



**PLANNING
4 JUNE 2008
APPENDICES**

<u>APPENDIX</u>	<u>REPORT</u>	<u>PAGE. NO.</u>
A	MINUTES 23.4.08	1
B	SERVICE PLAN 2007/08	11
C	APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES	23

Runnymede Borough CouncilPLANNING COMMITTEEAPPENDIX 'A'23 April 2008 at 7.30pm

Members of the
Committee present: Councillors G B Woodger (Chairman), D W Parr (Vice-Chairman), J R Ashmore,
Mrs F J Barden, J R Furey, Mrs E Gill, D R Hamilton, Ms R E Haylor,
C Knight, M T Kusneraitis, Mrs Y P Lay, Mrs J Norman, Mrs M Roberts and
P B Tuley

Members of the
Committee absent: Councillor J Broadhead

NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE

The Group mentioned below had notified the Chief Executive of its wish that the changes listed below 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.

Group requesting Change	Remove from Membership	Appoint Instead
Conservative	Councillor J M Edwards	Councillor D R Hamilton
Conservative	Councillor Mrs F M Angell	Councillor Ms R E Haylor

The Chief Executive had given effect to those wishes in accordance with Section 16(2) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 12 March 2008 were approved and signed as a correct record.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor J. Broadhead.

The following Councillor declared a personal interest under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members.

Councillor	Item	Nature of Interest
G B Woodger	Item 6. RU/09/0231	Personal but not prejudicial. Friendship with Councillor living adjacent to site.

COUNCILLORS MS R E HAYLOR AND MRS J NORMAN

The Chairman reminded Members of the Committee that this was probably the last Council Committee meeting to be held in the old Civic Offices prior to the move to the new building. He took the opportunity of thanking Councillors Ms R E Haylor and Mrs J Norman, who were not standing for re-election, for their past service and wished them well for the future.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The planning applications listed below were considered by the Committee. All representations received on the applications were reported and copies were made available for inspection by Members before the meeting. One objector and the applicant spoke on the application identified below.

RESOLVED that -

the following applications be determined as indicated and any permission granted be subject to the Conditions authorised.

APP NO	LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION
RU 08/0138	<p>St John's Beaumont School, Priest Hill, Old Windsor, Windsor Erection of detached two storey sports hall building with associated facilities including changing rooms, dance studios, rowing training rooms, following demolition of existing gymnasium and sheds.</p> <p>DECISION: The application be notified to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government as an acceptable departure from the provisions of the Development Plan in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development plans and Consultations) (Departures) Direction 1999 as the proposal represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt and that failing any directions from the Minister GRANT subject to Conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 (Condition 9 being deleted), Reasons and Informatives as per Agenda.</p>
RU 08/0219	<p>22 Thorncroft, Englefield Green Erection of detached garage to the rear/side of the property.</p> <p>DECISION: GRANT subject to Conditions and Informative as per Agenda.</p> <p>(Mrs C Dolan, an objector, and Mr G Prendergast, the applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application).</p>
RU 08/0231	<p>Rothwell, Ongar Hill, Addlestone Erection of four 2 storey high dwelling houses following the demolition of the existing dwelling and with access from Coombe Drive.</p> <p>DECISION: GRANT subject to Conditions, Reasons and Informatives as per Agenda.</p>

THAMES BASIN HEATH - SPECIAL PROTECTION AREA (SPA) AND SUITABLE ALTERNATIVE NATURAL GREEN SPACE (SANGS)

The Committee considered a request for approval to commence works to : (i) upgrade the Suitable Alternative Natural Green Spaces (SANGS), (ii) conduct surveys and (iii) establish the budget for this purpose which would be financed by contributions received from developers. The capital and ongoing revenue/maintenance costs associated with proposed first phase of the five year programme of works and other items to be financed from SANGS contributions was set out in a schedule to the appendix of the agenda report.

Members were advised that the total of SANGS contributions received at 31 March 2008 amounted to some £306,000. In accordance with the agreed policy, 50% (£153,000) had already been set aside for the upgrade of suitable sites for mitigation purposes. The first call on the funds would be for the promotional and monitoring work which was estimated to cost £105,000. This sum had been factored into the existing revenue budget for the Planning Committee with £3,000 allocated in the 2007/08 budget and a further £50,000 in 2008/09. The schemes which would proceed over the period 2008-2010 and costing some £309,000 in total were noted. The costs were reported as being:

	£
Works to Open Spaces	174,000
Surveys	30,000
Promotional Works and Monitoring	105,000
TOTAL:	309,000

Officers anticipated that sufficient contributions would be secured in order to meet these costs in the next financial year. The annual maintenance costs associated with this work would commence in the 2010/11 financial year.

Officers had conducted a risk evaluation and had identified that the main risk was insufficient further developer contributions to pay for the improvement and maintenance costs. In order to minimise this risk, future works would only be undertaken when funds had actually been secured. Further minimisation of risk would be to identify other sites for SANGS.

During the ensuing discussion, Members asked that an itemised breakdown of the promotional and monitoring work costs should be included in the reference to the Corporate Management Committee.

