

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday 13 May 2020 at 6.30 pm

A D D E N D U M

Item 6 Page 7 – Delegation of powers to Planning Officers

This report deals with the transfer of some powers from the Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control to the Corporate Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development.

Recommendation (iv) of the report deals with transferring the authority to enter into Planning Performance Agreements to the CHPPED. It is recommended part (iv) this is deleted.

The reason behind the proposed removal of this part of the recommendation is that upon further reflection it was felt that the execution of Planning Performance Agreements is something more associated with the processing of applications rather than something associated with Planning Policy processes.

Current Recommendation (iv), which states as follows 'The agreement and execution of Planning Performance Agreements', is therefore to be deleted and existing Recommendation (v), which states as follows 'Unless there is time to report to Committee, to agree Statements of Common Ground pursuant to the Duty to Co-operate with other bodies and provide responses to the emerging Local Plans of other Local Planning Authorities or Strategic Plans subject to the Duty to Co-operate in consultation with the Chair and Vice- Chair of the Planning Committee.' will now become Recommendation (iv).

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

RU.19/0465 Land to East of Orbis Causeway Business Park

The applicant has clarified a number of points in the report:

- The proposed floor areas for the units: The proposed floor area for the hotel is Gross External Area GEA . The area for the other plots listed in the report are Gross Internal Area. Gross External Area for Plot B = 4013, GEA Plot C= retail – 1862, GEA Plot C B8 = 7102
- Paragraph 3.9 the vacancy rate is 53% as referred to in the Summary Masterplan and in paragraph 6.5 of the report and not 34% referred to in the Design and Access Statement.
- Paragraph 6.9 confirmation of spaces for the MSCP – 364 total spaces, 185 for hotel, 45 for plot B, 20 for plot D and 114 for other users.

Officer Recommendation: Amend condition 5 – delete Drawing number PL 006 Rev C and replace with PL 006 Rev D so that the correct proposed site reference plan is referred to.

RU.20/0331 and RU.20/0169 Bellbourne Nursery applications

By way of completeness of information, Members are advised that two additional planning applications have recently been received relating to the land in the northern area, for Glasshouse 1 (which is a separate building to the glasshouse 2 which is the subject of the application RU.20/0331 on the agenda) as follows:

RU.20/0600 - Outline planning application for the proposed partial demolition and conversion of glasshouse 1 (including external alterations to the building) to provide 7 dwellings.

RU.20/0601-Outline planning application for the proposed partial demolition and conversion of glasshouse 1 (including external alterations to the building) to provide 5 dwellings.

RU.20/0331 Bellbourne Nursery, Glasshouse 2, Hurst Lane, Egham

Two additional letters of representation have been received from the same household raising objections and the main points raised are summarised as follows:

- This is a strange place for such an operation which would increase traffic in Hurst Lane and not fit with the rural community and the Green Belt.
- Hurst Lane is not suitable for this proposal.
- The original glasshouses were constructed for horticultural purposes which fitted in with nearby residential properties and open green space.
- The protection of the Green Belt has been forgotten.
- Hurst Lane should be developed in total or every effort should be made to ensure the area should be kept as a residential country lane.

RU.20/0169 Bellbourne Nursery, Unit 1, Hurst Lane, Egham

One additional letter has been received in support of the application for the reasons summarised as follows:

- The site as a logistics yard is not fit for purpose.
- A proposed change to residential use will vastly improve the area and health and lives of those living close to the site.
- The proposal will open up the area and give a far better view of fields and trees around the site.
- The proposal will prevent dust, pollution and noise which is associated with the existing use.

Two additional letters have been received from the same household raising objections to the proposal for the following reasons:

- Objections raised to this piecemeal residential development. Hurst lane should be considered as a whole to aid the country's shortage of housing
- The removal of the transport yard is welcomed but there was never any initial planning for such an operation. If this application is allowed, planning permission would have been granted by playing the planning system.
- Residents should be thinking long term and consider the long term residents of Hurst Lane who have witnessed planning abuse over 30 years.

RU.19/1718 Fangrove Park, Lyne Lane, Lyne, Chertsey

Since the report was published, a letter of representation has been withdrawn.

RU.20/0068 51 Stepgates, Chertsey

Paragraphs 6.3 and 6.4 of the report refer to 45 degree splaylines and states that the extension would not breach these from neighbouring windows. The submitted plans actually show the splaylines to be through the centre of a proposed wall (re No. 49 Stepgates) or inside a proposed wall (re No. 53a Stepgates). Therefore, the first floor extension does not comply with the Council's Adopted SPG Householder Guide in this respect. The report is hereby amended and Officers wish to apologise for any confusion or concern caused by this inaccurate commentary.

Since the report was drafted, two further representations against the development have been received which have been published on the website and the main points raised are summarised as follows:

- commenting that the plan shows the 45 degree line from the bedroom window at No 53a Stepgates but the report states that the proposal complies with the guidance, and there is roof overhang, which will further affect daylight to the room.

- Concern about the process for the planning committee meeting; impact on first floor flat at No. 53a from long concrete wall across window giving only daylight access to the rear of the flat; disruption and inconvenience to all objectors' quality of life if approved; will investigate legal avenues to prevent construction.

Further Information has been received from the applicant's agent and a representation from the applicant in response to letters of representation: proposed extension has been designed to maintain light and outlook to both neighbouring properties, 45 degree line is guidance, annotated extracts of plans showing rear bedroom window at No. 53a and the proposed extension, care taken in the design so that there is still a view from this window, 3D image provided to demonstrate their assessment of the light to the bedroom; conclusion is by agent that extension fully protects the amenity of both neighbours; concerns about allegations in letter of representation and considers these are not relevant to the application and have no legal basis.