

Runnymede Borough Council

Planning Committee

Wednesday, 2 March 2022 at 6.30 pm

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

Members of the Committee absent: Councillors M Willingale and D Anderson-Bassey.

In attendance: Councillor S Williams.

480 Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 9 February, 2022 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

481 Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Willingale and Anderson-Bassey.

482 Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were received.

483 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 and Applicant addressed the Committee on the application specified.

RESOLVED that –

the following applications be determined as indicated: -

APP NO

LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION

RU 20/0810

4 Aymer Close, Staines-upon-Thames

The retention and redistribution of soils at land at 4 Aymer Close and the use of the land for the private grazing of horses.

The Committee supported refusal of this application on the basis of the advice from the Environment Agency (EA) on the grounds that the works would increase flood risk at the site and elsewhere.

In response to a comment from a Member on the approach taken by

the EA, the CHDMBC noted that the EA was the statutory consultee on flooding matters whose consultation comments should be afforded significant weight. Officers had sought further confirmation from the EA with regards their approach to flood risk on the site. The EA confirmed that it was confident it could substantiate its proposed reason and demonstrate the planning harm with regards flood risk caused by the proposal.

The EA recommended that Planning Permission be refused.

RESOLVED that-

The CHDMBC be authorised to refuse permission for the following reason;

The applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed retention and redistribution of material on the site, over and above the 2010 land level at the site(level of the land pre land raising),would not result in an increase in flood risk. As such the proposal fails to comply with Policy EE13 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and policy and guidance within the NPPF and NPPG.

RU 21/1790

10 Station Parade, Virginia Water

Conversion to restaurant with small kitchen

This application had been deferred at the last meeting of the Committee to enable the Council's Environmental Health Officer to comment on the noise report submitted by the applicant. The comments of the Council's EHO were reported on the circulated Addendum.

Scaled elevations had been received confirming that the vent would be 2 metres away from the nearest window.

Further revisions had also been made to the extract canopy design to incorporate an acoustic Lined 90 Degree Bend and a revised drawing submitted. This drawing also clearly showed the installation of a Carbon Filter Unit, Antivibration Mountings, 400 MUB System Air unit and 2 Silencers.

The Council's Environmental Health Officer had confirmed that the noise insulation system would be acceptable with the noise acoustic report confirming that the vent would operate 5db below background noise level.

The applicant's proposal to provide an acoustic suspended ceiling within the restaurant area and hence prevent airborne noise within the restaurant area affecting residents above would also provide noise insulation and, if the calculations were correct, should not lead to noise nuisance conditions to the resident above the restaurant area.

The sound proofing measures would be fully implemented prior to occupation of the premises and retained and maintained thereafter. A condition to this effect was recommended.

The position on odour remained unchanged. The applicant proposed to have a system which provided fine filtration, and this was followed by carbon filtration. The fine filtration would be conducted using canopy baffle filters, grease filters and pre paper/bag filters. Once this was undertaken the carbon filters would then remove any remaining odours. The applicant had stated that this would require a strict regime of cleaning and replacing filters in order to keep the system operating at peak efficiency and hence in a state which could remove the material that could cause odour. A condition was therefore recommended to secure the proper maintenance of the system.

The Committee considered that the measures proposed addressed their previous concerns over the siting of the extraction system and its potential impact in terms of noise and odour on residential amenities of the occupiers of the flat above and thanked the Council's EHO and the applicant for their work on securing improvements to this application which addressed their concerns.

RESOLVED that-

The CHDMBC be authorised to grant planning permission subject to conditions (conditions 2,4 and 5 amended and condition 3 deleted as per Addendum), reasons and informatives listed on the Agenda .

(Ms Slocombe, an objector, and Mr Villalta, applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application)

(The meeting ended at 7.05 pm.)

Chairman