

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

14 April 2021 at 6.30pm via MS Teams

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

Members of the Committee absent: Councillor M Nuti

Councillors D Clarke, E Gill, J Olorenshaw and N Prescott also attended for all or part of the meeting via MS Teams as non-members of the Committee.

528 HRH PRINCE PHILIP

The Chairman called for a one minute silence in memory of HRH Prince Philip who had recently passed away.

529 NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Group mentioned below had notified the Chief Executive of their wish that the change listed below be made to the membership of the Committee. The change was for a fixed period ending on the day after the meeting and thereafter the Councillor removed would be reappointed.

<u>Group</u>	<u>Remove</u>	<u>Appoint instead</u>
Conservative	Cllr Anderson- Bassey	Cllr Maddox

The Chief Executive had given effect to the change to Committee membership in accordance with section 16(2) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989

530 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 24 March 2021 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

531 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Nuti.

532 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests declared.

533 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.

RESOLVED that –

the following applications be determined as indicated: -

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

RU 19/1659	Runnymede Hotel and Spa, Windsor Road, Old Windsor, Egham
-------------------	--

Extension to West Wing of hotel to create additional bedrooms (Use Class C1) and associated parking.

Some comment was made on overlooking of the lock keepers cottage, the lack of reference to impact on Green Belt in the report in relation to compliance with Local Plan Policy IE4, provision of parking spaces for disabled persons and provision of Electric Charging points in some of those spaces, and surface water drainage associated with the proposed car park .

Officers commented that the proposed development would not be extending any closer to the lock keepers cottage than the existing hotel retaining a separation distance of approx. 15 metres and that occupancy of the rooms would offer similar views that already exist from other parts of the hotel and as such it was considered that the proposed extension would not materially result in new permanent overlooking or the perception of being overlooked given the existing relationship with the hotel.

Green Belt considerations had already been fully addressed in the report and did not require repeat consideration in respect of Policy IE4; the report clearly set out the balancing between the acknowledged harms to the Green Belt with the very special circumstances including job creation and wider economic benefits both given weight in national and local policies, which clearly outweighed that harm, and in all other respects the development aligned with the objectives of Policy IE4. It was then necessary to consider if the particular benefits and circumstances of the application outweighed the harms to the Green Belt, and this was a decision for the Committee as the decision maker.

The CHDMBC confirmed that the applicant had stated that provision would be made for parking for disabled persons and Members agreed that there was ample parking already at the hotel including disabled parking close to the entrance. A Member familiar with the site confirmed that the hotel had a good quantum of well located disabled parking in place already. In light of this, Members did not consider a condition was necessary regarding disabled persons parking provision. The general provision of ECV points had been addressed by condition 14.

With regard to surface water drainage and the choice of materials for the new hardsurfacing, a robust Flood Risk Assessment had been submitted and the EA had raised no objection to the scheme subject to a condition (No 10) requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures identified in that Assessment. In addition, Condition 7 also required details of surface water drainage to be submitted for approval before commencement of construction of the development.

RESOLVED that-

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

RU 21/0243 Hawthorne, Ten Acre Lane, Egham

Retrospective application for a replacement garage (partially complete)
Demolition of existing modular garage.

The Committee fully supported the application and no new salient planning points were raised by Members.

RESOLVED that:

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

RU 21/0137 61 Farleigh Road, New Haw, Addlestone

Proposed single storey front, side and rear extension following removal of existing rear extension. New roof containing habitable accommodation with side box dormer and roof lights.

In response to a comment from a Member regarding the roof design ,Officers confirmed that the inclusion of a ridge on the roof was in character with the area and would not harmfully impact on the appearance of the dwelling or impact on the streetscene and complied with Local Plan Policy EE1 in this respect.

The Committee supported the application.

RESOLVED that-

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

(Mr Pope, an objector, requested that the Council's Legal representative read out his objection and Mr R Butler, the applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application.)

RU 20/1256 34 Moorfields Close, Staines-upon Thames

Garden outbuilding to provide ancillary accommodation (BBQ area).

Some comment was made on potential conversion of building into habitable accommodation and possibility of imposition of a condition to prevent such conversion.

The CHDMBC stated that a condition was not appropriate as the building could lawfully be used for purposes ancillary to the main residential use. The Committee accepted this advice.

The Committee supported the application.

RESOLVED that-

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

534 PARKING GUIDANCE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) NEXT STEPS

The Committee considered the potential next steps to move forward the Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

At the Planning Committee meeting on 4 November 2020 the Committee had deferred approval of the draft Parking Guidance SPD for public consultation in order to allow Officers to further review, in conjunction with Members, the proposed parking standards relating to student accommodation and office accommodation over which Members had expressed strong concerns .

Since that meeting, Officers had undertaken a benchmarking exercise of student and office accommodation in other Local Authority areas, the findings of which and a series of possible options setting out the pros and cons for each were discussed with members of the Planning Committee at a special working group meeting held in December 2020. The steer given to Officers at that meeting was that they should prepare a specification for tender to secure transport consultancy support to help gather robust evidence on which a parking standard(s) for purpose-built student accommodation might be based. In addition, Officers were also asked to seek transport consultancy advice on office parking standards.

Informal quotes had been obtained from transport consultancy firms which were reported and these indicated that a budget of £20,000 would need to be secured for the required transport consultancy support. No budgetary provision had originally been made in the 2021/22 budget for transport consultancy to support the production of the Parking SPD. The budget for the 2021/22 financial year (including monies which were to be requested to be carried over from the 2020/21 financial year) had been allocated to essential updates to the Local Plan evidence base to underpin the review of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and other committed projects (such as the Englefield Green Conservation Area Appraisal and Blue and Green Infrastructure SPD; both of which were already commissioned and the projects underway). A large chunk of the Local Plan evidence base needed to be updated by the end of the 2021/22 financial year in order to enable the review and update of the Local Plan to be completed within the 5-year period required by the NPPF.

