

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

4 November 2020 at 6.30pm via MS Teams

Members of                      Councillors M Willingale (Chairman), D Anderson-Bassey (Vice-Chairman) J Broadhead, M Cressey,  
Committee present              L Gillham, J Hulley, R King, M Kusneraitis,  
   I Mullens, M Nuti, P Snow, J Sohi, S Whyte,  
   and J Wilson

Members of the                      Councillor I Chaudhri  
Committee absent:

Councillors M Heath, M Maddox and N Prescott also attended the meeting via MS Teams as non-members of the Committee.

274    MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14 October 2020 were confirmed and signed as a correct record, subject to a minor clarification on the Minute regarding Ottershaw Neighbourhood Area.

275    APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Chaudhri

276    DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Snow, declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in application RU 20/1295 as he is the applicant and owner of the application site. Cllr Snow withdrew from the debate and returned to the meeting following this item.

Cllr Maddox, a non -member of the Committee, declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in application RU 20/1307 as he is the applicant and owner of the application site. Cllr Maddox withdrew from the debate.

277    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. Public speakers addressed the Committee as specified below.

**RESOLVED that –**

**the following applications be determined as indicated: -**

**APP NO****LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION**

RU 18/0443

Land east of Highcross Place, Chertsey

Outline planning application for the erection of up to 48 dwellings (was previously 52 dwellings) (including affordable housing), vehicular access via Pretoria Road and Hanworth Lane, with open space, landscaping including Sustainable Drainage System and all necessary ground works. All matters reserved except for means of access, layout and scale (revised plans received amending design and detailing of the units and further amended plans received 3 august 2020 reducing the number of flats and including 3 bed flats)

*Members mainly commented on the reduced level of affordable housing, level of clawback contribution towards the mitigation of A320 works, visibility of the development from Laburnum Road, and level of provision required for electric vehicle charging points compared to other developments.*

*Officers confirmed that the level of affordable housing on site was appropriate and in accordance with the independent viability assessment. In addition to on- site provision, Officers would also secure a financial contribution towards off site affordable housing.*

*With regard to the A320, Officers advised that following the submitted viability assessment the proposal did not support a 100% clawback to the A320 works in this instance and this was supported by the Highway Authority.*

*Officers confirmed that whilst the development would be highly visible and prominent from many neighbouring properties it was considered that due to the separation distances the proposed buildings would not materially result in an over dominant form of development which would be detrimental and harmful to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent neighbouring properties.*

*With regard to the level of electric vehicle charging points Officers confirmed that this was the appropriate level required for this site by SCC Highway Authority .However, the CHDMBC would discuss with the SCC Highway Authority their advice on requirements for such points in developments and this could be taken into account in the proposed new car parking standards.*

*In response to a comment made by the public speaker and a Member, the CHDMBC confirmed that matters relating to the cladding of the development was not a planning matter but would require approval under the Building Regulations.*

**RESOLVED that:**

**the CHDMBC be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to**

**The completion of a Section 106 Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the following obligations:**

- 1) Transportation Improvements and contributions including:**

- A contribution of £203,869 towards improvements to the A320 junctions and links
  - A travel Plan auditing fee £4,600
  - Provision of a car club bay and car club vehicle within the development site for use by both future occupiers and the wider public
- 2) **Education contributions**
    - £32,306 towards an early year's education infrastructure in Chertsey,
    - £65,620 towards primary education in the Chertsey, Addlestone and Ottershaw Area specifically a project at Meadowcroft Community Infant School, and
    - £59,573 towards secondary education in Runnymede specifically a project at Jubilee High School.
  - 3) **SAMM TBH SPA financial contribution of £630 per dwelling in the 5km zone (18 units) total - £11,340**
  - 4) **SANG TBH SPA - £2000 per unit in 5 km zone (18 units) £36,000**
  - 5) **Community facilities**
    - Play space - £70,438.20
    - Playing pitches - £38,864.70
    - Allotments – £4,464
    - Community facilities - £6,444.90
  - 6) **The delivery of 12 no. affordable units on the site. (8 affordable rent and 4 shared ownership)**
  - 7) **Affordable Housing contribution of £38,547.93**
  - 8) **Provide mitigation for relocation of reptiles and long term management and monitoring at site adjacent to Fair Oaks Airport.**
  - 9) **Monitoring fee £10,000**

**And conditions, reasons and informatives listed on the agenda.**

(Ms Bartholomew, an objector, and Mr Fairman, the applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application)

RU 20/0494      Hollywood Gardens, Coach Road, Ottershaw

Erection of 2 new detached dwellings following demolition of existing dwelling, garage and outbuildings (revised plans received 14 September amending design for plots 1 and 2).