It was RESOLVED that -

- i) the Corporate Management Committee be requested to approve revenue estimates in the sum of £309,000 for the works and associated costs as set out above to be financed from SANGS contributions received;**
- ii) the Corporate Management Committee be requested to also note the ongoing maintenance costs associated with the SANGS measures and provide for these costs to be met from SANGS contributions as they become available; and**
- iii) the Planning Committee receive a further programme of works when additional income is received.**

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - RETAIL ISSUES AND OPTIONS PAPER

The views of Members were sought on the Local Development Framework - Retail Issues and Options Paper (RIOP) which was appended to the report. This paper had been considered by the Local Development Framework Members' Working Group on the 25 March 2008. The RIOP formed one of the suite of documents establishing the issues to be considered when developing the policy approaches for consideration as part of the formal consultation on the Local Development Framework.

The Paper : (i) considered the key areas of national and strategic policy guidance; (ii) gathered the evidence to reflect local circumstances and (iii) detailed the key issues and established a set of policy options for consultation.

Members were reminded that Planning Policy Statements set out the Government's policies on aspects of planning in England. PPS6 - Planning for Town Centres, for instance, provided the National planning policy framework for delivering the Government's retail objectives. The policies in PPS6 were thus required to be taken into account by Local Planning Authorities and Regional Planning Bodies in the preparation of their Local Development Documents and Regional Spatial Strategies.

The key objective for town centres as identified in PPS6 was the need to maintain the viability and vitality of the town and local centres in order to fulfil the core principle of delivering sustainable development. There was a re-emphasis of the 'town centres first' objective, emphasising that development should be focused on the existing centres, promoting and enhancing them by providing a wide range of services, in a good environment, accessible to all whilst placing less reliance on the car.

Policy BE5 of the draft South East Plan also referred to small rural towns, and in the hierarchy of towns identified in the Plan, the three main centres in Runnymede, namely, Egham, Addlestone and Chertsey, fell within the category of small rural or 'market' town, having a population of approximately 20,000 each. These three centres served mainly local retail needs. Further local facilities were provided at Virginia Water, New Haw, Ottershaw and Englefield Green, and also in other smaller groups of shops around the Borough.

It was important to focus on a variety of uses in these centres, particularly the main town centres at a time of increasing mobility and competition from out-of-town facilities and other centres. It was important to maintain the retail function which was the mainstay of town centre activity and to promote residential and other leisure uses which would provide activity outside normal shopping hours. One of the key issues also identified in PPS6 was the need to tackle social exclusion by ensuring access for all to a wide range of everyday goods and services.

When considering the role and functions of Addlestone, Chertsey and Egham, the objective of enhancing consumer choice in terms of the range of shopping, leisure and local services available, to allow for genuine choice to meet the needs of the community, particularly socially excluded groups must be considered.

The key areas for consultation were discussed in detail and subject to two amendments, as shown below, the Paper was endorsed by the Committee :

- (i) a reference should be made to "considering opportunities for intervention to safeguard Post Offices;
- (ii) The heading "Internet shopping" should be changed to "Remote Shopping" so as to include telephone shopping.

The revised *Key Issues for Consultation* are now set out in *Appendix 'A'* hereto

RESOLVED that -

- i) **subject to two amendments, as outlined above, the Retail Issues and Options Paper and Retail Impact Assessment be approved for consultation; and**
- ii) **any subsequent technical changes to the document be agreed by the Director of Technical Services in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.**

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – THE ECONOMY ISSUES AND OPTIONS PAPER

The Committee's views on the Local Development Framework – Economy Issues and Options Paper (EIOP) were sought. This Paper was appended to the report. And it had been previously considered by the Local Development Framework Members' Working Group on 25 March 2008.

The EIOP was a key document that identified the economic issues that needed to be considered when developing policy options on which the public should be consulted during the process of preparing the Local Development Framework (LDF). It contained evidence about Runnymede's economy, summarised both national and strategic policy guidance and set out the identified key issues in Runnymede and the policy options for consultation.

During discussion, Members emphasised the increasing importance of the service industry in the national economy. *The Key Areas for Consultation*, as endorsed by the Committee, are set out in Appendix 'B' hereto.

RESOLVED that -

- i) the Economy Issues and Options paper be approved for consultation; and**
- ii) any subsequent technical changes be agreed by the Director of Technical Services in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.**

APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted that the Planning Inspectorate had recently determined the appeals mentioned below.

<u>Site/Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
a) 72-82 Pooley Green Road, Egham – planning appeal regarding erection of 32 sheltered apartments (06/1124)	ALLOWED
b) Morningside, Knowle Grove, Virginia Water – planning appeal regarding erection of 3 detached x 2 storey dwellings with associated vehicular access and carports following demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings (07/0738)	DISMISSED
c) Land off Green Lane, Egham – planning appeal regarding erection of three sided tower with two advertising panels and one display panel (07/0659 and 0663)	DISMISSED

PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES

A list of planning applications recently determined by the Director of Technical Services under his delegated powers was received and noted.

SURREY WASTE PLAN UPDATE

(Ref. Planning Committee Page 782, para 541. 26/2/08)

The Chairman had agreed that the Committee should consider this matter as an urgent item due to the timing of the decisions by Surrey County Council and the need to initiate any action through the Courts as soon as possible.

The Committee was advised that Surrey County Council (SCC) now intended to adopt the Surrey Waste Plan. It appeared, however, that SCC's Counsel had concerns about the Inspector's approach to the Habitats Directive. Counsel had pointed out that the Habitats Directive requirement to ascertain that there were no adverse effects on integrity at the Plan stage had two consequences:

- i) it was not possible to defer a policy for consideration at the project stage if there was uncertainty whether it would pass the assessment;

- ii) scientific doubt counted against the Plan.

