

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE2 September 2020 at 6.30pm via MS Teams

Members of
Committee present

Councillors, J Broadhead, I Chaudhri, R J Edis,
L Gillham, C Howorth, R King, M Kusneraitis,
I Mullens, M Nuti, P Snow (in the Chair), J Sohi and
S Whyte

Members of the
Committee absent:

Councillors Anderson-Bassey, Cressey and
Willingale

Councillor D Whyte also attended the meeting via MS Teams as a non-member of the Committee.

151 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE -CHAIRMAN

In the absence of the Chairman and Vice- Chairman, it was

RESOLVED that-

Councillor Snow be elected Chairman of the Committee and Councillor Broadhead be elected Vice -Chairman of the Committee for this evening's meeting only.

152 NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Groups mentioned below had notified the Chief Executive 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.

<u>Group</u>	<u>Remove</u>	<u>Appoint instead</u>
Conservative	Cllr Wilson	Cllr Edis
Runnymede Independent Residents'	Cllr Gill	Cllr Gillham

The Chief Executive had given effect to the changes to Committee membership in accordance with section 16(2) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.

153 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 15 July 2020 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

154 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Anderson-Bassey and Willingale

155 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllrs Broadhead, Chaudhri, Howorth, King, Kusneraitis, Nuti, Snow, J Sohi and Whyte declared non-pecuniary interests in applications RU 20/0789,0790 and 0880 as they knew

the objector who addressed the Committee in a personal or professional capacity, None of the Members had discussed the applications with the objector in advance of the meeting nor predisposed or predetermined the applications In addition Cllr Howorth declared that he was a local resident but not materially affected by the 3 applications on Wentworth Estate. In view of the nature of the interest, the Councillors remained in the room and participated in the debate on the applications and voted or abstained as indicated below.

Cllr R King declared a non-pecuniary interest in RU 19/1146 as he was an attendee at the Church to which the Vicarage is attached. Cllr King had not discussed the merits of the application with anyone concerned with the applicant and had not predisposed or predetermined the application. On that basis, Cllr King remained in the room and participated in the debate on the application and voted thereon

156 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The planning applications listed below were considered by the Committee. All representations received on the applications were reported and copies had been made available for inspection by Members before the meeting. The Addendum had also been published on the Council's website on the day of the meeting and sent to all public speakers. Public speakers addressed the Committee as specified below. With regard to applications RU20/0880,0789,0790,0110 and 0284, under Standing Order 39.23, the Chairman permitted the objectors and applicants or their agents to speak more than once on these applications.

As the meeting was being held remotely by audio via MS Teams, the Chairman requested that a named vote be taken on each planning application, and on the items on Local Development Scheme and Draft Statement of Community Involvement

RESOLVED that –

the following applications be determined as indicated: -

<u>APP NO</u>	<u>LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DEISION</u>
---------------	---------------------------------------

RU 19/1146	214 Wendover Road, Staines-upon-Thames
------------	--

Demolition of the former Vicarage and the erection of an apartment building containing 12 No apartments with associated bin and cycle stores and ancillary works including minor alterations to access arrangements (amended plans received)

The Committee was informed that the description of the development had been amended to reflect the revised plans deleting the individual dwellings and increasing the size of the flatted building.

The Committee was supportive of the application and pleased with the amendments which had been made to the original application, but some Members commented on the lack of affordable housing. Officers confirmed that the development, as amended, could not viably deliver any affordable housing, but this could be reviewed if any subsequent revisions were made to the development.

Members also welcomed the proposed amendment to condition 13 to require all parking spaces in the development to be provided with Electric Vehicle Charging Points in compliance with Local Plan Policy SD7, although some comment was made at the late imposition of this condition and potentially placing of unreasonable costs on the developer to make this provision. Officers confirmed that this would not place an unreasonable burden on the applicant and that it was common practice to

impose or amend conditions at this stage of consideration of an application ,and that if the applicant felt the condition was unreasonable they could apply to the local planning authority to vary the condition or appeal to the Planning Inspectorate to remove/vary the condition.

RESOLVED that:

Subject to the completion of a section 106 legal agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure a financial contribution of £13,582 towards education provision (Early Years £7,404 and Primary School £6,178) the Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control be authorised to GRANT permission subject to the conditions (amended condition 13 as per addendum),reasons and informatives listed on the agenda.

