

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE16 November 2005 at 7.30pm

Members of the Committee present: Councillors J.M. Edwards (Chairman), D.W. Parr (Vice-Chairman), A. Alderson, J.R. Ashmore, J. Broadhead, J.B. Dean, J.R. Furey, Mrs. C.E. Gant, Mrs J. Norman, R. Pate, Mrs. M. Roberts, J.R. Whiteley and G.B. Woodger.

Members of the Committee absent: Councillors C.J. Knight and H.W.V. Meares

365. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

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

Group requesting Change	Remove from Membership	Appoint Instead
Conservative	Councillor Mrs F.M. Angell	Councillor Mrs C.E. Gant
Runnymede Independent	Councillor B.J. Relph	Councillor A. Alderson

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

366. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 19 October 2005 were approved and signed as a correct record.

367. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C.J. Knight and H.W.V Meares.

368. 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. Applicants/agents and members of the public spoke on the applications identified below.

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 05/1019**

**Land at 40,48 & rear of 56 Pinewood Avenue, New Haw
Erection of 6 two-storey dwellings comprising 2 detached three bedroom houses and two pairs of two bedroom semi-detached houses with associated parking and garaging following demolition of 48 Pinewood Avenue (outline application).**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. **The proposed development by reason of the amount of floor area proposed, the position of dwellings and garages with a minimum separation distance between each other and the common boundaries represents a cramped form of development that would be detrimental to the character of the area and the visual amenities of the area contrary to Policies SE4 and LO2 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Policies BE2 and HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001, Surrey Design Guide and Planning Policy Guidance No 3 : 'Housing' March 2000.**

2. **The proposed development, by reason of its likely scale, massing, insufficient spacing between buildings and close proximity to common boundaries and insufficient separation distances to neighbouring properties is likely to result in overbearing and over dominant effects detrimental to the residential amenities of Nos 56 and 58 Pinewood Avenue and No 15 Cobs Way contrary to Policy HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**

(Mr Nixon, an objector, and Mr Vincent, the applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application).

RU/05/1032

**69,71, 73 & 75 Bridge Road, Chertsey
Erection of 1 no. x three storey 'L' shaped block comprising 18 no. x two-bed flats following the demolition of Nos 69, 71, 73 and 75 Bridge Road, Chertsey.**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. **The proposed development, by reason of its over-intensive form of development is likely to result in a cramped, contrived and incongruous form of development which would be damaging to and incompatible with the character of the surrounding area, detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the adjoining Green Belt and may be detrimental to the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties, and the setting of a listed building, the adjoining Belsize Grange, contrary to Policies SE4, SE5 and LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Policies HO9, BE2, BE10 and GB1 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001, the Surrey Design Guide (particularly Principle 7.3), Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 : Housing March 2000 and 'By Design', and Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 : 'Green Belts'.**

2. **This site lies within a high risk (Zone 3) flood zone of the River Thames Floodplain as shown on maps held by the Environment Agency. The proposed development will be at direct risk of flooding, may increase the flood risk to people and property on the site and in the surrounding area and will increase the number of people at risk from flooding by introducing additional households into the floodplain, contrary to Policy SE3 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Policy SV2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and Planning Policy Guidance Note 25 : Development and Flood Risk.**

RU 05/0678

**Veterinary Laboratories Agency, Woodham Lane, New Haw
Provision of two single-storey modular buildings, minor works to Buildings Nos 22 and 114 and relocation of existing Building Nos 52 and 53 to new locations on site.**

DECISION: NO OBJECTION subject to conditions, reasons and Informatives listed on agenda.

RU 05/0963

**Virginia Gate, Spring Woods, Virginia Water
Erection of detached two-storey dwelling with basement and accommodation in the roofspace including dormer windows in the front and rear elevations with detached triple garage and enclosed swimming pool following demolition of the existing dwelling and outbuildings (amendments to RU 03/0609).**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions (including prohibition of natural light to basement), reasons and Informatives listed on agenda.

