



# RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

27 APRIL 2005

### APPENDICES

<u>APPENDIX</u>	<u>REPORT</u>	<u>PAGE.</u> <u>NO.</u>
A	APPEAL DECISION – LAND ADJ 64 LARCHWOOD DRIVE, ENGLEFIELD GREEN	1
B	APPEAL DECISION – FORMER BT BUILDING FRONTING STRODE STREET AND CROWN STREET, EGHAM	5
C	PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES	11



# Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 1 March 2005

Site visit made on 1 March 2005

by **Julia Gregory** BSc (Hons) BTP MRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the First Secretary of State

The  
405  
Ten  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN  
☎ 0117 372 6372  
e-mail: enquiries@planning-  
inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

Date

06 APR 2005

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/A/04/1151276**

**Land adjacent to 64 Larchwood Drive, Englefield Green, Egham, Surrey TW20 0SH**

- 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 L Horsburgh against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
- The application Ref RU.04/0038, dated 12 January 2004, was refused by notice dated 26 February 2004.
- The development proposed is a new detached 3 bedroom house.

**Summary of Decision: The appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted subject to conditions set out below in the Formal Decision.**

## Main Issue

1. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

## Planning Policy

2. The development plan includes the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 (SP) and the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration (LP). SP policy SE4 promotes improvements to the quality of urban and rural areas, and development of a high standard integrating with their surroundings. Supplementary Planning Guidance, *Surrey Design* (SPG), specifies the fundamental design criteria that development schemes will be expected to comply with, and is linked to SP policy SE4 by its accompanying text. Accordingly, given that the SPG has been subject to consultation and has been adopted by the County Council, I accord it significant weight.
3. LP policy BE2 specifies issues which will be expected to be respected by proposals in relation to townscape character. LP policy HO9 specifies further design criteria. Of most relevance is the effect on the character and amenity of established residential areas, and the provision of appropriate space between existing and proposed residential units.
4. Planning Policy Statement 1: *Delivering Sustainable Development* (PPS1) seeks, amongst other matters to promote high quality inclusive design. High quality design is also sought by other national guidance.

## Reasons

5. The detached dwellinghouse would be sited on land at the corner of Larchwood Drive and Kingsley Avenue, which currently forms part of the garden of No 64 Larchwood Drive, which is a semi-detached dwelling. Most of the dwellings in the immediate vicinity are semi-detached or terraced and were built as part of a local authority housing estate.

6. The dwelling would provide a similar floorspace to No 64 and would be located with the front of its porch in line with the front wall of No 64. The fenestration, string course and door on this elevation would also be similar to those at No 64. Its eaves level would follow through, and it would have the same angle of pitch on the roof as those adjacent in Larchwood Road and Kingsley Avenue, but with a lower ridge height. I acknowledge that the dwellinghouse would be detached rather than semi-detached. However, because of its siting, massing and design, with the many similar features to others nearby, it would integrate well with dwellings close by.
7. No distance between dwellinghouses is specified in any part of the development plan or SPG, and indeed PPS1 advises that unnecessary prescription or detail should be avoided in design policies. Therefore, it is a matter for judgement, in the individual circumstances of the case, what would be acceptable. When viewed from Larchwood Drive, because partially in line with No 64, the gap between the new dwelling and that adjacent would become apparent only when close by. A gap of some 1m between side walls would in my view, in this case, given the complementary design of the dwelling, be sufficient so that it would not appear cramped in the street scene.
8. There is a substantial hedge on the boundary with Kingsley Avenue which would be kept, and would screen parts of the dwelling. It would be well set back from the corner for most of its length with its side elevation sited behind the front elevation of No 31 Kingsley Avenue. Because of this and because it would reflect the side elevation design of No 64 and others locally, I consider that the appearance of the dwelling from Kingsley Avenue would not be harmful to the street scene. I conclude that the proposal would integrate well with its surroundings, complying with the development plan, SPG and national planning policy and that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area.

