

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE20 June 2001 at 7.30 p.m.

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

Members of the Committee absent: None

Councillors Mrs. L.M. Gillham and Mrs. E.E. Price also attended.

82. 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 for a fixed period ending on the day after the meeting. Thereafter the Councillors removed should be re-appointed.

Group requesting Change	Remove from Membership	Appoint Instead
Conservative	Councillor Mrs. F.M. Angell	Councillor G.J. Thomas
Conservative	Councillor G.B. Woodger	Councillor J.R. Furey

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

83. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 30 May 2001 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

84. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor V.E. Barker declared an interest under the National Code of Local Government Conduct in planning applications RU01/0405, 0447 and 0446. As the interest was clear and substantial, Councillor Barker withdrew from the room and took no part in the consideration of the applications.

85. 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.**

APPLICATION  
NO**RU00/1248**LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION

**Bridge Wharf, Bridge Road, Chertsey  
New B1 office development comprising 4 no. 3-storey buildings, riverside walkway and nature reserve  
DECISION: DEFERRED to enable County Highway Authority to justify sustainability of proposal**

RU01/0194

**Sandgates, Guildford Road, Chertsey  
Erection of a two-storey building to provide affordable key worker accommodation to serve St Peter's Hospital and associated parking and landscaping (Additional Information)**

**DECISION: Refer additional information to Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions with the recommendation as previously stated that the proposal represents appropriate development due to exceptional circumstances and is an acceptable departure to the Development Plan for which permission should be granted**

RU01/0306

**117 Station Road, formerly Co-Op Superstore, Addlestone  
Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 6508 sq m of Class A1 foodstore and petrol filling station, service yard, car park, recycling centre, landscaping, plant and equipment and temporary building for Post Office**

**DECISION:**

- a) **Following the completion of a legal agreement under the Highways Act to secure i) a financial contribution of £25,000 towards the Action Addlestone Initiative to upgrade the roundabout and access to the site ii) an upgraded cycle lane and a refuge to assist cyclists crossing Station Road iii) an amended vehicular access to the site from the roundabout at the junction with Station Road, the Borough Technical Services Officer be authorised to GRANT permission following consultation where appropriate with the Chairman or in his absence, the Vice-Chairman of Committee subject to conditions**
- b) **The Officer views that an Environmental Impact Assessment was not required be endorsed**

RU01/0476

**4-6 The Parade, Thorpe Road, Egham  
Erection of a three-storey building comprising one retail unit (Class A1) and 14 flats (5 no. x two beds and 9 no. one beds) with rear car parking & access off Meadow Gardens**

**DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:**

1. **The proposed development by reason of its increase in floor area, height, rear projection, scale and mass and proximity to common boundaries would represent an overdevelopment 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 SE3 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft January 2001 and Policies BE2 and HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001**
2. **The proposed development by reason of its height, design, rear projection and proximity to common boundaries would result in an unneighbourly form of development by reason of overlooking, loss of**

**privacy, overshadowing and overbearing effects detrimental to the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties contrary to Policy HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration, April 2001**

**RU01/0477**

**4-6 The Parade, Thorpe Road, Egham**

**Erection of a three-storey building comprising one retail unit (Class A1) and 14 flats (5 no. x two beds and 9 no. one beds) with rear car parking and access off Meadow Gardens (duplicate application)**

**DECISION: APPLICATION WITHDRAWN**

**RU01/0536**

**Hamm Court Farm, Hamm Court, Weybridge**

**Change of use from industrial to residential involving demolition, refurbishment, extension and erection of dwellings to form 14 new residential units creating 15 units in total**

**DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:**

- 1. Residential Development (Major Development on Land Outside Settlements (R403)**
- 2. Undesirable Precedent (R420)**
- 3. Inadequate Provision of Affordable Housing (R439)**
- 4. Reliance on Car-Borne Transport (Contrary to PPG13) (R448)**
- 5. Felling of Trees (R422)**
- 6. The proposed development by reason Of its siting, size and appearance would adversely affect the historic fabric, character and interest of the listed building and harm its setting. The proposal is therefore unacceptable and contrary to Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan (Deposit Draft) January 2001 and BE9 and BE10 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration, April 2001**
- 7. The applicant has failed to submit an archaeological assessment for consideration as part of this application. The site is situated within an area of high archaeological potential and unsatisfactory information has been submitted in this respect. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan (Deposit Draft) January 2001 and BE15 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration, April 2001**
- 8. The proposed development lies within an area of land liable to flood as shown on maps held by the Environment Agency. The development will be at direct risk of flooding, and will increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy SV2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001**
- 9. The proposed development lies within the area of land liable to flood as shown on maps held by the Environment Agency. The development will be at direct risk of flooding, and will increase the number of people at risk from flooding by introducing additional households into the flood plain. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy SV2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001**

