

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE4 June 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, A.G. Collins, J.B. Dean, J.M. Edwards, Mrs C.E. Gant, 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

Councillors A. Alderson and Mrs E.E. Price also attended.

36. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Group mentioned below had notified the Chief Executive Officer of their wish that the change listed below be made to the membership of the Committee. The change was for a fixed period ending on the day after the meeting and thereafter the Councillor removed would be re-appointed.

Group requesting Change	Remove from Membership	Appoint Instead
Conservative	Councillor D.W. Parr	Councillor Mrs C E. Gant

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

37. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 7 May 2003 were approved and signed as a correct record.

38. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mrs L.M. Gillham declared a personal and prejudicial interest in applications RU 03/0308 and RU 03/0390 under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members as her interest was of a commercial nature. Councillor Mrs Gillham withdrew from the room when the applications were determined.

Councillor Mrs J. Norman declared a personal and prejudicial interest in application RU 02/1439 under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members as she lived in close proximity to the site. Councillor Mrs Norman withdrew from the room when the application was determined.

Councillor J.R. Whiteley declared a personal interest in application RU 03/0428 under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members as he was a Council appointed Governor of the School.

Councillor C. Knight declared a personal interest in the item on 'Future Development of Air Transport in the UK: South East' under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members as he was a Council appointment to the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee.

39. 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 03/0445	<p>Barrsbrook Farm, Guildford Road, Chertsey Erection of 17 affordable dwellings comprising 8 one bedroom flats, 8 two bedroom flats and 1 two bedroom wheelchair bungalow</p> <p>DECISION: The application be notified to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister as an acceptable departure from the provisions of the Development Plan in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Plans and Consultation) (Departures) Direction 1999 as the proposal would represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt and that failing any direction from the Minister permission be GRANTED subject to conditions</p>
RU03/0442	<p>Barrsbrook Farm, Guildford Road, Chertsey Change of use of land to form allotment site with access, allotment provision, associated building, parking, footpath link and security fence</p> <p>DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.</p>
RU 03/0491	<p>37, 39 and 41 Simplemarsh Road, Addlestone Demolition of 41 Simplemarsh Road, erection of 5 No. four bedroom dwellings and 1 No. three bedroom dwelling with new access road, parking and turning</p> <p>DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal constitutes undesirable overdevelopment of the site and by reason of the siting, number of units, location of access and its piecemeal nature would be out of keeping with the character of the streetscene and detrimental to the amenities of adjoining properties, contrary to Policy PE10 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002 and Policies HO1, HO9 and BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001. 2. The proposed development would, by virtue of the access road and car parking areas in close proximity to adjoining residential properties, be likely to lead to noise and disturbance to the occupiers of these properties to an unacceptable degree. As a result the proposals are 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 April 2001.

<u>APP. NO.</u>	<u>LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION</u>
RU 03/0308	<p>Blackhouse Farm & Land r/o Thorpe Village Hall, Coldharbour Lane, Thorpe Erection of 9 dwellings with detached car ports, retention of buildings, new village store, amenity space and car port for Village Hall with modified vehicular access (Revised Application)</p> <p>DECISION: Following the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement to secure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The provision of a twelve space car park as shown on the site layout drawing to be used exclusively by the users of Thorpe Village Hall prior to the occupation of any of the dwellings hereby approved. The top dressing of the car park shall be completed prior to the occupation of the last dwelling hereby approved; 2. The provision of a storage building to the rear of the Thorpe Village Hall to be used exclusively by the users of Thorpe Village Hall prior to the occupation of any of the dwellings hereby approved; 3. The provision of an enclosed secure amenity area to the rear of the Thorpe Village Hall to be used exclusively by the users of Thorpe Village Hall, prior to the occupation of any of the dwellings hereby approved; and 4. Amendments and additional white lining arrangements are carried out on Coldharbour Lane in the vicinity of Thorpe Village Hall so as to prevent car parking within the visibility splays and bellmouth radii of the modified vehicular access prior to the occupation of the last dwelling hereby approved. <p>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.</p>
RU 03/0390	<p>Blackhouse Farm & Land r/o Thorpe Village Hall, Coldharbour Lane, Thorpe Rebuilding of 30 metre length of boundary wall along Monks Walk (Amended Description)</p> <p>DECISION: GRANT listed building consent subject to conditions.</p>
RU 02/1439	<p>Land r/o 83 London Street, Chertsey Renewal of Planning Permission RU.99/1325 for the erection of a detached bungalow, integral garage and new garage (Revised Plans Received)</p>

