

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE19 January 2005 at 7.30 p.m.

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

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

465. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 22 December 2004 were approved and signed as a correct record.

466. 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 applicant(s) agent(s) 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 04/1333**

**Land r/o 21 - 35 Marsh Lane, Addlestone
Demolition of 31 Marsh Lane, formation of new access off Marsh Lane and erection of 12 no. two-storey dwellings comprising 1 pair of semis, and 2 terraces of 4 houses and one of 6 houses together with parking and associated works.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**RU 04/1380**

**Hayden Court, Pinewood Park, New Haw
Erection of 3-storey building comprising 6 no. 1 bedroom flats and demolition of 10 garages and refurbishment of 6 existing garages and store.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

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

RU 04/0987

**87 - 89 Common Lane, New Haw, Addlestone
Outline application for demolition of existing dwellings and erection of 4 no. semi-detached two-storey dwellings and 1 no. detached two-storey dwelling with parking, garage and vehicular access from Loncin Mead Avenue.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**RU 04/1264**

The Applestore, Wick Lane, Englefield Green

Erection of two-storey detached replacement dwelling and basement following demolition of the existing dwelling and the conservatory from West Lodge.

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:-

1. **The proposed replacement dwelling by reason of its increase in bulk, floor area, height and mass would result in an inappropriate development within the Green Belt over and above the size of the building on the site as at May 1986 which would be prominent, harmful and detrimental to the openness and visual amenities of the Green Belt, contrary to Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Policies GB1 and GB6 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and the advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: 'Green Belts'.**
2. **The Planning Authority do not consider that any very special circumstances have been put forward in support of this application to justify the granting of planning permission contrary to Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Policies GB1 and GB6 of the Runnymede Borough Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and the advice contained within Planning Guidance Note 2: 'Green Belts'.**

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

RU 04/1274

Central Veterinary Laboratory, Woodham Lane, New Haw

Erection of HV Building to provide accommodation for transformer, 2 no. switch rooms and aux/meter room following demolition of generator and freezer (Circular 18/84 Consultation).

DECISION: NO OBJECTIONS.

467. PLANNING OBLIGATIONS - REVISED CIRCULAR

The Committee considered a report on a draft Revised Circular which sought to improve the current system for Planning Obligations.

The consultation invited comments on two areas; namely revisions to Circular 1/97 and changes to appeal time limits.

The current planning obligation mechanism had created a certain amount of ambiguity in relation to what was 'necessary' for a development to proceed. The reforms focused on planning obligations being necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms. The revisions placed greater emphasis upon a link between the contribution sought and the presence of a relevant spatial planning policy. The emphasis of the new planning system was to set decisions on development proposals in the context of the wider social, economic and environmental requirements of the community. Accordingly whilst the essence of planning obligations was more narrowly defined, the context for decision making was much wider. This could compound the areas of ambiguity until such a time as some wider guidelines had been established.

The proposed clarification of Policy on contributions for Affordable Housing recognising the positive relationship between planning obligations and affordable housing would reflect current practice. This would provide the first stage in reviewing affordable housing secured through the planning framework. Whilst the clarification on Section 106 and affordable housing was welcomed, the uncertainties created by delaying a policy position on securing such housing through development value uplift did not help Local Planning Authorities (LPA) attempting to develop policies on their LDFs.

The Guidance on use of Independent Third Parties, recoup of costs and monitoring of implementation of Planning Obligations and the encouragement of use of formulae and standard charges and use of Unilateral Undertakings were welcomed, but it was important that the administrative cost of monitoring Section 106 Agreements needed to be recognised. The concept of a standard charge for Section 106 contributions was helpful. However, it must be recognised that a development would only be able to accommodate a certain level of cost. Accordingly the various Authorities (the LPA, the transport and even health interest) would need to recognise the 'limitations' of this concept.

The proposed reduction from 6 to 3 months of the time limit for appeals against refusal to allow modification and discharge of planning obligations was logical and consistent with related timescales for other types of planning appeal.

In conclusion the Committee considered that the test applied to securing contributions towards social and physical infrastructure deemed to be associated with new development had become confused and the revised Circular needed to provide clarity and sensibility.

RESOLVED that -

the above-mentioned comments be forwarded to the ODPM as the formal comments of this Council on the draft Revised Circular on Planning Obligations.

468. SURREY WASTE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION

The Committee considered a detailed report of the work being undertaken by Surrey County Council in relation to waste policy and details of numerous consultation documents which had been issued for comment.

Surrey County Council was reviewing the Surrey Waste Local Plan, which was now called a Waste Local Development Framework (LDF) under the recent Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. A number of issues papers and technical papers had been published for consultation.

It was anticipated that this consultation would help inform the draft plan stage which would commence in Autumn 2005, then following consultation on this, the revised plan would be submitted to the Secretary of State. A public examination was expected in 2006 followed by adoption in 2007.

The detailed issues contained within the various Consultation Papers and Officer comments thereon are attached at Appendix 'A'. These comments were fully endorsed by the Committee. The Consultation Papers reiterated the emphasis on waste minimisation, reuse and recycling, the promotion of management of waste close to place of origin (proximity principle), the reaffirmation of the move away from landfill except in exceptional circumstances. Other Consultation Papers outlined methodology for identification of sites for waste related activities, outlined the Best Practicable Options for Waste Disposal, and assessed individual sites for potential waste related development.

RESOLVED that -

the comments at Appendix 'A' be forwarded to Surrey County Council as this Authority's initial comments on the consultation paper.

469. 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.

470. APPEAL DECISIONS

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

<u>Site/Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
i) 9 Howards Lane, Addlestone - planning appeal regarding single storey infill extension (RU 04/0256)	ALLOWED
ii) Land adj 91 Chertsey Lane, Staines – open storage of five touring caravans for temporary period of six months (RU 04/0314)	DISMISSED

The Committee stressed the importance of stating in Supplementary Planning Guidance documents that their preparation had been the subject of public consultation.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 9.16 p.m.)