The voting was as follows:

For the Grant of permission (11) Councillors
Broadhead, Chaudhri, Edis, Gillham, Howorth, King, Mullens, Nuti, Snow, Sohi, and Whyte
Against (0)
Abstention (1) Councillor Kusneraitis

RU 19/1436 Sycamore Farm, Chertsey Lane, Staines-upon -Thames

Continued use of the site for storage (Use Class B8) ,including external storage in the form of 6 no. storage containers, erection of 2.4m high perimeter fencing (retrospective),resurfacing of yard ,provision of 6 no. car parking spaces, and landscaping (amended plan received 29.7.2020 removing container storage from southern boundary, acoustic fence to western boundary and along southern boundary of access road and raising of containers above ground level)

The Committee was informed that the description of the development had been amended to reflect the revised plans removing 8 of the storage containers from the scheme so that only 6 storage containers were now proposed.

The CHDMBC made a factual correction to a comment made by the objector in addressing the Committee. The CHDMBC advised the Committee that contrary to the comment made by the objector, Green Belt Policy had changed since 2001, PPG2 had been replaced by several versions of the NPPF which affected the application of Green Belt policy.

Some Members commented on the potential impact of additional storage in the Green Belt as well as the potential impact of the security fencing. Officers commented that the storage use was considered to be appropriate development for the reasons set out in the report (paras 6.3 & 6.4). The CHDMBC commented that a boundary treatment had previously existed on the site and that the impact of the fence on the Green Belt was not likely to be significantly greater than the impact of a fence that could be erected under permitted development. In combination with the additional landscaping the boundary treatments were considered to be acceptable to officers in Green Belt and visual terms.

Some Members commented on the potential for impact on the flood plain. Officers advised that this was considered in the report and that the Environment Agency had raised no objection and there were no planning grounds to refuse the application

RESOLVED that:

GRANT permission subject to conditions, reasons and informatives listed on agenda and additional conditions as set out in the Addendum

The voting was as follows:

For the Grant of permission (6) Councillors
Broadhead, Howorth, Mullens, Nuti, Snow and Sohi,

Against (5) Councillors Edis, Gillham, King, Kusneraitis and Whyte
Abstention (1) Councillor Chaudhri.

(Mr, McInulty, an objector and Ms Wilson, agent for the applicant addressed the Committee on the above application)

RU 20/0880 Wentworth Estate Roads, Wentworth, Virginia Water

The installation of 7 Vehicle Access Control Barriers, with free standing intercoms, plus paving slabs adjacent to the VACB on the Wentworth Estate, Virginia Water

Officers advised that the submission of a Transport Management Plan under proposed condition 5 would address some of the issues raised by Members regarding vehicle deliveries and access to the Estate.

The CHDMBC would inform the Applicant and management company of the need for provision of sufficient space around the barriers to accommodate mobility scooters

In response to Member comments, Officers confirmed that as the barriers would be replacing the existing of a similar scale, no special circumstances were required to be put forward to justify the proposed development.

RESOLVED that

GRANT permission subject to conditions (condition 6 amended as per Addendum), reasons and informative listed on the agenda,

The voting was as follows:

For the Grant of permission (8) Councillors
Broadhead, Chaudhri, Edis, Gillham, Howorth, Mullens, Snow, Sohi,

Against (1) Councillor Nuti
Abstention (3) Councillors King, Kusneraitis and Whyte.

(Mr Few, on behalf of an objector, and Mr Clarke, agent for the applicant addressed the Committee on the above application),

RU 20/0789 Wentworth Estate Roads, Wentworth, Virginia Water

The installation of 8 Vehicle Access Control Barriers, with free standing intercoms, plus paving slabs adjacent to the VACB on the Wentworth Estate, Virginia Water

Members enquired over the need for the barriers and level of support among residents on the estate for the barriers. Officers advised that the level of support or otherwise was not relevant to the determination of this application. The barriers were an acceptable form of development in a residential location and it was for the management company to be accountable to the residents for the provision of the barriers and its management of the Estate

RESOLVED that

GRANT permission subject to conditions and reasons listed on agenda.

