

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE16 December 2020 at 6.30pm via MS Teams

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

Members of the Committee absent:                      None

Councillors J Hulley, J Olorenshaw and N Prescott also attended the meeting via MS Teams as non-members of the Committee.

353 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 25 November 2020 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

354 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence. All present.

355 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Howorth and R King declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in application RU 20/0098 as they were employees of the Royal Holloway University of London. Both Councillors withdrew from the debate on this application and returned to the meeting following this item.

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

356 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: -**

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

**RU 20/0098 Rusham Park, Whitehall Lane, Egham**

Outline planning application (amended proposal) for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of purpose built student accommodation up to 1,400 study bedrooms, energy centre and ancillary uses, including a pedestrian footbridge over the railway, and associated landscaping –(a 'student village') on land at Rusham Park, Whitehall lane. Egham (amended scheme reducing site area and reducing number of study bedrooms from up to 2000 to up to 1400 with amended plans and supporting technical documentation received 11 and 16 September and 30 October 2020) .

*Some Members commented on the impact of the proposal on Whitehall Lane and its rural setting, and potential problems associated with the high concentration of students on this site such as on street parking, additional traffic movements and noise.*

*A Member of the Committee enquired about the lower number of study bedrooms in the revised scheme and low amount of surface parking on the site. Officers advised that the number of bed spaces had been reduced to make the scheme more acceptable in Green Belt terms and it was not considered that the bedrooms removed in the revised scheme could have been justified by the VSC case at this time.*

*Officers advised that the County Highway Authority had raised no objection subject to conditions. The multi storey car park would provide 408 spaces which, subject to future planning permission, would be available for the RHUL to manage as required. This car park was not currently required to mitigate this development, however is considered a windfall that provides additional car parking for the existing use.*

*Location of the surface parking had not been fixed at this stage and would be the subject of a reserved matters application. Officers informed the Committee that the University was developing an estate wide Car Parking Strategy separate from this application.*

*Some Members were supportive of the application as it would relieve pressure for student accommodation and associated parking in the surrounding area, particularly Englefield Green.*

*A Member raised the issue of the proposed CPZ for Englefield Green and considered that the monies arising should be ringfenced for Egham as well as Englefield Green. Officers advised that the monies would be for the whole CPZ project which would be available for both Egham and Englefield Green and not prioritised for either area, it would be up to the Council and SCC to decide how the monies should be spent and where.*

*The Committee noted the very special circumstances as outlined in the application report which it considered justified the authorisation of planning permission.*

**RESOLVED that:**

**Subject to referral of the application to the Secretary of State and provided he does not call in the application for determination by himself, the CHDMBC be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to the approval of a suitable strategy with Natural England to mitigate impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA ,**

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

- a) **The agreed SAMM payments and a suitable SANG avoidance strategy in accordance with the requirements of Natural England;**
- b) **Proportionate contributions towards setting up of a Controlled Parking Zone;**
- c) **The public use of the new railway bridge which will be funded and built by RHUL.**

**And conditions (amended conditions 7 and 13 as per Addendum), reasons and informatives listed on the agenda, with additional condition 41 as per addendum.**

(Mr Fisher, an objector on behalf Egham Residents Association, and Mr Layzell for the applicant addressed the Committee on the above application)

**RU 20/0675**

**Land at Brox End Nursery and 183 Brox Road, Ottershaw**

Demolition of 183 Brox Road and the development of land for the development of 46 residential dwellings with associated vehicular access, drainage works and landscaping, including provision of open space (amended plans received 23/10/20)

*Some Members commented on density of the development which they considered would be out of keeping with the neighbouring area, impact of the proposed access road or potential different access ,increased traffic volumes ,impact on the character and setting of the Locally Listed Heritage Asset of Anningsley Cottage, and sustainability of design and construction. A small number of Members wished to defer the application to enable some of these concerns to be addressed.*

*Officers advised that this site had been allocated for development since the early 1990s and was now allocated for development by the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan (by Policy SL2). The quantum of development proposed made an efficient use of an appropriate site and was not considered to be harmful to the character of the area and in this regard the attention of Members was also drawn to a previous appeal decision on the site which was a material consideration in the determination of this application. The site was in an accessible location. The traffic and highway safety aspects of the application had been reviewed by the County Highway Authority who had raised no objections and concluded that the proposed access was safe and no harmful impacts would arise in respect of the highway network in the area.*

*The Council's Conservation Officer was of the opinion that the new access road would not be harmful to the setting of Anningsley Cottage or the character of the wider area. It was also commented that the proposed development would increase the prominence of Anningsley Cottage which could lead to greater appreciation of this heritage asset.*

*No other technical planning issues had been identified that would warrant deferral or prevent planning permission being granted in accordance with the development plan and the NPPF.*

**RESOLVED that:**

**The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control be authorised to GRANT permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the following obligations:**

**1. Financial contributions of:**

- **£322,405 towards Early Years, Primary and Secondary School infrastructure (subject to final mix):**
- **£28,350 towards the provision of SAMP:**
- **£90,000 towards the provision of SANG .**

**2. The provision of 16 affordable housing units (11 affordable rent and 5 shared ownership) and subject to conditions (amended conditions 3,4,6,7,12,13,14,15,18,22, and 23 as per Addendum) reasons and informatives( deletion of Informative 5 as per Addendum) listed on the agenda, with additional condition 24 as per Addendum.**

*(Mr Nichol, an objector, and Ms Owen, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee on this application)*

**RU 20/1259**

**Land north of Littlecroft Road, Egham**

Creation of a temporary vehicular access road.