10. **The proposed development by reason of its size, siting and associated residential curtilages would lead to the moat which is of historic and archaeological significance being encased on 3 sides. This would remove the moat from its rural context and destroy its relationship with the surrounding landscape. The proposal is therefore contrary to PPG16 and Policies PE12, PE13 and PE14 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994 and Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan, Deposit Draft, January 2001 and Policies BE14 and BE16 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001**
11. **Insufficient information has been submitted in respect of drainage and the proposed development is likely to require drainage works which could adversely affect the water levels in the moat and this could affect the preservation of archaeological material. The proposal is therefore contrary to PPG16 and Policies PE12, PE13 and PE14 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994 and Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan, Deposit Draft, January 2001 and Policies BE14 and BE16 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001**

**RU01/0535**

**Hamm Court Farm, Hamm Court, Weybridge  
Removal of existing attached link to expose eastern elevation. Addition of two-storey extension to the western elevation**

**DECISION: REFUSE for the following reason:**

**The proposed development by reason of its siting, size and appearance would adversely affect the historic fabric, character and interest of the listed building and harm its setting. The proposal is therefore unacceptable and contrary to Policy PE12 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan (Deposit Draft) January 2001 and Policies BE9 and BE10 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration, April 2001**

**RU01/0183**

**180 Station Road, Addlestone  
Retention of an internally illuminated fascia sign and projecting box sign**

**DECISION:**

**a) REFUSE for the following reasons:**

1. **The internally illuminated fascia sign by reason of its form and size, colour of materials and illumination results in an excessive amount of advertising matter forming an over -prominent feature in the street scene and given the depth of the fascia is out of character with the adjoining sign and is detrimental to the visual amenities of Addlestone town centre, contrary to Policy PE10 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE3 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft, January 2001 and Policy BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration (Adopted April 2001) and to supplementary planning guidance**

2. **The internally illuminated projecting sign forms an over-prominent feature which is considered to be out of character in the street scene and if allowed would make it difficult to resist further proposals for illuminated projecting signs, to the detriment of the visual amenities and character of the town centre location and given the location of the projecting sign and extent of illumination has an adverse effect on the residential amenities of the adjoining flats, contrary to Policy PE10 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE3 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft, January 2001 and Policy TC1 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration (Adopted April 2001)**
- b) **The Borough Secretary and Leisure Services Officer be authorised to institute prosecution proceedings in respect of the unauthorised internally illuminated fascia sign and projecting box sign**

**RU01/0375**

**Embourne House, 7 Bourneside, Virginia Water  
Erection of part two storey, part single storey detached building incorporating triple garage and administration and staff facilities**

**DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:**

1. **The proposed detached two storey building, if permitted, would result in a substantial increase in floor area and building mass over and above the size of the dwelling on site in May 1986 and the existing dwelling which would be prominent and harmful development detrimental to the open character of the Green Belt, contrary to advice contained within Planning Guidance Note 2 : 'Green Belts' (January 1995), Policies PE1 and PE2 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy LO6 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft, January 2001 and Policy GB6 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration, April 2001**
2. **The Planning Authority do not consider that very special circumstances have been put forward in support of this application to justify the granting of permission contrary to Policy PE2 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy LO6 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft, January 2001, Policy GB6 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration, April 2001 and Planing Policy Guidance Note 2 : 'Green Belts'**

**RU01/0405**

**Englefield Park, formerly Barn Park, Englefield Green  
Erection of a two storey dwelling house with basement including integral six space garage following demolition of existing dwellinghouse**

**DECISION: Following the completion of i) a Modification Order in respect of those un-implemented parts of permission RU99/1161 and ii) Revocation Order in respect of permission RU97/0779 all without payment of compensation the Borough Technical Services Officer 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

- RU01/0447** Englefield Park, Englefield Green  
Erection of an enclosed horse walker and associated equipment adjacent to menage in south eastern corner of site  
**DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions**
- RU01/0446** Englefield Park, Englefield Green  
Modification to planning permission RU99/1161 to erect 2.4 metre high brick wall with iron railings above at the vehicular entrance to the site from Kingswood Rise  
**DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions**
- RU01/0444** Wey Farm, Guildford Road, Ottershaw  
Retention of caravan in connection with the boarding and breeding kennels, cattery and quarantine centre  
**DECISION:**
- a) **REFUSE for the following reasons:**
1. **Additional Staff Accommodation (Insufficient Justification) (R416) - after 1994 insert 'Policy LO6 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft January 2001' delete 'policies within the Runnymede Borough Local Plan First Alteration (Adopted 1993)' delete 'GB3' and 'Further Proposed Modifications April 2000' insert 'April 2001'**
  2. **Residential Caravan in Metropolitan Green Belt (R411) Delete 'Further Proposed Modifications April 2000' Insert 'LO6 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft January 2001' delete 'policies within the Runnymede Borough Local Plan First Alteration (Adopted 1993)' delete 'GB3'**
- b) i) **the Borough Secretary and Leisure Services Officer be authorised to issue a Breach of Condition Notice under section 187A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in relation to the failure of the applicant to remove Caravan C from the application site and the land reinstated to its former use**

