



RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

4 FEBRUARY 2004

APPENDICES

<u>APPENDIX</u>	<u>REPORT</u>	<u>PAGE. NO.</u>
A	MINUTES 7.1.04	1
B	PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES	7

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE7 January 2004 at 7.30 p.m.

Members of the Committee present: Councillors G.B. Woodger (Chairman), J.R. Ashmore, Mrs. F.J. Barden, J.B. Dean, J.M. Edwards, J.R. Furey, Mrs L.M. Gillham, Mrs C.Y. Jones, C Knight, D.W. Parr, R. Pate, P.J. Poole, N. Thewlis, A.P. Tollett and J.R. Whiteley

Members of the Committee absent: None

Councillor Mrs E E Price also attended.

NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Group mentioned below had notified the Chief Executive Officer of their wish that the changes listed below be made to the membership of the Committee. The changes were for a fixed period ending on the day after the meeting and thereafter the Councillors removed would be reappointed.

Group requesting Change	Remove from Membership	Appoint Instead
Conservative	Councillor Mrs J. Norman	Councillor Mrs C.Y. Jones
Conservative	Councillor H.W.V. Meares	Councillor P.J. Poole

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

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 3 December 2003 were approved and signed as a correct record.

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 03/1128**

**The Bungalow, Ruxbury Farm, St Ann's Hill Road, Chertsey
Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of
replacement bungalow**

DECISION: GRANT subject to conditions.

(The Committee requested that any future applications related to this site which the Director of Technical Services was minded to grant under his delegated powers, be referred to Committee for determination).

- RU 03/1201** **Tinkerbell, Wey Meadows, Weybridge**
Certificate of Lawfulness for the use of the site for informal recreation purposes and ancillary use of a caravan for storage purposes.
DECISION **GRANT Certificate of Lawfulness for use of land for storage of a single touring caravan only.**
- RU 03/1208** **85a and 86 High Street, Egham**
Amendments to approval RU.02/0641 for alterations to form two Class A1/A2 units with ancillary offices, refurbishment of 2 x flats above and erection of 2-storey rear extension comprising 2 no. flats following demolition of existing buildings.
DECISION: **GRANT subject to conditions.**

ESTIMATES 2004/2005

The Committee received and considered the draft Revenue Estimates and fees and charges for 2004/05 for the services under its remit.

RESOLVED that -

- i) the proposed fees and charges for 2004/2005 be approved to be effective from 1 April 2004 or as appropriate; and**
- ii) the draft Revenue Estimates for 2004/2005 be approved as submitted and the Corporate Management Committee be requested to make provision accordingly.**

PLANNING OBLIGATIONS CONSULTATION PAPER

The Committee considered a report on a consultation paper which proposed reform and improvements to the way planning obligations were processed.

The details of the Consultation Paper together with Officer comments thereon, which were endorsed by the Committee is shown in Appendix 'A'. Two of the key elements of the Paper were considered in more detail by Members.

The Consultation Paper suggested that Local Authorities could be required to set out in the Development Plan what contributions they were likely to seek through a Planning Obligation. This would set out how they would use negotiated planning obligations to secure developer contributions. In certain areas it was suggested that contributions were predictable and could be set out on the basis of formulae to explain the scale of contributions expected.

It was suggested that Planning Authorities could use planning obligations to secure on-going contributions and that contributions might be voluntarily pooled to help meet the needs of new development in the local community.

The Consultation Paper suggested that standard heads of terms and clauses for negotiated planning obligations could be used and if there was inadequate staff resources then additional staff resources might be brought in to be paid for by developers. It was further suggested that mediators could be brought in to help resolve any disputes.

The Committee considered that the Local Development Framework could be used to set out those aspects which the Council was seeking contributions for and this would make the process more transparent. However, local needs changed over time and such policies needed to be flexible enough to embrace new challenges locally. The idea of pooling such contributions was welcomed and this had already been used in Runnymede for funding of the Yellow Bus initiative.

Members supported the use of standard heads and terms as this would simplify the process to a degree, but did not consider that bringing in external resources would speed the process as internal staff still had to be involved in briefing such staff. Locally, whilst some obligations had taken time to negotiate for a variety of reasons, it was not considered that use of mediators would have improved this situation, although it was appreciated that elsewhere this may have facilitated earlier agreement.

