

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE27 October 2004 at 7.30 p.m.

Members of the Committee present: Councillors G.B. Woodger (Chairman), J.R. Ashmore, J. Broadhead, J.B. Dean, J.M. Edwards, Ms. R.E. Haylor, C. Knight, H.W.V. Meares, Mrs. J. Norman, R. Pate, B.J. Relph, N. Thewlis, A.P. Tollett and J.R. Whiteley

Members of the Committee absent: Councillor Mrs F. M. Angell.

Councillor Mrs. P.I. Broadhead also attended

292. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Group 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 J.R. Furey	Councillor J.M. Edwards
Conservative	Councillor D.W. Parr	Councillor C. Knight
Conservative	Councillor Mrs. F.J. Barden	Councillor Ms. R.E. Haylor

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

293. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 29 September 2004 were approved and signed as a correct record.

294. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Mrs. F.M. Angell.

295. 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 04/0906**

**16 Addlestone Park, Addlestone
Erection of 8 flats with associated parking and landscaping (amendments to planning approval RU 03/0181) (Additional plans received 21.9.04)**

DECISION: Following the completion of a legal

agreement to secure dedication of land to become a public highway in connection with the footway construction, 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.

RU 04/0879

**6 Caddy Close, Egham
Erection of first floor side and rear extension.**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. **The proposed side extension by reason of its design, siting, height, mass and bulk, and proximity to the common boundary with no.5 Caddy Close would result in an incongruous, prominent and over dominant structure out of keeping with the visual amenities of the street scene, contrary to Policy PE10 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002 (Proposed Modifications June 2004), Policies HO9 and BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration Adopted April 2001 and advice contained within the Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Householders' July 2003.**
2. **The proposed side extension by reason of its design, siting, height, mass and bulk in close proximity to the boundary with No. 5 would result in an un-neighbourly form of development having overbearing and overshadowing effects, detrimental to the residential amenities of No.5 Caddy Close, contrary to Policy PE10 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002 (Proposed Modifications June 2004), Policies HO9 and BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration Adopted April 2001 and advice contained within the Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Householders' July 2003.**

RU 04/0902

**Caradoc, Pinewood Road, Virginia Water
Erection of detached two storey 5 bed dwelling with basement following demolition of existing dwelling and detached garage (revised)**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

RU 04/0970

**Unit B12, Capons Yard, Thorpe Industrial Estate, Thorpe
Change of use of unit from printers to MOT testing, vehicle repair and servicing, and change to front elevation, increasing size of the front entrance doors.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

RU 04/1015

38 Wren Crescent, Addlestone
Erection of part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory and garage.

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

RU 04/1024

Land adjacent 27 Milton Road, Addlestone
Erection of 1 two storey attached dwelling to form a two-bed unit with car parking at rear.

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reason:

The proposed development by reason of its floor area, size, height, design and siting in close proximity to common boundaries would result in a significant amount of built form to the side of the existing property resulting in a cramped and prominent form of development, eroding the open character of this corner plot, incompatible with its surroundings, with a roof design which would unbalance the symmetry of the resulting building, detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the character of the surrounding area, contrary to Policies HO9 and BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan (Second Alteration) April 2001, Policy PE10 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft 2002 (Proposed Modifications June 2004), Surrey Design 2002 and Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: 'Housing'.

RU 04/1042

31 Farleigh Road, New Haw
Conversion of loft to habitable accommodation and incorporation of front and rear dormer windows

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

296. PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE NOTE 25: DEVELOPMENT AND FLOOD RISK - REVIEW OF

The Committee was invited by the Government to comment on the operation of the current PPG25: 'Development and Flood Risk' as it was considering revising the PPG as a new style planning policy statement in accordance with the new Planning Framework.

