

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE7 May 2003 at 7.30 p.m.

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

Members of the Committee absent: None.

Councillors Mrs C.E. Gant, C. Knight, P.J. Poole and Mrs. E.E. Price also attended.

794. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Group mentioned below had notified the Chief Executive Officer of their wish that the change listed below be made to the membership of the Committee. The change was for a fixed period ending on the day after the meeting.

Group requesting Change	Remove from Membership	Appoint Instead
Conservative	Vacancy	Councillor G.B. Woodger

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

795. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 2 April 2003 were approved and signed as a correct record.

796. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor J.R. Ashmore declared a personal and prejudicial interest in application RU 02/1335 under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members as he was a member of Coopers Hill Sports Club. Councillor A.G. Collins also declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the item on 15A Limes Road under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members as he was a close neighbour. Councillor Collins and Ashmore withdrew from the room when the respective items were determined. Councillors N. Thewlis, G.B. Woodger and J.R. Whiteley declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in planning application RU03/0212 under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members as the applicant was known to them in a professional capacity, and did not vote thereon.

797. 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>APP. NO.</u>	<u>LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION</u>
RU03/0289	37, 39 and 41 Simplemarsh Road, Addlestone Demolition of 41 Simplemarsh Road and construction of new access road and erection of 6 x three-bedroom dwellings with associated parking and turning areas

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:-

1. **The proposal constitutes undesirable over development of the site and by reason of the siting, number of units, location of access and its piecemeal nature would be out of keeping with the character of the street scene and detrimental to the amenities of adjoining properties, contrary to Policy PE10 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002 and Policies HO1, HO9 and BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**
2. **The proposed development would, by virtue of the access road and car parking areas in close proximity to adjoining residential properties, be likely to lead to noise and disturbance to the occupiers of these properties to an unacceptable degree. As a result the proposals are contrary to Policy PE10 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002 and Policies HO9 and BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**

RU03/0310 **Journey's End & Land r/o 4, 5 and 6 Mayfield Avenue, New Haw**
Demolition of Journeys End and erection of 9 dwellings, access road, parking and landscaping with conservatories to units 1, 2 and 3 and internal alterations at first floor level to units 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9 (revisions to permission RU.02/1205)
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions

RU03/0317 **4-6 The Parade, Thorpe Road, Egham**
Erection of three storey building comprising one retail unit (Class A1) and 9 flats (4 no. 1 bed, 4 no. 2 beds and 1 no. 3 bed) with rear car parking and access off Meadow Gardens (amended description 9.4.03)
DECISION: The Director of Technical Services be authorised to REFUSE permission for the following reason and to consider the addition of a further reason in relation to access/loss of parking

1. **The proposed development by reason of its increase in floor area, scale and mass and proximity to common boundaries would represent an over development of the site resulting in an incongruous building incompatible with its surroundings and detrimental to the character and visual amenities of the surrounding area contrary to Policy PE10 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002 and Policies BE2 and HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: 'Housing'.**

RU03/0326 **24-28 Simplemarsh Road, Addlestone**
Demolition of existing buildings and erection of four flats and eight dwellings
DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:-

1. **The proposal constitutes undesirable over development of the site and by reason of the siting, number of units, means of access and piecemeal nature of the proposal would be out of keeping with the character of the street scene and detrimental to the amenities of adjoining properties, contrary to Policy PE10 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002 and Policies HO1, HO9 and BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**
2. **The proposed development would, by virtue of an access road and car parking areas in close proximity to adjoining residential properties, be likely to lead to noise and disturbance to the occupiers of these properties to an unacceptable degree. As a result the proposals would be contrary to Policy PE10 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft, December 2002 and Policies HO9 and BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration, April 2001.**
3. **The proposed development would be likely to involve the felling of trees to the detriment of the visual character and amenities of the area, contrary to Policies PE9 and PE10 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE9 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft, December 2002 and Policies HO9, NE12 and NE14 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration, April 2001.**

RU02/1180

Compass House, Guildford Street, formerly Aymer House, Chertsey

Proposed retention of one double-sided non-illuminated post sign, five non-illuminated signs to the external elevations of the building and wall and kerb mounted signage

- DECISION:**
- 1) **GRANT consent for retention of four non-illuminated signs and one externally illuminated sign to the external elevation of the building and wall and kerb-mounted signage.**
 - 2) **REFUSE permission for retention of a single double sided non-illuminated post sign for the following reason:**

The double-sided post sign, by reason of its position, height and design represents an overly prominent feature within the street scene which is out of character with the visual amenities of the area, contrary to Policies PE10 and DP18 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft, December 2002 and Policies TC1, TC9 and BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.