APP. NO. **LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION**

DECISION: **Following receipt and consideration of the views of the Environment Agency and Surrey County Council Archaeological Section, the Director of Technical Services be authorised to GRANT permission following consultation where appropriate with the Chairman of the Committee subject to conditions.**

RU 03/0365 **95 Station Road, Chertsey
Erection of two storey side extension and ground floor, first floor and two storey rear extensions, including velux windows following demolition of existing side extension (Revised Description 10/4/03)**

DECISION: **GRANT subject to conditions.**

RU 03/0375 **Dover House, 60 London Street, Chertsey
Crown reduction by 25-30% of Oak tree to side of dwelling**

DECISION: **REFUSE for the following reason:
The proposed works are considered excessive and would adversely affect the overall shape of the crown of the tree to the detriment of the appearance of the tree that contributes to the special amenity value of the area. It would not accord with good arboricultural practice and is considered contrary to Policy PE9 of the Surrey Structure Plan and Policy NE12 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration, April 2001.**

RU 03/0428 **Christchurch School, Christchurch Road, Virginia Water
Extension to front car park for the provision of 6 no. car parking spaces**

DECISION: **GRANT subject to conditions.**

RU 03/0447 **79 Hare Hill, Addlestone
Erection of two-storey rear extension**

DECISION: **GRANT subject to conditions.**

40. **REGIONAL WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY – CONSULTATION DRAFT**

The Committee considered a report on a consultation paper entitled: 'No Time to Waste' – a regional waste management strategy produced by the South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA).

The proposed Strategy formally covered the period up to 2016, and set out a vision and planning framework looking to 2026 and even beyond. The Strategy focused on recycling as the main form of waste management which in turn gave rise to the need for significant facilities to accommodate recycling sites. Two strategy options were put forward, with a possible third variant:

- the first option (identified as the preferred option in this Strategy) would try to exceed the targets for recycling and recovery set by the Government and the European Commission.
- the second alternative option would envisage at least meeting the statutory targets but would not seek to exceed them and would therefore see the creation of new facilities running at a rather slower pace.

A possible hybrid of the two options could involve a slower initial build-up than under the preferred option, followed by rapid increases in recovery, including recycling, in the later stages of the Strategy.

The Committee expressed strong concerns over the proposed Strategy and made the following comments:-

- Runnymede had suffered considerably in the past from the environmental impact of mineral extraction, and then by the filling of voids with waste. Both these processes took many years to complete, and even then problems lingered concerning release of leachate and gas and impact on the ability of land to store floodwater.
- Where minerals were extracted adjacent to and in the Thames floodplain an additional problem arose where impervious clay-lined cells were created for subsequent waste infill and land raising occurred. This removed the ability for land to store water and exacerbated the flooding potential from run-off of capped waste.
- In terms of restoration of mineral sites with waste materials, past experience had shown problems of general bad practice, pollution, land raising resulting in alien land-forms, and loss of water storage in flood plain areas adding to the propensity for flooding. Given these environmental problems, the timescale involved in restoration and the current shortage of inert fill, leaving extraction sites as open water in floodplain areas should not be precluded.
- Landfill sites would continue to be required in the immediate future and, due to existing sites and mineral reserves in the area, Runnymede would remain vulnerable to these pressures. The emphasis had to be on restoration of environmentally degraded sites. To prolong their use by recycling or other waste processing facilities was unacceptable.
- There needed to be strong emphasis on waste management rather than waste disposal, and in this regard, the strategy's waste hierarchy of 'prevent, re-use, recycle, recover, dispose' was supported. Reduction of waste at source was a key issue and should be vigorously pursued. Recycling was part of the solution subject to properly planned allocation of sites.
- The Council was gravely concerned by the fact that the Consultation Draft proposed that in future the planning policy constraint of the Green Belt "should not be considered a barrier to development of waste management facilities". This weakening of Green Belt policy when coupled with the locational criteria for waste management facilities provided for in Policy W24 gave rise for even greater concern.
- The suggested significant undermining of Green Belt policy proposed in the strategy was considered to be totally unacceptable. The principles of appropriate and inappropriate Green Belt development were well established, as was the need to put forward special circumstances to permit inappropriate land uses. It would become a self-fulfilling prophecy that would drive waste facilities away from appropriate urban areas, and was contrary to the principle of locating such facilities close to areas of greatest demand. The presumption should be against the use of Green Belt sites for waste processing facilities unless suitable sites could be more conclusively demonstrated as part of a sequential search.
- The strategy should aim to achieve reasonable and equitable distribution of facilities across the region and not seek to take the easy option of perpetuating environmental damage in areas that have suffered years of degradation from waste disposal in the past.

