

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

28 July 2021 at 6.30 pm

Members of Committee present: Councillors P Snow (Vice-Chairman in the Chair) ,D Anderson-Bassey, J Broadhead, D Cotty, M Cressey, R Edis, L Gillham, C Howorth, M Kusneraitis, I Mullens, M Nuti, J Sohi and S Whyte

Members of the Committee absent: Councillors M Maddox and J Wilson

Councillors D Coen,E Gill,M Harnden and R King also attended as non-members of the Committee.

165 FIRE PRECAUTIONS

The Fire Precautions were read out.

166 NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

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

<u>Group</u>	<u>Remove</u>	<u>Appoint instead</u>
Conservative Independent	Cllr Willingale Cllr Mann	Cllr Howorth Cllr Cressey

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

167 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 23 June 2021 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

168 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Maddox and Wilson.

169 **LAND AT WHITEHALL FARM, STROUDE ROAD, EGHAM (RU 21/0597) - CONSULTATION BY SCC**

The Committee received a report on a Consultation from Surrey CC with regards an application for the extraction of sand and gravel from land at Whitehall Farm together with the erection of processing plant and associated mineral infrastructure, the provision of a new access from Stroude Road, restoration involving the importation of inert materials to agriculture, parkland, wet grassland, reedbeds, and new woodland on a site of 40 ha, and the temporary stopping up of footpath 64, and permanent diversion of footpath 39.

For clarification, the CHDMBC explained that a Planning Application had been made to Surrey County Council in its role as the Minerals Planning Authority. Surrey County Council was the determining Planning Authority and had the final decision with regards whether or not to award planning permission. As the relevant Planning Authority, Surrey had a duty to consider any representations and all material planning considerations brought to its attention during this consultation process. The role of RBC in this process was as a consultee.

The Development Management team on behalf of RBC as LPA had made an initial response to Surrey CC in its capacity as consultee raising no objection in principle to the application on the basis that the site had been allocated as a preferred minerals site in the Primary Aggregates Development Plan Document 19 July 2011 (Preferred Site E). The response drew attention to the numerous planning points and potential material considerations raised by residents and had asked that these issues be given particular scrutiny by SCC in determination of the application.

The Planning Application had attracted significant interest from local residents and Ward Members. A number of Ward Members had contacted Officers after the consultation response had been issued requesting that the consultation response be reviewed by the Planning Committee. As this was a consultation response and not a formal determination on the award of a planning permission there were no legal or procedural reasons why this could not occur. Whilst this was not normal practice, giving consideration to a number of Member requests and in light of the local interest in the matter the CHDMBC had agreed to the request for the matter to be referred to the Committee to give Members an opportunity to review and give further consideration to the response. Members of the committee expressed their appreciation for that opportunity.

Cllrs Gillham and Mullens articulated their strong concerns on the application which were based on grounds of impact on traffic, flooding and air quality. In addition, Cllr Gillham also questioned whether, in view of the age of the Minerals Plan and its forthcoming review, evidence still existed to confirm if this site was appropriate for extraction or was still genuinely required. These concerns were fully supported by other Members in the interests of residents and communities.

The Committee selected option 2 in the officer report and agreed that the initial RBC consultation response should be superseded with a letter of strong objection from the Planning Committee based on the similar grounds to those articulated by Cllrs Gillham and Mullens which also reflected points made by other members.

The CHDMBC would draft the response and circulate it to all members of the Committee (Cllr R King to be included for information purposes). The final response would be signed off by Cllr Snow (acting chair for this meeting) and despatched to SCC in the Planning Committee's name.

The CHDMBC also confirmed that any significant revised details subject to further consultation from SCC would be reported to Committee membership for appropriate consideration.

RESOLVED that

The initial RBC consultation response be superseded with a letter of strong objection from the Planning Committee based on the grounds articulated by Cllrs Gillham and Mullens (Flooding, air quality, traffic and whether SCC should be considering if this site is genuinely required). The CHDMBC would draft a response based on this debate and circulate it to all members of the Committee (Cllr R King to be included for information purposes) prior to sign off by Cllr Snow and despatch to SCC in the Planning Committee's name.

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

For (12): Councillors Anderson-Bassey, Broadhead, Cotty, Cressey, Edis, Gillham, Howorth, Kusneraitis, Mullens, Snow, Sohi, and Whyte

Against (0):

Abstention (1): Councillor Nuti as he is a member of SCC Cabinet.

170 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. No objectors or applicants had registered to speak.

RESOLVED that –

the following applications be determined as indicated: -

APP NO

LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION

RU 21/0382

Land at Kitsmead Recycling Centre, Kitsmead Lane, Lyne

Erection of two storey office and repurposing of existing light industrial units and upgrading of existing estate road and site yard surface and reprofiling of bank alongside site boundary.