The Consultation Paper also proposed the introduction of a new optional tariff charging regime as an alternative to traditional negotiated planning obligations.

Under such a regime a developer would have the option of paying a charge rather than entering into negotiations with the Planning Authority. The planning charge would be used to secure the same range of contributions as negotiated planning obligations, but a willingness to pay the charge would not guarantee the grant of planning permission.

Planning Authorities could set a charge in the Local Plan for development on sites identified in the Development Plan. The charge could be set at different levels for different types of development such as brownfield and greenfield sites, for residential and commercial development. The charge could be set at a level which would be sufficient to mitigate the likely impacts of new development.

Whilst setting a tariff offered an opportunity for a more transparent and speedy process, the Committee considered it would be very difficult for Local Authorities in many cases to establish the appropriate level of charge given the Local Plan process. Even though under the new Local Development Framework, this would be a speedier and more flexible process, there would still be a number of occasions where sites were identified well in advance of development, where it would not be possible to accurately estimate the environmental impact, and therefore the appropriate charge to be made. The proposed new regime was likely to lead to a situation whereby developers would pay the tariff where they believe this offered a better financial situation than negotiating, but would seek to negotiate where they believed that the tariff was set at too high a level. Such a regime would be more onerous in terms of staff time.

The Committee was keen that consultations take place prior to implementation on the operational details of any tariff scheme if the Government was minded to introduce such a scheme.

RESOLVED that -

the comments attached at Appendix 'A' be forwarded to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister as this Authority's comments on this Consultation Paper and the ODPM be informed that if the Government is minded to introduce a tariff regime consultation must take place on the detail of its operation prior to implementation.

APPEAL DECISIONS

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

	<u>Site Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
a)	13 Dudley Close, Addlestone - planning appeal regarding a single storey side rear extension with loft rooms over (RU.03/0009)	DISMISSED
b)	'Teulon', Knowle Grove, Virginia Water - planning appeal regarding erection of a 4 bed detached house with integral garage (RU.03/0648)	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 received and noted.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 8.53 p.m.)

PLANNING OBLIGATIONS CONSULTATION PAPER (DTS)3. Report

- 3.1 The Consultation Paper suggests that Local Authorities might be required to set out what contributions they are likely to seek in the Development Plan. This would set out how they would use negotiated planning obligations to secure developer contributions.
- 3.2 In certain areas it is suggested that contributions are predictable and could be set out on the basis of formulae to explain the scale of contributions expected.
- 3.3 It is suggested that Planning Authorities could use planning obligations to secure on-going contributions and that contributions might be voluntarily pooled to help meet the needs of new development in the local community.
- 3.4 It is suggested that standard heads of terms and clauses for negotiated planning obligations could be used and if there is inadequate staff resources then additional staff resources might be brought in to be paid for by developers. It is further suggested that mediators might be brought in to help resolve any disputes.

Comment

- 3.5 ***It is considered that the Local Development Framework might be used to set out those aspects which the Council is seeking contributions for and this would make the process more transparent. However, local needs do change over time and such policies need to be flexible enough to embrace new challenges locally. The idea of pooling such contributions is welcomed and this has already been used in Runnymede for funding of the Yellow Bus initiative.***
- 3.6 ***Standard heads and terms again would simplify the process to a degree, but it is not necessarily thought that bringing in external resources would speed the process as internal staff would still have to be involved in briefing such staff. Locally, whilst some obligations have taken time to negotiate, it is not considered that use of mediators would have improved this situation, although it is appreciated that elsewhere this may have facilitated earlier agreement. There are a variety of reasons why such agreements take longer than six months to complete, the majority of which relate to third party or multi-party delays in reaching agreement regarding the detailed wording of the respective obligations.***
- 3.7 The Consultation Paper indicates the Government has decided to introduce a new optional planning charge that would be an alternative to traditional negotiated planning obligations. This would mean that a developer would have the option of paying a charge rather than entering into negotiations with the Planning Authority.
- 3.8 The planning charge would be used to secure the same range of contributions as negotiated planning obligations, but a willingness to pay the charge would not guarantee the grant of planning permission.
- 3.9 One potential way forward is for Planning Authorities to set a charge in the Local Plan for development on sites identified in the Development Plan. The charge could be set at different levels for different types of development such as brownfield and greenfield sites, for residential and commercial development. The charge should be set at a level which would be sufficient to mitigate the likely impacts of new development.