It was SCC Counsel's view that the Inspector had failed to consider, firstly, whether the alternative options put forward for incineration were realistic and acceptable on other grounds and, secondly, the scientific uncertainties on pyrolysis and gasification. Counsel consequently concluded that the retention of the two sites in the Plan failed the Habitats Directive Assessment tests and, therefore, the Inspector's Report did not follow the purpose of the Directive at the Plan level.

SCC had sought an additional opinion from Leading Counsel which differed in only one significant area. He had suggested that as the other sites identified within the policy (Clockhouse Brickworks, Capel; Charlton Lane, Shepperton; and Land adjacent to Trumps Farm, Longcross) would provide sufficient thermal treatment capacity, then the objectives of the Plan as a whole could be delivered even if no satisfactory project level assessment was ever made at Wisley or Martyrs Lane. EC case law also appeared to support this view.

On the basis of this legal advice, County Officers were recommending to their Executive on 22 April that the Waste Plan be adopted in accordance with the Inspector's Report and Recommendations. If agreed, this recommendation would be put to the SCC Council for decision on 6 May.

Runnymede Officers believed, however, that the Habitats Regulations made it clear that an appropriate assessment was required at both the Plan and Project (i.e. planning application) stage. The current legal advice that SCC was following appeared to ignore the fact that the Plan level appropriate assessment of the impact of thermal treatment facilities at Wisley or Martyrs Lane could not conclude "no likely adverse impact". In effect, what was being suggested was that the appropriate assessment should be left to the project stage where adverse impact might well be demonstrated. There were, therefore, significant concerns about this interpretation of the Legislation.

Runnymede was seeking its own Counsel's opinion on both the legitimacy of this approach in terms of the interpretation of the Habitats Directive and also on the point made in to the February meeting of this Committee regarding the retention of the land adjacent to Trumps Farm, Longcross, as a potential site for thermal waste treatment where there was no obvious very special circumstances to allow such inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

It appeared to Officers that if SCC were to adopt this plan in its current form (i.e. as proposed by the Inspector), it would be acting outside the bounds of its authority. If the County Council did decide to adopt the Plan, and Runnymede decided to oppose it, a High Court challenge would need to be made within six weeks of their advertising the intention to adopt. Members were warned that such a challenge could be expensive to pursue and, if unsuccessful, then Runnymede could have to bear the other parties costs. A further report, including a detailed estimate of legal costs and options, would be presented to the next meeting when SCC's decision would be known.

RESOLVED that -

following receipt of further Counsel's opinion and a further report to this Committee, consideration be given at the next meeting to a High Court challenge if Surrey County Council subsequently proceeds to adopt the Surrey Waste Plan as recommended by the Planning Inspector.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 9.10 pm)

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - RETAIL ISSUES AND OPTIONS PAPER

Key Issues for Consultation taken from Section 13 of the RIOP

1. The following identify the areas for consultation.
Do we have an appropriate range of shopping, leisure and local services in each type of centre (ie town, local, village)?
 - The Plan will need to identify, by undertaking a survey, the local need for both the quantity and quality of local retail provision.
 - The town and local centres within Runnymede will not meet all local need as this will be provided at higher order towns in the area such as Woking and Staines.

2. Town Centres: Addlestone, Chertsey and Egham

Are our three town centres adequately providing for need (this to be assisted by a technical assessment). If not -
 - What is needed to support the towns as viable key centres of commercial and social activity?
 - What are the most important aspects of a town centre?
 - Are the physical areas of the defined town centres too large, too small or just right to accommodate the range of facilities necessary to cater for the local communities they serve (bearing in mind the role of larger centres such as Woking and Staines in meeting higher order needs)?
 - Is the primary shopping area correctly defined?
 - What is the key mix of uses in a town centre? Do we have the balance of uses right for each centre? Or are some town centres developing 'specialist attractions' - and should this be encouraged?
 - Are all ages catered for?
 - How do the centres meet social and leisure needs and do they have evening and night time economies?

3. Local/Village Centres: (e.g. Virginia Water, New Haw, Englefield Green, Ottershaw)
 - Can local centres compete in a modern competitive retail environment that is changing where and the ways we shop?
 - What are the key features of a viable local centre? What is the role of the Post Office? Are there areas that need to be protected for specific uses? - What are these uses?

4. Local/Parades of Shops (eg Pooley Green, Thorpe, Row Town, Chertsey Lane)
 - They cannot compete on price but are convenient - are they important to protect?
 - Is there a minimum size for a parade of shops that is needed to ensure sufficient footfall?

5. Farm Shops/Garden Centres

They are normally in rural locations and largely in the Green Belt.
 - What role do they play in meeting local need?

- Should they be allowed to expand or intensify use in the Green Belt location?
- Do they undermine the town centres?
- Should they be allowed to sell only locally produced goods?

6. Remote Shopping

- The Retail Impact Assessment (the Technical Assessment) will need to consider the effect this may have on shopping in the Borough.

