



RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 SEPTEMBER 2004

APPENDICES

<u>APPENDIX</u>	<u>REPORT</u>	<u>PAGE. NO.</u>
A	MINUTES – 18.8.04	1
B	SERVICE PLAN UPDATE	6
C	APPEAL DECISION – 23 AYEBRIDGES AVENUE	21
D	PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES	26

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEEAPPENDIX 'A'18 August 2004 at 7.30pm

Members of the
Committee present:

Councillors G.B. Woodger (Chairman), Mrs. F.M. Angell (Vice-Chairman)
J.R. Ashmore, Mrs F.J. Barden, J. Broadhead, J.B. Dean, J.R. Furey,
H.W.V. Meares, Mrs. J. Norman, D.W. Parr, R. Pate, B.J. Relph, N. Thewlis,
A.P. Tollett and J.R. Whiteley

Members of the
Committee absent:

None

Councillors J.M. Edwards, Mrs L.M. Gillham and C.J. Knight also attended.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14 July 2004 were approved and signed as a correct record.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following interests were made under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members by the Councillors shown.

Councillor	Item	Nature of Interest
Mrs F.J. Barden	8 Malus Drive, Addlestone (RU04/0717)	Personal and Prejudicial - applicant.
H.W.V. Meares	37-43 St Judes Road Englefield Green (RU04/0710)	Personal and Prejudicial - Former owner of application site.

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.

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

RU.04/0613

**352-358 Green Lane, Chertsey
Erection of 12 no. two-storey dwellings comprising 6
no. x 4 beds, 2 no. x 3 beds and 4 no. x 2 beds with
ancillary garages and car parking and vehicular access
off Green Lane following demolition of three existing
dwellings.**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reason:

The proposed development by reason of its overall scale, height, massing, layout, distances to boundaries and positioning in relation to the neighbouring public footpath and Green Belt land would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the local area and would not positively contribute to the townscape character of the locality or the adjoining green belt land contrary to Policies GB1, HO9 and BE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001, Policies PE1, PE2, PE10 and DP6 of the Surrey Structure Plan November 1994, Policies SE4 and LO2 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002 and advice within Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: "Green Belts".

RU.04/0710

Land at 37-43 St. Jude's Road, Englefield Green. Erection of two/three storey block of 18 flats comprising 10 no. x one bed flats and 8 no. x two bed flats, two storey replacement block for the Coach House comprising 2 no. x two bed flats all along road frontage and two-storey block of 1 no. x one bed flat and 7 no. x two bed flats at rear with associated access and parking.

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reason:

Block A by reason of its height, design, forward projection, bulk and mass would result in a prominent and incongruous frontal development and together with Block B by reason of its footprint, bulk and mass would result in an undesirable and cramped form of development of the site which would be incompatible with its surroundings, detrimental to established visual amenities of the street scene and pattern of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy PE10 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policy SE4 of Surrey Structure Plan Deposit Draft December 2002 (incorporating Proposed Modifications), Policies BE2 and HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan April 2001, the Surrey Design Guide January 2001, Planning Policy Guidance Note 1: 'General Policy and Principles' February 1997, Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: 'Housing' March 2000 and By Design.

RU.04/0744

95-133 Eastworth Road, Chertsey
Submission of reserved matters (design, external appearance, landscaping) following grant of outline planning permission (RU.02/1194) for the erection of 2/3 storey residential buildings comprising 22 flats, 5 x three bedroom and 6 x two bedroom terraced properties (amended scheme).

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

RU.03/1266

6 Colebrook, Ottershaw
Erection of rear conservatory and first floor rear extension to create additional accommodation (revised plans received on 29th January 2004).

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

RU.04/0674

**62 Larchwood Drive, Englefield Green
Single storey rear extension following demolition of
existing outbuildings**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

RU.04/0675

**Hope Springs, Ongar Road, Addlestone
Retention of existing single storey rear extension and
conservatory.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

RU.04/0689

**23 Simons Walk, Englefield Green
Conversion of existing bungalow into a two storey
detached dwelling comprising two storey side
extension, roof alterations to provide first floor
accommodation with front dormer windows and
increase in ridge height.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

RU.04/0715

**Former Safeway Car Park, 169 Station Road,
Addlestone
Use of part of car park for outdoor market on Sundays,
Wednesdays and Bank Holidays with 130 car parking
spaces and use as a pay and display car park on
Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

RU.04/0717

**8 Malus Drive, Addlestone
Erection of a two storey side and single storey rear
extension.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

RU.04/0726

**Land at Trumps Farm, Kitsmead Lane, Virginia Water
The deposit of waste soil to an average depth of less
than 1m on 3.1ha to facilitate the agricultural
improvement of farmland.**

**DECISION: RAISE STRONG OBJECTION for the
following reason:**

**The Planning Authority does not consider that the
applicant has provided sufficient information with this
application to justify the deposit of 30,000 cubic
metres of waste soil within the green belt or
assessment of the resulting impact on the landscape,
and to local amenity especially in regard to potential
odour issues and contamination of the site. As a result
the proposals would be contrary to Policies PE1, PE2
and DP32 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994, Policies
LO4 and LO5 of the Surrey Structure Plan Deposit**

Draft 2002 (Proposed Modification June 2004), Policies NE7 and NE10 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.

RU.04/0728

**Land at 38 and 40 Pinewood Avenue, New Haw
Outline application for erection of 3 detached and 2 semi detached dwellings with associated parking and garaging following demolition of existing house at 40 Pinewood Avenue.**

DECISION REFUSE for the following reasons.