RU 05/1016

**8 Station Road North, Egham
Retention of 4 no. metal container storage units.**

DECISION:

1. **REFUSE for the following reason:**

The four storage containers by reason of their siting, proximity to the common boundaries and to the Grade II Listed Building, design, colour, size, scale and height result in an unsympathetic incongruous and prominent form of development that:

- a) **Adversely affect the setting of the Grade II Listed Building, No 8 Station Road North, contrary to Policy SE5 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policies BE9 and BE10 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and**

advice contained in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 (PPG15) : 'Planning and the Historic Environment'.

- b) Is detrimental to the character and appearance of Egham Conservation Area contrary to Policy SE5 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policy BE5 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and advice contained in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 'Planning and the Historic Environment'.
 - c) Adversely affect the townscape character and visual amenities of the area contrary to Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policy BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and advice contained in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 (PPG15) : ' Planning and the Historic Environment'.
2. i) the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to issue an Enforcement Notice under Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring the removal of the four metal container storage units and external scaffolding to access the double decker storage container from the site.
- ii) the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to take appropriate action namely the carrying out of necessary works or prosecution under Section 178 and/or 179 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in the event that this Notice is not complied with.

Reason for Issuing Enforcement Notice

The four storage containers by reason of their siting, proximity to the common boundaries and to the Grade II Listed Building, design, colour, size, scale and height result in an unsympathetic incongruous and prominent form of development that:-

- a) adversely affect the setting of the Grade II Listed Building, No. 8 Station Road North, contrary to Policy SE5 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policies BE9 and BE10 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and advice contained in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 (PPG15) : 'Planning and the Historic Environment'.

- b) **Is detrimental to the character and appearance of Egham Conservation Area contrary to Policy SE5 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policy BE5 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and advice contained in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 (PPG15) : 'Planning and the Historic Environment'; and**
- c) **Adversely affect the townscape character, vitality and viability of Egham Town Centre and visual amenities of the area contrary to Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policy BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and advice contained in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 (PPG15) : 'Planning and the Historic Environment'.**

RU 05/1017

**8 Station Road North, Egham
Listed Building Consent for retention of 4 no. metal storage container units.**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reason:-

The four storage containers by reason of their siting, proximity to the common boundaries and to the Grade II Listed Building, design, colour, size, scale and height result in an unsympathetic incongruous and prominent form of development that adversely affect the setting of the Grade II Listed Building, No. 8 Station Road North, contrary to Policy SE5 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policies BE9 and BE10 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and advice contained in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 (PPG15) : 'Planning and the Historic Environment'.

RU 05/1021

**16 Slade Road, Ottershaw
Construction of new pitched roof with gable end over part of existing rear extension to allow habitable accommodation at first floor level with two rooflights to side elevation, two bay windows to front of property, insertion of lantern style rooflight and alterations to fenestration.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions, reasons and Informatives listed on agenda.

(Mr Grace, an objector, addressed the Committee on the above application).

RU 05/1022

**9 Rydal Way, Egham
Erection of a first floor side extension.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions, reasons and Informatives listed on agenda.

RU 05/1045

**11 Wavendene Avenue, Egham
Erection of a single-storey side and rear extension with insertion of rooflights following demolition of**

existing conservatory and garage and creation of a new pitched roof over existing porch.

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

(Mr Patel, an objector, and Mr Corpaul, the agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application).

RU 05/1051

**18 Chaseside Gardens, Chertsey
Conversion of garage into habitable accommodation, alterations to fenestration, removal of two existing chimneys and erection of a single storey rear extension and chimney with insertion of sunpipes on rear elevation.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to appropriate conditions to be imposed by the Director of Technical Services.

(By reason of special circumstances, the Committee was minded to grant permission on the basis that the development would have minimal impact on the amenities of the adjoining neighbour who also supported the proposals).

(A Motion to refuse permission was LOST).

(Mr Murchison, the applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application).

369. LAND AT WILMAR, HURST LANE, EGHAM, - ENFORCEMENT

The Committee considered authorisation of Enforcement Notices in respect of (i) the creation of a hardstanding and (ii) the stationing of a mobile home in residential use on land at Wilmar, Hurst Lane.

