

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE22 January 2003 at 7.30 p.m.

Members of the Committee present: Councillors V.E. Barker (Chairman), Mrs. J. Norman (Vice Chairman), Mrs. F.M. Angell, J.R. Ashmore, Mrs. F.J. Barden, J.R. Furey, Mrs. L.M. Gillham, P.A. Greenwood, C.J. Norman, R. Pate, P.J. Poole, Mrs. V.A. Smallman, N. Thewlis, A.P. Tollett, and J.R. Whiteley

Members of the Committee absent: None

Councillors A.J. Davis, Mrs. E.E. Price and G.J. Thomas also attended.

562. 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. The changes were for a fixed period ending on the day after the meeting and thereafter the Councillors removed would be re-appointed.

<u>Group requesting Change</u>	<u>Remove from Membership</u>	<u>Appoint Instead</u>
Conservative	Councillor J.M Edwards	Councillor P.J. Poole
Conservative	Councillor A.G. Collins	Councillor C.J. Norman

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

563. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 18 December 2002 were approved and signed as a correct record.

564. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor Mrs F.J. Barden declared a personal and prejudicial interest in applications RU 02/1477 and 1496 under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members on the basis of a personal acquaintance. Councillor Barden withdrew from the room when the applications were determined.

565. 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 02/1123

**Bridge Wharf, Bridge Road, Chertsey
Residential development comprising 198 new apartment dwellings, including the provision of 54 units as affordable housing**

DECISION: Following the consideration of any further views from the Environment Agency in respect of conservation matters, resolution of the security design issues and the completion of a legal agreement to secure:

- 1. the provision of access alterations, improvements to the existing right-hand turn lane and a traffic calming gateway feature at Bridge Road/Thames Street. (The access alterations and right-hand turn lane are generally as shown on application drawings and those approved under application no. RU 02/1006. The developer will be required to meet the costs of any Traffic Regulation Orders, new or amended street lighting, road markings, signing, re-surfacing, highway landscaping and any consultations required to implement the necessary works all as may be agreed with the Highway Authority.)**
- 2. a contribution of £30,000 towards traffic calming and/or junction improvements to the junction of Mead Lane/Stepgates/Fordwater Road/Weir Road and the installation and maintenance of two new bus stops on Bridge Road. In addition the developer shall meet all the expenses incurred by the Highway Authority in undertaking the required public consultation relating to the introduction of traffic calming features.**
- 3. the provision and maintenance of cycle tracks and footpaths through the site (including Hazelbank Road) together with all the necessary traffic signs, road markings and lighting associated with the footpaths and cycle routes through the site.**
- 4. a new footway along the Hazelbank Road frontage together with appropriate pedestrian dropped kerbs and tactile paving on the new and existing footways in Hazelbank Road and any new or amended street lighting.**
- 5. a contribution of £150,000 towards the 'Runnymede Travel Initiative'.**
- 6. the provision and maintenance of a Riverside Walkway together with adjoining landscaped areas over which the public will have access rights during daylight hours, such works to include linking the walkway with and through the adjoining public open space.**
- 7. funding of two CCTV cameras on the Riverside Walkway as part of the Safer Runnymede project to a maximum cost of £34,000.**

8. a contribution of £35,000 towards the provision of an equipped play area in the locality.
9. a contribution of £5,000 towards mitigation measures at Chertsey Meads LNR, including such measures as the provision of additional refuse collections.
10. provision of not less than 27% of the total number of dwellings as affordable housing units.

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 02/1142** ICL Beaumont, Burfield Road, Old Windsor, Berkshire Extensions to the buildings including a 3 storey accommodation block comprising 135 bedrooms with associated car park following demolition of ancillary buildings.
DECISION: Raise OBJECTION for the following reason:-
- The height of the proposed accommodation blocks would exceed the height of the adjoining Beaumont South accommodation building contrary to the advice contained in paragraphs C2 and C3 of Annex C of PPG2 : 'Green Belts'. The proposed development would therefore constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt contrary to PPG2 : 'Green Belts'.
- RU 02/1141** ICL Beaumont, Burfield Road, Old Windsor, Berkshire Listed Building consent for extensions to the buildings including a 3 storey accommodation block comprising 135 bedrooms with associated car parking following demolition of ancillary buildings.
DECISION: NO OBJECTION
- RU 02/1281** Ascot Race Course, High Street, Ascot, Berkshire The erection of a new grandstand with hotel, conference facilities, parade ring with associated works following demolition of existing grandstand.
DECISION: NO OBJECTION subject to conditions.
- RU 02/1412** 24-26 Simplemarsh Road, Addlestone Demolition of existing flats and outbuildings and erection of three-storey block comprising 6 no. two bedroom flats.
DECISION: APPLICATION WITHDRAWN
- RU 02/1477** Pannells Farm, Hanworth Lane, Chertsey Retention of mobile home on the land.
DECISION:
- i) Following receipt and consideration of any further representations received by 23.1.2003, 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.

