

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE14 October 2020 at 6.30pm via MS Teams

Members of
Committee present Councillors M Willingale (Chairman), J Broadhead, I Chaudhri,
M Cressey,
E Gill, C Howorth, R King, M Kusneraitis,
I Mullens, P Snow, J Sohi, S Whyte,
and J Wilson

Members of the
Committee absent: Councillors Anderson-Bassey and M Nuti

Councillors L Gillham and J Olorenshaw also attended the meeting via MS Teams as non-members of the Committee.

231 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 23 September, 2020 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

232 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

233 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Howorth, declared a non-pecuniary interest in application RU 20/1088 as he knew the owner of the application site. Cllr Howorth withdrew from the debate and returned to the meeting following this item.

Cllr Cressey declared a non-pecuniary interest in the item on Ottershaw Neighbourhood Area and Forum as he is a member of the Forum. Cllr Cressey withdrew from the debate and returned to the meeting following this item.

234 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, except for application RU 20/0448 where the objector had requested the Council's legal representative to read out the speech on his behalf.

RESOLVED that –

the following applications be determined as indicated: -

<u>APP NO</u>	<u>LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION</u>
RU 19/1762	Anningsley Park Farm, Brox Road, Ottershaw

Demolition of existing Clubhouse canteen facility at Anningsley Park Farm and construction of a new Clubhouse Canteen facility, and associated landscape design works (revised plans received 28/5/20) (amended site location plan received 27.8.20)

The Committee was supportive of the application which would modernise the site and was reassured by the agent for the applicant that there was no intention to further commercialise the polo facility which would address concerns of residents.

RESOLVED that:

The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control be authorised to GRANT permission subject to the conditions and reasons listed on the agenda.

(Mr Ward, an objector, and Mr Frampton, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application)

RU 20/1088 Savill Court Hotel, Wick Lane, Englefield Green

Application seeking a variation to planning condition 3 (approved drawing numbers) and 12 (hard and soft landscaping) of planning application RU 16/0824 for the redevelopment and refurbishment of the existing hotel, spa and conference facility to allow for the removal of a Wellingtonia Tree.

Some Members commented on the loss of a good specimen category A tree, but the Committee balanced this loss against the cumulative value of the compensatory two replacement trees (including the significant Wellingtonia specimen) and provision of the wider landscape improvements through the agreed landscaping plan which would achieve a net gain in biodiversity. Having balanced these considerations, the Committee-

RESOLVED that:

The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control be authorised to GRANT permission subject to the conditions reasons and informatives listed on the agenda.

RU 20/0448 4 Temple Gardens, Staines-upon-Thames

Demolition of existing 4 -bedroom house and erection of replacement 4-bedroom house, with associated works to land (amended information received)

The Committee was supportive of the application as it would be a significant improvement on the current building on the site, represented a sustainable form of development and had included appropriate mitigation measures to address potential flooding considerations. Members noted conditions regarding management of surface water drainage.

RESOLVED that

The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control be authorised to GRANT permission subject to the conditions reasons and informatives listed on the agenda.

(At the request of Mr Blackie, an objector, the Council's legal representative read out his statement, and Mr Leigh, agent for the applicant addressed the Committee on the above application),

RU 20/0609 22 Selsdon Road, Addlestone

Proposed single storey front, rear and side extensions. Extension and alteration to roof together with internal alterations to provide habitable accommodation in the roof space (amended plans and description)

The Committee was supportive of the application.

RESOLVED that

The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control be authorised to GRANT permission subject to the conditions reasons and informatives listed on the agenda.

RU 20/0862 Tamesis 2, The Glanty, Egham

Two storey office extension with ancillary rooftop plant, extension and reconfiguration of existing decked car park, and replacement of external fire staircase. Associated works, including alterations to the elevations, creation of a new entrance on the western façade and landscaping works.

Some comment was made on removal of trees. The CHDMBC confirmed that the application comprised landscaping at the site including green wall panels on the proposed car parking area, and conditions would be imposed requiring additional landscaping details and tree protection measures and requiring biodiversity enhancements in accordance with Local Plan Policy SD7.

In response to comments on the target in the Travel Plan to reduce people travelling to work in single occupancy vehicles by 5%, it was agreed to amend condition 7 to require submission of a written Travel Plan to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority in order to allow for the CHDMBC to review the Travel Plan and seek a higher target if appropriate.

RESOLVED that

The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control be authorised to GRANT permission subject to the conditions (condition 2 amended as per addendum) and amended condition 7 regarding submission of a written Travel Plan, reasons and informatives listed on the agenda.

