

## Runnymede Borough Council

### Planning Committee

Wednesday, 18 January 2023 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, V Cunningham, E Gill, C Howorth, S Jenkins (In place of I Mullens), R King (In place of A King), C Mann, M Nuti, S Whyte and J Wilson.

Members of the Committee absent: None.

#### 450 Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2022 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

#### 451 Apologies for Absence

No apologies for absence were received.

#### 452 Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

#### 453 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**

#### 454 **RU.21/1766 - Wheelers Green, Bittams Lane, Chertsey, KT16 9RG**

*Proposal: Construction of 6 apartments within two separate blocks, with revised vehicular access from Bittams Lane, landscaping and sustainable drainage systems.*

A Committee Member sought reassurance that the studios were not in breach of Local Plan policy SL19 around housing mix and size requirements, and was advised by the Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control that the scheme had been applied for as a one-person unit, there was no reason to dispute this, and the sizing and layout of the scheme was acceptable and in line with standards, whilst private gardens and landscaped areas were also available as a viable alternative outdoor space.

It was added that there was no reason that the wider site should not be able to accompany the expected minimum 75 units. In the officers' view was that the quantum of development on the site was appropriate given the constraints of the presence of a listed building, and that it was apparent that artificial sub-division had not occurred.

The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control went on to acknowledge the need for affordable housing in the borough, but it was officers' view that the development did not meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing, primarily due to the constraint of the listed building and that the site had not been artificially divided.

The Committee were advised that the applicant had provided supplementary information to the highways authority and carried out speed assessments along Bittams Lane. The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control had previously passed on the Committee's concerns about Bittams Lane to the highways authority and continue to raise this issue with County, there was however no reason to refuse this application as it was technically safe and part of a site allocation.

Whilst generally supportive of the application, several Committee members expressed concern about the number of visitor parking spaces. The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control agreed to follow up with the applicant under delegated authority to try and negotiate additional spaces prior to issuing a decision notice, this was to be a delegated matter, however he would consider bringing the matter back to Committee if he deemed it appropriate if the considered it significantly altered the scheme.

**Resolved that –**

- i) The CHDMBC was authorised to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement and compliance with conditions 1-17 and informatives 1-10.**
- ii) The CHDMBC to refuse planning permission should the Section 106 legal agreement not progress to his satisfaction.**

Mr Lewis, an objector, and Mr Malhotra, the applicant, addressed the Committee on this application.

**455 RU.22/0612 - 36 Queen Mary's Drive, Addlestone, KT15 3TW**

*Proposal: Change of use of existing dwelling to 2 flats with associated alterations, including two storey side extension.*

A Member sought clarification on the timing of the delivery of the second electric charging point. The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control would amend the condition wording under delegated authority to clarify that both electric charging points will be provided simultaneously.

**Resolved that –**

- i) The CHDMBC was authorised to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement and compliance with conditions 1-7.**
- ii) The CHDMBC to refuse the application should the Section 106 legal agreement not progress to his satisfaction.**

**456 RU.21/2188 - Park House, Wick Road Egham, Englefield Green, TW20 0HJ**

*Proposal: Change of use of building from single residential dwelling (C3 Use Class) and two storey extension to provide 8 dwellings comprising 4 x 2 bed and 4 x 3 bed (C3 Use Class), new access, associated car parking and plant, bin, and cycle storage.*

In response to a query from a Member about the access road at the location, including the loss of trees, the Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control advised that this was a re-submission of a previous application where the access road and subsequent loss of trees had been deemed acceptable, including those trees with a TPO. The Council's Tree Officer had reviewed the plans in significant detail once more and considered that there remained no reasons to raise an objection particularly given the recently lapsed permission,

The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control agreed that the timing of the condition under heating and cooling technologies could be more clear, and under delegated authority would amend the wording to reflect that modern heating and cooling technologies should be utilised "prior to development above slab level".

A Member raised the prospect of the development meeting the affordable housing threshold. The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control confirmed that this had been considered but similar to application RU.21/1766, there was no artificial sub-division and it was officers' view that the development did not meet the threshold.

A Member wished for their concern to be noted about the entrance and exit on Wick Lane owing to the volume of pedestrians crossing to access Windsor Great Park.

Several Members queried the possibility of vehicles reversing onto the main road to exit the development. The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control confirmed that whilst it would not be possible to mitigate against it entirely, a parking and turning area was provided to enable vehicles to exit in a forward gear, the access arrangements had not changed from the previous permission. Potential dangerous driving was a police matter.

The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control acknowledged the lack of footpath along Wick Lane, which had been highlighted at previous planning applications close by, however it was not considered that the provision of a limited number of flats through this application would act as a tipping point to taking action on the matter.

**Resolved that –**

- i) The CHDMBC was authorised to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement and compliance with conditions 1-17 and informatives 1-10.**
- ii) The CHDMBC to refuse planning permission should the Section 106 legal agreement not progress to his satisfaction.**

**457 Update of Planning Enforcement Charter**

The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control advised Committee that the Council had adopted a planning enforcement charter in 2013, which had been updated three years later. It was considered good practice under the National Planning Policy Framework to review and update the charter on a periodic basis.

The intention of the document was to make clear to residents how investigations into breaches of planning control occur and provide clearer detail of the legislative framework the council has to operate within, as well as what constitutes a breach of planning control, and a range of examples had been included within the charter.

There was also a clear guide on what information residents should produce on

enforcement requests, leading to quicker investigations and a higher standard of evidence. A customer care path with a clear route of escalation had also been included.

The Committee chair asked about a communications strategy for the charter, which the Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control would follow up with the Council's Communications team to establish the most appropriate mechanism, including the possibility of a video demo.

The Corporate Head of Development Management and Building Control acknowledged that planning enforcement was a very slow process in all authorities due to the legislation and delays at appeal. He had previously and would continue to provide training sessions for Members on enforcement with practical examples and timelines.

Members were supportive of the refresh to the charter.

**Resolved that –**

- i) The draft 2023 Enforcement Charter was adopted to replace the April 2016 version with effect from 1 February 2023.**
- ii) The CHDMBC was provided delegated authority to make minor typographical or similar corrections as appropriate prior to 1 February 2023.**

(The meeting ended at 7.42 pm.)

Chairman