

## Runnymede Borough Council

### Planning Committee

Wednesday, 9 November 2022 at 6.30 pm

Members of the Committee present:	Councillors M Willingale (Chairman), P Snow (Vice-Chairman), A Balkan, A Berardi, J Broadhead, R Bromley, E Gill, C Howorth, R King (In place of A King), C Mann, I Mullens, M Nuti, S Saise-Marshall (In place of V Cunningham), S Whyte and J Wilson.
Members of the Committee absent:	None
In attendance:	Councillor N Prescott.

#### 313 Minutes

Cllr S Whyte asked for additions to be made to the minutes of the meeting held on 5 October 2022 under the section about the Longcross North application to include the following points:

- Report from south west trains about data
- Approach to Surrey Police about the safety angle
- Lack of a path on the access road

The minutes were otherwise signed as a correct record.

#### 314 Apologies for Absence

No apologies received.

#### 315 Declarations of Interest

No interests declared.

#### 316 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. Objectors and applicants and /or their agents addressed the Committee on the applications specified.

#### **RESOLVED that –**

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

#### 317 **RU.22/1421 - The Savill Building, Wick Lane, Englefield Green, Surrey, TW20 0UU**

*Proposal: Full planning permission for proposed temporary Light Trail Event, starting and ending from The Savill Garden Visitor Centre Car Park and circumnavigating the Obelisk Pond along established footpaths/tracks.*

The committee identified traffic management as one of the key issues facing the application. The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control advised that whilst management of the highway was a County Council matter, a routing agreement had been provided and it had been deemed that the road usage associated with the event was suitable. Furthermore it would not be appropriate to impose a condition to require marshals to direct traffic.

In response to a question from a Member, the Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control confirmed that consideration had been given to routing traffic to the Virginia Water car park for a park & ride to the event, however this had been ruled out by the applicant for operational reasons.

The Committee raised concerns about the possible sound generated from the event, and it was advised that low-level festive music would be played but noise barriers had been put in place for the nearest properties, and the attraction that generated the most volume at last year's event would not be at this year's event. The Council's Environmental Health team had assessed the application and deemed the noise levels appropriate.

Concern was also raised from some Members about the narrow, unlit walkway alongside Wick Lane. The impact of the additional traffic was likely to render this stretch unavailable to walkers, however whilst acknowledging this it was considered that the economic benefits of the event outweighed the inconvenience of the few people likely to be on foot in the area during the dark winter months.

In the event of permission being granted, the Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control confirmed that any amendments to the route or allocation of the attractions would mean the application would need to return to Planning Committee to seek approval.

In response to a Member's concern about ecological impacts – particularly around bats – the Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control highlighted that one of the conditions of the application was the completion of annual ecological appraisal carried out by a professional ecologist. Should issues be identified through this process then mitigation would need to be put in place, such as routing away from a particular roost.

Whilst the application was for a four year term, in light of most of the Committee being in favour of a shorter timeframe to be able to monitor the impact, the Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control recommended amending permission to two years, with additional conditions for noise, light and traffic. The onus would be on the applicant to provide the information set out in the additional conditions.

#### **Resolved that –**

**The CHDMBC be authorised to grant planning permission subject to planning conditions 1-10 and informatives 1-2, which also includes amending the description of the development, to reduce the timeframe from four years to two years, as well as additional monitoring conditions relating to noise, light and traffic.**

Mr Lee Simon, an objector, and Mr Stephen Flint-Wood the applicant, addressed the committee on this application.

#### **318 RU.22/0611 - 15 Kingswood Close, Englefield Green, TW20 0NQ**

*Proposal: Full planning permission for part two storey part single storey rear extension and rear dormer. Two storey side extension. Replacement of front double storey section, new front bay windows, open porch and fenestration changes.*

A Member commented positively on the suitability of the application compared to what had come before, with more consideration given to surrounding neighbours without a loss of space.

Another Member raised concern that the development would significantly encroach on the boundary and have an overbearing and oppressive impact on a neighbouring kitchen, however the length of the application had been reduced and it had been cut in from both boundaries, leaving the Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control to conclude that it was in accordance with the council's borough design guide.

Further concern was raised about the glass roof on the ground extension that could impact neighbouring properties' privacy as well as the associated light pollution. However the Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control felt it would be an incredibly rare scenario to refuse on that basis, particularly as the light was not considered significant or oppressive.