1. **The proposed development by reason of its overall scale, size, bulk and massing and relationship to the existing built form would result in an unacceptable change in the character and appearance of the application site and the surrounding area and would not contribute positively to the townscape quality of the locality and would be contrary to Policies PE10 and DP6 of the Surrey Structure Plan 1994; Policies SE4 and LO2 of the emerging Surrey Structure Plan December 2002; and Policies HO9 and BE2 of the Runnymede Local Plan Second Alteration 2001, Surrey Design (including principle 7.3) 2002 and By Design.**
2. **The proposed development by reason of its scale, siting and position would create an unneighbourly form of development detrimental to the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties particularly nos. 11A, 11 and 9 Cobs Way due to the likely overbearing, overlooking and loss of outlook issues which would be contrary to Policy HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**

(A Motion to grant permission was lost. Upon a requisition that the names of those voting on the motion to grant be recorded, there voted:

For (5): Councillors Barden, J. Broadhead, Furey, Mrs Norman, and Woodger.

Against (9): Councillors Angell, Ashmore, Dean, Meares, Parr, Pate, Relph, Thewlis and Tollett.

Abstention (1): Councillor Whiteley).

RU.04/0783

**Land adjacent 30 Broomfield Road, New Haw
Erection of a detached dwelling house and creation of new access.**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

The Chairman of the Committee was of the opinion that the following application RU.03/1275 should be considered as a matter of urgency as the application had taken several months to process but all the necessary material had now been assembled upon which a decision

could be made and an undertaking had been given to the Local Government Ombudsman that the application would be considered in August.

RU.03/1275

Land to the rear of Blossom Farm, Rosemary Lane, Thorpe
Certificate of Existing Lawfulness application for refurbishment and repair to existing storage building, boundary wall and front gate.

DECISION:

1. **REFUSE A CERTIFICATE OF EXISTING LAWFULNESS for the refurbishment and repair of the existing single storey building and 2.1 metre high entrance gates because they require planning permission.**
2. **GRANT A CERTIFICATE OF EXISTING LAWFULNESS for the repair of the southern boundary wall because it was permitted development and therefore benefited from a deemed planning permission.**
3. **The owner be invited to seek planning permission for:-**
 - i) **the retention of the building;**
 - ii) **the retention of the gates (Rosemary Lane);**
 - iii) **the retention of the various sheds used to house chickens or other livestock; and**
 - iv) **the retention of the vehicular access and hardstanding off Muckhatch Lane.**

APPEAL DECISION

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

<u>Site/Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
38 Armstrong Road, Englefield Green – planning appeal regarding two storey rear extension (03/0998)	ALLOWED

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 9.05 pm).

SERVICE PLAN FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE

This plan sets out the details of the actions that the Council has agreed must be taken to improve the services provided by the Technical Services Department. It combines the targets that have been agreed within the –

- Leaders Position Statement - LPS
- Best Value Performance Indicators - BVPI
- Continuous Improvement Plan - CIP

The last column of the attached tables indicates the origin of the action point.

Officer's titles have been abbreviated as follows –

- Director of Technical Services - DTS
- Head of Planning - HP
- Development Control Manager - DCM
- Policy & Implementation Manager - PIM
- Principal Building Manager - PBM

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
To maintain rigorous financial control	PBM/ DCM/ PIM	End of financial year	Uncertainties about application numbers and fee income Uncertainties about Planning Delivery Grant	Support from Finance staff Building Control income expected to equate to fee related expenditure over the 3 year accounting period	i) Expenditure within budget ii) Income maximised.	Development Control, Policy and Building Control budgets on target. Planning fee income £14k below target; Building Control on target Changes in regulations to allow break-even only	LPS
To deliver a prompt and efficient service in relation to planning applications	DCM	ongoing	i) Time taken to ensure quality of major development and securing planning gain by s. 106 agreements Any staff shortages/ absences	Development Control Staff	i) Determine 60% of major planning applications within 13 weeks. ii) Determine 65% of minor planning applications within 8 weeks iii) Determine 80% of other planning applications within 8 weeks.	40% achieved 57% achieved 83% achieved (First quarter 2004/05)	LPS/ BVPI

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
To review the Local Plan (Local Development Framework)	PIM	April 2007	Legislative timetable Resources	Policy & Implementation staff Planning Delivery Grant	Promote and interpret policies to safeguard environmental quality, make best use of land and promote economic activity, provide recreational facilities and encourage an integrated approach to traffic and transportation management. Road enhancements and contributions towards traffic management and amelioration schemes delivered	Enactment of legislation delayed Provisional timetable agreed by Planning Committee June 2004	LPS
To seek community benefit through planning obligations.	DCM	ongoing	Government guidance on Planning Gain	Development Control staff	Road enhancements and contributions towards traffic management and amelioration schemes delivered	Internal protocol agreed and circulated	LPS
To make the best use of IT to improve service delivery.	DCM/ PIM	i) 30 March 2004	Other demands on IT staff	IT/GIS staff	i) Planning application forms simplified to enable electronic submission ii) Geographic Information System and electronic document management systems in place	i) All planning forms available on web site ii) GIS linkage to planning computer system. DMS being introduced.	LPS