RU02/1335

Coopers Hill Sports Club, Coopers Hill Lane, Englefield Green

Erection of 15 no. 6.7 metre high floodlighting columns for courts 1-4 to allow use of the four tennis courts up to 10 p.m. on any day

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:-

1. **The proposed floodlighting with its high level of vertical illumination would be an unneighbourly form of development exceeding the maximum lux levels for an area of Low District Brightness (Category E2) as defined by the Institute of Lighting Engineers 'Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution', detrimental to the residential amenities of nos. 1 and 2 Hollycombe, contrary to advice contained in Planning Policy Guidance Note 1: 'General Policy and Principles' February 1997 and Planning Policy guidance Note 17: 'Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation', July 2002.**
2. **The proposed number of floodlighting columns with their high level of vertical illumination would be detrimental to the character of the Englefield Green Conservation Area and the visual amenity of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy PE12 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE5 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft, December 2002, Policy BE5 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2002, Planning Policy Guidance Note 1: 'General Policy and Principles' February 1997, Planning Policy Guidance Note 15: 'Planning and Historic Environment' September 1994 and Planning Policy Guidance Note 17: 'Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation', July 2002.**

RU02/1437

Tesco, 117 Station Road, Addlestone

Variation of condition 13 of planning permission

RU.01/0306 to extend the hours of delivery from 0700-2100 to 0600-2300 Monday to Saturday and 0900-1700 to 0900-1800 on Sunday

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reason:

The proposed amendments to extend the hours of delivery are likely to give rise to noise and disturbance at times which will be to the detriment of the residential amenities of adjoining properties, contrary to Policies SH06 and MV4 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and advice contained in Planning Policy Guidance Notes 1, 6 and 24 and the provision within the guidance of Circular 11/95 regarding "The use of conditions in planning permissions".

(A Motion that permission be granted was LOST)

Upon the request for a named vote on the Motion to refuse there voted:

For 11 (Councillors Angell, Ashmore, Barden, Edwards, Gillham, Greenwood, Pate, Smallman, Thewlis, Tollett and Whiteley)

Against 4 (Councillors Collins, Furey, Norman and Woodger)

- RU03/0273** **Tesco, 117 Station Road, Addlestone**
Retention of external lighting scheme
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU03/0281** **Tesco, 117 Station Road, Addlestone**
Variation of condition 14 to allow the lighting to the
service delivery yard to operate between the hours of 06.00
to 23.00 Monday to Saturday and 09.00 to 18.00 on
Sunday
DECISION: In light of decision on RU02/1437, the
application was deferred.
- RU03/0200** **Trumps Farm Landfill Site, Kitsmead Lane, Lyne**
Construction and operation of two green waste in-vessel
composting units for a temporary period of up to two years
DECISION: Raise STRONG OBJECTION for the following
reasons:-
- 1. Undesirable Precedent (R420)**
 - 2. The proposal conflicts with the policy for the preservation of the Metropolitan Green Belt, as defined and described in Policies PE1 and PE2 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policies LO4 and LO5 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002 and Policy GB1 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**
 - 3. The proposal would serve to both perpetuate and increase the severe environmental damage which has already been caused to this area of Green Belt countryside and to local amenity contrary to the Surrey Structure Plan 1994 Policy and Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997 WLP7.**
 - 4. The Borough Council does not consider that the County Council has put forward sufficient reasons to justify the acceptance of the proposed development within the Green Belt or demonstrated by way of adequate technical information or through examples of other similar facilities, that proposed composting units can be located here without detriment to local amenity especially in regard to potential odour issues. As a result the proposals would be contrary to Policies PE1, PE2 and DP32 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policies LO4 and LO5 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002, Policy WLP7 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 1997 and Policies NE7 and NE10 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**
 - 5. The proposals would generate additional traffic which would intensify commercial activities within this prominent Green Belt area and further detract from the visual and general amenities of the area and its open character.**