#### **Conditions**

9. As materials have not been specified, I consider that details should be submitted and approved in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. I also consider that the boundary hedgerow should be retained, at a height of not less than 1.5m, in order to landscape the site boundary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

#### **Conclusions**

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the planning history of the site and other new developments in the area, the existence of a covenant, and the appellant's dissatisfaction with the Council's method of determination of the application, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

#### **Formal Decision**

11. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for a new detached 3 bedroom house at land adjacent to 64 Larchwood Drive, Englefield Green, Egham, Surrey TW20 0SH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref RU.04/0038, dated 12 January 2004, and the plans submitted therewith, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of five years from the date of this decision.

- 2) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 3) The hedgerow along the boundary of the site annotated on plan no 1502/3 at the corner of Larchwood Drive and Kingsley Avenue shall be retained at a height of not less than 1.5m.

*V. C. Gregory*

INSPECTOR

**APPEARANCES**

**FOR THE APPELLANT:**

Mr L Horsburgh	Appellant
Mrs T Horsburgh	Appellant's wife
Bob Falkner Architect	31 The Gower, Thorpe, Egham, Surrey TW20 8UB

**FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:**

Jonathan Partington	Team Leader, Runnymede Borough Council
---------------------	--

**DOCUMENTS**

Document 1	List of persons present at the hearing
Document 2	Council's letter of notification and circulation list
Document 3	Appendices to Council's written statement
Document 4	SP policy SE4 submitted by Mr Partington

**PLANS**

Plan A1- A2	Application plans 1502/3 and 1502/4
-------------	-------------------------------------

**PHOTOGRAPHS**

Photo 1-5	Photographs submitted by Mr Falkner
-----------	-------------------------------------



# Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 2 March 2005

Site visit made on 2 March 2005

by **Julia Gregory BSc (Hons) BTP MRTPI MCMI**

an Inspector appointed by the First Secretary of State

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/09 Kite Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN  
☎ 0117 372 6372  
e-mail: enquiries@planning-  
inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

Date

**05 APR 2005**

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/A/04/1151649**

**Former British Telecom Back-up Building fronting Strode Street and Crown Street, Egham, Surrey TW20 9BX**

- 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 Thomas Wrenn Homes Ltd against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
- The application Ref RU.04/0089, dated 16 January 2004, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2004.
- The development proposed is the demolition of the existing building and the construction of 2 No. blocks of 12 flats.

**Summary of Decision: The appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted subject to conditions set out below in the Formal Decision.**

## Procedural Matters

1. It was confirmed at the hearing by both main parties, that although referred to on the decision notice, plan no 03/2222/8 had been superseded by plan no 03/2222/8A prior to the Council's determination of the application, and that this plan had been subject to public consultation. I shall determine the proposal on this basis.

## Main Issues

2. I consider that there are three main issues. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. The second main issue is whether the proposal would be overbearing on living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring residential properties. The third main issue is whether the proposal would generate on-street parking, and the effect that this would have on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring residential properties.

## Planning Policy

3. The development plan includes the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 (SP) and the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration (LP). SP policy SE4 promotes improvements to the quality of urban and rural developments and development of a high standard integrating with their surroundings. *Surrey Design* (DSPG) specifies fundamental design criteria that development schemes will be expected to comply with and is linked to the policy in the text. Accordingly, given that it has been subject to consultation and adopted by the County Council, I accord the DSPG significant weight.
4. SP policy DN2 aims to minimise the transport impact of new development. SP policy DN3 relates to parking provision, and advises that maximum parking standards will be set. SP

policy LO1 seeks to locate new development in existing urban areas which can be accessed easily without a car. SP policy LO2 seeks to manage development within urban areas to enhance the quality of the built environment.

5. LP policy BE2 specifies issues which will be expected to be respected by proposals in relation to townscape character. LP policy HO9 specifies further design criteria for new housing development which include the effect on the character and amenity of established residential areas, and the provision of adequate space between existing and proposed residential property. LP policy HO1 seeks to maximise housing potential. LP policy MV9 requires development to comply with parking standards. On-street parking control is exercised in the interests of highway safety and protecting the environment.
6. The Council has produced Revised Parking Standards which were prepared and adopted after a period of public consultation as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPSG). These specify that two bedroom housing units should have no more than 1.5-2.0 car parking spaces as a standard provision, and no more than 1 space in town centres. I accord this guidance significant weight.
7. National planning policy contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: *Housing* (PPG3) advises that car parking standards which result on average in development with more than 1.5 off-street car parking spaces are unlikely to reflect the Government's emphasis on securing sustainable residential environments. Elsewhere in PPG3 and in other Government guidance, sustainability, including making better use of land, and high quality of design in new developments is promoted.