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
To maintain a high quality environment	DCM/ PIM	ongoing	Poor quality planning applications Development allowed on appeal	Development Control and Policy & Implementation staff	i) High quality developments enhancing town centres and villages achieved.. ii) Planning briefs for public consultation on significant development sites developed. iii) Inappropriate development that manifestly detracts from the environmental quality resisted. iv) Housing density targets achieved which satisfy design criteria to ensure a quality housing environment	i) On-going ii) No recent briefs prepared. iii) On-going. High appeal success record	LPS
Maintenance of the character of established residential areas							

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
To respond to the County Structure Plan	PIM	October 2003 (EIP date) September 2004 (comments on Modifications) October 2004 (expected approval)	Imposition by external factors (EIP panel/ODPM)	Policy & Implementation Section	i) Inequitable increase in housing allocations and premature release of reserve housing sites resisted. ii) Green Belt boundary changes only considered in the context of a future review of the Borough Local Plan.	i) Structure Plan allocation is currently equitable. SCC published proposed modifications July 2004 ii) No Green Belt boundary changes currently proposed.	LPS
Seek to provide affordable housing	DCM	Achieve 750 units by 2006 (Corporate objective)	Loss of LASHG and ability to fund RSL's	External funding	i) Affordable housing targets through the planning process met ii) Flats above shops brought back into residential use	457 units provided by August 2004 Revised housing needs survey anticipated planning	LPS

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
To seek improvements to responses from consultees	DCM	ongoing	Lack of resources at Environment Agency	Requires EA and CHA to provide adequate resources	Clear statements from Environment Agency, Highway Authority, Surrey Police Architectural Liaison Officer obtained on all relevant planning applications.	Ongoing dialogue with EA.. CHA staff attend Planning Committee as required	LPS
Ensure all significant developments contribute to the overall Community Safety Strategy					Comments and advice received from RBC Community Safety Officer and Surrey Police Architectural Liaison Officer	Community Safety Officer examines all relevant applications	
To take vigorous and timely planning enforcement action	DCM	Reported to each Review Board	Legislative constraints	Current planning enforcement team	Committee approval for prioritisation and timescale for enforcement investigation in place.	Enforcement priorities and timescales agreed by Planning Committee	LPS
Bring forward regular reports on enforcement progress		on case by case basis			Ward Members and public kept up to date with progress on cases	Reported to each Review Board	

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
To ensure that Members are offered training in planning issues	DTS	ongoing	Members' availability	- In-house and Members' training budget	Regular seminars available to all Members of the Council	Seminar on Appeals and Enforcement held on 10.2.04 Seminar on RSS/LDF held on 26.2.04	LPS
To increase/maintain high percentage of homes built on previously developed land	DCM	ongoing	Have consistently achieved 100%, but this would fall if one of the housing reserve sites (greenfield sites) had to be released	Development Control staff	At least 80% achieved	Annual figure of 100% anticipated	BVPI
To minimise the number of appeals allowed against decisions to refuse planning applications	DCM	ongoing	Budgetary provision	Development Control staff / external consultants	No more than 25% appeals allowed	33% allowed (April - August 2004)	BVPI
Ensure quality systems are in place to meet BVPI 'Quality of Service' checklist	HP	ongoing	Staff resources	Development Control staff	The new BVPI identifies 15 quality criteria and also 21 criteria relating to an electronic planning service. The indicator is a percentage based on the maximum total score of 18 points	Target of 94% likely to be achieved	BVPI
Carry out 'Plain English' review of all Policy & Implementation publications	PIM	ongoing	None	Policy & Implementation staff	All jargon and acronyms removed from publications	ongoing	CIP

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
Pursue 'e' route for information provision of all Policy & Implementation publications	PIM	ongoing	None	Policy & Implementation / IS staff	Publication on website of live information System set up for electronic management of LDF	Planning portal live On target	CIP
Involve the community effectively in planning policy development and improve publicity by prioritising resources to those channels identified in the Local Plan questionnaire survey	PIM	Approval of Statement of Community Involvement by November 2004	Enactment of legislation	Policy & Implementation staff	Increased involvement in Local Development Framework	Draft to Planning Committee June 2004	CIP
Adopt DMS to deal with all Policy & Implementation correspondence	PIM	April 2004	Corporate introduction of system	Corporate system acquired Policy & Implementation staff	Develop workflow	Initial system in place Workflow being refined to meet need of LDF	CIP
Use DMS in Policy & Implementation to track correspondence from Development Control	PIM	June 2004	Corporate introduction of system	Corporate system acquired Policy & Implementation staff	Develop workflow	Initial system in place Workflow being refined to meet need of P & I	CIP
Link DMS to Local Development Framework database for representations	PIM	Prior to publication of Local Development Framework	Corporate introduction of system	Corporate system acquired Policy & Implementation staff	Develop workflow	Initial system in place Workflow being refined to meet need of P & I	CIP

