

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE17 December 2003 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.R. Furey, Mrs L.M. Gillham, C. Knight, D.W. Parr, R. Pate, Mrs. E.E. Price, Mrs V.A. Smallman, N. Thewlis, A.P. Tollett and J. R. Whiteley

Members of the Committee absent: Councillor H.W.V. Meares

599. 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
Runnymede Independent	Councillor J.R. Ashmore	Councillor Mrs E.E. Price
Conservative	Councillor J.M. Edwards	Councillor Mrs V.A. Smallman

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

600. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 19 November 2003 were approved and signed as a correct record.

601. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors G.B. Woodger, Mrs V.A. Smallman, Mrs E.E. Price and Mrs L.M. Gillham declared personal and prejudicial interests under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members in planning application RU03/1224 on grounds of personal acquaintance with adjoining owner and/or objectors and withdrew from the meeting when the application was discussed. Councillors J.R. Furey and A.P. Tollett declared personal interests under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members in the same application but as their interests were not prejudicial the Councillors remained in attendance.

602. 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. Member(s) of the public and/or applicant(s)/agent(s) 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.

<u>APP. NO.</u>	<u>LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION</u>
RU03/0911	Savill Garden, Wick Lane, Englefield Green New Visitors' Centre and improvements to car park. Existing buildings to be demolished after completion (Circular 18/84 Consultation).

DECISION: Refer the application to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister as an acceptable departure from the provisions of the Development Plan in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Plans and Consultations) (Departures) Direction 1999 as the proposal could represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt and failing any Direction from the Minister, NO OBJECTION be raised subject to conditions.

RU03/1199

Whitedale, Tite Hill, Englefield Green
Retrospective application for insertion of velux windows in rear of roof.

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reason:

The three rooflights inserted in the rear elevation of the property would be an unneighbourly form of development causing overlooking and loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties, particularly No 4 Falaise, contrary to Policy HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.

(A motion to grant permission was lost).

(Mr D Brown, an objector and Mr Robinson, the applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application).

RU03/1205

17 Station Road North, Egham
Change of use of the ground floor from Class A1 (retail) use to Class A3 (food and drink) use.

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

RU03/1224

Wessex Cottage, College Avenue, Egham
Erection of one pair of two-storey semi-detached houses with an attached single garage with vehicular access onto College Avenue and a detached single garage with vehicular access onto Mead Close following the demolition of the existing bungalow.

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

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

RU03/1283

6 Malvern Close, Ottershaw
Erection of two-storey side extension following demolition of existing garage.

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

RU03/1322

194 Brox Road, Ottershaw
Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of two-semi-detached dwellinghouses.

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

RU03/1327

Trumps Farm Landfill Site, Kitsmead Lane, Lyne
Discharge of planning conditions 8, 10 and 11 of RU03/0200 in respect of a landfill gas assessment, details of monitoring of dust, particulates, bio aerosols and odour and a scheme of surface water management.

DECISION:

- 1) **NO OBJECTIONS** be raised in respect to the content of the Surface Water Management Plan as the details submitted are considered to comply with planning condition 11 of RU03/0200.
- 2) **NO OBJECTIONS** be raised to the Landfill Risk Assessment provided Surrey County Council fully consult with the Health and Safety Executive, the Environment Agency and any other relevant bodies to ensure that the details submitted fully meet the requirements of Planning Condition 8 of RU03/0200.
- 3) **STRONG OBJECTIONS** be raised to the discharge of condition 10 ("Programme for the monitoring of dust, particulates and odour") on the grounds that the monitoring programme details a very limited sampling regime, and insufficient regard has been given to the potential of the proposal to create odour problems.

The County Council be further advised of the Council's concerns in respect of the following matters:

- A) The programme of monitoring makes no reference to a procedure for responding to complaints, and the remedial actions to be taken should an odour/dust or particulate problem be identified.
- B) The site should be monitored to ensure that the final agreed programme is adhered to and that the operations are completed within the approved time limit.
- C) With regard to the Programme for monitoring dust, particulates and odour (condition 10), the following concerns be addressed by the applicant:
 - i) Further information is requested regarding the limited sampling regime, and why monitoring checks could not be undertaken on a more frequent basis.
 - ii) The programme makes no reference to the management of the green waste at the start of the process, and for the management and storage of the final product.
 - iii) The timescale between the receipt of waste on site and its introduction to the eco pod should be addressed, and the timescale minimised so as to reduce potential odour problems.
 - iv) Further information is also requested in relation to the arrangements for storing and screening the finished compost on site, and details for the monitoring and control of odour for the compost storage area.

D) The County Council be requested to provide details on gas generation and responses of EA/HSE on landfill Risk Assessment.