Some concern was expressed over removal of the proposed condition restricting hours of vehicular access to the new and refurbished buildings, but the CHDMBC confirmed that as the hours of use of the site currently had no restrictions, it would not be reasonable to apply this to a small part of it, particularly as there was no obvious additional planning harm arising.

Comment was made over the cumulative impact of HGV movements in Kitsmead Lane. CHDMBC indicated that the use of the wider site was not subject to this application.

The CHDMBC indicated that he would discuss with Cllrs S Whyte and Kusneraitis what options (if any) there are for the potential for reducing neighbour impacts or perceived issues relating to HGVs.

The CHDMBC informed the Committee that the SCC Environment Team had raised queries a few hours before the start of the meeting regarding the siting of the office block on the site of the existing green waste composting facility and its implications for future operation of the facility, and what measures had been taken to ensure the building would be constructed in such a way to prevent the risk of landfill gas entering it from the adjacent former SCC landfill site. The CHDMBC would consider the two queries raised under authority delegated to him, and if these materially impacted on the recommendation to grant permission, appropriate conditions would be imposed.

RESOLVED that

- i) The CHDMBC be authorised to grant permission subject to conditions (deletion of condition 11 and amendment of condition 12 as per addendum), reasons and informatives**

listed on agenda, with additional condition requiring removal of buildings as per the application; and

- ii) The CHDMBC consider the two queries raised by SCC Environment Team under authority delegated to him, and if these materially impact on the recommendation to grant permission, appropriate conditions be imposed.

RU 21/0739 **Land at Whitehill Place, Virginia Water**

The installation of 2 vehicle access control barriers, with free standing intercoms, at each entrance to Whitehill Place.

Some Members had concerns that the barriers would have an urbanising effect in this residential area, would form perceived barriers to local people moving along Whitehill Place, which would fail to promote social interaction and community cohesion, and could cause difficulties for access for emergency vehicles.

Compared to the barriers which were refused in 2019, the barriers now proposed had a slender design with low height when down of approximately 1m. The barriers also matched the appearance of similar barriers installed in the surrounding area and were not considered to be a prominent feature within the wider street scene.

Regarding community cohesion, Officers confirmed that the proposed scheme now only proposed barriers that covered the width of the road with no impediment to pedestrians using the pavement. It was also now a material consideration that the applicant had demonstrated a scheme for bollards in the same location could be constructed under 'Permitted Development' and would have a similar effect in controlling vehicle movements whilst not impeding pedestrians. This was considered to represent a material fallback position such that Officers considered the development would not be harmful to social interaction and community cohesion. Officers advised the Committee that the previous reasons for refusal had been overcome and the Committee accepted that there was no planning reason to justify refusal.

The safety aspects of the barriers for emergency vehicles had been addressed in the submitted application.

RESOLVED that:

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

171 **GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) INITIAL CONSULTATION**

The Committee was informed of the development of a new draft Supplementary Planning Document (draft SPD) which set out guidance for applicants of all scales of development in terms of how they could deliver enhanced or new green & blue infrastructure (GBI) features within their developments and achieve biodiversity net gain.

The Council had held a Stakeholder Workshop in March 2020 with interested parties to gain an understanding of what a GBI SPD should include. The issues/points raised at that stakeholder event had been taken into account as appropriate when drafting the SPD .

The draft SPD:

- Provided context and background for GBI and the network in Runnymede including key features and connections;
 - Included a section on how to use the SPD to guide applicants in delivering GBI features in accordance with 2030 Local Plan policies SD7, EE11 & EE12;
 - Set out a separate section for householder developments on how they could retain, enhance and provide GBI features including for biodiversity;
 - Set out a three-step approach for applicants of minor & major developments to follow including carrying out an audit of GBI on and near site, opportunities for enhancing and providing new GBI features on-site and how these would be incorporated into development;
 - Set out 6 design principles for minor & major developments including delivery of a multi-functional GBI network, reinforcing local character & sense of place, supporting nature & biodiversity, climate change, contributing to health & well-being and managing & maintaining GBI;
 - Included a number of criteria within each design principle on how developers could incorporate GBI into development as well as guidance that applicants should follow;
 - Included signposts to good practice and other guidance for delivering GBI within development.
- Incorporated appendices which set out opportunities to deliver enhancements and improvements for different GBI typologies.

Public consultation on the draft SPD would be undertaken for a period of 7 weeks from 9 August 2021 to 27 September 2021. The period for public consultation had been originally proposed to start on 2 August and run for 8 weeks. However, as the Council would be changing its web system on the 4 August, any weblinks placed in consultation correspondence when consultation was due to start on the 2 August would no longer be accessible on or after the 4 August. Reduction to a 7-week consultation period would still be within the statutory 4 week requirement.

The Committee was fully supportive of the SPD and public consultation thereon.

RESOLVED that

the draft Green & Blue Infrastructure SPD be APPROVED for public consultation for a period of seven weeks from 9 August-27 September 2021.

(The meeting ended at 8.27 pm)

Chairman