

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday 25th June 2008 at 7.30pm

A D D E N D U M

P L A N N I N G A P P L I C A T I O N S

1. **Page 4** **57-63 Woodham Lane and Land r/o 47-55 Woodham Lane, New Haw (RU.08/0341)**
- Consultations** Paragraph 4.1
- An additional letter of objection has been received reiterating concerns already raised by surrounding residents.
- An email has been received from a local resident reiterating the support for the scheme already expressed in an earlier letter.
-
2. **Page 16** **74 Station Road, Egham (RU.08/0372)**
- The applicant has asked that this application be deferred and has cited the following reasons:
- “Turning to the inaccuracies and mistakes in the Committee report itself I can comment (using your paragraph notation) as follows:-
- Title; note ‘AMENDMENTS to an existing planning consent 07/0370’ ***Comment: Agreed, but this is a full planning application dealt with on its own merits.***
- 3.2 (1) The ground floor finished floor level has been raised to (not by) 1.25m. The Committee has previously approved a FFL of 600mm in the previous approval.
Comment: The report simply states that the ground floor is 1.25m above ground level, it does not state that it is 1.25m higher than the previous scheme.
- 3.2 (2) If the planning officer with whom we had our pre-submission consultation had prepared the report she no doubt would have mentioned that the elevations were simplified at **her specific request** (previous Committee reports refer)
Comment: Agreed.
- 4.1 Fewer objections (only two- and those from the same person) than previous application recommended for approval and approved. ***Comment: Agreed. As you know, planning applications are not determined on the basis of how many objections are received.***
- 5.2 The character of the area has not changed since the last two recommendations/approvals.
Comment: Agreed, but the scheme has changed.

5.3 Again, a misunderstanding of the detail of what is proposed. The car park floor is proposed to be raised by a maximum of 700mm, the ground floor is raised by a lesser amount, the first floor by less again and so on, all within the constraint that we were advised was paramount, that the ridge height could under no circumstances exceed the previously permitted 9.6m (Any flexibility in that area would have immediately covered any concerns as to altered proportions of the building) The Officer's concerns over the previous designs are stated, and the current design criticised as too simplistic, but nowhere is the previous recommendation to Committee '*given that this is an area of mixed design and styles it is not considered that a refusal could be sustained on design grounds*'.

Comment: *Again, the report simply states that the floor area is raised by 1.25m above ground level. In this case, it is considered that a refusal can be sustained on design grounds so this phrase is inappropriate.*

5.5 It does seem bizarre that a refusal for an office building dating back to 1991 should feature in this report when that application was not considered relevant to either of the previous reports (both recommendations to approve/approved).

Comment: *Agreed that it should have probably been mentioned in the earlier reports.*

5.7 Again the misunderstanding relating to floor levels is repeated. In urban design terms the proposal is manifestly NOT a four storey block (that would result in a ridge height in excess of 11/12metres) and the 'disguise' scathingly referred to has already been recommended and approved by Officers and the Committee.

Comment: *The reference to the fourth floor includes the basement. It will be made clear to the Committee that this proposal has accommodation on three floors only. Para 5.3 clearly states the height of the building and that it is no higher than the previous scheme.*

5.9 This suggests that there has only been a cursory look at the plans, as the proposed pedestrian entrance is substantially and larger and more imposing than the previously approved scheme. The pedestrian access from the front is one of only two entrances, the other offering access from the car park – what is referred to by 'all other access'?

Comment: *The report states: 'All other resident access is from the rear' – we are agreeing that there are two pedestrian access points.*

5.11 see above – the entrance doorway faces the street as can be clearly seen by reference to the submitted plans. It will be noted that there **IS** a flight of stairs leading to the front entrance, although the reports suggests there isn't, which again suggests a cursory look at the plans at best.

