

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEE9 February 2022 at 6.30 pm

Members of Committee present: Councillors M Willingale (Chairman), P Snow (Vice-Chairman), A Balkan, J Broadhead, D Cotty, M Cressey, R Edis, L Gillham, C Howorth, M Kusneraitis, M Maddox, I Mullens, M Nuti, S Whyte and J Wilson

Members of the Committee absent: None

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>
Independent	Cllr Mann	Cllr Cressey
Conservative	Cllr Anderson Bassey	Cllr Howorth
Conservative	Cllr Sohi	Cllr Balkan

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

Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 19 January were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

Apologies for absence

No apologies were received

Declarations of interest

No declarations of interest were made.

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/ agents addressed the Committee on those applications specified.

RESOLVED that –

the following applications be determined as indicated: -

<u>APP NO</u>	<u>LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION</u>
---------------	--

RU 21/1750	65 Lindsay Road, Addlestone
-------------------	------------------------------------

Erect two-bedroom bungalow with parking on land to the rear of 65-69 Lindsay Road.

Despite the amended design of the proposal, some Members still considered the development was out of character with the area and development of an inappropriate character and siting.

Some Members also raised concerns over water levels at the site and potential flooding, potential use of the roof space for habitable accommodation, poor lighting in the road, sightlines, and sewerage capacity.

Other Members considered that the reasons for refusal of the previous application (RU 20/1081), had been satisfactorily addressed by the amendments in this proposal. Some Members noted that this would provide additional housing stock that might appeal to 'down-sizers'.

The CHDMBC commented that a detailed site-specific Flood Risk Assessment had been submitted and provided details of a study carried out to determine whether the site fell within flood zone 2 or 1. The study had been reviewed by the Council's Drainage Engineers who had accepted that the information provided demonstrated that the site fell outside the 1 in a 1000 year flood risk area (Flood zone 1). A reason for refusal on flooding grounds could not therefore be substantiated.

The CHDMBC further commented that Officers considered that the amended proposal was visually acceptable in the street scene with no harm arising to the character of the area and would be a windfall addition to housing supply. Whilst these matters had to be given weight, ultimately the scale, appearance and context of the proposed development were matters for the Committee to make a judgement on.

With regard to use of the roof space, proposed condition 5 would remove permitted development rights in relation to development within Classes B and C of Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order 2015 as amended but, if approved, the condition could be expanded to specifically prohibit habitable accommodation of roof space (with the exception of storage).

With regard to sightlines, the CHDMBC commented that It was unlikely that this stretch of road would attract high speeding vehicles, was relatively straight and SCC Highway Authority had not raised an objection to the application. As the proposal only added one dwelling, the impact on the sewerage system would not be significant to warrant refusal of the application. Finally, It would not be proportionate to impose a condition requiring lighting.

After due consideration, the Committee was minded to approve the application with the amended condition 5 prohibiting habitable accommodation in roof space.

It was noted that a completed Unilateral Undertaking to provide SANG and SAMM contributions in line with TBHSPA SPD 2021 had recently been submitted and was considered by Officers to be acceptable.

RESOLVED that-

The CHDMBC be authorised to grant permission subject to the conditions (condition 5 amended to prohibit habitable accommodation in roof space), reasons and informatives listed on the agenda,

The CHDMBC be authorised to refuse planning permission should the S106 not progress to his satisfaction on the grounds of harm to the TBHSPA or if any other material planning considerations arise prior to the issuing of the decision notice that in the opinion of the CHDMBC would warrant refusal of the application. Reasons for the refusal relating to any such matter be delegated to the CHDMBC.

(Mr Holcroft, an objector, and Mr Donnachie, applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application)

RU 21/1790 10 Station Parade, Virginia Water

Conversion to restaurant with small kitchen

Members expressed strong concern 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.