The Government was committed to ensuring that its development and planning policy sought where possible to reduce and certainly not to add to the overall level of flood risk. However, the Government had set out its ambition to achieve significant housing provision in the south-east over the period to 2016. For the foreseeable future, the Government envisaged that some development in flood risk areas would continue. The Government would need to ensure that where development took place in flood risk areas the risk was managed by the implementation of flood protection mitigation measures.

The focus of guidance for future flood policy in Runnymede would be the Local Development Framework (LDF). The advice would need to consider the pressure for development in the Borough with the need to minimise the potential impact of development within a flood risk area. It would be helpful if the Government sought a view from the Association of British Insurers to guide the preparation of the LDF on whether insurance would be available for developments that proceeded contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency (EA).

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) had reviewed the statutory consultee role of the EA and intended to consult on extending its role to all planning applications in areas of flood risk. This would provide, in cases where a planning authority proposed to proceed with approval of a development where there was a sustained objection from the Environment Agency, for a reference to be made to the Secretary of State (SoS) to decide whether it should be 'called in' for determination.

For minor applications the Council had agreed standing advice with the EA to process applications using agreed standard conditions. For other applications the EA required a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) to be undertaken. The comments from the EA on the FRA would be taken into account when determining the application. The quality of FRA submissions by applicants was variable with further information often required. The Committee considered that clearer direction was required regarding whether planning applications could be made invalid when an FRA was not submitted or whether the lack of FRA was sufficient reason to refuse a planning application.

The Committee was concerned at the potential change in legislation enabling the Secretary of State (SoS) to intervene. The Local Planning Authority would lose significant discretion when assessing the social, economic and environmental issues associated with a development scheme, if the SoS intervened in support of the EA. It would probably only take one or two local interventions to effectively set the future policy framework for applications in Flood Risk Areas.

Table 1 of PPG25 defined what type of developments may be allowed within the high risk developed, undeveloped and sparsely developed areas. A more detailed description of characteristics of these areas in flooding terms was required for more consistent decision making.

Further guidance and clarification on how the sequential tests in PPG25 should be applied was required. For example, could the search area for a lower risk site extend to the applicant's own land interest, Borough boundaries or flood catchment area?

There was no reference in PPG25 to 'dry islands'. There were many dry islands of varying sizes in the Borough and the EA often raised objection to a development because it was located within a dry island with no dry escape route to safely evacuate people. The absence of any guidance on this issue in PPG25 occasionally made it difficult to assess these applications. Clear and detailed guidance was required on this issue.

Redevelopment of existing buildings offered the opportunity to build in flood defence measures such as raised floor slabs or floodable voids. Government guidance should reflect this and encourage such positive redevelopment. Services and utilities serving dwellings should be made more flood resistant, to enable residents to remain in occupation in the event of a lesser flood threat.

Members considered that PPG25 should also address the issue of groundwater flooding. There was generally little or no evidence of this type of flooding but it did have an impact on flood events. Groundwater flooding data needed to be included with the new flood zone maps recently issued by the EA. Direct and explicit references that groundwater flooding was required within FRA would be helpful.

The issue of an agreed climate change tolerance figure over and above the known flood level for a site needed to be agreed for each flood catchment area. This would ensure that any new building was raised above the anticipated future flood level.

RESOLVED that –

the above-mentioned comments be forwarded as a formal response to the Government's request for observations on Planning Policy Guidance Note 25 : 'Development and Flood Risk.

297. SURREY MINERALS DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

The Committee considered a report on Surrey County Council's Report on Potential Mineral Working Zones for sand and gravel extraction across the County.

The report included 13 sites within Runnymede which had been assessed. A further site at Addlestone Quarry was within Elmbridge, but immediately abutted Runnymede and the Addlestone Bournside Ward.

The County Council indicated that no decisions had yet been made on the release of these sites for mineral extraction, each had been classified for 'inclusion' or 'exclusion' in the new proposed Minerals Development Framework (MDF).

The following sites were identified for 'exclusion'. These sites were all environmentally sensitive and the Committee agreed that they should be excluded from mineral extraction.