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - THE ECONOMY ISSUES AND OPTIONS PAPER (EIOP)(A) Key Economic issues as taken from Section 10 of the EIOP

- (a) There is an imbalance in the local labour market between the number of people working in Runnymede and the size of the locally resident working population – more people work in the Borough and there are local labour and skill shortages. How can this imbalance be improved?
- (b) Levels of increasingly unsustainable commuting by car into, out of and through Runnymede are high. How can levels of commuting be reduced and greater self containment of the local economy be achieved?
- (c) There is an increasing number of vacant and underused business premises in Runnymede as a result of continuous and rapid change in the needs of local businesses for premises and as a result of technological change and changes in working practices. How can better use be made of underused business premises?
- (d) The globalisation of the economy, electronic working, the increasing importance of home working, the emergence of e-commerce and business, and a significant shift towards service sector, high productivity and high value sectors of the economy mean that economic activity is far more footloose and less place dependant than it used to be. How can we ensure that Runnymede continues to attract and meet the needs of modern technology based businesses and service providers?
- (e) How can we ensure that new business and commercial developments are built and used in a way that reduces energy consumption?
- (f) There are a number of major developed sites in the Green Belt in Runnymede including: the Proctor & Gamble site, the former DERA site, St Peters Hospital, Royal Holloway and the Runnymede Brunel Campus, Hillswood Business Park, Thorpe Park and the Chertsey Sewage Treatment Works. All of these sites are employment locations, but consideration needs to be given to their future development and use?
- (g) The future development of the former DERA site has yet to be determined. How can an integrated, sustainable community be developed on this site if it is allocated for employment and housing in the South East Plan?

(B) The Policy Options for Consultation

1. Re: (a) above: **Labour imbalance and shortages**
 - i) Let market forces determine where people live and work with no intervention from the planning system to improve sustainability and the supply of local housing or
 - ii) Increase the amount of local housing and hence the size of the local workforce, but do not create additional employment floor space in the Borough if this would lead to additional demand for labour or
 - iii) Allow business premises in out of town and peripheral locations to be redeveloped for housing.
 - (iv) With regard to skill shortages carry out a survey of businesses in Runnymede and identify the skill sets that are most in demand and how training needs might be met by local educational establishments and training organisations, and by greater co-ordination between the business and educational sectors.
2. Re: (b) above: **Commuting and self containment**
 - i) Let market forces and personal choice determine the amount of commuting that takes place and allow congestion to act as the factor that determines

how people travel to work and how much time and resources they are prepared to spend travelling or

- ii) Provide more intensive economic development at public transport nodes and on public transport routes and improve walking and cycling accessibility at places of work and wherever services are provided and
 - iii) Extend the Yellow Bus service to more schools and consider whether this concept could be extended to the business community and
 - iv) Encourage more home based working and electronic working so that more business is carried out by phone and over the internet reducing the need for commuting and
 - v) Encourage the intensification of higher value land uses (such as offices) and increases in employment floor space in town centres and in major employment locations – such as business parks.
3. Re: (c) above: **Making better use of underused business premises**
- i) Allow redevelopment and change of use of existing business premises to residential use throughout the Borough or
 - ii) Protect existing business uses in town centres and in major employment locations such as on business parks, but allow changes of use and redevelopment for housing and other land uses elsewhere or
 - iii) Protect all business land uses and premises from redevelopment for housing or retail use.
4. Re: (d) above: **Embracing modern technology and ways of working**
- i) Ensure that all new business and commercial developments are future proofed and built to high electronic specifications that will meet future e-commerce and e-service delivery needs including networking with home based systems and
 - ii) Ensure that all major (>300 sq.m.) new commercial and business developments have an agreed travel plan.
5. Re: (e) above: **Ensuring sustainable construction and energy efficiency in commercial and business premises**
- i) Use sustainable construction techniques and achieve high energy efficiency in the development and use of new and refurbished buildings by requiring an energy statement to be submitted with all commercial planning applications where the floor space exceeds 300 square metres and require development to meet 15% of its energy needs from a renewable source.
6. Re (f) above: **Major Developed Sites (MDS) in the Green Belt**
- i) Identify how each of the MDS should be developed in the future and work with the landowner and community to create sustainable development that meets future economic and social needs while conserving the environment.
7. Re (g) above – **Former DERA Site**
- i) Redevelop with 100,000 sq m of B1 (business park); or
 - ii) Redevelop with 65,000 sq m of B1 and 2,500 houses; or
 - iii) Redevelop as a sustainable self-contained and properly served community.

SERVICE PLAN FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE 2007-08

This plan sets out the details of the actions that the Council has agreed must be taken to improve the services provided by the Technical Services Department. It combines the targets that have been agreed within the –

- | | | |
|--|---|------|
| • Strategic Plan | - | SP |
| • Best Value Improvement Plans (following service reviews) | - | BV |
| • Comprehensive Performance Assessment Improvement Plan | - | CPA |
| • Published Service Standards | - | PSS |
| • Best Value Performance Indicators | - | BVPI |
| • Community Strategy Targets | - | CST |
| • Risk Management Plan | - | RMP |

The last column of the attached tables indicates the origin of the action point.