- ii) **The Enforcement Notice dated 13.5.2002 in respect of the mobile home be withdrawn.**

- RU 02/1496** **Pannells Farm, Hanworth Lane, Chertsey
Removal of condition 3 of planning permission RU 98/0504 and condition 1 of planning permission RU 99/0446 in respect of the retention of existing farm buildings.
DECISION: Following receipt and consideration of any further representations received by 23.1.2003, 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 02/1318** **The Gate House, Wick Road, Englefield Green
Erection of single storey front and rear extensions plus alterations to use the existing building for an office (Class B1) use.
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**
- RU 02/1322** **Spring Cottage, 420D Woodham Lane, New Haw
Demolition of existing rear extension, erection of ground floor rear extension and conversion of loft area to habitable accommodation.
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**
- RU 02/1337** **166A and 167 High Street, Egham
Change of use of ground floor from Class A1 (retail) to Class A2 (financial and professional services) together with two storey rear extension with Class A2 and 1 no. flat on the ground floor of the extension and first floor flat above.
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**
- RU 02/1391** **85 Selbourne Avenue, New Haw
Erection of single storey side and rear extension
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**
- RU 02/1405** **Brook House, 71A Harpesford Avenue, Virginia Water
Felling of 5 Oak trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order
DECISION: REFUSE for the following reason:**
- The five Oak trees are considered to be in a sound and healthy condition and make a valuable contribution to public amenity and should continue to be preserved in accordance with Policy PE9 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE7 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002, and Policies NE12 and NE13 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**

(An Amendment that permission be granted for the felling of up to 3 trees on the eastern boundary of the site nearest the house subject to replacement young trees of suitable species being planted on advice of specialist arboricultural advice was LOST).

- RU 02/1407** **2 The Hythe, Staines**
Erection of single storey rear extension with balcony above
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU 02/1408** **2 The Hythe, Staines**
Erection of single storey rear extension with balcony above
DECISION: GRANT Listed Building Consent subject to
conditions.
- RU 02/1413** **Embourne House, Bourneside, Virginia Water**
Creation of a second vehicular access onto Bourneside and
the erection of entrance wall, brick piers and gates to a
maximum height of 2.7 metres
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.
- RU 02/1415** **Gayton Court, Woodham Lane, Woodham**
Demolition of existing garage and erection of new garage
and store with habitable accommodation above.
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.
- RU 02/1427** **Adj. 32 Strodes Street, Egham**
Erection of detached two storey dwelling with loft
accommodation following demolition of existing
fishmonger and curing buildings
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU 02/1431** **Curlhawes, Village Road, Thorpe**
Fell Purple Plum tree rear of garage along western side
boundary
DECISION: No Tree Preservation Order be made.

566. DRAFT SURREY STRUCTURE PLAN

The Committee considered a report on the Draft Surrey Structure Plan.

The County Council had proposed significant changes to the spatial strategy and the housing allocation for the county over the period 2001-2016. The changes had directed attention away from major urban extensions at Woking and Guildford, which had been supported by nine of the eleven Local Authorities in Surrey, to a housing distribution based upon the results of an urban capacity study. In addition the Government required the 7,500 urban reserve to be formally allocated as part of the urban capacity study.

The result of the change, in terms of the 'allocated housing', had been to raise the total proposed for Runnymede from 1700 to 1920. However, the 7,500 additional allocations (urban reserve) would also have to be allocated through the County. The work on allocating the 7,500 units would need to be completed by July 2003 so that the data could be considered by the time of the Examination in Public (a formal inquiry) in October 2003.

The Committee expressed some concern and surprise that the Spatial Strategy which had been carefully constructed over a lengthy period and met the approval of most authorities in Surrey had been changed without a robust technical appraisal or justification. This could be raised at the EIP. One of the key features of focusing development at Woking and Guildford, in terms of potential Local Transport Plan capital 'infrastructure' investment, had been lost. No real consideration of the opportunities lost, by concentrating infrastructure resources in these locations had been forthcoming.

The revised requirement to complete an urban capacity study by July 2003 rather than as originally required by December 2003 required a revised approach. The revised approach and timescale had significant staff resource implications and many authorities were unclear if they could meet the

requirements. In addition, the revised spatial strategy also changed the emphasis of the study from producing 57% of the housing total to approximately 93%. The study therefore had to be robust and able to withstand close scrutiny at the EIP. Resources may need to be diverted away from other activities to do the Urban Capacity Studies.

With regard to the reserve sites, some attention may focus on the category 2 and 3 sites to meet future housing requirements in the County for the period up to 2016. These were predominantly Greenfield sites within the urban area and as such should not fall into the category of sites to be considered as part of the urban capacity study. However, if the study failed to meet the target figures then attention may turn to other greenfield sites. In this scenario, there should be a strategic search across the County to release only the most sustainable sites.