The CHDMBC stated that due to the Government's amendments to the Use Class Order, no permission was required to change the use of the dry cleaners to a restaurant where the sale of food and drink for consumption would mostly be on the premises as this was permitted under new Use Class E. Permission was only required in this instance as the application was for a mix of eating in the premises and takeaway. Appropriate mitigation could be achieved by way of conditions to address concerns expressed by Members. Conditions were proposed to secure a noise insulation scheme if necessary; to ensure the satisfactory implementation and maintenance of an extraction system and restriction of opening times to between 0800 to 2200 Monday to Sunday. Normally siting of the vent flat on a wall would be considered de minimis in planning terms and generally would not require planning permission.

The CHDMBC informed the Committee that a noise report had been submitted on the day of the meeting to address the requirements of proposed condition 4. The Council's EPO had not been able to assess this information as yet.

In view of this and Member concerns, the Committee considered it appropriate to defer the application to allow this assessment to be made and for the application to be reported to a future meeting of the Committee with that additional assessment. In the interim the applicant was advised to reconsider the siting of the extractor fan.

RESOLVED that-

The application be deferred to allow the Council's Environmental Protection Officer to assess the information in the recently submitted Noise report relating to the extraction system and report the application with that additional assessment to the next meeting of the Committee.

The applicant be asked to consider further the location of the extractor fan.

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

RU 21/1809 Foxhills Country Club, Stonehill Road, Ottershaw

Installation of a seasonal temporary tennis dome over three existing tennis courts

The Committee was fully supportive of this application, recognising the circumstances detailed in the officer report, previous permission and the potential benefits for health, sport and recreation.

RESOLVED that-

Subject to no call in being received from the Secretary of State to whom the application needs to be referred under the Town and Country Planning (Consultation)(England) Direction 2021 the CHDMBC be authorised to grant planning permission subject to conditions and reasons listed on agenda.

RU 21/1913 Abraham Cowley Unit, St Peters Hospital, Holloway Hill, Chertsey

Redevelopment of the existing Abraham Cowley Unit (ACU) to provide modern mental health care services

The Committee was fully supportive of this application.

Some Members commented on potential noise from the active therapy garden and its impact on the residential amenities of residents in Holloway Hill and future key worker occupiers of the development at Greenlands, screening of the development and scale of fencing, and the need to retain the existing Holly hedge.

The CHDMBC said that the Council's Environmental Protection Officer had considered all noise aspects of the development, but it was considered that the development would not be unduly noisy or cause an amenity loss to nearby residential occupiers. Reasonable separation existed to nearby properties and many were separated by a busy road.

The CHDMBC commented that a high-quality landscaping scheme had been submitted. Whilst there would be some loss of mostly poor-quality trees, many trees including those along Holloway Hill would be retained. The landscape plan included a substantial amount of mature tree planting which would mitigate the tree loss and be more sustainable in the long term. High quality screening had been secured on site but it was not considered necessary to fully screen the development.

With regard to the Holly hedge, limited protections existed for hedges in the planning system unless they were ancient hedgerows. However, the Hedgerow was indicated as being retained on the plans and the CHDMBC was confident that the NHS was a responsible developer who he was optimistic would stick to their commitment to retain the hedge.

RESOLVED that-

The CHDMBC be authorised to grant permission subject to the conditions (condition 12 amended as per addendum), reasons and informatives listed on the agenda.

(Mrs Hale, an objector, and Ms Prince, agent for applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application)

Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) Findings

The Council had commissioned consultants to undertake the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA), a key piece of evidenced based work which would underpin the review of the Local Plan. One of the key outputs of the HEDNA was the calculation of the minimum housing need figure to be accommodated in the Borough in the next iteration of the Local Plan.

The calculation of housing need was undertaken using a standard method set out in Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) using nationally available datasets. There was an expectation in national policy and guidance that local authorities would follow this method when developing their Local Plans, unless they considered that 'exceptional circumstances' existed for not doing so.

The initial findings of the consultants undertaking the HEDNA were presented to Committee and the consultants responded to various questions raised by Members thereon.

Having received the presentation, the Committee agreed that the Council and those working on the HEDNA on behalf of the Council should follow the Government's standard method for calculating housing need for the review of the Local Plan.

RESOLVED that:

The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) follows the Government's Standard Methodology for assessing housing need and that the next iteration of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan be based on this figure

(The meeting ended at 9.47 pm)

Chairman