*A Member expressed concern over the potential for the new gate to be left open and for persons to access Strodes field in the evening and during the night which could potentially adversely impact on the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers.*

*In response, Officers advised that the gate was high and of substantial design, and that it was a management issue for the College to safeguard their property and to securely close the gate. The road would only be temporary and there was no justification to impose a condition on management of the gate and the land*

*A Member asked if the road could be re-routed to avoid loss of trees. Officers advised that any alternative route would encroach onto the field and cause more harm than the proposed route which would use the existing hard surface.*

**RESOLVED that-**

**the Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control be authorised to GRANT permission subject to conditions (amended condition 3 as per Addendum), reasons and informatives listed on the agenda**

**RU 20/0601**

**Bellbourne Nursery Hurst Lane, Egham**

Application seeking Full Planning Permission for the proposed conversion , partial demolition and internal /external alterations to the existing glasshouse (glasshouse 1) to provide 5 two-storey dwellings (including the partial demolition of glasshouse 2), associated parking and reconfiguration of the existing access to Hurst Lane(amended description and additional information received 02/07/20 and 08/07/20)

*Members understood the concerns of residents, but accepted that they had to determine the application in accordance with national legislation , recent case law ( Mansell v Tonbridge & Malling BC),and a recent appeal decision at North Somerset Council in the application of the principle of fall back against this particular class of development. These were all material considerations in the determination of this application and were fully explained to Members in the application report and addendum.*

*Some Members commented on the amenities for future occupiers and the suitability of the glasshouse structure for conversion.*

*Officers advised that structural information submitted with the application indicated that it would be suitable, and the reuse of the frame was in line with the Prior Approval on the site. As regards amenities of future occupiers , Officers considered that with the imposition of suitable planning conditions and the planning obligations proposed by the applicant to prevent the development until the adjoining B8 use was ceased and not to implement the prior approvals for Glasshouse 2 ,the development would meet the requirements of Policy EE1 and the NPPF.*

*Officers advised the Committee that there was a realistic fallback position to provide 5 homes under a prior approval permission which would have poorer quality development than what was now proposed in this application. Given that the proposal would be developed/converted in a similar manner to the class Q prior approval scheme on the same footprint in a relatively similar form, it was considered that there was a realistic proposition that the conversion/part demolition of Glasshouse 1 for 5 dwellings could take place under the implementation of the prior approval.*

*Officers commented that whilst the scheme was not of particularly high quality the planning application would still provide a better quality development, than that which could be built out under the prior approval permission.*

*Taking all these factors into account, the Committee considered that very special circumstances existed which clearly outweighed the harm in principle to the Green Belt, and justified the granting of planning permission.*

*On this basis, the Committee authorised planning permission*

**RESOLVED that-**

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

*(Ms Morgan, an objector, and Mr Williams, agent for applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application and the following application relating to the same site)*

**RU 20/0600 Glasshouse 1, Bellbourne Nursery, Hurst Lane, Egham**

Application seeking Full Planning Permission for the proposed conversion ,partial demolition and internal /external alterations to the existing glasshouse (glasshouse 1) to provide 7 two-storey dwellings (including the partial demolition of glasshouse 2),associated parking and reconfiguration of the existing access to Hurst Lane(amended description and additional information received 02/07/20 and 08/07/20).

*No further salient planning points to that raised on the preceding application (RU 20/0601) were raised on this application. The committee noted the additional two units and associated paraphernalia, however considered that the material considerations and VSC on balance outweighed the harm in light of the very similar fall back position.*

*The Committee authorised planning permission subject to completion of planning obligations and appropriate conditions.*

**RESOLVED that-**

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

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

For the 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)

*Officers advised the Committee that this application had previously been considered by the Committee on 2 September 2020 when permission was authorised subject to the completion of a S106 legal agreement and planning conditions which included an amended condition 12 as per the addendum which required all the spaces for the development to have electric vehicle charging points.*

*Officers advised that the Committee had been given conflicting information on EV charging for flatted developments, due to unfortunate timing of the original decision immediately after the adoption of the Local Plan. Further advice from the Highway authority had been received which confirmed that only 20% EV should have been pursued on this application for flatted development. 20% is consistent with the quantity required on other applications at committee following the updated highway advice.*

*The decision notice had not been issued on this application as the legal agreement was still being prepared. In view of these circumstances, and as the application had not been formally determined, Officers considered it correct to bring back this application to the committee, with the same report (but updating officer Electric Vehicle Charging advice), for the Committee to reconsider the development with particular reference to condition 12. Officers recommended that planning permission be granted with the condition 12 as originally proposed prior to the addendum amendment. This condition would require that 2 parking spaces for the occupiers be provided with electric charging points, and two further spaces be provided with a passive electricity supply so that future charging points could be installed. Officers considered this would ensure that the development*

*complied with the SCC parking guidance, and was consistent with other planning applications which had been considered by the Committee.*

*No other changes to the report or conditions were considered necessary as there had been no other material changes to the circumstances of the site or planning policies since 2 September 2020.*

*In coming to agreed resolutions, Members had given weight to the current parking guidance of Surrey County Council Highway Authority, which recommended 20% of parking spaces be provided with electric charging points.*

*The Committee endorsed the approach of Officers and authorised planning permission accordingly.*

**RESOLVED that-**

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

:  
(The meeting ended at 10.20 pm)

Chairman