**Reason for Issue of Notice**

**The on-going breach of condition 4 of planning permission RU00/0448 is unacceptable as the site lies within the Green Belt where new residential development is not normally permitted. In order to comply with the terms of this planning approval enforcement action is therefore considered to be the only way that the breach can be addressed.**

- ii) **the Borough Secretary and Leisure Services Officer be authorised to take appropriate action including carrying out any prosecution under Section 197A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in the event that the notice, once effective, is not complied with.**

<b>RU01/0450</b>	<b>7 Hanworth Lane, Chertsey Erection of ground floor front extension and first floor rear extension DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions</b>
<b>RU01/0452</b>	<b>Two Bridges, Guildford Street, Chertsey Installation of revolving doors, disability side door access and installation of external plant DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions</b>
<b>RU01/0482</b>	<b>Carless, Thorpe Road, Staines Erection of first floor extension over existing bungalow and addition of front porch DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions</b>
<b>RU01/0486</b>	<b>361 Green Lane, Chertsey Erection of rear conservatory DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions</b>
<b>RU01/0496</b>	<b>Ewhurst, Woodham Park Way, Woodham Erection of two storey front extension DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions</b>
<b>RU01/0512</b>	<b>Fairways, Faris Lane, Woodham Demolition of existing buildings and erection of double garage and store DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions</b>
<b>RU01/0520</b>	<b>Chertsey Town Football Club, Alwyns Lane, Chertsey Erection of single storey extension to provide toilet to clubhouse DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions</b>
<b>RU01/0549</b>	<b>2 Westerham Close, Addlestone Erection of single and two storey front extension and first floor side and rear extension DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions</b>
<b>RU01/0570</b>	<b>120 Warwick Avenue, Egham Erection of two storey side extension and part single storey and part two storey rear extension DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions</b>
<b>RU01/0575</b>	<b>Civic Offices, Station Road, Addlestone Infilling of existing walkway to Safer Runnymede reception, provision of cycle rack shelter and retention of storage container DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions</b>

86. AIMS AND TARGETS 2000/2001 - INTERIM REPORT

The Committee noted progress in meeting Aims and Targets for 2000/2001 in respect of planning and engineering functions.

Some comment was made on the decline in numbers of planning applications determined within eight weeks. This was a result of turnover in staff, maternity leave and associated difficulties in finding maternity cover together with the continued high number of applications being submitted. However, the number of applications determined last month had risen to 75%.

A Member requested that conditions imposed on planning consents be monitored and enforced more proactively. It was pointed out that to monitor all conditions carried significant resource implications. Other comments made related to the need to be more proactive in prohibition of 'rat running', maintenance of road signs, and speed limits in Green Lane. Members noted that whilst funds were available for highway schemes, progress was sometimes delayed owing to difficulties in retention and recruitment of engineers.

On a more general point, it was considered that a more definite timescale should be included for the various targets. This would be addressed.

#### 87. LOCAL PLAN REVIEW - REVISED PROGRAMME

The Committee considered the timescale and revised programme for the review of the Local Plan to ensure that local planning guidance was kept up-to-date, and responsive to changes in national, regional and strategic planning advice. The Local Plan Review would provide guidance for the period to 2016. The Review would recognise a number of key issues of both national and local importance and reflect the practice of best value when formulating the Plan. Members noted that the main focus of the Review would be the housing requirements to 2016.

The next key stages in the review process were as follows:

Pre-Deposit Draft:	December 2001
Deposit Draft:	December 2002
Local Plan Inquiry:	Summer 2003
Adoption:	Summer 2004

Members noted that the process was lengthy and complex, involving many stages of consultation and review between each key stage. Progress was also dependent upon the timescale for the emerging Surrey Structure Plan. The results of each consultation, and Officer recommendations for proposed changes to the plan, would be presented to this Committee for consideration at all stages in the process. The process would begin with the publication of the Pre-Deposit Draft, followed by a 6-week period of public consultation, which would take place in Spring 2002. Once the comments and objections had been considered, proposed changes to the Plan would be recommended, and incorporated into the preparation of the Deposit Draft. The aim would be to publish the revised Draft in December 2002. The process of consultation would then begin again, followed by the publication of proposed changes to the Deposit Draft, which would also be subject to consultation. A Local Plan Inquiry would be held in Summer 2003 to consider objections to the plan. The Inspector's Report should then be received towards the end of 2003, when further proposed changes would be published for consultation. Adoption should follow in Summer 2004.