235 **DRAFT RESPONSE TO GOVERNMENT WHITE PAPER “PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE”**

The Committee was informed that the Government had published two significant consultations on planning matters on 6th August. Potentially the most far-reaching was the Planning White Paper ‘Planning for the Future’ which sets out plans to potentially undertake a fundamental reform of the planning system. It contained proposals that could have implications for future planning policy and the Council’s role in planning decision making, and could have an impact on the consideration of planning applications and how development was applied for in the Borough

As responses were required by 29th October, an initial draft response had been prepared for the Committee’s consideration by Officers in the Council’s Development Management, Planning Policy and Housing sections.

The Committee endorsed the responses proposed and in addition asked Officers to consider the following suggestions for incorporation in the response in consultation with the Chairman:

- Question 4-Inclusion of heritage buildings on page 14 on the third bullet point. In addition, amendment to bullet point two to say “Provision of an appropriate number of homes in the right places with adequate parking/amenities”;
- Question 8 (a)-Flood Plain 3 -could be an absolute constraint or capable of negotiation;
- Question 8(b) -emphasise throughout the response the direct issue the borough faces, which is the lack of infrastructure, poor connectivity, that leads to an increase in people, relying on private vehicle use;
- Question 9(b)-inclusion of protected sites in addition to renewal sites in relation to automatic consents;
- Question 9(c)-NSIPs-emphasise importance of local control and confirmation that NSIPs would only be used in exceptional circumstances and not for small/medium sized developments;
- Question 13(a)-Neighbourhood Plan process needs to be strongly supported but with increased resourcing. In addition, greater weight should be given at an earlier stage in decision making to Neighbourhood Plans, so far as the Plans were material to an application;
- Question 13(b)-There were technical issues associated with digitisation of Neighbourhood Plan process and this needed to be acknowledged;
- Question 15-more control required over prior approvals;
- Traveller communities and sites-provision for;
- Question 19-include reference to Design South East; and
- Question 21(when new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it). More emphasis was required on quality of build and being realistic about the need for amenities such as parking provision, even whilst striving to be greener.

The Committee thanked officers for their work in drafting the response and the Chairman thanked Members for their contribution to the responses. The final response would be circulated to all Members of the Committee and Cllr Gillham.

RESOLVED that:

- i) **the Council respond to the MHCLG consultation “Planning for the Future”; and**
- ii) **the CHDMBC & CHPPED be authorised to respond to the consultation after agreeing the final content with the Chairman of the Planning Committee.**

236 **DESIGNATION OF OTTERSASHAW NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM AND OTTERSASHAW NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA**

The Council had received applications for the designation of an Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum and an Ottershaw Neighbourhood Area under the Localism Act 2011.

The geographic extent of the proposed neighbourhood area submitted with the application and that covered by the prospective Forum was proposed to be bound by Stonehill Road to the north west, the St Peter’s Hospital site and A320 to the north, a range of features including the River Bourne, M25, a number of roads, the edges of established residential development and parts of recognised footpaths to the east/south east, and the Borough boundary to the west. The proposed area was contained entirely within the Ottershaw ward although excluded the area bounded by Spinney Hill, Ongar Hill, Hare Hill and the Ridings, the Scout Hut and Creepers Nursery, which the prospective forum considered to be part of the separate Rowtown community, and the area to the east of the M25, which the prospective forum considered to be part of the Addlestone community.

The applications had been subject to public consultation. Twelve letters of representation had been received and a summary thereof was given. Six of these letters were from local residents and generally raised objections to the extent of the neighbourhood area proposed. Two of these letters also raised concerns about the role and remit of the Neighbourhood Forum.

The Neighbourhood Forum application was considered to fully meet the conditions set out within the relevant Act of parliament and associated regulations. The geographical extent of the proposed Neighbourhood Area was also considered appropriate and compliant with relevant regulations.

Officers responded to a question from a Member on the inclusion of Hare Hill open space within the Neighbourhood Area and associated potential implications for the future Referendum.

The Committee supported the designation of the Neighbourhood Area and Forum as proposed.

Cllrs Gill and Gillham were thanked for leading the way on Neighbourhood Plans with their work on the Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan and for assistance given to other areas in the borough on developing their Plans.

RESOLVED that:

- i) **the Ottershaw Neighbourhood Area be designated as identified on the plan attached at Appendix D to the Agenda; and**
- ii) **the Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum be designated to cover the area as shown on the plan at Appendix D to the Agenda.**

(The meeting ended at 9.20 pm)

Chairman