

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE16 July 2003 at 7.30 p.m.

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

Members of the Committee absent: None

Councillor P.A. Greenwood also attended.

187. 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. 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
Conservative	Councillor D.W. Parr	Councillor Mrs P I Broadhead
Conservative	Councillor J.M. Edwards	Councillor J. Broadhead

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

188. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 18 June 2003 were approved and signed as a correct record.

189. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor C. Knight declared a personal and prejudicial interest in application RU 03/0373 under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members as he was an owner of land adjoining part of application site. Councillor Knight withdrew from the room when the application was determined.

190. 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. Members of the public and/or applicant(s)/agent(s) spoke on those 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 03/0373**

**Land r/o 79-107 New Haw Road, Addlestone
Demolition of 85 New Haw Road and the erection of ten detached dwellings with garages and new access road.**

DECISION: Following the completion of a legal agreement to secure a contribution of £6,000 towards speed reinforcing measures, 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.

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

(Mr Anderson, Managing Director of the applicant firm addressed the Committee on the above application)

RU 03/0580

**Land at Woburn Corner, Station Road, Addlestone
Erection of 15 residential units with new access,
associated car parking and landscaping.**

DECISION: Following the completion of a legal agreement to secure the provision of a 3 metre wide joint cycle/footway along the whole of the site frontage along Station Road and the provision of a £10,000 financial contribution towards the Highway Authority's costs for white lining, improved street lighting, signing, dropped kerbs to improve the cycle and pedestrian routes in the immediate vicinity of the site, 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.

RU 03/0523

**Bishopsgate School, Bishopsgate Road, Englefield Green
Erection of new single-storey lower school classroom block following demolition of six existing buildings.**

DECISION: The application be notified to the ODPM as an acceptable departure from the provisions of the Development Plan in accordance with the requirements of Town and Country Planning (Development Plans & Consultation) (Departures) Direction 1999 as the proposal could represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt and that failing any direction from the Minister, the Director of Technical Services be authorised to GRANT permission subject to conditions.

RU 03/0607

**TASIS England, Coldharbour Lane, Thorpe
Erection of security entrance building at the Ten Acre Lane entrance to the school.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

RU 03/0616

**56 London Street, Chertsey
Change of use from private residence to bed and breakfast accommodation.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

(Mr Pratt, on behalf of Mrs Dryburgh who was an objector, addressed the Committee on the above application).

RU 03/0621

**Bylands, 31 Abbots Drive, Virginia Water
Demolition of existing building and erection of two storey dwelling with accommodation in the roof and attached double garage with accommodation above and additional vehicular access off Abbots Drive.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

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

RU 03/0626

**Probyns Cottage, Wick Lane, Englefield Green
Amendment to planning permission RU 02/0683 (erection of detached dwelling and detached garage) involving the insertion of two dormer windows in the rear elevation.**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. **The proposed replacement dwelling by reason of its increase in floor area, height, design, bulk and mass would result in an inappropriate development within the Green Belt over and above the size of the dwelling as at May 1986 which would be prominent harmful and detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt contrary to Policies PE1 and PE2 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policies L04 and L05 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002, Policies GB1 and GB6 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and the advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: 'Green Belts'.**
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 planning permission contrary to Policies PE1 and PE2 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policies L04 and L05 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002, Policies GB1 and GB6 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and the advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: 'Green Belts'.**

(Mr R. Clarke, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the above application).

RU 03/0628

**April Lodge, 22 Monks Road, Virginia Water
Erection of a detached house with attached double garage following demolition of existing bungalow.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

RU 03/0646

**47 Rowan Avenue, Egham
Erection of a single storey rear extension following demolition of an existing rear extension.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

191. LOCAL PLAN REVIEW (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) ISSUES AND OPTIONS PAPER - DESIGN AND DENSITY

The Committee was informed of some of the emerging issues that would be considered as part of the Local Plan Review (Local Development Framework) and considered an Issues and Options Paper on design and density issues related to residential developments.

The Paper setting out the issues and options was divided into five sections. The first provided an introduction to the subject and the second provided a summary of the current Government guidance in relation to design and density. The third section set out the relevant guidance at regional and County level while the fourth described existing Local Plan policies and supplementary guidance and identified where changes were required. The final section considered the policy approach to be adopted in Runnymede in light of national and regional guidance and the particular issues facing the Borough.