**RESOLVED that -**

**the timescale and revised programme for the preparation of the review of the Local Plan as set out above be approved.**

#### 88. BEST VALUE – FORWARD PLANNING SERVICE SCOPING AND CHALLENGE REPORT

The Committee considered the Scoping and Challenge report for the Forward Planning Service (Appendix 'A').

The Committee was asked to consider whether the objectives for the provision of this service continued to meet the Council's aspirations, and to satisfy themselves that there had been sufficient rigour in completing the Challenge phase of the Best Value review.

This service review had commenced on 2 May and the Lead Officer for this review was Max Baker, the Urban Design and Conservation Officer. Appropriate Officers and representatives from the

Ottershaw Society, Runnymede Business Partnership and the House Builders Federation had been involved in the Challenge Workshop.

The compare part of the process would involve taking relevant comparative service, quality and financial data and looking at similar service areas in the other four North West Surrey Authorities, who had formed a Benchmarking Group (Spelthorne, Surrey Heath, Woking and Elmbridge). In addition, data would be drawn from nationally published figures and from private planning consultancies.

As far as consultation was concerned, it was proposed to carry out questionnaire surveys of external and internal users of the planning policy service and users of Business Partnership services during July and August.

Overall, the Challenge Workshop had identified numerous proposals for change/areas of scrutiny as set out in the resolution below and these would be examined during the remaining stages of the Review.

The Committee concurred that the objectives of the service continued to meet the Council's aspirations and Members agreed to endorse the Challenge stage. A final report would be submitted to Committee in September 2001 following completion of the remaining three stages of the Review. A suggestion was made that the three Chambers of Commerce should work closer together. It was acknowledged that each Chamber concentrated on their own local area but that there were issues which lended themselves to a joint approach Officers would pursue the matter.

**RESOLVED that -**

- i) the scope of this Review and Challenge phase be endorsed with particular areas of scrutiny and Proposals for Change as follows:**

**Forward Planning**

- a) Review procurement options for Forward Planning services**
- b) Speed up local plan adoption process**
- c) Increase public awareness and participation in the local plan process**
- d) Use DMS to improve efficiency and service delivery**

**Runnymede Business Partnership**

- a) Increase businesses awareness of the Partnership and its activities**
- b) Double the number of businesses participating in the Loyalty Card Scheme**
- c) Review the potential for running a 'Meet the Buyers' fair**
- d) Seek long term business sponsorship for the Partnership's running costs**
- e) Continue to develop the Runnymede Travel Initiative, particularly the school bus element**
- f) Prepare an Economic Development Strategy for the Borough**
- g) Officers liaise with the three Chambers of Commerce in the Borough with a view to encouraging cross-Chamber liaison**

**ii) the Runnymede Business Partnership targets be endorsed by the Partnership's Steering Group**

89. PLANNING BRIEFS – REPORT ON CONSULTATION

(Ref Minutes of Planning & Regulatory Committee 17 January 2001, page 1153, para 558)

The Committee was informed of the outcome of the consultation exercise on four Draft Planning Briefs: Bridge Wharf, Chertsey; St Ann's Heath, Virginia Water; Franklands Drive, Addlestone; and Wick Road, Englefield Green, and considered the adoption of revised Planning Briefs as supplementary planning guidance.

In total 26 representations had been received. A full analysis of the representations including a summary of each representation, Officers' response and a recommendation is attached at Appendix 'B'.

Minor changes had been made to the Briefs to reflect representations made.

**RECOMMEND that -**

**the revised Planning Briefs at Appendices 'C', 'D', 'E' & 'F' be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance.**

90. APPEAL DECISION

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

<u>Site/Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
Land rear of 49 Harvest Road, Englefield Green – planning appeal regarding erection of 2 detached houses with garages and on site parking (RU 00/0856)	DISMISSED

91. 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.

92. 26-28 PINWOOD GROVE, NEW HAW - 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.

By reason of special circumstances, namely the trees were considered to be under threat of felling, the Chairman was of the opinion that the matter should be considered as a matter of urgency.

The Committee considered placing a Tree Preservation Order on four trees at the above site.

A planning application had been made for the demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of four new dwellings on the site and it was considered that the trees were under threat, others on the site having recently been felled.

The trees were considered to make a significant contribution to the visual amenities of the area and were in good shape and condition.

**RESOLVED that -**

**i) the Borough Secretary and Leisure Services Officer be authorised to make a Tree Preservation Order pursuant to Sections 198 and 201 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in respect of four trees at 26-28 Pinewood Grove, New Haw for the following reason:**

**The trees make a significant contribution to the visual amenities of the 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 Borough Secretary and Leisure Services Officer be authorised to confirm the Order without modification.**

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 10.12 p.m.)