Officer's titles have been abbreviated as follows –

- | | | |
|--|---|------|
| Director of Technical Services | - | DTS |
| Director of Housing & Community Services | - | DHCS |
| Head of Planning | - | HP |
| Development Control Manager | - | DCM |
| Policy & Implementation Manager | - | PIM |
| Building Control Manager | - | BCM |

Target/Indicator	Lead Officer	Implement by	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Progress	Target Origin
<p>Provide a range of Affordable housing for those in housing need, including those with support needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an additional 500 units between 2006 and 2011 • Determine future level of need and establish new target • Design policies to address any unmet needs • Ensure that land resources are maximised and that housing densities are appropriate, protecting the Green Belt and achieving quality development 	<p>HP</p> <p>DHCS</p> <p>PIM</p> <p>HP</p>	<p>2011</p> <p>December 2006</p>	<p>Achieving schemes that are economically viable to secure the units required</p> <p>The housing market not delivering the housing numbers</p>	<p>Production of Supplementary Planning Document on Affordable Housing and contributions to set context for new requirements</p>	<p>Supplementary Planning Guidance adopted December 2007</p>	<p>SP</p>
<p>Improve accessibility by more choice in methods of transport and by safer and more convenient modes of travel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote company travel plans • Assist Surrey County Council in providing cycle routes and infrastructure improvements • Support the 'Airtrack' initiative 	<p>HP</p> <p>DCM</p> <p>PIM</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Reluctance of company staff to participate</p> <p>Resources to implement – SCC budget constrained to maintenance</p> <p>Securing financial package to enable scheme to proceed</p>	<p>Participate in Airtrack Forum (£5,000 per annum contribution)</p>	<p>Travel plans in place for major developments</p> <p>Extending cycle route network</p> <p>Continued support of Airtrack scheme subject to suitable infrastructure provision. TWAA now being assembled to promote the scheme</p>	<p>SP</p>

Target/Indicator	Lead Officer	Implement by	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Progress	Target Origin
<p>Fulfil obligation under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, to improve community safety, reduce fear of crime and increase reassurance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support measures which reduce anti-social behaviour and crime & disorder Design out crime potential as part of the development process <p>Seek measures to reduce traffic speeds and traffic/pedestrian conflict</p>	DCM DCM DCM	Ongoing Ongoing Ongoing	Conflicts with other planning criteria Availability of resources	Existing planning staff / Community Safety Officer	Improved design which takes crime & disorder into account Implementation of measures approved as part of planning applications	SP
<p>Ensure that planning is environmentally sensitive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carry out environmental / sustainability appraisals of all developing policies Incorporate up to date policies on design Seek to achieve increased densities in appropriate locations 	PIM PIM DCM	Ongoing Stage 1 LDF Ongoing	Raising the profile of such appraisals with the development sector Needs to reflect Government advice & Surrey Design Guide Needs to be environmentally sensitive	Existing planning staff	Development recognising the need for sustainable development Acceptance/adoption of policies in the LDF Proceeding to consultation on Issues and Options in June 2008, although informal consultation started in early 2008	SP

Target/Indicator	Lead Officer	Implement by	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Progress	Target Origin
<p>Ensure Runnymede is a healthy, pleasant place in which to work, rest and play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare policies to ensure that the Borough's three town centres remain vibrant and attractive Prepare policies to ensure that outdoor sports and leisure facilities are maintained, and enhanced new provision through appropriate developments, to reflect requirements of PPG 17. 	PIM	Set within context of LDF programme	Involving the development sector in process	P & I staff	Included in LDF Issues and Options consultation, June 2008	SP
<p>Protect Green Belt land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Green Belt protection policies Support Surrey County Council Structure Plan approach to protecting Green Belt in this part of Surrey Devise planning policy approach to secure improvements to urban fringe and other Green Belt land 	PIM	December 2006	Resources to complete study to satisfy the requirements of PPG 17	P & I staff	PPG 17 study completed	SP
	PIM	Set within context of LDF programme	Adoption of Green Belt policy as part of LDF process	Existing planning staff	Support purposes of the Green Belt	SP
	PIM	Ongoing			Included in LDF Issues and Options consultation, June 2008	
	PIM	Set within context of LDF programme				

Target/Indicator	Lead Officer	Implement by	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Progress	Target Origin
Encourage the Environment Agency to deliver a flood alleviation scheme on the River Bourne at Chertsey	HP		Availability of Treasury funding	Treasury funding	Concerns from Environment Agency that any discrete works in Chertsey may have an impact elsewhere and affect future viability of wider Thames scheme	SP
Encourage the Environment Agency to take action to alleviate the potential for flooding on the River Thames	HP		Availability of Treasury funding	Treasury funding P & I staff	Scheme funding unlikely for the foreseeable future. Work on Strategic Flood Risk Assessment underway	
Use lawful powers to prevent illegal incursions and to remove offenders as rapidly as is lawfully possible	DCM	Ongoing	Lack of support from Courts and landowners	Existing planning & legal staff	Reduced number of incursions Speedy removal of illegal incursions Good liaison with Police	SP
Work closely with business and those wishing to locate or expand in the Borough to maintain and improve the current economic prosperity.	HP	Ongoing	Conflicts with planning policy 'Credit crunch' may have impact on prosperity	Existing planning staff	Buoyant local economy; high employment rates Continued support given to Runnymede Business Partnership	SP