The voting was as follows:

For the Grant of permission (9) Councillors
Broadhead, Chaudhri, Edis, Gillham, Howorth, Mullens, Snow, Sohi, Whyte

Against (0)
Abstention (3) Councillors King, Kusneraitis and Nuti

(Mr Few, on behalf of an objector, and Mr Clarke, agent for the applicant addressed the Committee on the above application)

RU 20/0790 Monks Road, Wentworth, Virginia Water

The installation of 1 Vehicle Access Control Barrier, with free standing intercoms. plus, hard surfacing to secure pedestrian /wheelchairs access to the side of the VACB at Monks Road, Wentworth Estate, Virginia Water

Apart from the CHDMBC advising the Committee that the previous refusal of planning application RU 20/0166 for a higher number of Vehicle Access Control Barriers on the Estate was a material planning consideration in making decisions on current and any future applications on the Estate, no new salient planning points were raised which had not already been raised during consideration of the previous applications relating to the Estate on the agenda.

RESOLVED that

GRANT permission subject to conditions and reasons listed on agenda.

The voting was as follows:

For the Grant of permission (8) Councillors
Broadhead, Chaudhri, Edis, Gillham, Howorth, Mullens, Snow, Sohi,

Against (2) Councillors Nuti and Whyte
Abstention (2) Councillors King and Kusneraitis.

(Mr Few, on behalf of an objector, and Mr Clarke, agent for the applicant addressed the Committee on the above application)

RU 20/0110 11 Spencer Gardens, Englefield Green

2-storey extension to front, single storey extension to north side, 2 -storey extension to rear and alterations/extension to south including accommodation in the roof space. The alterations also include the removal of the rear conservatory and the porch structure to the front (amended plans received)

The Committee expressed concern that the previous planning permission had not been fully complied with. The CHDMBC confirmed that the site would be monitored for future compliance with approved plans and conditions.

Members commented on treatment of the southern boundary of the site and the Committee agreed that an additional condition be imposed to require submission of all boundary treatments for approval to protect the privacy of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling.

RESOLVED that

GRANT permission subject to conditions, reasons and informative listed on agenda, and additional condition requiring submission of details of all garden boundary treatments for approval.

The voting was as follows:

For the Grant of permission (12) Councillors
Broadhead, Chaudhri, Edis, Gillham, Howorth, King, Kusneraitis, Mullens, Nuti, Snow, Sohi, Whyte

Against (0)
Abstention (0)

(Mrs Simmonds, an objector and Mr Palen, the applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application)

RU 20/0824 11 Spencer Gardens, Englefield Green

Retention of summerhouse /garden store

The Committee agreed that an additional condition be imposed restricting use of the summerhouse to an ancillary fashion to the main dwelling house, and not as separate residential accommodation.

RESOLVED that

GRANT permission subject to condition, reason and informative listed on agenda, and additional condition restricting use of the summerhouse to an ancillary fashion to the main dwelling house, and not as separate residential accommodation.

The voting was as follows:

For the Grant of permission (12) Councillors

Broadhead, Chaudhri, Edis, Gillham, Howorth, King, Kusneraitis, Mullens, Nuti, Snow, Sohi, Whyte

Against (0)
Abstention (0).

(Mrs Simmonds, an objector and Mr Palen, applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application)

157 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

The Committee considered approval of a new Local Development Scheme (LDS) following the adoption of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan.

The Borough Council was required by law to produce a project plan, known as a 'Local Development Scheme' (LDS), setting out how its Local Plan and other related documents would be produced, and a timetable for their production. The purpose of the LDS was to keep the public and other stakeholders informed and to promote good management of the Local Plan preparation process.

The Council was no longer obliged to submit a copy of its LDS to the Secretary of State to bring the Scheme into effect. Instead, the Local Planning Authority had to resolve that the scheme was to have effect, and, in its resolution, specify the date from which the scheme would have effect.

The Council's current LDS was adopted in March 2018 and was primarily concerned with setting out the timetable for the preparation of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan. Now that the Local Plan had been adopted, Officers considered it an appropriate point to revise the LDS.

The LDS prepared by officers sought to ensure that the Council would be able to complete the Local Plan review and policies update by July 2025 as was required by legislation and the Local Plan. The LDS also sets out the remainder of the timetable for the adoption and implementation of CIL

The key milestones for the review and update of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan as outlined in the LDS were as follows:

Milestone	Target
Regulation 18: Issues and Options consultation	Late Summer 2022
Regulation 18: Draft Plan consultation	Spring 2023
Regulation 19: Pre-Submission consultation	Winter 2024
Regulation 22: Submission	July 2024
Examination	August 2024 – May 2025
Adoption	July 2025

Officers were currently reviewing the proposed reforms set out in the Planning White Paper (August 2020) which included reforms to the Plan Making system and to the Community Infrastructure Levy regime. These proposals were subject to consultation and should the Government introduce the proposals set out in the White Paper, this might require the Council to revise its LDS and a further report thereon would be made to Committee.