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
Include indicators and targets, including a sustainability audit, in the Local Development Framework	PIM	As integral part of LDF	Lack of formal guidance on sustainability audits and enactment of legislation	Policy & Implementation staff	Published in Local Development Framework	To be included in line with agreed timetable.	CIP
Continue to work with the NW Surrey Benchmarking Group to develop better performance indicators for Forward Planning Sections	PIM	ongoing	Information from other authorities	Policy & Implementation staff	Regular meetings established between authorities	Working together on LDF's	CIP
Prepare a 'State of Runnymede' baseline environmental study of the Borough	PIM	June 2004	Closely linked to LDF process	Policy & Implementation staff	Initial Statement produced	Baseline work being undertaken as part of LDF	CIP
Examine 94% Building Regulation applications in 10 working days.	PBM	ongoing	Staff shortages	Building Control staff	Target achieved	95% of applications examined within 10 working days Achieved	CIP
Examine all Building Regulation applications within average of 10 days.	PBM	ongoing	Staff shortages	Building Control staff	Target achieved	Achieved	CIP
Determine 100% of Building Regulation applications within statutory period.	PBM	ongoing	Staff shortages	Building Control staff	Target achieved	Achieved	CIP
Seek to investigate Building Control complaints within 3 working days and respond accordingly.	PBM	ongoing	None	PBM	Target achieved	No complaints received	CIP
Respond to all requests for Building Control site inspection received by 10.00am the same day.	PBM	ongoing	Staff shortages	Building Control staff	Target achieved	Achieved	CIP

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
Monitor statutory consultees response times using quality assurance processes	DCM/ PBM	ongoing	Resources of consultees	PBM / DCM	All responses received to enable determination within 8 weeks	ongoing	CIP
Agree protocols with statutory consultees including response times and electronic information exchange	DCM		Introduction of DMS. Availability of technology by consultees		Written protocols in place and electronic interface established	Protocol agreed with Environment Agency. Improved response times from Highways Authority	CIP
Monitor performance against Charter	DCM / PBM	ongoing		DCM/PBM	Compliance with Charter standards. No complaints against performance	Complaints monitored	CIP
Establish benchmarking comparison with Audit Commission family group	DCM / PBM	ongoing		DCM/PBM	Comparative data available	ongoing	CIP
Introduce electronic document management system to Development Control / Building Control	DCM / PBM	March 2004	Corporate introduction of system	Corporate system acquired	System running live	Building Control live	CIP
Analyse reasons why planning applications are determined outside of Government targets	DCM	On-going on quarterly basis		DCM	All applications determined within guidelines	ongoing	CIP

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
Continue to monitor correspondence for timely response	DCM / PBM	ongoing		DCM/PBM	All correspondence answered according to Corporate guidelines	Monitored in individual sections, with departmental random sampling.	CIP
Establish measurements for, and monitoring of, effectiveness of pre-application discussions	DCM	March 2004	Problem of defining effectiveness measurement	DCM/ Development Control team leaders	Measurements in place	Not yet implemented	CIP
Monitor progress on s.106 and compliance with requirements	DCM	ongoing		Development Control and legal staff	Monitoring undertaken	Quarterly meetings in place.	CIP
Establish measurements for and monitoring of 'added-value' of Development Control process	DCM	March 2004	Problem of defining quality measurement	External consultancy resource?	Measurements in place	Not yet implemented	CIP
Establish peer review of completed developments	DCM	Annually		DCM	Review established	Not yet arranged	CIP
Establish regular tour of completed developments for Members	DTS	Annually		DTS	Tour undertaken	Not yet arranged	CIP
Seek to identify best practice from across the country and implement locally where appropriate	ALL	ongoing		ALL	New initiatives identified and implemented	On-going	CIP
Maintain staff continued professional development	DCM / PBM	ongoing	Availability of appropriate training courses	Establish through annual appraisals and budget process	To RTPI/RICS standards	All staff's training needs identified in appraisals.	CIP

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
Maintain Annual Design Awards	PIM	Annually		Policy & Implementation staff	Design award competition organised	Awards to be presented at December 2004 Council Meeting.	CIP
Promote principles of Surrey Design Guide	DCM/ PIM	ongoing	Measurability of success	Development Control staff	Improved design	Surrey Design Guide referred to in application discussions and reports.	CIP
Provide Supplementary Planning Guidance on key issues	PIM	ongoing	Staff workload	Policy & Implementation staff	SPG produced	To be provided as part of LDF preparation.	CIP
Produce and maintain guidance on development in Conservation Areas	PIM	ongoing	Staff workload	Policy & Implementation staff	Guidance produced	To be provided as part of LDF preparation.	CIP
Provide development briefs on major sites	PIM	ongoing	Where sites come forward for development without prior notice	Policy & Implementation staff	Development Briefs produced	To be provided as part of LDF preparation.	CIP
Ensure that staff salaries and conditions of service remain competitive	DTS	ongoing	Budget availability	Career scheme funded through Planning Delivery Grant	Comparison with other local authorities in region undertaken	Career progression scheme introduced Corporate review underway	CIP

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
Ensure that staff priorities and targets are clearly set through appraisal process, and reflect corporate aspirations	ALL	ongoing		Identified through budget process	Appraisal forms reflect priorities and targets	Objectives set for all staff through October 2003 appraisals.	CIP
Continue to explore potential for joint working with other authorities	ALL	ongoing	Willingness of partners; legal implications	To be identified	Identification and implementation of joint initiatives	ongoing Discussions on joint Building Control work and High Hedges	CIP
Investigate connection to Planning Portal Programme	DTS	March 2004		To be identified	Seamless connection to Planning Portal in place	Discussions continuing with Planning Portal.	CIP
Set timescales for response to requests for pre-application discussions. Aim to give verbal/written advice to avoid unnecessary meetings. Monitor compliance	DCM	December 2003		Development Control staff	Timescales set and met	Not yet completed	CIP
Ensure availability of Planning Advice Assistants during office hours	DCM	ongoing	Staff shortages	Existing staff establishment	Continued availability of staff	Availability maintained	CIP
Ensure availability of Building Control Surveyors in person or via mobile phones during office hours	PBM	ongoing	Staff shortages	Existing staff establishment	Continued availability of staff	Achieved	CIP