However, the Committee was informed that following the publication of the Planning Committee agenda, the Chief Executive had confirmed that the £20,000 addition to the Planning Policy budget could be met from his Community Initiatives Fund which was held in the Corporate Management Committee budget. As this transfer would be for over £10,000, under Financial Regulations, the approval of the Corporate Management Committee would be required.

Support for the expenditure among Members was finely balanced. Some Members did not consider the expenditure was justified whilst other Members considered it was the preferred way forward in order to address concerns of residents and give greater clarity to developers and residents.

Following a full debate, the Committee decided to request Officers to seek approval from Corporate Management Committee to enable the Planning Policy team to secure the services of a Transport Consultancy firm to underpin a locally derived and robustly evidenced parking standard for both Purpose Built Student Accommodation and Office Accommodation.

If approved by Corporate Management Committee, Officers would prepare a detailed tender specification and share it with members of Planning Committee prior to commencement of

the formal tender exercise. The specification would cover Englefield Green and Egham areas. Members stated that the timing of the evidence gathering was important to gain an accurate position post Covid and to reflect the numbers of students returning to Royal Holloway University. A provisional timetable for the remainder of the Parking SPD project if approved and subject to agreement with the appointed consultant, was noted. Officers would engage with Members throughout the process. Finally, Members noted from the report that the findings of any independent professional transport consultancy advice sought might not address the concerns raised previously by the Committee.

RESOLVED that:

Corporate Management Committee be requested to approve that an additional £20,000 be provided to the Planning Policy budget for the 2021/22 financial year via a transfer of budget from the Chief Executive's Community Initiatives Fund to allow transport consultancy support to be procured to help underpin a locally derived and robustly evidenced parking standard(s) for:

- a) Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA); and**
- b) Office accommodation**

Under Standing Order 39.2 a request was made by Cllr Kusneraitis for the names of those voting on the above- mentioned matter to be recorded and the voting was as follows:

For (7): Councillors Broadhead, Howorth, King, Kusneraitis, Maddox, Sohi and Willingale.

Against (6): Councillors Cressey, Gillham, Mullens, Snow, Whyte and Wilson.

Abstentions: (0)

535 THAMES BASIN HEATHS SPECIAL PROTECTION AREA SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) - ADOPTION

The Committee received and considered the updated Thames Basin Heaths SPA SPD setting out the avoidance and mitigation measures required to prevent development causing significant adverse impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA.). The SPD updated the existing Thames Basin Heaths SPA Supplementary Planning Guidance (2009) and took into account advice that had been issued since the 2009 SPG was adopted.

The main change to the guidance involved moving from a dwelling based to an occupancy based financial contribution. The draft SPD had been subject to public consultation from 30 November 2020 to 18 January 2021 and a total of 10 representations had been received, a summary of which and Officer response thereon had been placed on the website. Following consultation and other material considerations a number of modifications were proposed to the SPD for clarification as set out below:

- Description of protected sites amended to reflect UK exiting the EU;
- Occupancy of C2 or C3 care homes and student accommodation to be considered on an individual basis under advice from Natural England;
- Clarification that only net additional dwellings in class C3 give rise to effects on the SPA and deletion of reference to replacement dwellings and extensions;
- Clarification that prior approvals cannot proceed and will not be assigned SANG until written agreement under the Habitats Regulations is given by the Council;
- Occupancy rate for Traveller pitches added to guide SANG/SAMM contributions from Traveller sites;

- Confirmation that the SANG contribution includes the uplift agreed by the TBH Joint Strategic Planning Board on 19 November 2020 to account for inflation since 2010;
- Clarification for contributions made by instalments;
- Further detail added to confirm that where occupancy is unknown at the time of application the Council may apply a formula based approach similar to the approach in the Infrastructure Delivery & Prioritisation SPD;
- Criteria added to SANG design guidance to confirm that it will be expected that access points will be designed to be accessible to those using mobility scooters and that a proportion of SANG parking should be disabled parking bays.
- Amending SANG rates in Tables 7 & 9 to 2 decimal places rather than rounding numbers to ensure accuracy.

The above-mentioned modifications were not considered significant in nature and further consultation was not warranted. As such, the SPD as modified was recommended for adoption with an implementation date of 15 April 2021.

The change of most significance related to the current approach to calculation and collection of SANG and SANG payments (on a per unit basis) which did not adequately address the potential increase in residents within the vicinity of the SPA. To ensure that the strategy was more equitable in better reflecting the impacts from larger homes on the SPA, it was proposed to alter the approach to calculating developer contributions from a dwelling to an occupancy based tariff. This would align the Council's strategy with that of the other local authorities affected by the Thames Basin Heaths. The strategy set out in the SPD would also help to ensure that SANGs were delivered appropriately within the Borough and were managed and maintained in perpetuity, in accordance with Natural England's guidance.

The Committee supported the adoption of the modified SPD and Members were pleased that the Guidelines for creation of SANGS now required access points to be designed so that access by those persons using a mobility scooter or similar was achievable, and provision of disabled parking bays.

Officers offered to provide more information on terminology used in section 3 on Care Homes and on the range of criteria against which student accommodation would be assessed but Members did not wish any amendment to be made to the SPD in this regard.

RESOLVED that

the draft Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area SPD, as modified and reported, be APPROVED for adoption with an implementation date of 15 April 2021

(The meeting ended at 8.53pm)

Chairman