

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE5 March 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, E.G. Barrett, J.M. Edwards, J.R. Furey, P.A. Greenwood, B.J. Relph, Mrs. V.A. Smallman, N. Thewlis, A.P. Tollett, and G.B. Woodger

Members of the Committee absent: Councillor A.G. Collins

Councillors A.J. Davis, Ms. C.M. Simmons and D.W. Parr also attended.

643. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Groups mentioned below had notified the Chief Executive Officer of their wishes 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.

Group requesting Change	Remove from Membership	Appoint Instead
Runnymede Independent	Councillor Mrs. L.M. Gillham	Councillor B.J. Relph
Conservative	Councillor J.R. Whiteley	Councillor G.B. Woodger
Labour	Councillor R. Pate	Councillor E.G. Barrett

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

644. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 5 February 2003 were approved and signed as a correct record.

645. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor V.E. Barker declared a personal and prejudicial interest in application RU 03/0066 under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members as one of his business clients was a neighbouring landowner. Councillor Barker withdrew from the room when the application was determined and Councillor Mrs Norman took the Chair.

Councillor V.E. Barker also declared a personal interest in application RU 02/1386 under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members as a relative lived near to the site. Councillor Barker remained in the room and took part in the determination of the application.

646. 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>
RU 02/1386	<p><b>Land rear of 21-43 Marsh Lane, Addlestone Demolition of 31 Marsh Lane, formation of new access road and erection of 17 no. x two storey dwellings (revised plans received on 18.12.02 and 31.1.03).</b></p> <p><b>DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.</b></p> <p>(Upon a request for a named vote on the above application, there voted – For; 10 (Councillors Angell, Barden, Barker, Edwards, Furey, Mrs Norman, Smallman, Thewlis, Tollett and Woodger.  Against; 4 (Councillors Ashmore, Barrett, Greenwood and Relph).</p>
RU03/0049	<p><b>16 Addlestone Park, Addlestone Erection of 10 residential flats.</b></p> <p><b>DECISION: REFUSE for the following reason:</b></p> <p><b>The proposed development, by reason of its form, height, bulk, mass, design and number of units constitutes an over development of the site, out of keeping with the character of the street scene and detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring properties. As a result, the proposal 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 Adopted April 2001.</b></p>
RU 03/0071	<p><b>26 &amp; 34 Grange Road, New Haw. Erection of two pairs of semi-detached and one detached 4-bedroom dwellings with accommodation in the roof.</b></p> <p><b>DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.</b></p>
RU 02/1430	<p><b>Enterprise House, Delta Way, Crabtree Road, Egham Creation of new car parking area along eastern side of building, alterations to existing car parking layout, erection of 1.8 metre high wall along western boundary and additional windows inserted into building.</b></p> <p><b>DECISION: Following the completion of a legal agreement to secure the following:</b></p> <p>(a) a Company Travel Plan to be submitted and agreed with the Local Planning Authority and the County Highway Authority; and</p> <p>(b) a contribution of £2,000 to assist in the monitoring of the Travel Plan by the Highway Authority.</p> <p><b>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.</b></p>

- RU 03/0005**            **11 Waverley Drive, Chertsey**  
**Erection of single-storey front and side extension.**
- DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**
- RU 03/0012**            **Withany, Heath Rise, Virginia Water**  
**First Floor side extension.**
- DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**
- RU 03/0019**            **1 Hytheheld Avenue, Egham**  
**Erection of a single-storey side extension following**  
**demolition of detached garage and outbuildings.**
- DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**
- RU 03/0020**            **52 Trumps Green Avenue, Virginia Water**  
**Two-storey side extension and part one, part two-storey**  
**rear extension.**
- DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**
- RU 03/0023**            **Cleveland, Roberts Way, Egham**  
**Erection of first floor side extension.**
- DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**
- RU 03/0043**            **The Coach House, The Dell, Englefield Green**  
**External alterations and conversion of existing**  
**garages/stores into habitable accommodation.**
- DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**
- RU 03/0046**            **6 Astor Close, Addlestone**  
**Erection of two-storey rear and side extension and front**  
**porch.**
- DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**
- RU 03/0048**            **9 & 10 Parklands, Addlestone.**  
**Erection of ground and first floor rear extensions at nos 9**  
**and 10 Parklands.**
- DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**
- RU 03/0058**            **129A Guildford Street, Chertsey**  
**Conversion of existing two bedroom flat to form two studio**  
**apartments.**
- DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**
- RU 03/0059**            **1 Woodlee Cottages, Callow Hill, Virginia Water**  
**Felling of Horse Chestnut tree subject to Tree Preservation**  
**Order No. 280.**