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
Ensure staff receive on-going customer care training	ALL	ongoing		Recent corporate training completed	Low level of complaints	ongoing	CIP
Respond sensitively to all genuine requests to provide information for those with mobility difficulties or other special needs that prevent them from attending the Civic Offices	ALL	ongoing		All staff	Response to all reasonable requests; lack of complaints	ongoing	CIP
Maintain contacts with Chambers of Commerce/business community	DTS / PIM	ongoing	Staff availability		Attendance at meetings	Maintained through Business Partnership – forums, Steering Group and Sub-Group.	CIP
Use residents panel for communication on planning issues	DTS / PIM	As required	Need to ensure that residents panel is not overused	Existing resources	Response rate of over 30%	Not yet used, but may be used for LDF preparation	CIP
Provide staff to address residents/amenity group meetings as requested	DTS	As required	Staff availability	within existing staff resources	Positive response to reasonable requests	Achieved	CIP
Ensure that Planning Advice Assistants receive appropriate training	DCM	ongoing	Experience of staff	Budgets available for CPD and post-entry training	Low level of complaints	Day release being provided for relevant staff.	CIP

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
Investigate provision of projection facilities in Council Chamber to display plans, photos etc.	DTS	December 2003	Civic Offices re-provision	Approx. £30,000	Report prepared for Corporate Management Committee	Not yet completed	CIP
Provide planning/building control information as part of Annual Report, which is delivered to all households in Borough	DCM / PBM	Annually within DAL's timetable	Availability of space in Report	DCM/PBM	Publication of articles	ongoing Building Control article provided	CIP
Benchmark on broad costs with other local authorities in Audit Commission family group	DCM / PBM	ongoing	Variations in way budgets are formulated	DCM/PBM	Comparisons monitored	CIPFA data monitored	CIP
Monitor staff levels in relation to workload	DCM / PBM	ongoing	Availability of qualified/experienced staff	To be identified in Annual Personnel Report	Achievement of performance indicators	ongoing	CIP
Maintain regular liaison with Group Accountant	ALL	ongoing		Existing	Regular contact undertaken	Regular contact maintained as required.	CIP
Examine potential use of external providers to deliver all or part of service	ALL	ongoing	Increased costs of consultancy		Opportunities to compare service taken	ongoing	CIP



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2004

by **G P Bailey** MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the First Secretary of State

APPENDIX 'C'

orate

2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 6372
e-mail: enquiries@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

Date
17 AUG 2004

Appeal Reference: APP/Q3630/A/04/1143419

23 Ayesbridges Avenue, Egham, TW20 8HR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr C Jagatia against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
- The application (ref. RU.03/1460), dated 4 December 2003, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2004.
- The development proposed is described as proposed internal alterations and first floor addition for residential purposes.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is allowed in part and is dismissed in part as detailed in the Formal Decision below.

Procedural Matters

1. During the course of the application, the description of the scheme was amended to "the erection of a first floor rear extension above the existing flat roof rear extension and two bay windows to the front of the property". I have considered the scheme on that basis as, I believe, the Council has done, as shown on the appellant's drawings, including Dwg.No. K1345/01 Revision L.

Main Issues

2. The main issue in this case is, in the light of the Council's policies, the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the building and its surroundings.

The Development Plan

3. The development plan for the locality includes the Surrey Structure Replacement Plan 1994, adopted in 1995 and the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration, adopted in 2001.
4. In line with national advice now found in Planning Policy Guidance ("PPG") 1 (1997), by Structure Plan Policy PE10, the character of urban areas will be conserved and enhanced; policies will encourage, among other matters, the diversity of urban development and good urban design, and will ensure that new development makes a positive contribution to the existing character and does not detract from its surroundings. By Local Plan Policy HO9, the Council will require sensitively-designed proposals that, among other matters, do not damage the character and amenity of established residential areas. Policy BE2 adds that within the urban area, proposals will be expected to respect townscape character of recognised high quality by reference to a number of issues including existing buildings, street scene and building height and roof treatment.

Other Policy Provisions

5. The Deposit Draft Surrey Structure Plan is a review of part of the development plan. By Policy SE4, development should contribute to improvements to the quality of urban areas and the design, both of buildings themselves and of the way they integrate with their surroundings, must be of a high standard. However, at this stage in its progress towards adoption, this Policy does not carry the force of those of the development plan.
6. Also relevant is "*The Surrey Design Guide*", adopted by the Council in 2002 as supplementary planning guidance. This sets out "...*objectives and guiding principles within which genuine inspiration and design creativity can be encouraged...*".
7. In addition, the Council's "*Householder Guide*", published by the Council in 2003 as supplementary planning guidance, provides detailed advice on home and roof extensions. It advises that extensions should not dominate the original building, but should be smaller and lower than the original building in order to respect its scale and form. Extensions should not significantly harm the privacy or outlook of neighbouring properties through overlooking or being over-dominant. They should respect the architectural style of the original building and roof extensions should be carefully designed to avoid them being dominant features and harming the street scene. Dormer windows should be designed to match the style, alignment and proportions of existing windows.
8. These publications are all material considerations.