*Members considered that the application was an improvement on the previously submitted scheme and that the site was of sufficient size to accommodate the two proposed dwellings.*

*Some comment was made over the impact on the Red House from plot 2. Officers reported that following discussions with the applicant amendments had been made to the scheme to reduce the depth of the dwelling on plot 2 and reduce the number of first floor windows proposed.*

*The windows would all serve non habitable areas of the property such as bathrooms, dressing areas and hallways and would be conditioned to be obscure glazed to protect the privacy of the garden of the Red House. The reduced depth of plot 2 would result in a minimal projection beyond the rear of the Red House and whilst there would be a greater forward projection there would be sufficient distance between the properties to prevent overshadowing or overbearing.*

*In response to a question from a Member regarding location of electric vehicle charging points in car ports ,Officers confirmed that the Planning Authority could not require this by way of condition, but it was for the developer to determine their location in order to maximise site layout.*

**RESOLVED that:**

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

(Mr Griffith, an objector, and Mr Freeland, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application).

RU 20/1307      26 Scotland Bridge Road, Addlestone

Single storey front/side porch extension

*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 conditions reasons and informative listed on the agenda.**

RU 20/1295      Dwelling to rear of 4 Orchard Way, Addlestone

Single storey ground floor rear extension

*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 conditions reasons and informative listed on the agenda.**

:

## **INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY AND PRIORITISATION SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) ADOPTION**

The Committee received for adoption the Infrastructure Delivery and Prioritisation SPD.

The Committee was informed that to help secure infrastructure improvements across the Borough to support the 2030 Local Plan further guidance was required to outline how the Council would prioritise infrastructure funding, the relationship between different funding mechanisms and the basis for negotiating financial contributions via Section 106. Appropriate guidance had been prepared through a draft Infrastructure Delivery & Prioritisation Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which had now been the subject of two rounds of public consultation in February to April and July to August 2020

A total of 21 representations had been received during the two rounds of consultation and a copy of the Consultation Statement which summarised these representations and how they had been taken into account had been placed on the Council's website with the Committee Agenda.

A late representation had been received on 1 September on behalf of the applicant for Parklands, Bittams Lane, Chertsey (also known as Bittams D). Despite, this being received after the close of the consultation period, the LPA had had regard to the contents of the letter but officers did not think that the issues raised materially impacted on the officer recommendation nor did they support any additional amendments to those proposed.

The proposed amendments to the draft SPD considered for consultation by the Planning Committee on 15 July were as follows:

- Addition of Blue Infrastructure to the list of infrastructure types;
- Confirmation the Council would not request financial contributions through Section 106 toward infrastructure projects physically provided by a development other than for management/maintenance;
- Placing a cap on the monitoring contribution per Section 106 agreement;
- Clarification of how net dwellings/occupants should be calculated;
- Confirming a formula-based approach to contributions at outline stage where deemed appropriate;
- Signposting that infrastructure for Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) might be negotiated;
- Referencing the Playing Pitch Strategy for Outdoor Sports Contributions;
- Adding the methodology used to calculate estimated net floorspace from sites contingent on A320 improvements.
- Clarifying the approach to developer contributions towards A320 improvements

In light of representations received during the July-August consultation further minor amendments to the draft were proposed as follows:

- Amendment of 2030 Local Plan Policy number for Longcross Garden Village in Table 3-4 from SD10 to SD9;
- Clarification that where a developer provided A320 improvements physically, if the costs of this were greater than would be achieved through a financial contribution, to consider whether this warranted a reduction in other contributions to maintain proportionality;
- Clarification that Surrey County Council were the accountable body for HIF recovery and recycling and that recovery of funds might be spent throughout the County;
- Clarification that where development exceeded policy requirements the Council would still seek 100% clawback of HIF;
- Clarification that developer contributions to S106 monitoring would be on a case by case basis and related to the S106 obligation sought;

- Clarification that retrospective education contributions would only be sought from a development where it had been necessary to forward-fund education infrastructure due to that development.

The Committee was informed that all of the amendments proposed did not change the general purpose of the SPD in that it continued to set out a prioritisation hierarchy, the same cost impacts for different infrastructure types and contained an approach to securing Section 106 agreements once a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was in place. Therefore, as the amendments were for clarification, Officers considered that no further consultation was required.