Target/Indicator	Lead Officer	Implement by	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Progress	Target Origin
<p>Improve opportunities for young people:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with schools and governing bodies to develop leisure based and sports-based after school activities • Encourage young people in town centre regeneration e.g. in the Planning for Real type exercises • Improve the safety of young people going to and from school 	<p>HP</p> <p>PIM</p> <p>PIM</p>	<p>Consult as part of LDF process</p>	<p>Failure to 'engage' with young people</p> <p>Needs to fit into school curriculum</p>	<p>P & I staff</p>	<p>Involvement with development of 14-19 Diploma – liaison with schools & Business Partnership</p> <p>Full engagement of young people in the process</p> <p>Engagement with schools as part of LDF consultation</p> <p>Yellow school bus scheme Continuing</p>	
<p>Consider the implications of the Urban Bio-diversity Action Plan for Surrey "wildlife on your Doorstep" for local land owners, developers and as part of planning policy</p>	<p>PIM</p>	<p>Part of LDF process</p>	<p>Failure to engage with development sector</p> <p>Links to Thames Basin Heaths SPA</p>	<p>P & I staff</p>	<p>Profile of bio-diversity established/raised. Part of LDF consultation</p> <p>Supplementary Planning Guidance on Thames Basin Heaths SPA adopted Dec. 2007</p>	
<p>Percentage of new homes built on previously developed land</p>	<p>HP</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Release of Greenfield sites necessitated by failure to meet housing targets</p>	<p>Planning staff</p>	<p>100% of all new built homes on previously used land</p>	<p>BVPI (106)</p>

Target/Indicator	Lead Officer	Implement by	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Progress	Target Origin
Planning application determination: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60% major applications determined within 13 weeks 65% minor applications determined within 8 weeks 80% Other applications determined within 8 weeks 	DCM	Ongoing	Staff resources; desire for quality outcome reduces speed of determination	Development Control staff	Targets exceeded: 86% determined 89% determined 97% determined	BVPI (109a) (109b) (109c)
Submission of revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) by July 2007 Thereafter maintain 3 year rolling programme	PIM	Achieved	None	P & I staff	Achieved	BVPI (200a)
Meeting milestones set out in the current LDS	PIM	LDS timescale	Changes in Government advice such as Planning White Paper	P & I staff	Ongoing	
Publish an annual monitoring report on LDF by 31 December each year	PIM	December 2006	Loss of staff resources	P & I staff	Timescales met	BVPI (200b)
Percentage of appeal decisions allowed	DCM	Ongoing	Staff resources	P & I staff	Annual report endorsed by Council and linked to Community Strategy monitoring 20% allowed	BVPI (200c) SP BVPI (204)

Target/Indicator	Lead Officer	Implement by	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Progress	Target Origin
Score against a 'quality of planning services' checklist	HP	December 2007	Software implementation		94% met	(BVPI (205)
Pursue 'e' route for information provision of all Policy & Implementation publications	PIM	ongoing	Software difficulties	Policy & Implementation / IS staff	Publication on website of live information System set up for electronic management of LDF	CIP
Involve the community effectively in planning policy development and improve publicity by prioritising resources to those channels identified in the Local Plan questionnaire survey	PIM	Adoption of Statement of Community Involvement by April 2005	Enactment of legislation	Policy & Implementation staff	Increased involvement in Local Development Framework LDF consultation June 2008	CIP
Adopt DMS to deal with all Policy & Implementation correspondence	PIM	December 2007	Corporate introduction of system Software difficulties	Corporate system acquired Policy & Implementation staff	Develop workflow, but delays due to technical difficulties	CIP
Use DMS in Policy & Implementation to track correspondence from Development Control	PIM	December 2007	Corporate introduction of system Software difficulties	Corporate system acquired Policy & Implementation staff	Develop workflow	CIP

Target/Indicator	Lead Officer	Implement by	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Progress	Target Origin
Link DMS to Local Development Framework database for representations	PIM	As part of publication of Local Development Framework	Corporate introduction of system Software difficulties	Corporate system acquired Policy & Implementation staff	Develop workflow, but also using Access database as an IT solution	CIP
Include indicators and targets, including a sustainability audit, in the Local Development Framework	PIM	As integral part of LDF and formal Annual Monitoring Report 12/06	Lack of formal guidance on sustainability audits and enactment of legislation Staff resources	Policy & Implementation staff	Published in Local Development Framework and linked to the Community Strategy Annual Report	CIP
Continue to work with the NW Surrey Benchmarking Group to develop better Performance indicators for Forward Planning Sections	PIM	ongoing	Information from other authorities	Policy & Implementation staff	Regular meetings established between authorities Interim Advice Note on Planning Obligations published for comment (outcome of joint working between Surrey authorities)	CIP
Annually review the 'State of Runnymede' baseline environmental study of the Borough	PIM	Annual update	Closely linked to LDF process	Policy & Implementation staff	Review completed – need to integrate into Council policy	CIP
Examine 94% Building Regulation applications in 10 working days.	BCM	ongoing	Staff shortages	Building Control staff	Target achieved	CIP
Examine all Building Regulation applications within average of 10 days.	BCM	ongoing	Staff shortages	Building Control staff	Target achieved	CIP
Determine 100% of Building Regulation applications within statutory period.	BCM	ongoing	Staff shortages	Building Control staff	Target achieved	CIP