Reasons

9. The Council raises no objections to the two bay windows proposed on the front elevation of the existing bungalow or to the downward and outward projection of the front roof slope across and between them. The scale and design of these works would be proportional and complementary to the simple front façade of the existing bungalow and to its setting in the street scene; as such, this part of the scheme would accord with the Council's policies and would be acceptable. The Council's concerns are directed at the proposed first floor extension.
10. The detached bungalow, standing in a rectangular plot that comprises the appeal site, is one of a number of similar bungalows, numbered consecutively 15-24, that lie on the north-east side of this residential cul-de-sac all of uniform age and original external design, but now displaying detailed alterations. Pairs of semi-detached bungalows at Nos.25-26 and those at Nos.28-28A are of differing design and appearance. On the opposite, south-west, side of the road stand detached and semi-detached dwellings, of mixed styles, designs and proportions, including some bungalows and others containing first floor rooms. The character of the area is drawn from the limited spaciousness of the street scene derived from the close-spacing of dwellings and front gardens of limited depth; the distinctiveness arising from the uniformity of appearance of the line of bungalows, all with similar ridge heights; and the contrasting openness of the generous depths of rear gardens.
11. I deduce that the original bungalow was essentially of simple rectangular form of low profile with gable ends and the ridge of the roof set roughly parallel to the front boundary. The building stands on the boundary with No.24 to the south-east; separating the north-west flank from the boundary with No.22 is a passageway, probably of sufficient width to enable a small car to pass along.

12. The appeal site now has a long and complex planning history. Over the years, permissions have been granted and refused for a variety of schemes. There now exists a single-storey flat-roofed structure that extends across the full width of the building and some 8.5m in depth from the eaves of the original rear roof slope. In addition, within the rear garden of the appeal site, stand two large detached outbuildings.
13. The Council explains that in July 2003, permission was granted for a first floor rear extension above the existing flat roof rear extension. It is described as having a maximum projection of 7.8m, a width of 7m and a height of 5.5m, comprising 52sq.m of additional floorspace; a condition on the permission limited the highest part of the development permitted to not exceeding 5.5m in height, measured from the immediately adjoining ground level.
14. The currently-proposed first floor rear extension would extend across the full width of the rear extension, but the sides would be sloped at an angle of about 35°. A lower, minor, part of the end elevation would also be sloped, but most would stand vertical, within which a window would be placed. An area of flat roof would surmount these sloping and end sides. Linking the ridge of the main roof to the perimeter of the flat roof would be a sloping, tiled, roof area, pitched upwards from the main ridge at a shallow angle, a little less than that of the pitch of the front main roof slope.
15. No plans of the previously-permitted scheme have been submitted, to enable a direct comparison with the appeal scheme. However, both main parties state that the appeal scheme has been submitted on the basis that the height of the roof has to be raised to allow a functional headroom height within the proposed roof space. The appellant refers to the need to comply with Building Regulations requirements.
16. A letter dated 28 January 2004 to the appellant's agent supplements the Council's case; the Council argues that the July 2003 planning permission does not authorise any structure that would exceed the ridge height of the existing bungalow, but it would allow a first floor rear extension behind the unaltered bungalow roof. It is the Council's view that, because of certain alleged discrepancies in measurements, the July 2003 planning permission could not be implemented in accordance with the permitted drawings. In response, the appellant points out that the Council has mistakenly defined the appeal scheme as increasing the ridge height above that of the main dwelling by 0.6m. The appellant opines that the maximum increase would be 0.45m.
17. Much of this dispute about relative heights would appear to arise from the precise point or points at which measurements of height have been ascertained. There are certain differences in levels surrounding the buildings and in comparison with those at Nos.22 and 24 adjacent; those differences are not great in depth, but they might be sufficient to explain the perceived discrepancies. However, it would not be necessary for me to resolve this particular aspect of the dispute. What is not at issue is that the current scheme in question would be higher than that of the ridge of the roof of the existing dwelling.
18. It is the appellant's case that the purpose of this design would be to ensure that the new roof structure would not be seen from the road. It is argued that this would be achieved because it would be hidden behind the main ridge in views, angled upwards, from persons standing in the road. The appellant's drawing shows the distance from the front elevation that would be needed to enable a person to obtain a view of the new structure; such distance would not be within the width of the public domain. A temporary framework had been erected at the

time of my site visit to illustrate the proposed arrangement. Nevertheless, the Council remains convinced that the proposed roof would be seen from the road, from the front and from the sides.