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

**The tree is considered to be in a healthy and stable condition and the proposed felling would result in the loss of a tree which contributes to the special amenity value of the area. The felling is therefore considered unacceptable and contrary to Policy PE9 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE9 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002, and Policies NE12 and NE13 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan April 2001.**

**RU 03/0061**

**Birchington, Gorse Hill Road, Virginia Water  
Erection of detached two-storey dwelling, detached front double garage and outdoor swimming pool utilising existing access following demolition of existing dwelling.**

**DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions**

**RU 03/0066**

**Land at Priest Hill, Englefield Green  
Erection of a 15m high telegraph pole style telecommunication mast and associated ground level equipment cabinets.**

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

- 1. The proposed development by reason of its siting, height and prominence would represent inappropriate development, harmful to the open character of this sensitive part of the Green Belt. The inappropriateness of the use outweighs the technical need or lack of alternatives with no other very special circumstances put forward by the applicant. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies PE1, PE2 and DP8 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002 and Policies GB1 and SV3 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**
- 2. The proposed development by reason of its siting, height and prominence would be visually intrusive which would conflict with and not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Englefield Green Conservation Area, contrary to Policies PE12 and DP8 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE5 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002 and Policies BE5 and SV3 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan April 2001.**
- 3. The proposed development by reason of its siting, height and prominence would be visually intrusive which would be out of keeping with the Area of Landscape Importance, contrary to Policy PE7 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE8 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002 and Policy NE8 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan April 2001.**

**RU 03/0074**

**129A Guildford Street, Chertsey  
Conversion to form two studio apartments.**

**DECISION: GRANT Listed Building Consent subject to conditions.**

**RU 03/0090**      **Brier Cottage, Portnall Rise, Virginia Water**  
**Erection of single-storey side extensions with basements**  
**below and two-storey front extensions incorporating a new**  
**staircase.**

**DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**

**RU 03/0105**      **Runnymede Council Depot Social Club, Stoneylands Road,**  
**Egham**  
**Renewal of temporary permission for the siting of**  
**residential caravan for a security guard.**

**DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.**

**RU 03/0144**      **23 Ayebridges Avenue, Egham**  
**Retention of existing garage to the rear of the property to**  
**be used as an office.**

**DECISION: Following expiry of consultation period, 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.**

647. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (LOCAL PLAN) - OPEN SPACE TOPIC PAPER

The Committee considered a report regarding the Topic Paper on Open Space, Sport and Recreation that had been prepared and would contribute to the new Local Development Framework document emerging as the proposed replacement for the Local Plan.

The Topic Paper had been developed within the context of PPG17 'Open Space Sport and Recreation'. PPG17 which recommended that local authorities should undertake audits of existing open space, sports and recreational facilities, the use made of existing facilities, access in terms of location and costs and opportunities for new open space and facilities.

The proposed approach to incorporate the guidance contained in PPG17 on Open Space Sport and Recreation into the LDD's was to develop a methodology based upon geographically distinct areas. An assessment of local need would be based upon the characteristics of the area. However, there would also need to be an assessment that also looked at the wider sub-borough and borough wide requirements of the population. The leisure needs of the Borough would be identified through the use of a hierarchy based on the categories shown below. The hierarchy would be based on distance (catchments) thresholds, local market research, population-based quantity standards and quality standards as follows :-

- Local settlements facilities, with a purely local impact, located in or directly related to residents in a settlement (e.g. kickabout areas or play areas).
- Sub-borough facilities, which either serve an area wider than the settlement or appeal to special interest groups (Egham Sports Centre, Homewood Park, etc.), and serve the whole of the Borough and possibly areas beyond it (Runnymede and the Pleasure Grounds, etc.).
- Borough-wide facilities (and beyond) which provide a high profile (Thorpe Park, Wentworth, Windsor Park, etc.).

The Topic Paper would also take into account issues covered in the Community Strategy.