The Government had confirmed that due to the current COVID19 pandemic, all neighbourhood planning referendums that had been recently cancelled, or were scheduled to take place, between 16 March 2020 and 5 May 2021 were postponed. However where the local planning authority had issued a decision statement (as set out under Regulation 18 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012) detailing its intention to send a neighbourhood plan to referendum, that plan could be given significant weight in decision-making, so far as the plan was material to the application. A footnote to this effect would be added to paragraph 2.11 of the LDS.

RESOLVED that:

- (i) the September 2020 Runnymede Borough Council Local Development Scheme, as amended, be approved; and**
- (ii) the Local Development Scheme come into effect on 3rd September 2020.**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (12) Councillors

Broadhead, Chaudhri, Edis, Gillham, Howorth, King, Kusneraitis, Mullens, Nuti, Snow, Sohi, Whyte

Against (0)

Abstention (0)

158 **RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL DRAFT STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (SCI)**

The Committee received a draft SCI which set out how the Council would involve the community and other stakeholders in the preparation of the Runnymede 2040 Local Plan, during the preparation of other planning policy documents and during the planning application and enforcement processes.

The Council adopted its last SCI in December 2014, with temporary amendments being made to this document in May 2020 in response to the COVID 19 pandemic and updated Government guidance. The Council had a legal requirement to update its SCI every 5 years. As such, a comprehensive review of the SCI had been undertaken and the draft document proposed for public consultation was reported to Members. The Council had regard to national planning policy and legislation in preparing the new SCI, and, once adopted, would replace the SCI adopted by the Council in December 2014 and the temporarily amended SCI which was published in May 2020

The draft SCI had been updated to include the following:

- The use of simplified language and limiting references to legislation unless absolutely necessary, yet ensuring the statutory background was clearly presented;
- The insertion of new web links to revised legislation where legislative references were made;
- The deletion of the lists of named groups and organisations from the current SCI Appendices A and C (which set out the list of Local Development Document consultees and Residents Associations), given that any person or group could add or remove themselves from the Council's Planning Policy and Strategy Database at any time, rendering the lists out of date;
- Changes to the section on planning applications to ensure consistency with current legislation and best practice;

- A review of the neighbourhood plan process to confirm at what stages interested parties could get involved, and also the Council's role in advising and assisting community groups as they progress their neighbourhood plans. Clarification of this process was considered necessary given the heightened interest from local communities in preparing Neighbourhood Plans since the 2014 SCI was published and the endorsement of their production by the Leader;
- Clarification of how and when the development of the Community Infrastructure Levy would be consulted on; and
- Additional text to confirm how the Council would amend its consultation processes in light of any current or future COVID-19 lockdown measures. This included how the Council would make documents available for public inspection during any periods of lockdown to ensure that those without ready access to technology/web access could still access/view consultation documents and make representations to the Council.

The Runnymede draft SCI had been screened to establish whether there may be an impact whether positive or negative on any of the nine protected characteristics (namely, age, disability, race/ethnicity, pregnancy and maternity, religion, sexual orientation, sex, gender reassignment and marriage / civil partnership). An updated Screening Assessment was circulated which had concluded that a full Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) was not required

Whilst there was no statutory requirement to consult on the SCI, Officers considered it good practice to do so, and the Committee agreed for consultation to be undertaken for a period of six weeks with the local community and other stakeholders. A summary of all the comments received during this period of consultation and a final draft of the SCI would then be reported to the Planning Committee for adoption.

RESOLVED that:

the draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), with the updated Equality Screening Assessment, be approved for public consultation for a period of six weeks.

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (12) Councillors

Broadhead, Chaudhri, Edis, Gillham, Howorth, King, Kusneraitis, Mullens, Nuti, Snow, Sohi, Whyte

Against (0)

Abstention (0)

159 **THAMES BASIN HEATHS SPECIAL PROTECTION AREA SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) INITIAL CONSULTATION**

This item was deferred and would be reported to a future meeting of the Committee.

(The meeting ended at 10.07 pm)

Chairman