19. There is no dispute that, taken in isolation, the height and design of the scheme would project above the ridge of the existing bungalow, as a matter of fact. The Council believes the resulting development would be prominent and incongruous. As a consequence it believes such development would be detrimental to the character of the surrounding area and detrimental to what it describes as the visual amenities of the street scene. Taking these matters together, the Council's objections, as expressed in its reason for refusal, are more wide-ranging than solely those concerned with views obtainable of the scheme from the road.
20. The original bungalow was clearly of modest proportion that has been extended substantially. As far as I could see from the rear garden, some of the other similar bungalows in this row have accommodated single-storey rear extensions, including those with roofs pitched from the original ridge at a shallower angle so as to embrace the depth of the rear projection. But there is none of comparable size, proportion and siting in this row, certainly not immediately adjoining.
21. The proposed first floor extension would add a structure of considerable bulk that would have an imposing and dominant impact on the appearance of the existing building. It might be the case that the Council has accepted a previous scheme, not dissimilar in terms of its width and depth. But that would not be sufficient, in my view, to justify an alternative structure of increased height.
22. The rear elevations of these bungalows are not seen from public vantage points. The depth of the rear gardens and the quantity of garden vegetation would limit the views obtained of the appeal site from the rear gardens of dwellings in Park Avenue to the north-east, at least in summer months. Nevertheless, the scale and proportions of the proposed addition would be seen clearly from the rear gardens of many of the neighbouring bungalows.
23. The size of the scheme, given further emphasis by its increased height above that of the original ridge, would be seen as a prominent and imposing addition. In comparison with the small scale and proportions of adjoining bungalows, the proposed addition would appear over-dominant and as an incongruous and insensitive feature. As such, it would act to the detriment of the appearance of existing building and, in this way, would fail to respect the townscape characteristics of its surroundings, harming the outlook of adjoining occupants. Moreover, permission in this case would encourage further such inappropriate development, with an expectation of success, that would severely alter the appearance of this row of bungalows, to their detriment.
24. When viewed directly from the front, even in the "worst-case" situation that the Council's estimate of the difference in height is correct and the appellant's drawn projections are misleading, nevertheless it would be likely that no more than a glimpse of the scheme would be obtainable. However, whatever the actual difference in height, a little more of the scheme would be likely to be seen in angled views along the road, although the roofs of the bungalows on either side would hide the majority of it. I do not believe the Council has shown sufficiently clearly that structure would have a significant impact on views along the road. However, I estimate that the scale and proportions of the scheme and its increased height above the original roof, contrary to the Council's "Householder Guide" would be

apparent in angled views from those of the dwellings on the opposite side of the road with first floor windows; although this, in itself, would not justify refusal of the scheme, it adds to my concerns about the inappropriateness of this form of development.

25. It is clear from the planning history of the appeal site that the Council would be prepared to accept a first floor rear extension of suitable design and appearance. Whilst I do not fully share the Council's concern about the impact of the scheme on the street scene, support for the scheme in this respect would be outweighed by my strong objections to the adverse impact that the scheme would have on the appearance of these bungalows. Such harm would serve to detract from the qualities of the surroundings and, as a consequence, would fail to conserve the character of the established residential area, contrary to Structure Plan Policy PE10, Local Plan Policies HO9 and BE2 and the Council's supplementary guidance.

Conditions

26. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions, inasmuch as they would pertain to the proposed two bay windows, in the light of advice in Circular 11/95. To ensure that the proposed development would harmonise with the existing front elevation, a condition requiring the use of appropriate external materials would be justified.

Conclusions

27. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the need to meet Building Regulations requirements, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed only in part, but otherwise dismissed.

Formal Decision

28. I dismiss the appeal insofar as it relates to the erection of a first floor rear extension above the existing flat roof rear extension.
29. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to two bay windows to the front of the property and I grant planning permission for two bay windows to the front of the property at 23 Ayebridges Avenue, Egham in accordance with the terms of the application (ref. RU.03/1460) dated 4 December 2003 and the plans submitted therewith (so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted) and subject to the condition that the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.



INSPECTOR

PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY

 DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES

FROM 16TH TO 27TH AUGUST 2004

<u>APP. NO.</u>	<u>LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION</u>
04/0614	Cedar Springs, Waverley Drive, Virginia Water Erection of detached two storey dwelling with basement following demolition of existing dwelling. DECISION: REFUSE
04/0616	96 Guildford Street, Chertsey Change of use of the ground floor of the property from retail use (Class A1) to financial and professional services (Class A2). DECISION: REFUSE
04/0699	10 Timsway, Staines Extensions to existing dormer windows at front and rear elevations and insertion of new dormer window to front elevation. DECISION: GRANT
04/0700	Scout Association, Pond Road, Egham Erection of detached wooden shed for storage purposes. DECISION: GRANT
04/0714	Land adj. 4 Masonic Hall Road, Chertsey Erection of one detached two storey dwelling. DECISION: REFUSE
04/0724	4 Chaworth Close, Ottershaw Insertion of dormers to front and rear to create habitable accommodation in roof space. DECISION: GRANT
04/0732	The Jolly Farmer, The Hythe, Staines External alterations involving replacement of first floor window on rear elevation with fire escape doorway and staircase and replacement of existing double doors with single door and glazed side panel. DECISION: REFUSE

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

04/0733 The Jolly Farmer, The Hythe, Staines
Replacement of first floor window on rear elevation with fire escape door and staircase.

DECISION: **REFUSE**

04/0737 21 Osborne Road, Egham
Erection of a conservatory to the side of the property.

DECISION: **GRANT**

04/0738 Leas Cottage, Callow Hill, Virginia Water
Erection of single storey front extension (revised plans received).

DECISION: **REFUSE**

04/0745 45 Liberty Hall Road, Addlestone
Erection of double garage and greenhouse following demolition of existing garage.

DECISION: **GRANT**

04/0747 20 Little Green Lane, Chertsey
Increase height of roof to allow conversion of loft space into residential accommodation and erection of front extension to form new entrance to Post Office.

DECISION: **GRANT**

04/0749 5 Astor Close, Addlestone
Erection of part two storey, part single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory.

DECISION: **GRANT**

04/0750 Willow Haven, Laleham Reach, Chertsey
Renewal of planning permission RU.99/0617 for erection of chalet bungalow and detached garage following demolition of existing bungalow, garage and outbuilding.

DECISION: **GRANT**

04/0752 Warrenhurst, West Drive, Virginia Water
2 No. new external staircase from the basement to the ground floor, erection of ground floor pergola attached to the dwelling, new portico to the existing pavilion and erection detached a new gazebo in rear garden.