A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) screening and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening determined that a SEA and/or a HRA was not required.

The date of adoption referred to in the SPD foreword and front cover would be changed to 4 November 2020.

The Committee fully supported adoption of the SPD and agreed that no further consultation was necessary. The Committee also thanked Officers for their work in producing the SPD.

**RESOLVED that-**

**the Draft Infrastructure Delivery & Prioritisation SPD be adopted, subject to the date of adoption referred to in the SPD foreword and front cover being amended to state 4 November 2020.**

**DRAFT REVISED PARKING GUIDANCE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)**

The Committee received a draft revised Parking Guidance SPD for public consultation

The draft revised parking guidance had been prepared to reflect the up to date guidance set out in the NPPF and to support the policies contained in the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan. The guidance had been prepared taking account of national planning guidance and the updated parking guidance published by Surrey County Council in January 2018. The guidance drafted for consultation sought to provide a degree of certainty for developers and communities in respect of the levels of vehicular and cycle parking that would be required in association with new development but also provided flexibility to assess individual schemes where that might be more appropriate given the nature of development proposed. The draft revised guidance also sought to take account of the locational characteristics and the ability to travel by walking, cycling and use of public transport where those modes of travel were convenient options, the need to plan for greater use of electric vehicles in the future and the potential need to control on-street car parking in certain locations through the use of controlled parking zones (CPZs).

The Chairman moved the approval of the SPD for public consultation, which was duly seconded.

Some Members expressed strong concern over the proposed parking standard for new student accommodation. These Members considered that a specific minimum parking standard should be specified instead of the proposed case by case assessment in order to address concerns of residents in the Englefield Green area and give greater clarity to developers and residents. An amendment to this effect was moved and seconded. These Members wished Officers to give further consideration thereon.

Officers were also asked to give further consideration to the proposed parking standard on Offices to address some of the concerns of Members.

In view of the level of debate and significance of the concerns expressed by Members, the Chairman, with the consent of his seconder, withdrew his motion to approve the SPD for public consultation and instead moved deferral of consideration of the SPD until a future meeting in order to allow Officers to further review, in conjunction with Members, the proposed parking standards relating to student accommodation and office accommodation. Deferral was supported by the Committee.

**RESOLVED that**

**the draft revised Runnymede Borough Parking Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) be deferred until a future meeting in order to allow Officers to further review in conjunction with ward Members the proposed parking standards relating to student accommodation and office accommodation.**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY SELECT COMMITTEE – REVIEW OF THE PLANNING SERVICE**

The Committee received the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee in respect of the scrutiny review of the Council's Planning Service and an update from senior Planning Officers regarding the efforts made to date in response to these recommendations in addition to any advice as to the continued relevance of the recommendations noting that the Council had recently adopted its 2030 Local Plan.

The Committee was informed that the Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee on 6 February 2020 had adopted all of the Panel recommendations on the 23 recommendations from the Planning Advisory Service that it had set up to undertake tasks to progress the scrutiny review of the Council's Planning Service and recommended that the Planning Committee accept and adopt all of these Panel recommendations

The Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee also agreed to recommend that it should receive a report at its meeting on 1 October 2020 from the Planning Committee providing an update on progress on any action agreed by the Planning Committee arising from the Panel recommendations.

This report had been planned to be presented to Planning Committee back on 25 March 2020, but this was cancelled due to the national lockdown that came into place on 23 March 2020. The deadlines for compliance with recommendations and the report back to Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee at its meeting on 1 October 2020 had all been set prior to the COVID pandemic and due to the need to support the Council's response efforts, work toward these deadlines had paused.

The CHDMBC and the CHPPED advised the Committee that the PAS report was received some time ago and contained a number of useful recommendations. Due to the work of officers and the passage of time a number of recommendations had been in place for some time and some were currently being progressed, details of which were noted. Others might need adapting in light of Coronavirus or were affected by loss of budgetary growth.

Corporate Heads would report to a future Committee meeting detailing how each of the recommendations had been implemented so far, progress on other recommendations which had not been completed (including a revised potential timeline for delivery) or detailing ones that potentially could not be progressed fully in the recommended form.

### **RESOLVED that:**

- 1. the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee as set out in paragraphs 1.6 and 1.7 of this report be noted; and**
- 2. Officers from within the Development Management and Policy and Economic Development Teams report to a future meeting with guidance on how best to progress compliance with the recommendations and outcomes of the scrutiny review.**

(The meeting ended at 9.41 pm)

Chairman