

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE3 October 2001 at 7.30 p.m.

Members of the Committee present: Councillors K.J. Clark (Chairman), V.E. Barker (Vice-Chairman), Mrs. F.M. Angell, Mrs. F.J. Barden, Mrs. P.I. Broadhead, A.G. Collins, J.M. Edwards, Mrs. C.Y. Jones, Mrs. V.R.T. Lenton-Smith, A.M. Moore, Mrs. J. Norman, R. Pate, A.P. Tollett, F.J. Tourlamain and J.R. Whiteley

Members of the Committee absent: None

Councillors Mrs. L.M. Gillham, Mrs. E.E. Price and G.B. Woodger also attended.

280. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 5 September 2001 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

281. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors A.G. Collins and G.B. Woodger declared interests under the National Code of Local Government Conduct in respect of planning applications RU.01/0811 and RU.01/0697 respectively. As the interests were clear and substantial, Councillors Collins and Woodger withdrew from the room at the appropriate time.

282. 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:

<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION</u>
RU.01/0225	50 Station Road, Egham Continued use of ground floor as taxi control office and a separate office use (Class B1) in the rear part of the ground floor. DECISION: GRANT temporary one year permission subject to conditions.
RU.01/0556	12 Northcroft Villas, Englefield Green Renewal of planning permission RU.96/0367 for erection of a two-storey side and rear extension. DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.
RU.01/0697	Ebro Cottage, Wellington Avenue, Virginia Water Erection of a detached games room in the rear garden of the property. DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

- RU.01/0704** **Auto-Italia, Bridge Road, formerly Abbey Mead, Bridge Road, Chertsey**
Installation of seven lights.
DECISION: Following consultation with the Council's Lighting Engineer to impose appropriate conditions to prevent light spillage beyond the site, the Borough Technical Services Officer be authorised to GRANT permission following consultation with Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee.
- RU.01/0743** **222 Chertsey Lane, Staines**
Erection of conservatory to the rear of the dwelling.
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.
- RU.01/0811** **Fort Rupert Villa, 15 Limes Road, Egham**
Erection of two-storey rear extension following demolition of existing single-storey extension (amended plans received 13.9.01)
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.
- RU.01/0866** **26 - 28 Pinewood Grove, New Haw**
Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of four new dwellings with associated parking.
DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:
- 1. The proposed development represents a piecemeal backland development which is out of character and detrimental to the appearance of the area. Due to the backland nature it would lead to overlooking and an increase in noise and disturbance to existing residential dwellings to the detriment of the amenities of the occupiers of these properties. The proposal is therefore considered unacceptable and contrary to Policy PE10 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994 and Policies HO9 and BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan April 2001.**
 - 2. Notwithstanding the inaccuracies of the plan in relation to the location and crown spread of the trees, the proposed development by reason of its siting would be likely to damage the existing trees on the site which are protected by Tree Preservation Order No. 334. Furthermore, due to the proximity of the trees to the proposed dwellings, Plots 2 to 4, it is unlikely that a satisfactory living environment would be created for future occupiers and it is likely there would be requests for removal of the trees or regular tree works would be required. This would be detrimental to the health of the trees, the visual amenities of the area and contrary to Policies NE12 and NE14 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**
 - 3. Undesirable Precedent (R445)**
- RU.01/0879** **74 Bishops Way, formerly Thorpe Road Estate, Egham**
Erection of a detached garage to the rear of the property.
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

- RU.01/0895** **19 Gogmore Farm Close, formerly part of Gogmore Farm, Erkenwald Close, Chertsey**
Single-storey front extension.
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.
- RU.01/0910** **23 Linden Close, New Haw**
Single-storey extension to the side, comprising garage and store, following demolition of existing (revised plan received 20.9.01)
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.
- RU.01/0914** **Little Gable, 7 Foxhills Close, Ottershaw**
Formation of rooms in the roof space, garage side extension, single storey side extension to form study and porch, rear conservatory and front side extension to form porch and dining room.
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.
- RU.01/0915** **DSO, Fordwater Trading Estate, Ford Road, Chertsey**
Erection of new refuse vehicle wash-down bay
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.
- RU.01/0919** **2 Crown Cottage, Whitehall Lane, Egham**
Erection of a two-storey side extension
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.
- RU.01/0923** **Ambergate, Heath Rise, Virginia Water**
Erection of first-floor side extension and front porch, conversion of existing integral double garages to habitable accommodation and erection of a detached double garage at the front of the plot
DECISION: REFUSE for the following reason:
The proposed detached garage by reason of its floor area, prominent position in close proximity to the front boundary would result in a dominant structure detrimental to the visual amenities of the streetscene and out of character with the surrounding area contrary to Policy PE10 of the Surrey Structure Plan and Policies BE2 and HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.
- RU.01/0960** **28 Orchard Avenue, Woodham**
Erection of part single and two-storey rear extension (revised plans received 24.9.01)
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.
- RU.01/0984** **8 Manor Way, Egham**
Demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey side and rear extension and erection of front porch canopy.