Target/Indicator	Lead Officer	Implement by	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Progress	Target Origin
Seek to investigate Building Control complaints within 3 working days and respond accordingly.	BCM	ongoing		BCM	Target achieved	CIP
Respond to all requests for Building Control site inspection received by 10.00am the same day.	BCM	ongoing	Staff shortages	Building Control staff	Target achieved	CIP
Maintain ISO accreditation and carry out biennial customer surveys	BCM	ongoing		BCM	ISO accreditation maintained Survey undertaken	CIP
Monitor statutory consultees response times using quality assurance processes	DCM/ BCM	ongoing	Resources of consultees	BCM / DCM	Informal monitoring in place	CIP
Agree protocols with statutory consultees including response times and electronic information exchange	DCM	April 2006	Introduction of DMS. Availability of technology by consultees	DTS	Being pursued on a statutory basis by Government	CIP
Monitor performance against Charter	DCM / BCM	ongoing		DCM/BCM	Ongoing	CIP
Establish benchmarking comparison with Audit Commission family group	DCM / BCM	ongoing		DCM/BCM	Comparative data available	CIP
Introduce electronic document management system to Development Control / Building Control	DCM / BCM	March 2006	Corporate introduction of system	Corporate system acquired	Building Regulations applications scanned on receipt and on completion.	CIP
Analyse reasons why planning applications are determined outside of Government targets	DCM	On-going on quarterly basis		DCM	Informal monitoring in place	CIP

Target/Indicator	Lead Officer	Implement by	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Progress	Target Origin
Continue to monitor correspondence for timely response	DCM / BCM	ongoing	Pressure to process applications Availability of staff	DCM/BCM	Monitoring in place of Corporate guidelines	CIP
Monitor progress on s.106 and compliance with requirements	DCM	ongoing		Development Control and legal staff	Monitoring undertaken Staff resource being recruited	CIP
Arrange annual tour of completed developments for Members	DTS	Annually		DTS	Tour to be arranged in 2008	CIP
Seek to identify best practice from across the country and implement locally where appropriate	ALL	ongoing		ALL	Discussions with IDEa and PAS regarding improvements	CIP
Maintain staff continued professional development	DCM / BCM / PIM	ongoing	Availability of appropriate training courses	Establish through annual appraisals and budget process	To RTP/RICS standards	CIP
Maintain Annual Design Awards	PIM	Annually	Availability of staff	Policy & Implementation staff	Design award competition organised. Awards presented at April 2008 Council meeting	CIP
Promote principles of Surrey Design Guide	DCM/ PIM	ongoing	Measurability of success	Development Control staff	Improved design. Success at appeal	CIP
Maintain contact with main Residents' and Amenity Groups on planning issues	DTS/ HP	Ongoing (quarterly)		Existing staff	Regular meetings of Planning Liaison Group	CIP

Target/Indicator	Lead Officer	Implement by	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Progress	Target Origin
Continue to explore potential for joint working with other authorities	ALL	ongoing	Willingness of partners; legal implications	To be identified	Planning Collaboration Project launched in association with IDeA and PAS	CIP
Finalise full connection to Planning Portal Programme	DTS	December 2006		To be identified	Seamless connection to Planning Portal in place	CIP
Undertake Equality Impact Assessments in all service areas and reassess every three years. Implement appropriate action to remedy any adverse impact found or research to fully understand impact. Monitor existing and proposed policies, procedures and strategies for adverse impact on equality	ALL	As set out in Equality Action Plan As appropriate ongoing		Existing staff	EIA completed in Development Control and Building Control. LDF policies to be reviewed as developed	Equality Policy and Action Plan
Respond sensitively to all genuine requests to provide information for those with mobility difficulties or other special needs that prevent them from attending the Civic Offices	ALL	ongoing		All staff	Response to all reasonable requests; lack of complaints	CIP

PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY

 DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES

28TH APRIL TO 16TH MAY 2008

<u>APP. NO.</u>	<u>LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION</u>
08/0076	84-86 Guildford Street, Chertsey Change of use from A1 retail to A4 lounge bar DECISION: REFUSE
08/0094	1 Sainsburys Centre, Heriot Road, Chertsey Advertisement consent for the replacement of 3 no. car park signs and the installation of 7 no. new car park signs DECISION: GRANT
08/0236	Mullaghmore, Staines Road, Laleham, Staines Consultation by Spelthorne Borough Council for the erection of replacement garage with ancillary office accommodation at first floor following demolition of existing garage/garden store DECISION: NO OBJECTION
08/0243	Greenmeads, Ten Acre Lane, Thorpe, Egham Erection of single storey rear/side extension DECISION: GRANT
08/0249	Blandings, Pinewood Road, Virginia Water Erection of single storey flat roofed extension to rear of existing dwelling DECISION: GRANT
08/0251	Centrica, 30 The Causeway, Staines Advertisement consent for the erection of 4 signs, 1.5m high to be illuminated following approval of RU.07/1145 DECISION: GRANT
08/0254	25 Weymede Close, Chertsey Erection of single storey side extension incorporating two rooflights in side elevation DECISION: GRANT
08/0263	Retail 3, Phoenix Plaza, Guildford Street, Chertsey Installation of one air conditioning unit (retrospective) and one external retractable canopy to enable the outside area to be used as ancillary outside seating DECISION: GRANT