In September 2005 reports were received of development occurring on the site. Site visits were made and it was confirmed that a hard surface had been laid and a mobile home placed upon it. The owner of 'Wilmar' confirmed that he was responsible for the works and stated that he would be moving into the mobile home (as the sole occupier) with immediate effect, leaving his wife to occupy the main dwelling, Wilmar. It was explained to the owner that the works were unauthorised and a serious breach of planning policy. He was also advised of the need for planning permission and that enforcement action was likely.

The mobile home was a self-contained dwelling, and constituted an additional dwelling in the Green Belt. The hardstanding was only provided as a base for the mobile home and was not therefore incidental development, and required a planning application in its own right.

The mobile home and hardstanding were therefore considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which was detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt. The hardstanding and mobile home was also considered to be detrimental to the visual amenities of the Green Belt and no special circumstances had been put forward to overcome the harm to the Green Belt.

The Human Rights considerations associated with this case were noted.

RESOLVED that -

- i) the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to issue Enforcement Notices under Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) requiring:**

- (a) **the removal of the hardstanding and the reinstatement of the land to its former condition, and**
 - (b) **the removal of the mobile home from the site.**
- ii) **the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to take appropriate action in carrying out necessary works or instituting a prosecution pursuant to Sections 178 and 179 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) in the event that the Notices once effective, are not complied with.**

Reasons for Issuing the Notice(s)

1. **The construction of the hardstanding and the siting of a mobile home in residential use represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt which by definition is harmful to the openness and the visual amenities of the Green Belt, contrary to Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Policies GB1 and GB13 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and the advice in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 : 'Green Belts'.**
2. **The Planning Authority do not consider that very special circumstances have been put forward to justify the grant of planning permission for the development contrary to Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Policies GB1 and GB13 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and the advice in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 : 'Green Belts'.**

370. **TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO. 369 - LAND BETWEEN 25/27 AND 27 HOLLAND GARDENS, THORPE**

The Committee considered the confirmation of a Tree Preservation Order (with modification) regarding a Walnut Tree (T1) on land between 25/27 and 27 Holland Gardens, Thorpe.

Following the making of the Tree Preservation Order in September 2005 no adverse representations had been received but the freehold owners of No. 27 Holland Gardens, Mr and Mrs Young, had written to the Council, through their surveyor, suggesting that the plan which formed part of the Order was inaccurate. Mr & Mrs Young considered that whilst the location of the tree was correct, the boundaries of the various properties as shown thereon were wrong and therefore misleading.

The plan attached to the Tree Preservation Order showed the tree to be located within the boundary of the unnumbered plot of land situated between Nos. 25 and 27 Holland Gardens, but the plan attached to Mr and Mrs Young's deeds of No. 27 Holland Gardens shows the tree to be located within the ownership of their property. Accordingly, Mr and Mrs Young had asked the Council to modify the Order accordingly.

Officers confirmed that the boundaries shown on the plan attached to Mr and Mrs Young's deeds of No. 27 Holland Gardens were not clearly marked on the ground. Also the boundaries shown on the Land Registry Plan for the unnumbered plot of adjacent land followed a different route to that shown on the title documents of 27 Holland Gardens and as a result of these boundary anomalies it was considered safer to amend the Tree Preservation Order's description and the title of the plan to ensure the tree's position was correctly described. Accordingly, the Committee approved the replacement of the plan attached to the Order to include all the land within the title boundaries of the land lying between 25 and 27 Holland Gardens and 27 Holland Gardens itself.

RESOLVED that -

the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to

- i) modify Tree Preservation Order 369 in the following terms:**

the description of the Order be changed to "Tree Preservation Order No. 369 - land between 25/27 and 27 Holland Gardens, Thorpe, Surrey"; and

the plan of the relevant area of land attached to Tree Preservation Order 369 be replaced with the plan reported on the Agenda; and

- ii) confirm Tree Preservation Order 369 as an unopposed Tree Preservation Order pursuant to Section 199(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.**

371. 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 noted.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 9.00pm)