RESOLVED that -

the response to SEERA on the Consultation Paper dealing with the Regional Waste Strategy be based on the agenda report and strengthened along the lines mentioned above following consultation with the Chairman of the Committee and minority groups.

41. THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF AIR TRANSPORT IN THE UK; SOUTH EAST

The Committee considered a report on a revised Government Consultation Paper on the future development of air transport in the South East over the next 30 years which now included options for development at Gatwick. The Paper sought views on future airport capacity requirements and the location of any new airport capacity. Under Runnymede's Scheme of Delegation the response was for Economic Development Committee to determine having considered the views of this Committee.

The Government wished to ensure that the long term development of aviation was sustainable. The Government considered that its policy for airports in the South East should aim both to maximise the significant social and economic benefits that growth in aviation would bring, whilst trying to minimise the environmental impact.

The Consultation Paper set out a series of options for the 'major airport' development, namely:-

- Heathrow: a new (short) 2,000m runway with associated terminal development enhanced public transport links and additional motorway road infrastructure.
- Gatwick: one or two new runways with new terminal development.
- Stansted: expansion from one to three new runways and associated terminal development.
- Cliffe (Kent): a new airport built on the south side of the Thames Estuary. Four/five runway airport with terminal facilities.

The Committee supported the principle of airport expansion in the South East to maximise social and economic benefits, subject to the minimisation of the environmental impact.

The Committee acknowledged that whilst the development of an entirely new airport at Cliffe would regenerate land to the east of London, it seemed unlikely to receive the support of BA and BAA (the principal backers of any future airport development) in view of the scale of investment required and their preference for expansion at Heathrow.

With regard to Heathrow, some Members again expressed concern over the adverse environmental impact of further expansion, in terms of noise and air pollution, traffic generation, infrastructure problems and increased pressure for housing in the area, and also potential safety concerns.

The Committee balanced these concerns with the economic benefits of the proposals for additional airport development at Heathrow. On balance the Committee supported an expansion of Heathrow subject to enhancements of public transport to the south and west of the Airport (with the Airtrack project forming the core of the improvements) prior to any development of a third runway and subject to guaranteed strict controls on night flights, air and noise pollution and water run off forming a fundamental part of any planning permission.

Heathrow played a significant role in the local economy both directly and indirectly. Whilst the impact of economic advantage and disadvantage of growth at the Airport was difficult to assess, on balance the Committee supported the maintenance of the position of Heathrow as a premier hub airport.

RESOLVED that -

the above mentioned comments be forwarded to the Economic Development Committee as this Committee's views on 'The Future Development of Air Transport in the UK: South East'.

Upon a requisition that the names of those voting on the above item be recorded, there voted -

- For: 9 (Councillors Collins, Dean, Edwards, Gant, Norman, Thewlis, Tollett, Whiteley and Woodger)
- Against: 5 (Councillors Ashmore, Gillham, Knight, Pate and Smallman)
- Not Voting: 1 (Councillor Barden)

42. APPEAL DECISIONS

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

<u>Site/Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
a) Unit C, The Causeway, Staines - planning appeal regarding demolition of existing building and erection of a single office building with car parking spaces and landscaping	DISMISSED
b) 170 Station Road, Addlestone - planning appeal regarding change of use from Class A1 (retail) to Class A3 (Hot Food drink)	ALLOWED
c) Dalkeith House, London Road, Englefield Green - planning appeal regarding erection of triple garage with accommodation above and erection of brick piers and entrance gates along Bagshot Road	PART ALLOWED/DISMISSED
d) Hardwick Park, Hardwick Lane, Chertsey - enforcement appeal regarding erection of a steel framed two storey barn	DISMISSED AND NOTICE UPHELD WITH VARIATION
e) 11 Wilson Drive, Ottershaw - planning and enforcement appeals regarding change of use of land to use for residential purposes	DISMISSED AND NOTICE UPHELD SUBJECT TO MINOR VARIATION

43. 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.

44. STANDING ORDER NO. 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:

<u>Officer</u>	<u>Action Taken</u>	<u>Central Index No.</u>
Director of Administration and Leisure	Withdrawal of Enforcement Notices in respect of Clarence House, Stuart Way, Virginia Water	528

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 9.30 p.m.)