirements of the emerging South East Plan. The proposal is therefore premature and contrary to saved Policies LO4 and LO6 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and the principles underpinning saved Policies HO6 and HO7 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001, and Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing.**
- 2. The proposal, by reason of the premature release of the safeguarded site, would prejudice decisions about the scale, sustainability and phasing of new housing development in the Borough. The proposed development, if permitted, would be likely to set an unacceptable precedent for similar proposals in respect of other land safeguarded to meet long term housing needs, which might then be difficult to resist, the cumulative effect of which would further undermine the phased release of housing land to the detriment of the long term protection of the Green Belt. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved Policies LO4 and LO6 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and the principles underpinning saved Policies HO6 and HO7 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001, and Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing.**
- 3. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal, by reason of the density of the proposed residential development, would make the most efficient use of the land in the absence of sustainability and character assessments in association with housing supply assessments to be carried out as part of the emerging Local Development Framework and Sites Allocation Development Plan Documents. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved Policy SE4 of the Surrey**

**Structure Plan 2004, Planning Policy
Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable
Development and Planning Policy Statement
3: Housing.**

- 4. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that adequate pedestrian and vehicular access can be provided to the site from Brox Road contrary to saved policies DN1 and DN2 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and saved Policies MV3 and MV4 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**
- 5. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that affordable housing provision will be provided in accordance with the requirements in the Council's Interim Advice Note on Affordable Housing, including the securing of a legal agreement. The application is therefore contrary to saved Policy DN11 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and saved Policy H04 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001, the Adopted Interim Advice Note on Affordable Housing and Planning Policy Statement (PPS3) : 'Housing'.**
- 6. The applicant has failed to demonstrate within the submitted Flood Risk Assessment, to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency, that surface water drainage would be adequately accommodated on site, contrary to Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk December 2006.**
- 7. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the application provides for the necessary infrastructure provision in order to avoid negative impacts arising from the development, contrary to saved Policy DN1 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and advice contained within Circular 05/2005.**

(Mr. O'Sullivan, an objector, addressed the Committee on the above application).

RU.07/0984

**72-82 Pooley Green Road, Egham
Erection of 29 no. 1 bedroom and 3 no. 2 bedroom sheltered apartments (Category ii) with guest suite and communal facilities and house manager's facilities, landscaping and associated car parking with access off Pooley Green Road.**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed development by reason of its overall scale, depth, height, massing, positioning and distances to the common site boundaries of the site would result in a cramped and over dominant form of**

development which fails to improve the character and quality of the area and would not contribute positively to the townscape character of the locality contrary to Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policies HO9 and BE2 of the Runnymede Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001, the Surrey Design Guide (January 2002), PPS1 : 'Delivering Sustainable Development', PPS3 : 'Housing' and 'By Design'.

- 2. The site lies within the floodplain (Zone 3) on maps held by the Environment Agency and the proposed building is at direct risk of flooding and the development increases the number of people at risk from flooding by introducing additional vulnerable people/ households into the floodplain contrary to policy SV2 of the Runnymede Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001, and advice contained in PPS25: Development and Flood Risk.**

(Mr Bendenelli, Agent for Applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application)

RU.07/1021

**1 Crockford Park Road, Addlestone
Erection of a building with 3 levels of accommodation, incorporating 8 no. x one bedroom flats and associated parking and bin store following demolition of existing building. (Amended plans received 15.10.07)**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposal, by reason of the density, bulk, mass, scale and height of the main building, its siting close to common boundaries, and the site coverage by building and hard standing, would result in a cramped form of development, detrimental to the character of the surrounding area and fails to improve the quality of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved Policy HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001, saved Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development, Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing, By Design and Surrey Design.**
- 2. The proposal, by reason of its bulk, mass, height and design of the building particularly the roof, and its siting closer to the site frontages, the siting of the proposed bin store on the Crockford Park Road frontage, and the height and position of the proposed noise barrier around the external perimeter of the south corner of the site, would result in a prominent and intrusive scheme, detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene of Brighton Road and Crockford Park Road, which fails to improve the quality of the**

area, contrary to saved Policies BE2 and HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001, saved Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development, Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing, By Design and Surrey Design.

3. The proposal, by reason of the proximity of the main building to the neighbouring residential properties, the siting of windows to habitable rooms facing the neighbours, and the siting of the parking spaces and associated vehicle turning areas adjacent to the neighbouring residential properties, would result in an unneighbourly form of development, overlooking, loss of privacy, and undue noise and disturbance arising from vehicle movements, detrimental to the residential amenities of properties, particularly No.77 Brighton Road and No.3 Crockford Park Road, contrary to saved Policy HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.
4. The proposal, by reason of the siting of the building closer to the road frontages and the layout proposing bedrooms on the front elevation of the building, would be subject to unacceptable levels of traffic noise for the proposed occupants, with inadequate details of ventilation, contrary to Planning Policy Guidance 24: Planning and Noise.
5. The applicant has not demonstrated that the installation of the proposed noise barrier around the perimeter of the site would retain the existing hedge and trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order, with consequent harm to the visual amenities of the area, contrary to saved Policy NE14 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001, and saved Policy SE9 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004.
6. The applicant has not demonstrated that 10% of the energy requirements of the development would be met through renewable means, contrary to saved Policy SE2 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and the Council's adopted Interim Advice Note: Renewable Energy.