In response to concerns that the glass roof could potentially hinder a future planning application from a neighbouring property, it was highlighted that under planning law potential future scenarios could not be taken into account, whilst the protected tree in the garden had been assessed and no concerns raised. Anything else removed from the garden was within the applicant's gift.

**Resolved that –**

**The CHDMBC be authorised to grant planning permission subject to planning conditions 1-4 and informative 1 as set out in the agenda.**

319 **RU.22/0270 - 11-13 St Judes Road, Englefield Green, Surrey, TW20 0BY**

*Proposal: Full planning permission for alterations and extension to Basement store area, side and rear extension to Ground Floor Shop and 1st Floor Flat and a new Shop Front.*

Several committee members commented that the application was an example of good practise, with the application amended to address the concern of nearby residents. It was also considered a positive move that a run-down shop would be brought up to a better standard.

**Resolved that –**

**The CHDMBC be authorised to grant planning permission subject to planning conditions 1-3 and informatives 1-4 as set out in the agenda.**

320 **RU.22/0729 - Unit 7, Fordwater Trading Estate, Medcalf And Co Limited, Ford Road, Chertsey, KT16 8HG**

*Proposal: Full planning permission for the redevelopment of existing industrial/commercial site to provide a new industrial/commercial unit.*

The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control confirmed that the application was coming to committee due to it being some 50sqm over the threshold for permitted development.

The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control clarified that whilst 10% of the energy consumption would be from renewable sources there was no scope to dictate how that 10% was made up, although the developer had indicated it would be via PV panels.

**Resolved that –**

**The CHDMBC be authorised to grant planning permission subject to planning conditions 1-21 and informatives 1-10 as set out in the agenda.**

321 **Caxton Avenue Conservation Area**

The Senior Planning Policy Officer advised that officers were of the view that 26 dwellings and their curtilages at Coombelands Lane and Caxton Avenue were suitable for designation as a conservation area due to their special architectural and historic interest.

This view was informed in consultation with Surrey County Council's Historic Environment Planning team and RBC's Heritage officer, who undertook separate appraisals of the area.

The properties are in an area that was in a proposed garden village that never materialised and has links to the Caxton printworks.

A proposed consultation would take place for four weeks from Friday 18 November, with the results of that consultation fed back to a future committee.

The committee chair confirmed his support for the proposal, highlighting the importance of recognising heritage.

**Resolved that –**

**Committee approved the draft Caxton Avenue Conservation Area Appraisal for public consultation for a period of four weeks, commencing on 18th November 2022.**

322 **Adoption of the Runnymede Parking Guidance Supplementary Planning Document**

The Corporate Head of Planning, Policy and Economic Development reported that following a six week consultation period on the Parking Guidance Supplementary Planning Document, 16 responses were received, and these responses had been reflected in the updated policy.

The most significant alterations were considered to relate to the addition of further information in chapter 3 on the trends of car ownership and additional information on cycling, as well as changes to the residential parking standards.

The existing guidance was adopted over twenty years old and was therefore significantly out of date. It was also given limited weight by development management in the decision making process.

The new guidance sought to provide more certainty for developers and communities relating to vehicle and cycle parking in association with new development, but possessed the flexibility to assess different parking schemes when an alternative approach may be appropriate.

Whilst acknowledging the Council would never be in a position to please everyone about parking, the committee chair added his support to the document, which was echoed by the committee.

It was added that getting people out of their cars would be extremely challenging until cycling infrastructure improved, and it was hoped that the Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and CIL monies would address those concerns in the long-term.

Officers confirmed that the allocation of CIL funding would be covered in the CIL governance arrangements and this document would not override any borough prioritisation documents, and whilst each application would be considered on its own merits, any developer that deviated from the standards set out within would be asked why.

**Resolved that –**

**1. The Runnymede Parking Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as modified and as set out at Appendix A was approved for adoption with an implementation date of 16 November 2022.**

**2. Delegated authority was approved for the Local Plans Manager, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Authority to update the SPD on receipt of the updated EV charging standards published by Surrey County Council (expected imminently).**

323 **Gypsy and Traveller allocation scheme SPD**

With the agreement of the Planning Committee Chair and Vice Chair, this item was deferred to a future meeting due to officer illness, along with the need to consider the implications of a relevant court case on the accompanying Equalities Assessment.

(The meeting ended at 8.50 pm.)

Chairman