

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

24 March 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, P Snow, J Sohi, S Whyte and J Wilson

Members of the Committee absent:                      None

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

511    MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 3 March 2021 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

512    APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None. All members of the Committee present.

513    DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Nuti declared a non-pecuniary interest in RU 20/1777 as he knew the owner of the site. Councillor Nuti withdrew from the debate on this application and returned to the meeting following this item.

Both Councillors Howorth and Kusneraitis confirmed that they no longer had declarable interests in RU 20/1491 in relation to employment or any other connection with the applicant and made respective statements of clarification of their positions in relation to that planning application. Councillor Howorth remained in the meeting and voted on the application. Notwithstanding the fact that he had no declarable interest now, Cllr Kusneraitis withdrew from the meeting when the application was considered on the basis of employment interests which he had previously declared in relation to the applicant, but which now no longer existed.

514    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. An objector addressed the Committee on planning application RU 20/1777 as shown below, but the applicant did not wish to exercise their right of reply.

**RESOLVED that –**

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

**APP NO**

**LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION**

**RU 20/0892**

**6 Holland Gardens, Egham**

Proposed 1 ½ storey rear extension and conversion of existing garage to habitable accommodation. Replacement roof with raised eaves level to provide accommodation at first floor level (amended plans received)

*The Committee understood the concerns of residents regarding flooding, and noted the site was located within Flood Zone 3B. However, the Committee also noted the development was classed as minor development under the NPPG and that such developments were unlikely to raise significant flood risk issues. The Committee therefore judged the proposal was unlikely to significantly increase flood risk, and as such refusal could not be justified.*

*In response to Member questions on the Householder Guidance which is used to assess the impact of development proposals on neighbouring amenity, Officers confirmed that the 60 degree test which was typically used to assess the impact of a single storey extension had comfortably been complied with and whilst there would be a minor breach of the 45 degree test, it was not considered that there would be any material impact on neighbouring amenities.*

**RESOLVED that-**

**The CHDMBC be authorised to GRANT permission subject to conditions, reasons and informatives listed on agenda.**

**RU 20/1491**

**Belgravia House and Cheval Manor, Bishopsgate Road, Englefield Green**

Replacement dwelling and associated buildings, underground basement car museum, dance studio and storage with access ramp and Pedestrian access stairwell and two underground tunnels connecting Cheval Manor and Belgravia House to the underground basement

*Some Members commented on the potential environmental damage which could be caused by the tunnelling operations. Members also commented on the disposal of the resultant soil from the tunnelling operations and sought reassurance that this would not be transported off site.*

*Officers confirmed that the proposed new tunnels would not have any new impacts on trees compared with the previously approved schemes. With regard to soil removal, the CHDMBC commented that the tunnelling operation would largely be a cut and fill task and that as the site was large any excess excavated soil would likely be redistributed on-site, but to reassure Members a condition could be imposed requiring submission of details for disposal of excavated soil if planning permission was authorised.*

*The Committee was supportive of the application and the imposition of an additional condition regarding arrangements for disposal of excavated soil.*

**RESOLVED that:**

**The CHDMBC be authorised to GRANT permission subject to conditions, reasons and informatives listed on agenda with an additional condition requiring submission of a scheme to the Local Planning Authority detailing use and disposal of excavated soil.**

**RU 20/1777      18 Ongar Place, Addlestone**

Erection of a detached three-bedroom chalet bungalow following the demolition of existing garage. With off-street parking and garden amenity space, and access taken off Coombelands Lane (Proposal to supercede approved application RU 19/0449) .

*The main concern expressed by some Members was over highway safety in that vehicles would have to reverse out of the site onto Coombelands Lane rather than in forward gear .The CHDMBC commented that whilst ideally it would be preferable for vehicles to leave the site in forward gear ,reversal out of a site was not uncommon and the County Highway Authority had raised no objection to the application subject to conditions, one of which would require provision of visibility zones onto Coombelands Lane .Refusal of the application on highway safety grounds could not be justified in planning terms, nor would a condition requiring provision of turning space within the site to allow vehicles to leave the site in forward gear be reasonable or enforceable.*

*The Committee noted the position on CIL liability and the CHDMBC agreed to provide Members with a Briefing Note in relation to Self-Build Exemptions from CIL.*

**RESOLVED that-**

**The CHDMBC be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions, reasons and informatives listed on the agenda.**

(Mr Egginton, an objector, addressed the Committee on the above application. The applicant did not wish to exercise their right of reply)

**RU 20/1309      302 Woodham Lane, Addlestone**

Reserved matters for landscaping for planning application RU17/1120 (Outline application with some matters reserved for the demolition of existing garage and forecourt sales area and erection of two and half storey apartment block consisting of 14 no one and two bedroom apartments and two retail units with associated access and parking).

*The Committee was fully supportive of the application for Reserved Matters.*

**RESOLVED that-**

**The CHDMBC be authorised to GRANT permission subject to conditions, reasons and informatives listed on agenda**

## 515 HOUSING DELIVERY TEST REPORT

The Committee was provided with information on the Housing Delivery Test, and how Runnymede had performed to date compared to other local Boroughs and Districts since the test was introduced in 2018.

The Housing Delivery Test (HDT) had been introduced through the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in 2018. Its purpose was to calculate the performance of each Borough's housing delivery on an annual basis, and to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of new homes.

A Government data return had to be completed by all Local Authorities in November each year to inform the HDT. The HDT results were then published the following January/February. The results sought to provide up to date statistics on a Borough's performance and to identify if any actions were necessary to assist housing delivery.

The Housing Delivery Test (HDT) was calculated by looking at how many homes were delivered (with adjustments for net student and net other communal accommodation) in a Local Authority area in the last 3 monitoring years (1<sup>st</sup> April - 31<sup>st</sup> March) against the homes required in that same period. The housing requirement figure was determined as the lowest of either: the latest adopted housing requirement figure, or the minimum annual local housing need figure as determined using the standard method for assessing the minimum annual local housing need figure set out in national planning guidance. The formula for calculating a Borough's HDT score and the three potential consequences for a Local authority if their delivery fell below 95% were noted.

The Committee was informed that Runnymede had performed well in its housing delivery since the introduction of the HDT in 2018. The Council had consistently delivered in excess of 100% of its requirement and as such there had been no measures imposed on the Council to date to boost housing delivery. Furthermore, the statistics showed that the Council's performance had improved year on year to date.

There were however indicators that could lessen Runnymede's success from a housing delivery perspective, at least in the short term. For example, any reductions in the HDT result figures in 2021 could potentially be linked to impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic on housebuilding (although the result could be assisted if the Government again made an adjustment to the housing delivery targets of Local Authorities as they did for the 2020 year). There would also be a potential lag between adoption of the Local Plan, granting of planning permission on some of the large allocated sites and the completion of units on the ground. However, beyond the short-term position, the recent adoption of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan was considered extremely positive in terms of putting Runnymede in the best position to meet its housing delivery targets in future years up to 2030.

Performance in the Housing Delivery Test would continue to be monitored, with Members being updated on the results in future years.

Officers were thanked for their achievement and in response to requests from Members agreed to provide Members with i) further information on the data used for inclusion in the Government Data Return which informed the HDT, and ii) the trajectory for affordable housing.

(The meeting ended at 8.18 pm)

Chairman