

Public Document Pack



Planning Committee

Wednesday, 22 June 2022 at 6.30 pm

Council Chamber, Runnymede Civic Centre, Addlestone

Supplementary Agenda

Addendum

Page

2 - 6

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday 22nd June 2022 at 6.30 pm

A D D E N D U M

RU.21/0893 Land at Chilsey Green Farm, Chertsey

Representation

Since the publication of the report four additional letters of representation has been received which raise the following concerns:

- The proposal would be extending close to the Old Coach House and should be moved away.

Officer Comment – the impact of this is considered in paragraph 7.15 of the Committee Report. The detached garage building closest to the property would have a hipped roof with an eave's height of 2.4 metres and a maximum ridge height of 5.2 metres.

- The proposal would add additional vehicles using the road which would have an adverse impact on an already busy road.
- The proposal is for too many houses and gypsy and traveller pitches should not be proposed on the site.
- The Ownership of the ditch has not been established and who is responsible for its upkeep. There is concern that the potential increase in volume of surface Water will flood properties adjacent to the ditch.

Officer comment – Highway safety and the quantum and mix of development have been covered in the Committee Report at paragraphs 7.17-7.22 and 7.1 – 7.16 respectively.

Officer comment - The Drainage ditch is outside of the red line of the application site and is not under the control of the applicant.

Paragraphs 7.25- 7.29 in the report refer to Surface Water Drainage and the Environment Agency, RBC drainage engineers and the LLFA raise no objection to the application. As indicated in the report, surface water at the site would have a controlled release into the ditch and a management and maintenance plan of the surface water strategy is required to be submitted by condition 9.

Following concerns of residents regarding the maintenance of the drainage ditch, condition 26 has been amended to the following.

Prior to the commencement of above ground works of the development hereby approved, details of the provision of the equipped open space (trim trail), public open space and amenity areas, to be incorporated within the development, including a Management Plan, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The Management Plan shall include a phasing plan for delivery and details of the management and maintenance of the public open space and associated play area(s) including potential measures to mitigate the risk of significant debris from the development site entering or obstructing the

Rutherwyck Ditch, in so far as is practicable, and to facilitate access from the Development site to the Rutherwyck Ditch for the Environment Agency, or other such Organisation formally responsible for management of the ditch, for the purposes of its maintenance.

Condition 12 to be amended to facilitate site set up prior to works commencing on site. Revisions in italics

No part of the development *hereby approved* shall be commenced, *except for site set up and enabling works*, until the proposed primary vehicular access to Pycroft Road has been constructed and provided with visibility zones in accordance with the approved plans and thereafter the visibility zones shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction over 0.6m high.

Proposed Car Parking spaces at the site

The applicant has submitted an additional note about car parking with the number of parking spaces proposed at the site referred to in paragraphs 3.3 and 7.19 of the Committee Report to change to 297.

Parking Clarification

The Transport Supplementary Technical Note referred to was prepared in November 2021 and the layout has since been amended, therefore, please find the up-to-date parking figures below:

No of Bedrooms	No of dwellings	Maximum parking standard (spaces per dwelling)	Required Parking provision (total development)	Proposed parking provision	Additional garages (not counted as a parking space)
1	30	1	30	30	0
2	47	1.5-2	70.5-94	81	0
3	64	2	128	128	29
4	29	2	58	58	29
Total	170		286.5-310	297	58

The table above demonstrates that based on the proposed development schedule and Runnymede Borough Councils adopted parking standard's, a maximum of 310 parking spaces should be provided. It is proposed to provide 297 allocated parking spaces for the development.

As previously identified, it is also proposed that a number of the three- and four-bedroom dwellings would provide a garage which has not been included within the parking provision – as identified in the table above. The Department for Transport Manual for Streets Guidance document identifies that only around a third of garages are used for parking, therefore, where a garage has been provided in addition to the required number of parking spaces, it has not been included in the total as it is unlikely to be used for this purpose.