## Reasons

### *Character and Appearance*

8. The site comprises some 0.11ha currently occupied by a vacant British Telecom Back-up building, and its curtilage, mainly comprising hard surfaced and grassed areas. The site has frontages to both Strode Street/ Mandeville Court and to Crown Street. 12 flats would be erected in two blocks, with 12 car parking spaces and a bike/bin store. Both blocks would be set within streets comprising predominantly two storey semi-detached and terraced housing, although Mandeville Court comprises three storey maisonette development.
9. The building facing Crown Street, although three storey to the north would have a two storey elevation facing Crown Street, with three roof lights. The ridge and eaves line of the roof would follow through at a similar level to that at adjacent No 51 Crown Street and Nos 1 and 2 Cedar Court, and gable-fronted bays would break up the block. Although the side elevations of the block would present a mansard style roof, because the front of the block is in line with adjacent dwellings, this would not be noticeable in the street scene. Domestic scale windows coupled with attention to architectural detailing, and landscaping, would in combination with its form ensure that this block would enhance the street scene.
10. The building facing Strode Street is three storey. However, the incorporation of windows cutting through at eaves level enables a reduced ridge height on that section of the roof nearest to No 31 Strode Street. Because of this, and because the building would be separated from that property by some 7.4m including the access way, with its frontage set on the building line, I consider that the proposal would not look oppressively high in the street scene. Although the roof would be mansard, because the front of the block would be

set in a line with the front of Nos 31 and 32 this would not in my view appear prominent or bulky. The step in the roof, use of gables and bay windows, the break in the front elevation at the entrance, combined with the landscaping on this elevation would all serve to break up the bulk of the building.

11. I acknowledge that from the north, the side elevation would be plain, with a mansard roof. However, this would be only some 9m deep, set back some 2.8m from its frontage, and facing a garage court rather than directly towards residential property. Although this elevation would be visible from some properties in Mandeville Court, I consider that it would not appear incongruous or out of character with the area. Indeed Mandeville Court is three storey. The proposal would also remove a building which does not reflect the design of any others that have been brought to my attention. I conclude that the proposal would integrate well with existing development and would enhance the character and appearance of the area. The development would not be contrary to local or national planning policy in this regard.

#### *Living Conditions*

12. Although there are east facing windows on No 31 Strode Street these would be some distance from the west facing elevation of the block facing Strode Street, separated by an access way and with tall conifers on a substantial section of the common boundary. I consider therefore that the proposal would not be overbearing on the outlook from that property.
13. There are windows at No 51 Crown Street which look towards its rear garden. The block facing Strode Street would be a sufficient distance away not to cause unreasonable overlooking. There are also windows serving a kitchen and toilet facing the site. However these would be some way distant from the block facing Crown Street, which being some 8.4m deep; would be less deep than that dwelling. Although three storey, because this uses the roof space, its height and bulk would not in my view be overbearing on the outlook. Subject to obscure glazing small side windows to block A, neither block would cause harmful overlooking to No 51.
14. No 1 Cedar Court is set well away from the east facing side of the block adjacent with an intervening high boundary wall and in my view living conditions in this property would not be adversely affected. I have considered the relationship of the blocks to properties in Strode Street and Crown Street, including where facing No 54 Crown Street and the rear of No 19 Herndon Close. These are such that the proposal would not cause unreasonable overlooking, oppressive to living conditions. No evidence presented leads me to conclude that the proposal would cause harmful loss of sunlight or daylight to the occupiers of neighbouring properties. I consider that the proposal would not be overbearing on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring residential properties such that it would be harmful to their living conditions or be contrary to the development plan and DSPG in this regard.