The Best Value exercise undertaken in respect of playing fields revealed that there was some concern about the quality of provision amongst sports clubs, whilst the young peoples fora highlighted the need for an artificial turf pitch in the borough. The emerging Leisure policy approach on play and sport development in Runnymede would form part of the guidance within the LDD.

The Committee considered that it would be difficult to fulfil the Government's aspirations for open space provision.

An initial audit of the Local Authority open space stock had been undertaken and was based upon the settlement criteria identified above. Initially work had been undertaken on the two representative settlements of Englefield Green and Little Green Lane to consider how the policy framework would be developed and to assess the implications of earlier Council resolutions on sites within these areas.

With regard to Englefield Green, consideration could be given to provision of some type of formal play area in the east of the settlement if the opportunity arose, but it was not considered essential given the quality of facilities that currently exist.

The provision of a quality play facility at Fernlands Close for the younger population in the Little Green Lane area of Chertsey was supported to address the shortfall in such provision.

Some changes of wording were made to the Topic Paper. A final Paper would be prepared for the Committee as the topic was developed in more detail.

**RESOLVED that -**

**the Topic Paper on Open Space, Sport and Recreation be approved as part of the preparatory work associated with the proposed Local Development Documents.**

648. AIRTRACK – FUNDING OF CONSULTANCY WORK

The Committee gave consideration to a request from the AirTrack Forum for the Council to contribute £10,000 towards the cost of the technical work in connection with the proposed AirTrack rail link to Heathrow.

The AirTrack Forum Steering Group had reported that it was now essential to raise funds in order to carry out technical work which it considered was an essential prerequisite to any successful implementation of the AirTrack scheme. The exercise had to be undertaken very quickly in order to collate all the technical work, which had been carried out on the AirTrack proposals from a consultant study in 1998 to date. This exercise would also review engineering costs in the light of all the changes to the industry over the last few years and take account of new information regarding design requirements and environmental impacts.

The output from this work would constitute an up to date Outline Business Case (OBC). The intention would then be to investigate fully all options to raise private and public capital for the scheme. It would also be used as a basis for lobbying to secure the incorporation of AirTrack into Government Policy in the forthcoming Aviation White Paper.

The Forum would seek to ensure that this work was carried out with the active co-operation of important players such as the Strategic Rail Authority, BAA and Network Rail. It was clearly important that the resultant OBC must be technically acceptable to potential partners, funders and other interested parties who might take an active role in implementing AirTrack.

The Forum would work closely with the South East England Development Agency (SEEDA) and the South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA), both of whom had expressed strong support for the AirTrack proposals and recognised the key role to be played by AirTrack in delivering economic and regional transport objectives.

The Committee noted that due to track capacity constraints, the Airtrack Initiative was unlikely to increase the number of peak hour trains. The proposed study would consider the impact of a new service in the local area enabling issues such as impact on level crossings to be addressed in the context of a comprehensive overview. The study would consider, inter alia, the full implications of the service, the local lines and especially the environmental and traffic impact. The Committee supported the study. As the Council had been a long term supporter of the project it was recommended that £10,000 be made available to support the technical work and to ensure the Council maintains its position on the Airtrack Steering Group. The monies would be drawn from appropriate existing budgets.

Contributing organisations would be entitled to a seat on the new Steering Group which would oversee the technical work, whilst those not able to contribute towards the work could retain membership of the Forum, but would only be entitled to receive information and attend the full meetings of the Forum. 11 local authorities had been requested to provide funding for the OBC. Surrey County Council would undertake to provide the leadership for undertaking this exercise, including acting as banker, arranging for the project management for the OBC work. The County Council would also contribute towards the OBC.

**RESOLVED that –**

**the Economic Development Committee be informed that this Committee supports the provision of up to £10,000 to support technical work on the Airtrack project.**

649. APPEAL DECISIONS

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

<u>Site/Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
Trumps Farm, Kitsmead Lane, Longcross - enforcement appeal regarding construction of a crushed concrete hardstanding.	DISMISSED, ENFORCEMENT NOTICE UPHeld WITH CORRECTIONS/VARIATIONS
Land adjacent 32 Mayfield Avenue, New Haw - planning appeal regarding erection of two bedroom semi-detached houses in variation to current permission for three bedroom detached house (RU02/0615).	DISMISSED

650. 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 9.45 p.m.)