The Committee was prepared to accommodate a housing distribution based on an equitable allocation of the total requirement provided it was based on a thorough and robust urban capacity study in each borough in accordance with an agreed and rigorously applied methodology.

In view of deadline for comment, this matter was a delegated function for the purposes of this decision only in accordance with Para 1.3 of the Constitution.

RESOLVED that –

- i) the comments set out in this report be forwarded to the County Council as formal observations on the draft Surrey Structure Plan;**
- ii) the County Council be advised that the Borough Council is prepared to accommodate a housing distribution which reflects an equitable allocation of the total requirement that is based upon:**
 - (a) a thorough and robust urban capacity study in each borough, which is based on an agreed and rigorously applied methodology**
 - (b) the opportunity for independent audit of the complete study before it is published to ensure compliance with (a),**
- iii) an understanding that the urban capacity study would not include the housing reserve sites, the inclusion of which would be contrary to the Structure Plan Priorities in the North Surrey Sub-area, which aim to restrict development to the re-use of previously developed land and buildings and retain and improve all urban open land and urban fringe countryside; and**
- iv) the means of providing appropriate officer resources to complete the work be endorsed.**

567. HABITATS DIRECTIVE AND LAND USE PLANNING REGIME – CONSULTATION ON LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

The Committee considered a report on a Consultation Paper on the Habitats Directive and Land Use Planning Regime issued by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA).

The Government proposed to revise the Regulations surrounding the granting of planning permission on development sites that had European protected species. It proposed to combine the two current mechanisms into one process.

The Government considered that it would be desirable for Local Planning Authorities to have the responsibility of judging whether the issues which arose from activities related to the granting of planning permission met the tests laid down in the guidance appropriate for the issuing of a separate licence in respect of protected species. This would mean that all of the issues relevant to a development proposal would be considered as part of a single process rather than in two separate regimes as currently occurred. This would ensure effective implementation of the Directive, remove the need for a separate application for a licence and provide a more efficient overall service. The Government therefore proposed to amend the procedures for dealing with licences resulting from developmental activities authorised by the granting of planning permission.

Members considered that the integration of the land use planning regime and the licence arrangements were a rational way to deal with development related proposals that impacted upon European protected species on a specific site.

The presence of protected species did not automatically preclude development taking place although certain conditions would need to be satisfied before permission could be granted. Specialist advice would need to be sought on sites that contained protected species, and English Nature would retain its general statutory function to provide advice on such development proposals. If the Local Planning Authority disagreed with the advice of English Nature, then the Authority would need to seek the views of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister before proceeding to grant planning permission.

Guidance would also be provided where a developer post-planning permission discovered protected species on site. This would require another survey and inevitably give rise to delays in the development process until the matter was resolved. This highlighted the need for a thorough survey to be undertaken at the outset. The developers would be required to seek the agreement of the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to proceed. The Secretary of State would then seek the views of the Local Planning Authority (LPA) and English Nature (EN).

The Committee considered that the proposals, in principle, for the draft Guidance to regulate the assessment of proposals on development sites that had protected species were acceptable. Each case would need to be determined on merit and the opportunity to refer applications to the ODPM where there were differences of opinion between the LPA and EN would be a constructive way forward. Some clarification was required as to whether the presence of a protected species on a site would be pivotal in determining a development proposal.

Whilst the resource implications for Councils arising from the proposal would be minimal, it would be important to ensure that there were sufficient resources at EN to meet the Government objectives for determining applications within the target statutory timescales.

RESOLVED that –

the above-mentioned comments be forwarded to the Government as a formal response to the consultation on legislative proposals: Habitats Directive and Land Use Planning Regime.

568. APPEAL DECISIONS

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

<u>Site/Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
i) 44 Common Lane, New Haw – planning appeal regarding alteration to existing planning permission to enlarge study bedroom and provide two conservatories (RU02/0543)	ALLOWED
ii) Rose Cottage, Stonehill Road, Chertsey – planning appeal regarding construction of a first floor rear extension (RU02/0311)	ALLOWED

569. STANDING ORDER 42 – URGENT ACTION

The Committee noted that acting in accordance with Standing Order 42 the following action had been undertaken by the officers shown below after consultation with the Chairman.

<u>Officer</u>	<u>Action Taken</u>	<u>Central Index No</u>
Director of Technical Services	Authorisation to place an emergency Tree Preservation Order on 8 trees within the curtilage of Stillwater and Wych Dell, Oak End Way, Woodham.	513
Director of Administration and Leisure	Deletion of reference to retention of pontoons from Section 106 Agreement in connection with the Chertsey Bridge Wharf redevelopment	514

570. 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 10.08 p.m.)