

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE19 October 2005 at 7.30pm

Members of the Committee present: Councillors J.M. Edwards (Chairman), D.W. Parr (Vice-Chairman), J.R. Ashmore, J. Broadhead, Mrs. P.I Broadhead, J.B. Dean, J.R. Furey, Miss. M. N. Heath, C. Knight, Mrs. J. Norman, R. Pate, B.J. Relph, Mrs. M. Roberts, J.R. Whiteley and G.B. Woodger.

Members of the Committee absent: None

316. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Group mentioned below had notified the Chief Executive Officer of its 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. P.I. Broadhead
Conservative	Councillor H.W.V. Meares	Councillor Miss M.N. Heath

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

317. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 21 September 2005 were approved and signed as a correct record.

318. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following interest was declared under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members by the Councillor shown.

Councillor	Item	Nature of Interest
B J Relph	6. Application No. RU.05/0957 Land r/o The Laurels, Barley Mow Road, Englefield Green	Personal and prejudicial – Personal friend of the Managing Director of applicant company.
	6. Application No. RU. 05/0898 High Acre, Portnall Drive, Virginia Water	Occasional professional association with the agents/planning consultants.

319. 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 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.

RU 05/0626

LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION

**Blackboy Farm, Addlestone Road, Addlestone
Renewal of temporary planning permission RU
04/0330 for the siting of a mobile home for a
further temporary period of 5 years.**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

- 1. It has not been demonstrated that the proposed mobile home is required to meet an essential need of the existing agricultural holding. That essential need is met by the existing dwelling on the holding and there exists other possible sources of accommodation near to the site which could satisfy the desire of the applicant's son to live near the holding. As such the proposal is an inappropriate development harmful to the openness of the green belt, contrary to Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Policies GB1 and GB4 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001, Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 'Green Belts' and Planning Policy Statement 7 : 'Sustainable Development in Rural Areas'.**
- 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 Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Policies GB1 and GB4 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan April 2001, the advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: 'Green Belts' and Planning Policy Statement 7 : 'Sustainable Development in Rural Areas'.**
- 3. The proposed development lies within the area of land liable to flood as shown on maps held by the Environment Agency. No technical information or flood risk assessment (FRA) has been provided with the application. As submitted, 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 an additional household into the flood plain 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'.**

(Mrs. Hawkins, the applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application).

RU 05/0869

**The Bees Nest, Shepley Drive, Virginia Water
Construction of an extension to existing basement
to create laundry, sauna, bathroom and exercise
area and rebuilding of the existing eastern wing over
proposed basement.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions

RU 05/0892

**The Bees Nest, Shepley Drive, Virginia Water
Erection of first floor rear extension following
demolition of the rear ground floor bay window and
part of the existing garage to the north of the
dwelling.**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed first floor extension by reason of its increase in floor area, bulk and mass would result in an inappropriate development within the Green Belt over and above the size of the building on the site as at May 1986 which would be prominent, harmful and detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt, contrary to Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, 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 any very special circumstances have been put forward in support of this application to justify the granting of planning permission contrary to Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Policies GB1 and GB6 of the Runnymede Borough Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and the advice contained with Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: 'Green Belts'.**

(Mr Carter, the applicant's agent, addressed the Committee on the above application).

RU 05/0898

**High Acre, Portnall Drive, Virginia Water
Erection of a single-storey rear extension with
internal alterations, basement plant room and new
porch canopy.**

**DECISION: Application DEFERRED until next
Planning Committee to be held on 2 November 2005
to allow corrections to be made to some of the floor
area figures and percentage increase figures in the
report.**

that, subject to the uncertainty of estimating land supply over a 20-year period, the proposed allocation could be accommodated primarily in the urban area. Recent housing completion rates in the Borough from 2001 to 2005 confirmed this assumption, with approximately 200 dwellings completed per year during this period, predominantly within the urban areas (with the exception of schemes such as the Sandgates key worker housing development at Guildford Road, Chertsey).