#### *On-street Car parking*

15. 12 off-street parking spaces would be provided, including two spaces which are specified as for disabled parking. The disabled spaces are part of the overall provision. This would not exceed the maximum standards set down in the PSPG, which would be a maximum of 12 in a town centre location or a maximum of 24 elsewhere. The proposal therefore complies

with LP policy MV9. It also accords with the advice in PPG3. Although the site does not lie within the town centre as defined in the LP proposals map, this location is in my view highly accessible within easy walking and cycling distance of town centre facilities, bus stops and the railway station. I consider therefore that the provision of 12 spaces would be in accordance with national and local planning policies. Whether or not any occupants and visitors to the flats would park on-street in the vicinity, at times when space was available, the Government is committed to restricting the provision of car parking spaces as a means of securing sustainable residential environments.

16. I acknowledge the concerns of the Council and of local residents in this residential area about the visual impact of on-street car parking. However, I note from representations that on many occasions, especially at night, all available on-street space is already taken up with car parking. Purchasers of the flats will be able to see for themselves the situation, and given that roads in the area are already congested, the proposal would not in my view make the situation worse visually.
17. I also acknowledge the concerns of local residents about access for emergency, refuse and service vehicles, about parking obstructing the footway and about traffic generally in the area. Both Strode Street and Crown Street lack turning space, and from representations I note that many of these issues already cause problems. However, the Highway Authority has not raised any objections about highway safety, and I consider that the current situation would not be significantly affected by the proposal.
18. I note that inconvenience may be caused to existing local residents if residents and visitors to the flats park on-street, as many occupants of existing dwellings in the vicinity do not have off-street parking space. Additionally, where this does exist driveways could be blocked. However, the highway in the area is not specifically designated for parking, and there are no local controls. This is not a matter that therefore justifies increasing off-street car parking space, contrary to local and national planning policy objectives.

#### Conditions

19. I have considered the conditions discussed at the hearing in the light of Circular 11/95: *The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions*. I consider that control of materials is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. Restricting permitted development rights is unnecessary given that it was acknowledged by the parties there are no permitted development rights for flats. Requiring obscure glazing to the side elevations of Block A would prevent overlooking on these elevations. The use of the parking spaces would be controlled by a condition.
20. Boundary treatment and landscaping has not been fully specified in the proposal and therefore details, including any features or trees to be retained, need to be approved in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, and flood risk. The height of the floor slab, control of the pedestrian access and surface water control measures are required in relation to protection from flooding. Conditions requiring compliance with the submitted plans are unnecessary, because that is all that is approved. I consider it reasonable to require that the flats are not occupied until the vehicular access has been constructed, and to ensure that provision is made for construction vehicles, plant and material in the interests of highway safety.

### **Conclusions**

21. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the planning history of the site, and the flood risk information, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

### **Formal Decision**

22. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for the demolition of the existing building and the construction of 2 No. blocks of 12 flats at former British Telecom Back-up Building fronting Strode Street and Crown Street, Egham, Surrey TW20 9BX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref RU.04/0089, dated 16 January 2004, and the plans submitted therewith, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of five years from the date of this decision.
- 2) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 3) No development shall take place until details and samples of all surfacing materials, including those to all access driveways/forecourts/footways, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) The windows in the eastern and western facing side elevations of Block A shall be obscure glazed in perpetuity.
- 5) The parking spaces shown on the approved plans shall only be used for the parking of vehicles incidental and ancillary to the residential use of the flats hereby permitted and shall thereafter be maintained solely for parking purposes and made available to the occupiers of those properties at all times for such purposes. The parking spaces shall not be used for the parking or storage of boats, caravans or trailers.
- 6) Prior to the commencement of any development hereby permitted detailed drawings of any proposed walls, fences or other means of enclosure within or around the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The design of any wall, fence or other means of enclosure must be permeable to flood water. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.
- 7) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, surface water source control measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.
- 8) The means of pedestrian access to Crown Street as shown on drawing no. 19/11/05 B shall be maintained in perpetuity.
- 9) The buildings hereby permitted shall be constructed with the underside of the floor slab at 15.71 AOD (N).
- 10) No development shall take place until details of the provision to be made for the parking and turning on site of operatives and construction vehicles loading and unloading plant and materials and storage of plant and materials during the contract period have been submitted

to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such measures shall be retained for the duration of the construction period.

