

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

20 January 2021 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, J Sohi, S Whyte, and J Wilson

Members of the Committee absent: Councillor P Snow

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

397 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 16 December 2020 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

398 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Snow.

399 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Howorth and R King declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in application RU 20/0092 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 Kusneraitis declared a non-pecuniary interest in RU 20/1082 on the grounds of friendship with the owner. Councillor Kusneraitis withdrew from the debate on this application and returned to the meeting following this item.

400 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, except for application RU 19/1779 where the agent for the applicant had requested the Council's legal representative to read out the speech on his behalf.

RESOLVED that –

the following applications be determined as indicated: -

APP NO **LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION**

RU 20/0092 **Rusham Park, Whitehall Lane, Egham**

Variation of Condition 3 of planning approval RU 96/1049(construction of multi deck car park) to enable use by Royal Holloway University of London as part of a Campus Wide Car Parking Management Strategy

The Committee was fully supportive of the application.

In response to a Member question, the CHDMBC confirmed that either the Local Planning authority or County Highway Authority could exercise control over the future location of 'Variable Message Signs' around RHUL, dependent on their location. A comment was also expressed about the car park management by RHUL.

RESOLVED that:

The CHDMBC be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions (amended condition 2 as per Addendum), reasons and informatives listed on the agenda.

RU 20/0005 **Anningsley Park Farm, Brox Road, Ottershaw**

Application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990(Section 106a(3) Request to vary the planning obligation agreement of 11 June 1998 (as modified) in respect of planning permission RU 98/0069 Change of use to a mixed use of agriculture and keeping of horses for recreational purposes and the demolition of existing buildings and replacement with new buildings

The Committee was supportive of the application.

The CHDMBC clarified some of the proposed operational arrangements at the site arising from the proposed variation of the S106 Agreement including numbers of horses to be kept on site and vehicle movements.

The Committee was particularly pleased to see that the applicant had addressed concerns of residents regarding the impact of large vehicles travelling through the village along Brox Road and had suggested a preferred route which would seek to avoid traffic movements along the lower sections of Brox Road. In this regard, it had been agreed with Officers that an additional clause would be included within the S106 Agreement to agree a communications strategy to detail how users of the site would be informed of this preferred route to and from the site

RESOLVED that:

The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control in association with the Corporate Head of Law and Governance be authorised to modify the obligations contained within the Third Schedule of the S106 Agreement dated 11 June 1998(attached to planning permission RU 98/0098 and RU 98/1097) in accordance with the terms of the application, and for an additional clause to be included

in the S106 to agree a communications strategy on the preferred route for vehicles to and from the site.

(Mr Ward, on behalf of objectors, and Mr Frampton, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee on this application)

RU 19/1779 17 Park Road, Egham

Conversion of house to 4 x 1 bedroom flats (further amended plans 10/11/20).

The Committee raised strong concerns about the size of the flats which Members considered amounted to a significant shortfall below the Council's minimum acceptable floorspace standards in Policy SL19, which would affect the quality of living for the future occupiers, and would not be high quality design.

The Committee noted the external patios and garden areas, but did not consider that this provided mitigation for the significant shortfall in internal space.

Members were particularly concerned about both the shortfall on the ground floor flats, as well as the likely shortfall if the first floor flats were used as 2 bedroom flats.

Members were aware of the planning history of the site and also expressed concern over the retrospective nature of the application and that the applicant had not complied with the previous planning permission in constructing a building for four flats without planning permission, though recognised that this was not relevant to the decision being made.

The Committee concluded that the proposal failed to meet the minimum acceptable space standards set out in adopted policy with a significant shortfall in internal floor space, and that the resulting units would fail to provide an adequate level of residential amenity to the detriment of future occupants of the flats. The Committee concluded that this harm was contrary to Policy SL19 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and the NPPF and warranted the refusal of the application.

Following a full debate the Committee authorised the CHDMBC to refuse the application.

RESOLVED that-

The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control be authorised to REFUSE permission on the basis of lack of acceptable internal amenity space for future occupants of the flats contrary to Local Plan Policy SL19.