- RU03/0212** **13 Abbots Drive, Virginia Water**
Erection of two-storey detached dwelling with accommodation in the roof with attached garage following demolition of existing dwelling (amended plans received 10.4.03)
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU03/0214** **18 Clarence Street, Egham**
Erection of conservatory to rear of property
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU03/0229** **70 The Grove, Egham**
Erection of two-storey extension following demolition of existing conservatory
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU03/0251** **27 Fletcher Road, Ottershaw**
Erection of rear conservatory
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU03/0260** **48 Park Avenue, Egham**
Erection of single-storey rear and two-storey side extensions following part demolition of existing garage
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU03/0269** **Orchard End, Tite Hill, Englefield Green**
Erection of brick wall with a maximum height of 2.1 metres above ground level along road frontage following removal of Leylandii hedging along road frontage
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU03/0271** **11 Orchard Avenue, Woodham**
Erection of detached single garage to rear of property (retrospective)
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU03/0272** **Land r/o 96 & 98 Liberty Lane, Addlestone**
Erection of two-storey detached dwelling following demolition of existing single garage with access off The Grove (revised description 26.3.03)
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU03/0276** **Salesian School, Guildford Road, Chertsey**
Erection of two-storey extension
DECISION: The application be notified to ODPM 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 Consultation) (Departures) Direction 1999 as the proposal would represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt and failing any Direction from the Minister, permission be GRANTED

- RU03/0280** **Gogmore Farm Park, Curfew Bell Road, Chertsey**
Change of use of pavilion/caretaker's house to a centre for youth activities
DECISION: Following agreement on hours of operation the Director of Technical Services be authorised to GRANT permission subject to conditions.
- RU03/0288** **3 Chaseside Gardens, Chertsey**
Erection of rear conservatory (revised plans received 15.4.03)
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU03/0293** **33 The Ridings, Addlestone**
Erection of single-storey side and rear extension with increased roof height and insertion of dormers in western elevation to create rooms in roof space for use as a separate annexe
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU03/0297** **49 Bourneside Road, Addlestone**
Erection of first floor rear extension
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU03/0303** **Pantiles & Queenswood, Roberts Way, Englefield Green**
Erection of 2 no. two-storey detached dwellings each with an integral double garage following demolition of existing two houses, garaging and annexe
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU03/0309** **Kesters, Trumps Green Road, Virginia Water**
Erection of 2 no. detached two-storey dwellings with integral garage and accommodation in the roof including new vehicular access off Trumps Green Road following demolition of exiting dwelling
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU03/0315** **9 Cabrera Close, Virginia Water**
Erection of single-storey rear extension, front porch and conversion of loft space into habitable rooms, incorporating insertion of velux windows and skylights in roof
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions
- RU03/0316** **22 Huntingfield Way, Egham**
Erection of single-storey rear extension following removal of existing shed
DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions

798. PLANNING ENFORCEMENT POLICY AND PRIORITY

The Committee reaffirmed, with amendment, the Council's policy for planning enforcement and agreed priorities for investigation of complaints.

The following policy had been adopted in July 1993 in respect of planning enforcement in Runnymede:

- "1. The Council will aim to respond to all bona fide complaints about breaches of planning law within 3 days;

2. Where a breach is identified, it will be assessed as to whether its continuation would affect public amenity to an unacceptable extent;
3. If not, or if such effects could be controlled by conditions, a planning application will be invited;
4. If the breach is unacceptable, the Council will initially seek to remedy the breach by negotiation;
5. If negotiation fails, formal enforcement action will be taken, commensurate with the breach of planning control, and taking into account Government advice;
6. Steps to cease the unauthorised activity will be vigorously pursued, through any appeals process, and through the Courts.”

The principles with their emphasis on negotiations were still valid, subject to the replacement of (1) with “ The Council will aim to respond to all bona fide complaints about breaches of planning law in accordance with agreed priorities and timescales” and addition of a seventh principle stating that 'enforcement cases will be monitored and reviewed'. This currently happens by way of reports to the Review Board.