- 11) The dwellings shall not be occupied until the vehicular access has been constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans.
- 12) No development shall take place until full details of hard landscape works have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. These details shall include proposed finished levels, means of enclosures, car parking layouts, hard surfacing materials, minor structures and existing features to be retained. The works shall be carried out as approved and completed before the last dwelling hereby approved is occupied
- 13) No development shall take place until full details of the soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include planting plans, written specifications, schedules of plants and trees, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers and densities of planting. The works shall be carried out as approved and completed during the first planting season following the completion of the development hereby approved or in accordance with a programme agreed with the local planning authority.
- 14) If within a period of five years from the date of the planting of any tree, shrub or plant that tree shrub or plant or any tree shrub or plant planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted, destroyed, dies or becomes seriously damaged or defective another tree, shrub or plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place.
- 15) Prior to the commencement of any development hereby approved and before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purposes of the development hereby approved, details of the specification and position of the fencing for the protection of any retained tree to comply with BS 5837: 1991 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be carried out as approved and the fencing shall be maintained until the development has been completed and all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site.

*J. C. Gregory*

INSPECTOR

PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY  
 \*\*\*\*\*  
 DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES  
 \*\*\*\*\*

FROM 29TH MARCH TO 8TH APRIL 2005

<u>APP. NO.</u>	<u>LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION</u>
05/0059	8 Clarence Drive, Englefield Green, Egham Fell 3 no. Conifer trees close to rear boundary wall (Trees in Conservation Area). <b>DECISION: NO OBJECTION</b>
05/0099	Ensign House, Brighton Road, Addlestone Siting of a two storey portacabin to be used as a sales centre, 1 no. signboard (4.4 metres high) and 7 no. x flagpoles for a temporary period of two years. <b>DECISION: REFUSE</b>
05/0115	Land adjacent Fagins Cottage, Middle Hill, Egham Erection of attached 3 bedroom two storey dwelling with parking and amenity space following demolition of existing outbuildings. <b>DECISION: REFUSE</b>
05/0123	28 Templefield Close, Addlestone Erection of a single storey front extension with rooflights, erection of pitched roof over existing garage and first floor side extension incorporating roof light. <b>DECISION: GRANT</b>
05/0128	22 Ayebridges Avenue, Egham Erection of a single storey rear extension. <b>DECISION: GRANT</b>
05/0139	8 Frenchaye, Addlestone Conversion of roofspace to habitable accommodation with insertion of windows in side elevation. <b>DECISION: GRANT</b>
05/0141	177 High Street, Egham Erection of rear access staircase. <b>DECISION: GRANT</b>
05/0142	177 High Street, Egham Listed building consent for erection of rear access stairway, installation of new external door in first floor rear elevation and replacement windows. <b>DECISION: GRANT</b>

APP. NO.      LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

- 05/0143      4 Ayebridges Avenue, Egham  
Erection of timber frame outbuilding for use as games room following demolition of existing detached garage.  
**DECISION:**                      **GRANT**
- 05/0145      99 Spinney Hill, Addlestone  
Erection of first floor rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable accommodation incorporating a rooflight to side and dormer windows to both sides and front elevations.  
**DECISION:**                      **REFUSE**
- 05/0147      14 Langton Way, Egham  
Erection of single storey rear and side extensions following demolition of existing shed and w.c.  
**DECISION:**                      **GRANT**
- 05/0151      Glebe House, Christchurch Road, Virginia Water  
Erection of first floor side, single storey front and side extensions comprising study and double garage following demolition of existing store and garage.  
**DECISION:**                      **GRANT**
- 05/0152      Land at Coxes Lock/Wey Navigation, Bourneside Road, Addlestone  
Removal of 2 no. Ash Trees.  
**DECISION:**                      **NO OBJECTION**
- 05/0153      14 Ripley Avenue, Egham  
Erection of single storey rear extension, construction of front dormer to allow habitable accommodation and insertion of rooflights.  
**DECISION:**                      **GRANT**
- 05/0154      Addlestone Lodge Nursing Home, Ongar Hill, Addlestone  
Erection of 1/1.5 storey rear extension to provide 3 no. bedrooms and lounge at ground floor with staff accommodation over (variation to approval RU.02/1476).  
**DECISION:**                      **REFUSE**
- 05/0156      Yonderberry, Hamm Court, Weybridge  
Erection of Rear Conservatory.  
**DECISION:**                      **GRANT**
- 05/0157      9 Meadow Way, Addlestone  
Erection of first floor side extension.  
**DECISION:**                      **REFUSE**
- 05/0158      2 Junewood Close, Woodham, Addlestone  
Conversion of integral garage to habitable accommodation (Revised plans received 17th March 2005).  
**DECISION:**                      **GRANT**