(A Motion to authorise the CHDMBC to grant permission was moved earlier in the debate but was lost)

(Mr Raven, an objector, addressed the Committee on this application and the Council's legal representative read out a statement on behalf of the applicant)

RU 20/1588 9-11 Victoria Street and 49-50 Albert Road, Egham

Demolition of the existing buildings; erection of a residential development up to two storeys plus roof accommodation comprising two terraces of eight houses, a detached building comprising 4 garages and one flat above ;provision of amenity space, car parking and modifications to existing access off Albert Road (amendment to approved application RU 20/0107 comprising addition of one 2 bed flat above garage block and alterations to parking layout)

The Committee was fully supportive of this application and, in particular, some Members were pleased to see the increased parking provision and were complimentary on the design of the development.

RESOLVED that-

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

RU 20/1082 Dial House and Wisteria Lodge, Northcroft Road, Englefield Green

Variation of condition 2 of application RU 18/1649(demolition of Two Dwellings and erection of Twelve Dwellings.(Amended plans received 20/12/2018 and 22/1/2019) for the increase in width of the proposed single storey rear projections and increase in height of plots 1-9 by 300mm and lowering plots 11 and 12 into the ground by 300mm to allow for an increased height.

Prior to the commencement of debate and in response to comments made by the objector in his address to the Committee regarding the relevance of the Finney case to the lawful consideration of this application ,the CHDMBC informed the Committee that the development which was the subject of that case involved very different circumstances (a wind turbine with a specified height in the description of development and on the application form). Having previously read the judgement and legal opinions on the matter he was satisfied that the decision on this application would be lawful and that this application was not a similar case to Finney. The CHDMBC was satisfied that this could be determined under S73.

The CHDMBC confirmed the increase in the size of the dwellings did not require any additional S106 financial contributions under this application.

In addition, Officers advised the Committee that the minor increase in floor area and heights of dwellings would have no harmful impacts on residential amenities and no other harms would arise.

The Committee supported grant of the S73 permission.

RESOLVED that-

The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control be authorised to GRANT permission subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation to the S106 Agreement attached to RU 18/1649 and conditions, reasons and informatives listed on agenda

(Mr Wilson, an objector, and Mr Bateman, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee on this application)

RU 20/1409 79 Vegal Crescent, Englefield Green

Variation of condition 2 of application RU 19/0723 (for a side/front and rear extension, alterations and extension of roof to facilitate loft conversion, including dormer windows to front, rear and side elevation and a front porch) to allow for increase in width of the previously approved extensions.

The Committee was supportive of the application.

Some Members commented on the width of the garage. Officers confirmed that the garage was of sufficient width to accommodate an average size vehicle. Officers also confirmed that there was no planning policy objection to increasing the width of the previously approved extensions up to the rear and side boundaries.

In response to a Member comment, Officers confirmed that a condition restricting use of the roof area to storage would not be enforceable and that there was also no reason to remove permitted development rights at the site

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.

(Ms Gray on behalf of an objector, and Ms Gunasekaram, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee on this application)

RU 20/1152 1 Lodge Close, Englefield Green

1.-Full conversion of partially converted integral garage. 2.- Construction of timber detached garage to front of property. 3.-Landscaping, including new drive, pathways and front boundary wall (amended plans received 9/11/2020)

The Committee was supportive of the application, but some Members commented on the visual appearance of the timber garage which they did not consider was in keeping with the streetscene. To address these concerns, the Committee agreed to impose a condition requiring submission for approval of a scheme for treatment to improve the appearance of the front elevation to the timber garage, particularly as it was likely to be some time until landscaping could mitigate the impact.

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, with additional condition requiring submission of scheme for treatment of front elevation of the timber garage.

RU 20/1232 5 Mead Lane, Chertsey

Alterations to previously approved change of use of existing building from A1 use(retail) to C3(residential) use to create 1 No residential unit. Alterations include increase in ridge height, front dormer windows and internal/external alterations, at 5 Mead Lane, Chertsey

Whilst some Members expressed concerns over the proposal and in particular whether there would be sufficient light within the dwelling, Members acknowledged that as this application was for alterations to facilitate the Prior Approval granted in 2020 for change of use of the site from retail to dwellinghouse. Members were not generally satisfied with the quality of the development but recognised that the prior approval application meant that there was no justification to refuse the application and as a result authorised the grant of permission.

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

(The meeting ended at 9.51 pm)

Chairman