The South East Plan's preferred option and proposed district housing distribution was in line with current housing growth in the Borough and was also consistent with Runnymede's own preferred option for meeting the housing requirement, as set out in both the draft Core Strategy and Housing DPD. This option similarly accorded with Government advice in terms of concentrating development in existing urban areas, the re-use of previously developed land, as well as protecting the Green Belt. It was also believed that the potential disadvantages, such as the effect of higher density schemes on existing local character and amenity, could be regulated with good planning and design standards.

The three housing distribution options proposed in the SEP consultation had also been the subject of a sustainability appraisal, set against the Integrated Regional Framework objectives, in order to identify their implications. The results of this appraisal had indicated that the preferred option offered more scope for benefits than the alternative options.

In relation to sustainability issues, however, it was unclear whether the proposed options took full account of the potential effect of the Thames Basin Heaths (TBH) Special Protection Area (SPA) upon future housing delivery. The TBH SPA covered 8,000ha of land comprising 13 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) that required protection from development in order to preserve internationally important stocks of birds. The SPA was unusual in that it covered a largely urban area, affecting some 40,000 new dwellings, allocated within various Local Plans, across the affected area. Many local planning authorities were reported as refusing planning permission for housing development in the vicinity of the SPA, partly based on comments received from English Nature (EN).

EN's concerns generally related to any increases in population from housing development and the likely increases in the number of cats and dogs in the vicinity of the SPA because of the potential to disturb the protected ground nesting birds. Joint discussions were currently underway with GOSE, SEERA, EN and those affected local authorities, in consultation with DEFRA, to formulate an approach to deal with residential applications and a protocol of measures that might allow the residential allocations in local plans to proceed without causing harm to the SPA. Sight of a draft protocol was awaited, but until such time this issue was resolved, further housing development proposed by the South East Plan within the area affected by the SPA might be unachievable.

It was also noted that the TBH SPA also required local planning authorities to make the appropriate assessments and, as a result, local planning authorities had no discretion in deciding whether such assessments were required or not.

Since it was unclear whether the proposed options took full account of the potential effect of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area upon future housing delivery, this issue needed to be resolved before the residential allocations for those areas affected by the SPA could be finalised.

During the closing discussion one Member spoke of the lack of emphasis on affordable housing and asked for a Recorded Vote to be taken.

RESOLVED that -

- (i) the above-mentioned comments be forwarded to Surrey County Council as the Borough's formal response to the proposed district housing distribution over the period of the South East Plan from 2006 to 2026, as outlined in the consultation document: "The South East Plan - The Future of Housing in Surrey : September 2005"; and**
- (ii) with the proviso that the potential effect of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area upon future housing delivery be satisfactorily resolved, the preferred option of meeting the housing requirement by**

further development within towns across Surrey, be supported by Runnymede Borough Council.

(Upon a requisition that the names be recorded of those voting on the Motion to forward the report together with the above proviso there voted:-

For: (14) Councillors Ashmore, Broadhead, Mrs. P. Broadhead, Dean, Edwards, Furey, Miss M. Heath, Knight, Mrs. J. Norman, Parr, Relph, Mrs. M. Roberts, Whiteley and Woodger

Against: (1) Councillor Pate

321. APPEAL DECISIONS

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

Site/Development	Decision
a) 17 Common Lane, New Haw - planning appeal regarding modifications and extensions.	ALLOWED
b) Pantiles, 26 Ottershaw Park, Ottershaw - planning appeals regarding	
i) Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a two-storey replacement dwelling and detached garage.	ALLOWED
ii) Variation of Condition 3 of RU 04/1045.	DISMISSED

322. STANDING ORDER 42 - URGENT ACTION

The Committee noted that acting in accordance with Standing Order 42 the following action had been undertaken by the officer shown below after consultation with the Chairman of this Committee.

Officer	Action Taken	Central Index No
Director of Administration and Leisure	In the event of planning permission being granted on appeal, execution of Section 106 Agreement to secure a financial contribution in the sum of £10,000 towards highway infrastructure improvements in the locality of a proposed development at 1-5 College Close and 278 Station Road, Addlestone.	601

323 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 8.45 pm)