Comment

- 3.10 ***It is considered that it would be very difficult in many cases to set a detailed tariff in relation to specific sites identified in the Local Development Plan. Often these are "in principle" allocations of land which have not been subjected to detailed scrutiny. It is only when a planning application is being considered that some detailed elements would be***

likely to arise. These could include the need for highways infrastructure, dealing with potentially contaminated land, and contributions to health or education facilities which may not be known in advance. These aspects would normally be negotiated as part of a planning application and therefore would be on the basis of known information. If a tariff was set in advance of this detailed examination it would be likely to under-estimate the cost of provision of such facilities. If a charge was set at a sufficiently high rate to be able to cater for the possibility for such infrastructure improvements, it would be claimed by developers to be too high, unless a mechanism for a refund, once the final costs are known, can be included.

- 3.11 The Consultation Paper seeks views on whether affordable housing contributions could be treated in this way, including the potential for financial contribution.

Comment

- 3.12 *This Authority's experience and those of other Authorities in Surrey is that financial contributions in lieu of on-site provision for affordable housing does not result in affordable housing actually being provided. This is due to the very high costs of land acquisition for housing in the area. It is strongly recommended that the onus should be on on-site provision for affordable housing provided by the developer.*

- 3.13 The Consultation Paper suggests that a charge scheme should vary according to the use of the development, perhaps being based on either charge per unit for residential and by floorspace for commercial. It also asks whether the charge should only apply to sites identified in the Development Plan.

Comment

- 3.14 *A charging regime based on individual residential units or commercial floorspace would seem the most transparent means of calculating a charge. There are a great number of sites that come forward through "windfall" rather than being previously identified within the Local Plan. It is considered to be essential that any regime is capable of ensuring that there are contributions from developers for such schemes. Also many small schemes have an impact on the local area but do not give rise to an infrastructure contribution. As it is likely that such developments will form a significant part of future provision some recognition in the form of a per unit contribution, may be appropriate on schemes of site size less than 0.4ha.*

- 3.15 The Consultation Paper asks whether Planning Authorities should be able to pool planning charge contributions, and also queries whether they should be able to spend receipts from a planning charge only on those elements specified in the Local Plan. Lastly, it indicates that if a developer has chosen to pay the charge, they should not be asked to make additional financial contributions through a Section 106 Agreement.

Comment

- 3.16 *As already indicated, pooling resources does seem sensible, particularly where there are major long-term infrastructure improvements, or potentially, revenue consequences of initiatives that need to be supported.*

- 3.17 *It would seem reasonable that contributions are spent on items identified in the Local Development Plan, but again there needs to be an element of flexibility to cope with new local issues.*

- 3.18 *It might be reasonable to ask a developer to contribute to an element which is directly related to his development, even though he has already provided a financial contribution. This would be the case where it can be clearly identified that the proposed development raised environmental issues that need to be addressed before development could proceed and not adequately covered by the financial contributions.*

PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY

 DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES

FROM 5TH JANUARY 2004 TO 16TH JANUARY 2004

<u>APP. NO.</u>	<u>LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION</u>
03/1065	10 Wilson Drive, Ottershaw, Chertsey Pruning of two Oak trees DECISION: GRANT
03/1084	Pelta Associates, 41 London Street, Chertsey Alterations to existing office building including works to roof; a new external steel staircase to rear elevation; insertion of window in first floor side elevation and new door in rear north elevation incorporating a 1.8 metre screen. DECISION: GRANT
03/1229	21 Rosefield Gardens, Ottershaw, Chertsey Felling of Acacia tree and crown reduction to Holly Tree at front of property. DECISION: GRANT
03/1271	The Retreat, Foxhills Road, Ottershaw, Chertsey Conversion of roofspace to habitable accommodation incorporating a dormer window to front and rear elevations and a velux window to side elevation. DECISION: GRANT
03/1301	8 Beech Hall, Guildford Road, Ottershaw Works to Ash tree. DECISION: GRANT
03/1347	Little Bushey, 51 Chertsey Lane, Staines Erection of detached two storey dwelling following demolition of existing dwelling and summerhouse with vehicular access off Chertsey Lane. DECISION: GRANT
03/1351	2 Blue Ball Lane, Egham Erection of two storey front extension following demolition of existing extension. DECISION: GRANT
03/1352	2 Moore Close, Addlestone Erection of single storey rear extension incorporating a velux window. DECISION: GRANT
03/1354	First Floor, 317 Woodham Lane, New Haw, Addlestone Certificate of Lawfulness for existing use of first floor for offices. DECISION: GRANT