RU.21/2211 Dell Park House and Fairmont Hotel

6. Consultations

Minerals Planning Authority

Comments have been received from the Minerals Planning Authority raising no objection to the application provided that the council is satisfied that the development seeks to:

i) Minimise any waste generated by the construction of the development and maximise opportunities for the recycling of waste (*Officers comments: This is a retrospective application and given the nature of the development it is considered that any waste generated by the development was minimal*)

ii) Sufficient on-site facilities are provided to manage waste during the operation of the development. (*Officers comments: Provision for the storage of waste (including recyclable waste) will be provided and will be collected daily by hotel housekeeping in relation to the existing hotel use*)

iii) Prevent unacceptable amenity impacts on any future occupiers of the development which may arise from future mineral working within the Mineral Safeguarding Area (*Officers comments: Having regard to the positioning of the development and existing/proposed planting there is not considered to be any potential harmful impacts on the occupiers of the development from any future mineral workings*)

Councils Drainage Section

Comments have been received from the Councils Drainage Section regarding additional drainage information received on the 07.06.2022. The Councils Drainage Section raise no objections in principle to the drainage scheme but request further information regarding the 'as built' design to ensure that it meets their requirements. In addition the Councils Drainage Section request the submission of a Management and Maintenance Plan. It is considered that this can be dealt with as a planning condition should planning permission be granted for the development.

Additional planning condition

SuDS (scheme for approval)

Within 4 months of the date of this permission further details of the surface water drainage works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). The submitted details shall:

- a) include further information regarding the design and implementation of the proposed sustainable drainage scheme; and
- b) provide a Management and Maintenance Plan for the proposed sustainable drainage scheme and the existing pond for the lifetime of the development.

Prior to the occupation of the treehouse lodges hereby approved the surface water drainage works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the sustainable urban drainage system shall thereafter be managed and maintained in accordance with the agreed Management and Maintenance Plan.

Reason: To provide a sustainable development and to comply with Policies SD7 and EE13 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.

Amend planning condition 1 (List of approved plans)

Amend planning condition 1 to include the following additional drainage information received on the 07.06.2022:

Proposed drainage (0001-P8) received 07.06.2022:

Greenfield run-off rates received 07.06.2022:

Surface Water Storage received 07.06.2022:

Letters of representation

7 additional letters of representation have been received which are summarised below:

- Strong objections still raised to the development and the application should be refused.
- Permission should not be granted for any significant retrospective developments.
- Being an experienced developer there is no excuse for these to have been built without planning permission which was a deliberate action by the applicant.
- It seems entirely wrong that a major experienced company like the Fairmont could deliberately ignore planning laws and then be granted approval.
- If the Council approves the application it makes a mockery of the whole system and sets a dangerous precedent.
- If the Council does refuse the application then the Planning Inspectorate will sweep in and brush all the objections aside (i.e. the Danehurst development on Harvest Road).
- The buildings encroach on valuable Green Belt which is land that should be protected at all costs. The development is contrary to the NPPF.
- No thought has been given to the protection of the natural environment.
- Additional noise and pollution.
- This development is of no advantage to local residents.
- Taking down the development would now also be irresponsible ecologically but there should be significant consequences.
- Significant loss of flora and fauna which needs to be fully mitigated. Planting a few trees is not enough.
- Burning on site also happened during the construction which is illegal and an offence under the Clean Air Act 1993 and Environmental Protection 1990.
- The council should require further land owned by the applicant to be handed over to wildlife.
- Impacts on climate emergency.
- Strong objections are still raised to the development even if the development may be well built, interesting and lucrative.
- The development is spoiling the village.
- Recent developments by Royal Holloway in the local area have created parking problems for local residents and damage to cars. Officers should be looking at the implications of highway safety for this development.
- No thought has been given to the destruction of wildlife and ancient woodland within the grounds of Fairmont Park. Our countryside is shrinking and great care must be taken to keep it safe and out of the hands of profiteers.
- Concerns are raised that the council will allow further illegal permissions given funding received from the applicant.

An additional letter has been received from the Englefield Green Neighbourhood Forum which is summarised below:

- The Forum opposes this application and consider it should be refused.

- The installation of the tree houses has led to the destruction of woodland and caused major harm to the ecology of the area. We therefore see no circumstances where this application compensates in any way for the harm caused to the ecology of the area and the destruction of trees.
- The offer to remove some minor buildings and to undertake minor landscaping does not compensate for the harm to the Green Belt.
- The application should be rejected and the applicant asked to resubmit, either indicating how he proposes to remove the structures and reinstate the grounds, or offering the removal of substantial habitable buildings, the installation of landscaping and other compensatory measures that can be considered to create special circumstances to justify acceptance of the significant harm that has been done to the Green Belt and truly creates a net zero effect on the ecology of the area.

RU.22/0435 – 19 The Avenue Egham – no update to report