DECISION: **REFUSE**

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

- 04/0757 41 Tennyson Road, Addlestone
Alteration to roof from hipped to gable end incorporating a rear dormer window to allow habitable accommodation in roofspace.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 04/0758 29 Nightingale Shott, Egham
Change of use of property to use for multiple occupation for up to 7 people.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 04/0760 15 Masonic Hall Road, Chertsey
Erection of single storey side extension and insertion of rear window at first floor level following demolition of existing porch.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0761 18 Row Hill, Addlestone
Erection of two storey side and single storey side and rear extension.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0762 39 Lindsay Road, New Haw
Erection of single storey front, side and rear extensions and rear conservatory following demolition of existing garage.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 04/0763 12 Derwent Close, Addlestone
Erection of two storey rear extension with insertion of rooflights in side elevation and single storey front extension following demolition of existing ground floor extensions.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 04/0764 62 Wey Meadows, Weybridge
Erection of single storey dwelling.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 04/0768 The Plantation, Docket Eddy Island, Chertsey
Extension to existing external terrace and new steps.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0769 38 Ferndale Avenue, Chertsey
Erection of single storey rear extension.
DECISION: **GRANT**

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

- 04/0771 29 Vegal Crescent, Englefield Green
Erection of two storey side extension and construction of conservatory to rear.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 04/0772 Land at Byfleet Road, New Haw
Prior approval for the siting and appearance of a 12.5 metre high slim line telecommunication column with 3 No. x equipment cabinets at the base of the column.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 04/0773 59 Pinewood Avenue, New Haw
Erection of single storey rear extension.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0777 31 Crouch Oak Lane, Addlestone
Erection of single storey front extension.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0778 55 Victoria Street, Englefield Green
Erection of single storey front extension and extension of the roof to allow habitable accommodation with insertion of rooflights.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0779 46 Spring Avenue, Egham
Erection of single storey rear extension.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0780 Academy House, 241 Chertsey Road, Addlestone
Erection of a 1.8 metre wide vinyl banner on railings abutting Eastworth Road.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0781 14 Ripley Avenue, Egham
Erection of single storey rear extension, construction of front dormer to allow habitable accommodation and insertion of rooflights.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 04/0782 13 Brentwood Court, Simplemarsh Road, Addlestone
Erection of trellis on top of existing wooden fence (Retrospective).
DECISION: **GRANT**

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

- 04/0788 42 Orchard Avenue, Woodham
Erection of two storey rear extension and rear conservatory.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0789 9 Upper Walk, Virginia Water
Tree works to pollard a plane tree protected by a planning condition.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0791 1 Rowhurst Avenue, Addlestone
Erection of boundary wall to front and side of property.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 04/0792 14 Alderside Walk, Englefield Green
Erection of two storey side and front extensions incorporating an integral garage and construction of dormer window to front elevation.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0793 Summerhill, Guildford Road, Ottershaw
Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two storey dwelling and car port. (Renewal of application RU.99/0624)
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0794 The Conifers, Thorpe Lea Road, Egham
Outline application for sub-division of site and erection of a detached two storey dwelling south of the existing dwelling with the creation of a separate access and curtilage.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 04/0795 24 Caxton Avenue, Addlestone
Erection of two storey side and single storey rear extensions. (Amendments to planning approval RU.02/1376)
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0796 Land at junction of The Broadway & Woodham Lane, New Haw
Installation of a 12.5m high monopole with associated shrouded antennae and two equipment cabinets.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 04/0798 Land adj. 2 Rickman Crescent, Addlestone
Erection of pair of semi-detached houses with accommodation in the roof and parking to the front.
DECISION: **REFUSE**

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

- 04/0801 99 Spring Rise, Egham
Erection of first floor rear extension.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0803 Evelyn, 8 Stoneylands Road, Egham
Erection of two storey rear extension and hip to gable to incorporate loft conversion and insertion of front dormer window and rooflights on northern side elevation. (Amended description 16/07/04)
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0811 63 Byfleet Road, New Haw
Erection of first floor rear extension and construction of pitched roof over existing garage and single storey extension.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0812 26 Free Prae Road, Chertsey
Erection of first floor side extension.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0815 35 Orchard Avenue, Woodham
Erection of single storey rear extension with insertion of rooflights to create habitable accommodation in roofspace.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0824 Cobb Crest, 134 Byfleet Road, New Haw
Erection of rear conservatory following demolition of existing bay window.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0825 2 Hythe Field Avenue, Egham
Erection of single storey rear and two storey side extensions incorporating an attached garage following demolition of existing garage and conservatory.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0838 16 Hollycombe, Englefield Green
Tree works to Cedar tree in rear garden subject to Tree Preservation Order 4 including removal of deadwood, thinning of limbs and of canopy.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 04/0852 Arden, Wey Road, Weybridge
Demolition of existing house and outbuildings and erection of a detached replacement house with garaging and associated access.
DECISION: **NO OBJECTION**

DELEGATED DECISIONS IN CONSULTATION WITH CHAIRMAN & VICE-CHAIRMAN

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

04/0742 Rose Cottage, Shrubbs Hill, Sunningdale
Erection of first floor front extension following demolition of existing loggia.
DECISION: REFUSE

04/0746 7 Quiet Close, Addlestone
Erection of two storey side extension incorporating a rooflight to side
elevation following demolition of existing side extension and garage.
DECISION: GRANT