603. PLANNING POLICY STATEMENT 12: LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORKS AND ACCOMPANYING DRAFT REGULATIONS

The Committee considered a detailed report on recently published draft Government Guidance and Regulations relating to local development frameworks, namely:-

- Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks
- Draft Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004
- Draft Town and Country Planning (Transitional Arrangements) (England) Regulations 2004

These documents set out in detail the requirements for the preparation of LDFs. The LDF would comprise a set of Local Development Documents (LDDs), some of which would be Development Plan documents (which formed part of the Development Plan) and others would be supplementary planning documents.

The proposed new system could have some advantages in terms of increased flexibility to produce new or revised LDDs to reflect changing circumstances and in terms of producing a more constant planning policy workload once the system was established.

The details of the Planning Policy Statement and associated Regulations, together with Officer comments thereon, which were endorsed and added to by the Committee, is attached at Appendix 'A'. The Chairman would send a covering letter with the response to highlight the following concerns expressed by Committee regarding the proposals:

- The main aim of the new planning regime was to streamline the process to overcome the delays associated with the existing system. However, it was not clear how this would be achieved with regard to the proposals for public consultation.
- There was particular concern about the timescale set out for delivery of the LDF. A major area of concern related to the procedures and practices proposed for consultation. Whilst the Council welcomed the opportunities to engage the local community with the preparation of the LDF, it was difficult to see how this could be fully or realistically achieved in the timescale envisaged having regard to the increase in bureaucracy.
- The Government needed to recognise the resource implications in meeting the objectives of public consultation and the tight timescale proposed.

RESOLVED that -

the above-mentioned comments together with the comments shown on Appendix 'A' be forwarded to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister as this Council's response to the consultation on the draft Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks, Draft Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 and Draft Town and Country Planning (Transitional Arrangements) (England) Regulations 2004.

604. DRAFT CONSULTATION PAPER ON NEW PLANNING POLICY STATEMENT 11 - REGIONAL PLANNING

The Committee considered a report on the Government's revised approach to Regional Planning set out in Planning Policy Statement 11 - Regional Planning. Under the new system the Regional Planning Bodies (RPBs) would prepare Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) to replace the existing Regional Planning Guidance (RPG) and to provide a spatial framework for preparation of LDF.

The Government required RSS to be in place within the next two years or so to set the context for LDFs. The LDFs in turn had to be completed by late 2006/early 2007. The new process and procedures were creating significant logistical problems for those authorities charged with preparing the various elements of the Development Plan document. There would be an intense period of activity associated with the new planning framework over the next 2 years and the Committee considered that the Government would need to ensure that it allocated appropriate resources to local government through such mechanisms as the Planning Delivery Grant to ensure adherence to the timescale envisaged in this PPS and documents in the same family.

Whilst the RSS set a strategic context, it would also consider sub-regional issues where appropriate. It would be for each RPB to decide upon how best to take sub-regional matters forward in the region. The deletion of the Structure Plan from the new planning framework would require new methods of working to be established. At the Borough level Members and Officers would be required to contribute towards both the technical and policy development of the RSS, particularly at the sub-regional level. This process had already commenced and Officers were involved with two sub-regional working groups. It was important that this took place to ensure policy development reflected the aspirations of the lower tiers of government. However, it was drawing Officers into additional areas of work at a time when changes were being made at the local level of the plan-making process that were already requiring significant adjustments in priorities.

The RPB would need to work on a partnership basis with local planning authorities and the Strategic Planning Authorities. The Councils would be a key part of the work of the RPB in providing information for the RSS, developing the strategy and ultimately implementing the policy approach. A key part of the RSS's would be the distribution of housing down to borough level. This will be co-ordinated by the RPB.

From the information provided it was assumed that the strategic planning authorities would be the county councils. This seemed to retain a county level input into the new planning framework without a statutory context. Whilst the Government appeared to be allowing a flexible interpretation of the counties' role in the planning process, the Committee considered it could be more appropriate and consistent with the new approach to divert the appropriate resources and powers to the borough council in a county to identify how best to satisfy the 'strategic planning input'.

RESOLVED that -

the above-mentioned comments be forwarded to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister as the formal comments of the Council in respect of the consultation on the document entitled Draft PPS 11 - Regional Planning.

605. APPEAL DECISIONS

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

<u>Site/Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
Sainsbury's, The Causeway, Staines - advert appeal regarding 3 x internally illuminated 6 sheet display units (RU03/0946)	DISMISSED
74 Harvest Road, Englefield Green - planning appeal regarding loft conversion comprising a side gable plus front and rear velux roof windows (RU03/0412)	DISMISSED

606. 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 9.32pm).