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

- 03/1359 Kesterport Ltd, Hanworth Lane, Chertsey
Three storey extension to existing office building and general refurbishment works to existing office and industrial unit.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1360 Meadow Court, Rowtown, Addlestone
Roof alterations including one front and two dormer windows to both side elevations.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 03/1364 56 Bond Street, Englefield Green, Egham
Display of an illuminated fascia sign to the front of the property.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1365 Leisurelea, Hamm Court, Weybridge
Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of replacement dwelling.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 03/1367 3 Trumps Green Avenue, Virginia Water
Erection of two storey side and single storey front extensions
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1369 Bantre Nook, Hurst Lane, Egham
Erection of rear conservatory
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1380 43 St. Anns Road, Chertsey
Formation of dropped kerb to allow vehicular access.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1382 15 & 16 Upper Walk, Virginia Water
Fell Cooper Beech tree between nos, 15 and 16 Upper Walk.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1386 12 Clarence Drive, Englefield Green, Egham
Pruning of an Ash tree and Red Oak tree to the front of the property.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1387 33A & 33B Victoria Street, Englefield Green
Erection of detached garages to front of properties and conversion of existing garages to habitable accommodation.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 03/1391 91 Guildford Street, Chertsey
Erection of two storey rear extension for the use as beauty salon.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1393 87 New Haw Road, Addlestone
Erection of porch to side of property.
DECISION: **GRANT**

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

- 03/1395 Hillgrove, Stonehill Road, Chertsey
Alterations and increase in height of roof to form first floor accommodation incorporating dormer windows to the front, rear and side elevations.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 03/1397 Westwood, South Drive, Virginia Water
Erection of a rear conservatory and internal and external refurbishment works to the property.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1410 Alderwood, Bakeham Lane, Englefield Green, Egham
Erection of a detached stable block incorporating 3 stables and a riding arena.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1411 The Castle Public House, 1 Fordwater Road, Chertsey
Erection of wooden railings on perimeter of ground floor rear extension.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 03/1414 266 Woodham Lane, New Haw, Addlestone
Erection of front porch following demolition of existing porch.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1420 3 Shakespeare Road, Addlestone
Erection of two storey rear extension.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 03/1421 Chertsey Bridge Wharf, Bridge Road, Chertsey
Works to Yew Tree.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1422 7 Oakhill Road, Addlestone
Erection of two storey side extension incorporating a garage following the demolition of existing garage.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 03/1425 51 Barker Road, Chertsey
Erection of single storey rear extension.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1426 58 Weston Avenue, Addlestone
Erection of two storey side and rear extension and detached double garage with rear access from Emley Road.
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 03/1428 Park End, 2 Whitehall Lane, Egham
Erection of single storey rear extension.
DECISION: **GRANT**

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

- 03/1432 10 Lynwood Avenue, Egham
Erection of a single storey rear extension.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1437 1A Strode Street, Egham
Erection of two storey building with accommodation in the roof incorporating rear dormer windows to be used as two flats following the demolition of the existing workshop. (amended 23/12/03).
DECISION: **REFUSE**
- 03/1440 14 Clarendon Gate, Ottershaw, Chertsey
Erection of rear conservatory (revised plans received 7/01/04)
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1443 27 Ongar Road, Addlestone
Erection of single storey rear extension.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1447 Flats at the Wharf & The Mill, Whittets Ait, Jessamy Road, Weybridge
Formation of timber decking for ground floor apartments in both buildings (Consultation by Elmbridge Borough Council).
DECISION: **NO OBJECTION**
- 03/1451 447 Woodham Lane, Woodham, Addlestone
Erection of first floor side extension.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1452 45 Selsdon Road, New Haw
Erection of single storey rear and front extensions, roof alterations with insertion of velux windows in both side elevations to create rooms in roofspace.
DECISION: **GRANT**
- 03/1472 21 Hanworth Lane, Chertsey
Formation of pitched roof to front of property over existing garage and porch.
DECISION: **GRANT**