

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday 24 June 2020 at 6.30 pm

A D D E N D U M

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

One additional letter of objection has been received outlining the following additional comments:

- Either the whole of Hurst Lane should be developed to aid the country's shortage of housing or every effort should be made to return it to the original residential country lane that it once was.
- The top of the lane falls within Thorpe while the majority of the lane is in Virginia Water. As far as postally, it is in Egham.
- The top of the lane has to be driven or walked to get access to all properties and on this basis there should be no major developments unless it includes the whole of the lane.
- There have been so many planning applications for the site. The owners are trying to play the system.
- The Council should reject the application while a decision is made on what should happen with the whole area.

Officers recommendation

Officers are awaiting the submission of an updated Unilateral Undertaking to provide financial contributions towards the SANGS and the SAMM. Amend Officers recommendation to read as follows:

Subject to the completion of a Unilateral Undertaking to secure the agreed contributions to the SANGS & the SAMM, the Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in the committee report.

RU.20/0250 Unit A Gogmore Lane, Chertsey

One additional letter raising an objection has been received from the Chertsey Society. The main points within are summarised below:

- Overdevelopment;
- Insufficient parking, previous application had 6 parking spaces;
- Concern that there is no watching brief proposed given the proposal location and the unknown location of an important 15th century Eldridge bell foundry which is thought to be off Guildford Street.

Officer note: The previous application was approved with 4 parking spaces. Surrey County Highways do not object to the proposal stating it would not result in a significant impact to the local highway network in safety or capacity terms. With regards to Archaeology and historic matters, part of the site (eastern) lies within an Area of High Archaeological Potential. The applicant has provided a Heritage Statement within which it states that if required a condition for a watching brief is accepted (final paragraph). RBC Conservation Officer and Surrey County Council Archaeology Advisor do not object to the application and did not request conditions in relation to a watching brief.

RU.20/0470 American Community School, London Road, Englefield Green, Egham

A typing error has been identified at paragraph 6.4 of the report 'significantly less' should be replaced with the words 'significantly greater' so that the sentence reads:

The existing single storey building comprises a large roof form that overhangs the ramped access to the building entrance and adjoining walkways with a total covered area of 840 sq.m which is significantly **greater** than the footprint of the proposed development of 623 sq.m.

In addition, a slight revision is proposed to Condition 9 and 10 in order to correct a typing error and to provide clarity and avoid repetition. Amendment to condition 9 : first paragraph replaced with:

Tree protection

Notwithstanding the details submitted, prior to the commencement of any works hereby approved, including demolition, and before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site, an updated Tree Protection Plan and method statement and prepared in accordance with the Construction Transport Management Plan required by Condition 12, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. This shall include details to how construction traffic and site operations will be managed with regards to the protection of trees to be retained. Tree protective measures shall be installed in accordance with the approved details. Once in place, photographic evidence of the protective measures shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) for approval.

Amendment to condition 10 : To be replaced with:

Landscaping

a. Notwithstanding the details submitted with the application, the building hereby approved shall not be occupied until full details of the soft landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) which take account of the advice of Surrey Wildlife Trust, and these works shall be carried out as approved prior to the first occupation of the development or in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

This scheme shall include the existing trees and hedges to be retained, together with the new planting to be carried out.

b. Any trees or plants, which within a period of five years of the commencement of any works in pursuance of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as practicable with others of similar size and species, following consultation with the LPA, unless the LPA gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding area and to comply with saved Policies NE14, NE15 and GB1 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001, Policies EE1, EE9, EE11 of the 2030 Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.

RU.20/0489 11 Beauforts, Englefield Green, TW20 0DW

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

- Disappointed that the application has been recommended for approval pre committee without a site visit (due to COVID-19) and many objections
- We hope the committee will take the following into account: effect on the amenity of nearby residents, the effect on the appearance of the road and the relationship of the extension to the existing house
- Our privacy, outlook and daylight will be greatly affected by the overshadowing and visual dominance of the proposed development
- The changes to the front elevation have added to the bulk of the brickwork that makes it look out of character with adjacent properties and the street scene
- The reduction to the rear does not justify a large building on a relatively small plot and does not alleviate its detrimental impact on neighbouring properties
- No information if any trees or hedges would need to be pruned or removed.

Officer note: although a site visit was not able to be conducted to the rear of the site due to COVID-19 restrictions, the officer did visit the site to view the street scene.