The prioritisation of cases would be made by the Senior Enforcement Officer as being High, Medium or Low priority, upon receipt although this could be subject to change over time.

Members endorsed the table of priorities set out below. High priority included those matters where irreparable damage might be caused in a short period of time, or those matters that may cause serious harm to a number of people. Medium and Low priority included matters that caused limited impact or impact to a small number of people.

Priority	Type of Development	Investigation Timescale
High	① Unauthorised demolition or alterations to a Listed Building or other building or other structures which it is considered essential to retain	IMMEDIATE
	① Unauthorised felling or works to a preserved tree, tree in a Conservation Area, or other trees which it is considered essential to retain	IMMEDIATE
	① Breaches of planning control or conditions which results in serious harm to amenity in a neighbourhood and affects a number of parties	WITHIN 3 WORKING DAYS
	① Unauthorised development within a Conservation Area which is likely to have a serious impact on the Conservation Area	WITHIN 3 WORKING DAYS
	① Breaches of planning control or conditions where the time limit for enforcement action will expire within the next six months	WITHIN 3 WORKING DAYS
	① Unauthorised encampments by travellers	IMMEDIATE
	① Unauthorised development which might be a danger to the public or might be likely to cause accidents	IMMEDIATE
Medium	② Breaches of planning control or conditions that cause demonstrable nuisance to the residential enjoyment of neighbouring properties	WITHIN 5 WORKING DAYS
	② Breaches of advert control in Conservation Areas	WITHIN 5 WORKING DAYS
	② Breaches of advert control involving widespread fly-posting	WITHIN 5 WORKING DAYS
Low	③ Advert control not included above	WITHIN 10 WORKING DAYS
	③ Breaches which are technical in nature and not in significant conflict with planning policy	WITHIN 10 WORKING DAYS
	③ Breaches which are temporary in nature	WITHIN 10 WORKING DAYS
	③ Breaches likely to be resolved quickly by negotiation	WITHIN 10 WORKING DAYS

The timescales related to the initial investigation of a complaint, not its resolution. Some matters could be resolved quickly and others could become very complex and take a considerable period to resolve. The timescales had to be taken as being indicative rather than rigid. Some would be investigated in shorter timescales, but at times of high workload, some would take longer. This did however need to be monitored to ensure that they were reasonably realistic.

These priorities would guide Officers and enable the best use to be made of resources, to target the breaches of planning control that had the greatest environmental impact. The resources in the administration and legal sections to process urgent priority cases were limited and it may be necessary to employ external resources in particular cases.

RESOLVED that -

- i) the Council's policy on Planning Enforcement (as amended) be endorsed; and**
- ii) breaches of planning control be prioritised for investigation in accordance with the above-mentioned table.**

799. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (LOCAL PLAN)

The Committee considered a report on further work which had been undertaken as part of the new Local Development Framework document emerging as the proposed replacement for the Local Plan.

The Committee received details of the Open Space, Sport and Recreation study in the Chertsey, Ottershaw and Thorpe areas.

With regard to Chertsey, consideration was currently being given to the provision of an additional formal play area in the east of the settlement.

The release of the Painesfield Allotments, for housing purposes, would represent both a loss of an allotment facility and also in the contribution it made as open space. However, the allotment holders would be relocated to other sites in Chertsey, which were currently the subject of discussions. The loss of an 'open amenity area' was mitigated to a degree by the fact that it was adjacent to the open countryside to which local residents would still have access.

With regard to Thorpe, no further action was required to increase the amount of open space provision within the village.

With regard to Ottershaw, consideration could be given to the provision of some form of formal play area in the east of the settlement if the opportunity arose, but this was not essential given the quality of facilities that existed.

RECOMMEND that -

the detailed analysis of Chertsey, Thorpe and Ottershaw set out in Appendix 'A' be approved as part of the preparatory work associated with the proposed Local Development Framework Documents.

800. HOUSING LAND SUPPLY

The Committee was advised of the outcome of the annual assessment of the housing land supply in the Borough.