The Paper proposed a range of policy approaches to achieve the following: -

- a) consistently high standards of design;
- b) density in the Runnymede context;
- c) identification and preservation of the character of attractive residential areas in the Borough;
- d) ensure that design and density policies contributed to the achievement of sustainable development;
- e) set targets and monitor performance.

The policy approaches would help to address a number of areas of Council policy as set out in the Leader's Position Statement.

Members noted that in order to avoid some of the problems associated with higher densities, the proposed approach would be to adopt policies which sought to achieve development at a density which was commensurate with environmental and amenity considerations, and which also encouraged high standards of design in order to achieve higher densities without causing undue harm to the amenity of residents.

Members noted that the LDF would need to be underpinned by a sustainability audit and that this would have an impact on a number of Council services that had land use implications. The initial part of the work on the sustainability audit of the LDF, would be to establish a baseline of data for a number of policy areas. The information set out in the Paper formed a part of this process. Further details of the audit would be considered by the Committee in the autumn.

The process of policy development for the new Local Development Framework would be informed by the Community Strategy and involve direct input from a number of the Community Strategy Task Groups. In this case it was proposed to use feedback on these Papers from the Environment Task Group and the Access and Transport Task Group to guide the drafting of policies.

Minor changes of wording were made to paragraphs 5.2.14, 5.2.15 and 5.5.3.

RECOMMEND that -

the Issues and Options Paper on Design and Density of Development as amended, be approved as part of the preparatory work for the proposed Local Development Framework.

192. SURREY STRUCTURE PLAN - DEPOSIT DRAFT 2003

The Committee considered a report on the changes to the Surrey Structure Plan, Deposit Draft 2003 which involved modifications to the distribution of housing in the County for the period 2001 - 2016.

In January 2003, the Committee had expressed concern at the proposals to revise the housing allocations but was prepared to accommodate a housing distribution based on an equitable allocation of the total requirement provided it was based on a thorough and robust urban capacity study in each borough in accordance with an agreed and rigorously applied methodology.

The housing capacity study had now been completed by the County Council and the proposed distribution of housing (compared with the position in January 2003 was reported as set out below:

Table 1

District	Distribution in Deposit Draft Surrey Structure Plan 2003		Revised Distribution	
	Allocated Housing	Strategic Allocations	Allocated Housing	Strategic Allocations
Elmbridge	1,800	-	3,370	-
Epsom & Ewell	2,170	-	2,650	-
Guildford	2,350	2,500	2,720	2,500
Mole Valley	1,330	-	2,330	-
Reigate & Banstead	2,540	2,600	3,690	2,600
Runnymede	1,920	-	2,030	-
Spelthorne	1,700	-	2,450	-
Surrey Heath	1,970	-	2,780	-
Tandridge	1,920	-	2,120	-
Waverley	1,850	-	2,810	-
Woking	2,350	1,000	2,350	1,000
Total	21,800 (a)	6,100 (b)	29,300 (d)	6,100 (e)
Additional Housing Requirement	7,500 ©	-	-	-
Total	35,400 (a+b+c)		35,400 (d+e)	

Members noted that although the housing provision for each district had been increased, there was no change to the total provision for the county. A part of the housing requirement comprising 7,500 dwellings (the urban reserve) was allocated as additional housing and it was inevitable that a large part would go to the urban areas. It was also noted that the allocated housing shown in the revised distribution was largely a reflection of the development that was already committed.

For Runnymede the housing distribution had increased to 2030 from the figure of 1920 in January 2003. However, this scale of increase reflected green belt and flood plain constraints together with a recognition that Runnymede had the smallest urban area where development could take place in a manner consistent with Government advice.

The Committee endorsed the proposed allocation as it represented an equitable housing distribution and resisted the premature release of the reserve sites. The percentage of the allocations generally reflected the percentage of urban land in each of the districts.

Concern was expressed that a move away from larger allocations to infill developments in urban areas would lead to a series of small-scale developments. This would neither provide infrastructure enhancements nor fall within affordable housing thresholds, and communities would see little benefit deriving from them.

RECOMMEND that-

- i) the comments set out in this report be forwarded to the County Council as formal observations on the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft 2003; and**
- ii) the Borough Council accepts the proposed distribution of housing for the period 2001-2016.**

193. APPEAL DECISION

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

<u>Site/Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
Lantern Cottage, Bakeham Lane, Egham - first floor rear extension to existing bungalow	DISMISSED

194. 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 9.56 pm)