Comment: *The report doesn't say that there isn't a flight of steps proposed, it suggests that there might be better design solutions for this main elevation, which also include steps.*

5.12 Whilst significant parts of the report have been transcribed from earlier reports RU 07/0370, some key passages have been edited out. Of particular note is '*given this is an area of mixed development and styles it is not considered a refusal could be sustained on design grounds*'

Comment: *See note above under para 5.3*

5.14 In this subjective view the EXTANT consents clearly should be assessed.

Comment: The report deals with this application on its merits.

5.19 The possible requirement for affordable housing provision was specifically discussed at the pre-submission consultation previously referred to, which took place in January 2008 (ie after the adoption of the new standards by Council). My Clients were assured that as they were not seeking to increase the numbers of permitted units beyond their existing consent, there would be NO INCREASE IN NET PROVISION, and therefore no requirement to provide for affordable housing. If the advice had been any different, it is difficult to see the financial logic in submitting this application in the first place.

Comment: It is agreed that this view was expressed. Clearly revised policy is now in force and it needs to be addressed. If the scheme was otherwise acceptable, then this aspect would have been discussed with you in more detail. The fact that there are extant permissions will be considered, as well as unusual costs of development such as the need for decontamination. It will be made clear to the committee that this is an issue that needs further discussion.

5.20 No written justification was submitted because of the assurance my client had been given, but it would have been a simple matter to recite the reasons for non-provision in a written justification had anyone bothered to ask.

Comment: See above.

5.22 In the case of County Highways the report concedes the principal of an extant consent which contrasts with the two paras above. Why?

Comment: A financial provision was made as part of the earlier application and it is not considered reasonable to duplicate that on your present application.

Proposed reasons for refusal;

1&2 these should be contrasted with para 5.13 of the report to committee regarding the part implemented scheme RU07/0370 .. 'as before the scheme represents an intensive use of this highly accessible urban site in accordance with Government advice, and whilst it is relatively bulky in relation to the Rusham Road properties, the design (is?) somewhat fussy and it will erode the level of privacy of these properties, it is not on balance considered that a refusal could be supported on these grounds'

Comment: There are concerns that what is considered to be a poorer design will have an impact on adjoining residential amenity.

It would appear that the reception of these latest proposal rests more with the Officer preparing the report and the timetable pressure given the tardy way in which the application was first considered, rather than the merits of the application itself, and it is to address these evident shortcomings that we request the matter be deferred, whilst noting Officers were not prepared to assist in this request."

3. Page 39

12 Willow Close, Woodham (RU.08/0470)

Consultations:

Paragraph 4.1

2 additional letters of objection have been received raising the following additional concerns:

- None of houses in the road have been demolished but have been extended; the new development will look out of place and will have detrimental impact on whole road.
- Plans for two houses contravene deeds
- The road is narrow and the additional house will exacerbate existing parking problem by residents and guests.
- Report does not objectively clarify how the proposal improves the appearance and character of the area.
- Level of objection is under represented as more people have written in.

Conditions:

Add additional highway condition:

“Prior to the occupation of the dwellings hereby approved, a 2 metre by 2 metre pedestrian visibility splay shall be provided on either side of the vehicular access onto Willow Close, the depth measured from the back of the footway and the widths outwards from the edges of the access. There shall be no obstructions within the 0.6 metre to 2 metre height range within the area contained within the sightline and shall be kept permanently clear of any obstructions.

Reason: The above condition is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety, the free flow of traffic nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to comply with saved Policy DN2 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and saved Policy MV4 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.”

4. Page 45

Land Adjacent to 10 Limes Road, Egham (RU.08/0494)

Application:

Paragraph 3.4

The applicant states that no trees are to be removed but following a site visit it would appear that there would be several trees to be removed adjacent to the existing dwelling at 10 Limes Road but none that would satisfy the requirements for a preservation order.

**Planning
Considerations:**

Insert new paragraph 5.9:

“An objector raises the point that five trees are to be removed if the proposal were to be granted planning permission. It is not considered that the trees are worthy of a Tree Preservation Order on the basis of their size, species and positioning within the plot; their amenity value to the surrounding area is limited.”