Monks Grove, Chertsey
 Abbey Mead, Chertsey
 Abbey Chase Farm, Chertsey
 Chertsey Meads, Chertsey
 Hamm Court Farm, Chertsey
 Runnymede, Egham
 Land South East of Stroude, Stroude

Three sites at Whitehall Farm, Egham, Milton Park Farm, Egham, and Land South of Great Fosters, Egham had been designated for 'inclusion'. These sites abutted each other and therefore the impact of extraction would be concentrated in a single area over a considerable period of time. However, as they had been previously identified to be brought forward as part of the adopted Minerals Local Plan and this was accepted by the previous Planning Inspector, the Committee considered that no objections, in principle, should be raised at this time.

One site, land north of Thorpe, was identified for 'inclusion'. The site was Category 2 in the current Minerals Plan, with a very strong presumption against working. Surrey County Council now proposed the inclusion of the northern part of the site only in the new MDF.

In the previous plan, there was a recognition of the cumulative impact of mineral extraction on Thorpe, and Members expressed concerns that the presumption against working of this land may be reversed, especially as only a part of this relatively small site would be available. Strong objections were raised to the inclusion of this site.

Sites at Prune Hill, Egham and also at Trumps Farm, Virginia Water were suggested for 'inclusion' in the current assessment report although neither were identified in the current adopted Minerals Plan.

The Prune Hill site adjoined the Whitehall Farm site in Egham, and could only be worked in association with it. This would have the effect of further enlarging an area of potential extraction, comprising the abutting sites at Milton Park Farm, Whitehall Farm and Land South of Great Fosters.

There was considerable concern that restoration in the form of a suggested ornamental lake would destroy yet more of the traditional farming landscape in this part of the Borough. The County Council would be informed that the Prune Hill site should be excluded from the MDF.

The Trumps Farm, Virginia Water site, was immediately south of the former Trumps Farm landfill site, which had suffered severe landscape degradation. There was particular concern regarding the potential groundwater contamination because of the proximity of the Trumps Farm landfill. The mineral was described as poor quality fine-grained sand, and the Committee questioned whether there should be further landscape degradation over such an extensive area, plus the consequential disruption to the existing farming activities for the mining of such poor quality material. As a result, the Committee considered that this site should be excluded from the MDF.

No objections were raised to the potential extension to Addlestone Quarry which abutted the Borough boundary.

The Committee considered that a more robust approach to restoration of sites should be taken and considered it imperative that when any site was being considered to be brought forward, restoration plans had to be agreed at the outset, with a demonstration that the required quantity and quality of fill was available to complete that restoration. Permissions should be granted on a phased basis, which should be strictly adhered to so that if effective progressive restoration was not being achieved, then the next phase of mineral extraction was prevented. Fundamentally, restoration should strive to restore the land at least to its previous state, if not further improved for agricultural purposes.

RESOLVED that -

the above-mentioned comments be forwarded to Surrey County Council as this Council's comments on the Report on Potential Mineral Working Zones.

298. 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.

299. APPEAL DECISIONS

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

<u>Site/Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
a) Sainsbury's, The Causeway, Staines - advert appeal regarding two 6 sheet display unit (04/0611).	ALLOWED
b) Whitedale, Tite Hill, Egham - planning appeal regarding insertion of velux style rooflights in roof area (03/1199)	ALLOWED
c) 30 The Causeway, Staines - planning appeal regarding redevelopment to provide 11, 419 sq m of office floorspace (B1a) with associated 326 car park spaces (03/0624)	DISMISSED
d) Land at Byfleet Road, New Haw – planning appeals regarding erection of 14 and 15 metre high streetworks columns with three antennae and two equipment cabinets (03/1473) (04/0251)	DISMISSED

The Committee expressed its appreciation of the work undertaken by Officers in connection with the appeal regarding 30 The Causeway, Staines.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 8.52 p.m.)