RU.07/1028

**Virginia Water Car Park, London Road, Virginia Water
Landscape enhancement of existing car parking
including resurfacing and provision of railings, lamps,
seating, bins, footway and planting.**

**DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions, reasons and
Informatives listed on Agenda, and amended conditions
6 and 7 and additional conditions listed on Addendum.**

RU.07/1072

**30 Bridge Road, r/o 28 Bridge Road and 39 Weir Road,
Chertsey
Erection of 8 semi-detached houses with associated car
parking, garaging, access and landscaping following the
demolition of the existing dwellings**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed development, by reason of its siting, mass, bulk, height and scale of the buildings, plot dimensions, inadequate space to common boundaries and around the proposed buildings for amenity space and landscaping, would have a cramped and overbearing appearance, resulting in an overdevelopment of the site and a harmful impact on the street scene and fails to improve the character and quality of the area, and is contrary to saved Policies BE2 and HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001, saved Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Planning Policy Statement 1: 'Delivering Sustainable Development', Planning Policy Statement 3: 'Housing', By Design and Surrey Design.**
- 2. The proposal, by reason of the siting and layout of the proposed vehicular accesses, garage blocks and parking spaces, would have a cramped and contrived appearance with a harmful impact on the street scene and fails to improve the character and quality of the area, contrary to saved Policies BE2 and HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001, saved Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Planning Policy Statement 1: 'Delivering Sustainable Development', Planning Policy Statement 3: 'Housing', By Design and Surrey Design.**
- 3. The applicant has not demonstrated that the development would not be at risk from flooding nor that a sustainable urban drainage system approach to surface water drainage would be adopted, contrary to Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flooding.**

RU. 07/0962

**6 Fircroft, Englefield Green
Erection of two storey side and single storey rear
extension.**

**DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions, reasons and
Informatives listed on Agenda.**

RU. 07/0994

**Kingsbourne, Pinewood Road, Virginia Water
Elevation alterations to main dwelling and excavation
under front driveway to form new enclosed basement
accommodation. Alterations to existing driveway and
hard standing at front and reduction of existing patio
area to the rear.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions, reason and Informatives listed on Agenda, and subject to deletion of condition 3.

RU. 07/1015

**Glebe House, Christchurch Road, Virginia Water
Change of use of part of ground floor of dwelling to dental practice including two surgeries, waiting and reception areas**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions, reasons and Informatives listed on Agenda, and additional conditions listed on Addendum.

(Dr Moore, an objector, and Mr Van Gelderen, the applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application)

RU. 07/1068

**17 and 19 The Crescent, Egham
Erection of 3 No x two storey dwellings following demolition of existing dwellings No's 17 and 19 The Crescent.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions, reasons and Informatives listed on Agenda and amendment to condition 11 and additional Informatives as per Addendum.

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

RU. 07/1067

**19 The Crescent, Egham
Erection of one detached two storey dwelling to the side of No. 19 following demolition of existing side annex.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions, reasons and Informatives listed on Agenda, and subject to additional Informatives listed on Addendum.

RU. 07/1070

**Runnymede Hotel & Spa, Windsor Road, Egham
Single storey extensions to ground floor comprising reception area, office area, kitchen support, leisure area and private events area. Elevation enhancements, minor alterations to existing parking, new cycle and footpath route linking the Thames Path to Runnymede Meadows.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions, reason and Informatives listed on Agenda.

RU. 07/1087

**Land adj 55 Riversdell Close, Chertsey
Retrospective application for amendment to planning permission RU. 06/0622 to change rear conservatory to brick built extension and insertion of one ground floor window in side southern elevation and one first floor obscure glazed side window in northern elevation.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions, reasons and Informatives listed on Agenda.

(Mr Collinge, an objector, and Mr. Hussain, the applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application).

332. 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.

333. URGENT ACTION - STANDING ORDER 42

The Committee noted that the following action had been taken after consultation with the Chairman of this Committee under Standing Order 42.

<u>Officer</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Central Index No.</u>
Director of Technical Services	Release of planning permission in respect of residential development at 18, 20, and 22 Bousley Rise, Ottershaw, upon safe receipt of financial contribution avoiding the need to complete a Section 106 Agreement.	646

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 9.53 p.m.)