<u>APP. NO.</u>	<u>LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION</u>
05/0159	66 Liberty Hall Road, Addlestone Erection of single storey rear extension incorporating a rooflight. <b>DECISION: GRANT</b>
05/0162	33 Wheatash Road, Addlestone Conversion of loft to habitable accommodation incorporating a rear dormer window and rooflights to front elevation. <b>DECISION: GRANT</b>
05/0163	14 Dudley Close, Addlestone Erection of two storey front extension incorporating rooflights to side elevation. <b>DECISION: GRANT</b>
05/0165	320 Green Lane, Chertsey Erection of part two storey, part first floor front and first floor rear extensions following demolition of existing porch. <b>DECISION: GRANT</b>
05/0172	5 Brox Road, Ottershaw, Chertsey Installation of new shop front. <b>DECISION: GRANT</b>
05/0177	178 Station Road, Addlestone Conversion of commercial building at rear into 3 no. two bed flats including the installation of windows in the flank elevations and fenestration alterations in the rear (south east) elevation. <b>DECISION: GRANT</b>
05/0178	Arcadia, Hamm Court, Weybridge Reconstruction and refurbishment of existing garage and carport to form double garage with pitched roof. <b>DECISION: GRANT</b>
05/0181	New Haw Mooring Line, River Wey Navigation, New Haw Tree works to 23 no. trees including removal of deadwood, lifting of lower branches and reduction. <b>DECISION: NO OBJECTION</b>
05/0187	142 Woodham Lane, New Haw, Addlestone Erection of rear conservatory. <b>DECISION: GRANT</b>
05/0188	28, 29 & 30 Hummer Road, Egham Erection of three garages to the rear of 28, 29 & 30 Hummer Road following demolition of existing garages and shed. <b>DECISION: GRANT</b>

APP. NO.      LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

- 05/0196      11 Rudge Rise, Addlestone  
Erection of part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension and detached garage following demolition of existing outbuildings and garage.  
**DECISION:**                      **GRANT**
- 05/0227      9 Borrowdale Close, Egham  
Erection of conservatory to rear of the property.  
**DECISION:**                      **GRANT**
- 05/0250      74 Harpesford Avenue, Virginia Water  
Erection of a single storey side extension.  
**DECISION:**                      **GRANT**
- 05/0252      Glencourt, Knowle Grove Close, Virginia Water  
Erection of a single storey rear extension.  
**DECISION:**                      **GRANT**
- 05/0253      25 Boshers Gardens, Egham  
Erection of a single storey rear extension.  
**DECISION:**                      **GRANT**
- 05/0259      8 Stepgates Close, Chertsey  
Erection of rear conservatory.  
**DECISION:**                      **GRANT**

**DELEGATED DECISIONS IN CONSULTATION WITH CHAIRMAN & VICE-CHAIRMAN**

**APP. NO.**      **LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION**

05/0098      22-22 London Street, Chertsey  
Demolition of two storey rear extension and erection of two storey rear extension with internal alterations to provide office (Class A2) accommodation at ground floor with two bed flat at first floor (Listed Building Consent).

**DECISION:**                      **GRANT**

05/0169      Land in curtilage of Savill Court Hotel, Wick Lane, Englefield Green, Egham  
Deposition of excavated material from the extension works in two locations around the grounds of the hotel involving regrading of land and associated landscaping, including temporary storage area.

**DECISION:**                      **GRANT**