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

283. CAR PARKING STANDARDS – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

The Committee was informed of comments received following public consultation on the Revised Car Parking Standards which would form supplementary planning guidance to the Borough Local Plan and be accompanied by details of the Runnymede Travel Initiative and Travel Plans.

Appendix 'A' sets out a summary of comments received during the consultation period together with Officer responses and recommendations.

The main issues and concerns arising from the public consultation were that the reduced residential parking standard would increase on-street parking problems and that the standard should be operated as a minimum, increased congestion caused by new businesses being attracted to Runnymede as a result of an apparent relaxed commercial parking standard compared to other authorities and doubts over the establishment of a link between the Car Parking Standard, the Runnymede Travel Initiative (RTI) and Travel Plans.

With regard to the residential parking standard, Government guidance was very prescriptive and left little scope for flexibility, although the Council had advised Government of the need to make further investment to encourage less reliance on cars.

The commercial standard was consistent with Government advice and reflected a realistic balance between the needs to travel by car and available public transport alternatives in Runnymede compared to other boroughs.

In view of Government advice to secure travel plans alongside planning applications which were likely to have significant transport implications and that these could form part of wider local authority initiatives, it was considered appropriate to emphasise the relationship between the Standard, RTI and Travel Plans.

A few minor changes would be made to the Standard, but in general the recommended changes focused on the need to clarify the status of the documents accompanying the Supplementary Planning Guidance.

RECOMMEND that -

the amendments proposed in Appendix 'A' be approved and the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Car Parking incorporating these changes and set out in Appendix 'B' be formally adopted.

284. 'SURREY DESIGN : A STRATEGIC GUIDE FOR QUALITY BUILT ENVIRONMENTS' – CONSULTATION

The Committee considered a report on the Consultation draft of a new Design Guide for built development in Surrey, which had been prepared by the Surrey Local Government Association (SLGA).

The previous Guide was very much concentrated on highway design and tended to result in layouts based on the needs of the car without regard to other considerations. The new Guide covered the full range of considerations necessary to achieve high quality sustainable built development. The Guide gave advice on numerous areas but greater emphasis was now being placed on pedestrians, people with mobility impairments, cyclists and public transport and less on highway engineering requirements.

The Guide would be used by architects and developers in designing schemes and give an indication of the expectations of the planning authorities. It would also be used by planning officers to help them assess the quality of submitted applications and pre-application proposals.

It was considered that the draft Guide was very lengthy and that further work was required to revise the document to address the needs of planning staff or to create a further version that met their specific needs.

As a strategic guide, and concentrating on design principles rather than their practical application, there was concern that it would not be as effective as it could be. The Guide should be more focused on the needs of its target users in order to be more useful as a design tool. In this respect greater use should be made of case studies to demonstrate how principles should be applied (for example how to achieve high quality high density residential development). Training on urban design based on the draft Guide was planned for later in the year. Design training could also be tailored for Members of the Planning Committee.

The use of the Design Guide had resource implications. Planning Officers would be expected to consider a wide range of design matters, including some areas where they may have limited expertise or experience, which would be more time consuming. Developers would also be required to provide additional information and additional officer time might be taken up in ensuring that this

was achieved, with consequent cost implications and adverse effect on speed of determination of applications.

The encouragement of flexible application of highways' standards would require greater resources to determine the acceptability of future schemes in highways' terms. The County Council would need to ensure that they had sufficient resources to provide the level of advice required.

RESOLVED that -

- i) Members endorse the design principles set out in 'Surrey Design';**
- ii) the SLGA be informed of the above-mentioned concerns; and**
- iii) Members note the resource implications associated with achieving higher quality built developments.**

285. PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY BOROUGH TECHNICAL SERVICES OFFICER

A list of the planning applications recently determined by the Borough Technical Services Officer under his delegated powers was received and noted.

286. APPEAL DECISION

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

Site/Development

Decision

156 Almnors Road, Lyne – planning appeal regarding replacement roof incorporating living accommodation (RU 01/0053)

DISMISSED

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 9.10 p.m.)