The housing land supply as at 31 March 2003 was as set out below:-

<u>Type</u>	<u>Period</u>	<u>Housing Units</u>	<u>Total No. Units</u>
Completions	1991-2003	2010+155	2165
Outstanding Planning Permission/Subject to Resolution	2003-2006		361
Small Site Estimate	2003-2006	3 x 35.15	105
Medium Site Estimate	2003-2006	3 x 20.85	62
			2693

The housing requirement for the Local Plan period (1991-2006) was 2400. The housing land supply assessment for the period 1991-2002 revealed that the requirements of Policy HO6 were being satisfied. Comments had been received from the House Builders Federation and Members endorsed the Officer responses thereon that no change be made to the housing data.

RESOLVED that -

the details of the housing land supply table be noted and the responses to the House Builders Federation be approved.

801. APPEAL DECISIONS

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

<u>Site/Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
i) Weir Cottage, Bridge Road, Chertsey - planning appeal regarding creation of access drive, turning and parking area from Abbey Chase to serve existing dwelling.	DISMISSED
ii) 16 Addlestone Park, Addlestone - amendment and alterations to RU02/0756 to provide 8 flats.	DISMISSED

802. 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.

803. STANDING ORDER NO. 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 Administration and Leisure	Authorisation of High Court proceedings in respect of unauthorised development at Willow Farm, Chobham Road, Ottershaw	524
Director of Technical Services	Enforcement action and Injunctive action in respect of unauthorised storage of caravans, trailers and mobile homes on land rear of South Lodge, Ottershaw.	525

804. LAND AT KESTERS, TRUMPS GREEN ROAD, VIRGINIA WATER – PROPOSED TREE PRESERVATION ORDER

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this report under section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the report in question would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in para.13 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

The Committee considered placing a Tree Preservation Order on a group of Oak trees (G1) in the front garden and one Oak tree (T1) in the rear garden of Kesters, Trumps Green Road, Virginia Water.

A revised planning application for two detached houses on the land had been approved earlier in the meeting.

The group of semi-mature Oaks (G1) located in the front garden of Kesters were clearly visible from the street scene and as a group offered significant amenity value to the Trumps Green Road frontage and from King George V playing fields opposite. The single mature Oak in the rear garden was also visually prominent, clearly visible from most properties in the surrounding area, visible from Trumps Green Road and Oak Tree Close and was considered to offer a high level of amenity.

The Human Rights considerations associated with this case were noted.

RESOLVED that -

- i) **the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to make a Tree Preservation Order pursuant to Section 198 to 201 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in respect of the group of semi-mature Oaks (G1) and the single mature Oak (T1) at Kesters, Trumps Green Road, Virginia Water for the following reason:**

The trees make a significant contribution to the visual amenities of the surrounding area and therefore should be protected in accordance with Policies NE12 and NE13 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan, Second Alteration, April 2001.

- ii) **subject to no adverse representations being received, the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to confirm the Order without modification.**

805. LAND AT 15A LIMES ROAD, EGHAM – PROPOSED TREE PRESERVATION ORDER

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this report under section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the report in question would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in para.13 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

The Committee considered placing a Tree Preservation Order on a Silver Birch tree in the front garden of 15A Limes Road, Egham following a request from the owner.

The Silver Birch was mature with a good crown shape with a spread of approximately 10 metres. There was no visual evidence, from a ground level inspection, of any serious pests, diseases or cavities present. The diameter at breast height was approximately 50 centimetres forming three main trunks at 1.5 metres above ground level. The Silver Birch had an estimated age of 40 to 50 years and a future lifespan of 20+ years. The Silver Birch was visually prominent and clearly visible from most of Limes Road.

The Human Rights considerations associated with this case were noted.

RESOLVED that –

- i) **the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to make a Tree Preservation Order pursuant to Section 198 to 201 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in respect of a mature Silver Birch tree at 15A Limes Road, Egham for the following reason:**

The tree makes a significant contribution to the visual amenities of the surrounding area and therefore should be protected in accordance with Policies NE12 and NE13 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan, Second Alteration, April 2001.

- ii) subject to no adverse representations being received, the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to confirm the Order without modification.**

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 10.38 p.m.)