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

- 08/0264 258 Chertsey Lane, Staines
Erection of single storey side and rear extensions incorporating two rooflights to rear elevation and a garage following demolition of existing garage
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0266 16 Row Hill, Addlestone
Erection of a single storey side extension
DECISION: REFUSE
- 08/0268 212 Chertsey Lane, Staines
Erection of a single storey front extension
DECISION: REFUSE
- 08/0271 8 Oak Avenue, Egham
Erection of single storey rear and side extension following demolition of existing conservatory and side extension
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0272 65 Riversdell Close, Chertsey
Erection of single storey rear and first floor side extensions with insertion of 2 raised rooflights to rear following removal of existing conservatory
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0277 Co-op, 14-16 The Broadway, New Haw, Addlestone
Replacement fascia and projecting signs, internally illuminated
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0279 29 Woodhaw, Egham
Erection of a detached two storey, two bedroom dwelling following demolition of existing garage/workshop
DECISION: REFUSE
- 08/0282 35 Woodham Lane, New Haw, Addlestone
Erection of two storey side extension and single storey side/rear extension incorporating rooflights following part demolition of existing rear extension
DECISION: REFUSE
- 08/0283 7 Lime Tree Walk, Virginia Water
Fell one conifer in the rear garden
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0284 Copthorne, Portnall Drive, Virginia Water
Replacement and repositioning of main entrance, alterations to fenestration, creation of one dormer with insertion of two rooflights in northern elevation and four dormers to southern elevation to allow habitable accommodation in the roofspace
DECISION: GRANT

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

- 08/0285 The Bothys, Dell Park Farm, Bishopsgate Road, Englefield Green
Erection of a new dwelling and garage following demolition of existing dwellings garaging and sheds
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0288 Kingswood, Meadow Road, Virginia Water
Certificate of Existing Lawful Development for the retention of a gallery and gym/pool complex
DECISION: GRANT CERTIFICATE OF EXISTING LAWFULNESS
- 08/0293 Tavistock, Christchurch Road, Virginia Water
Erection of first floor side, single storey rear extensions, rear conservatory and construction of front canopy to form entrance porch
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0294 Land r/o 83 London Street, Chertsey
Erection of a pair of two storey dwellings with linked car ports
DECISION: REFUSE
- 08/0295 1 Holmwood Close, Addlestone
Proposed first floor rear extension to provide an additional bedroom and new sloping roof to existing ground floor extension. (Revised description 1st May 2008)
DECISION: REFUSE
- 08/0296 7 Manor Way, Egham
Certificate of Proposed Lawfulness for erection of single storey rear extension
DECISION: GRANT CERTIFICATE OF PROPOSED LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT
- 08/0297 25 Fairway, Chertsey
Erection of a two storey rear extension with the insertion of two rooflights to the rear roofslope of the existing roof and a single solar panel to the front roofslope. (Revised description 2nd April 2008)
DECISION: REFUSE
- 08/0300 6 Slade Road, Ottershaw
Erection of two storey rear and single storey side extensions following demolition of existing single storey rear element
DECISION: REFUSE
- 08/0301 Land adjacent 6 Warwick Villas, Thorpe Lea Road, Egham
Erection of 2 bedroom house attached to flank of 6 Warwick Villas
DECISION: REFUSE

<u>APP. NO.</u>	<u>LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION</u>
08/0302	Lyne Lane Civic Amenity Site, Lyne, Chertsey Details of the construction of the surface water and foul drainage system pursuant to Condition 4, details of a scheme for surface water source control measures pursuant to Condition 5, and details of a scheme of floodlighting pursuant to Condition 6 of planning permission RU.06/0716 DECISION: NO OBJECTION
08/0303	32A Mayfield Avenue, New Haw, Addlestone Erection of first floor side and single storey rear extensions DECISION: GRANT
08/0305	Rodwell Court, Garfield Road, Addlestone Erection of an additional floor with mansard roof, dormers and terraces to form four self-contained one bedroom flats and proposed refuse and cycle stores DECISION: REFUSE
08/0307	Unit 9, Weybridge Business Park, Addlestone Road, Addlestone Erection of brick built storage shed next to existing bin store and new flat roof for existing bin store in car park at rear of Unit 9, Weybridge Business Park DECISION: GRANT
08/0310	Staines Town Hall, Market Square, Staines Variation of Condition 8 attached to planning permission 04/00906/FUL (for the conversion to a restaurant/public house with associated alterations) to permit a dance floor for dancing purposes DECISION: NO OBJECTION
08/0312	Pembrook House, Wellington Avenue, Virginia Water Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development for the erection of a triple garage DECISION: GRANT CERTIFICATE OF PROPOSED LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT
08/0313	5 Oak Tree Close, Virginia Water Erection of rear conservatory, conversion of existing garage into habitable accommodation and formation of roof canopies to form porches to the side and new entrance to the front elevation DECISION: GRANT
08/0314	33 Langton Way, Egham Erection of a two storey side extension DECISION: GRANT
08/0319	The Vicarage Lodge, Longcross Road, Longcross, Chertsey Erection of a detached single storey garage following demolition of existing sheds DECISION: GRANT

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

- 08/0321 22 Silver Birch Close, Woodham
Fell one pine tree in rear garden protected by Tree Preservation Order 366
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0322 19 Bois Hall Road, Addlestone
Certificate of Proposed Lawful Development for a single storey rear extension
DECISION: GRANT CERTIFICATE OF PROPOSED LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT
- 08/0327 26 Brighton Road, Addlestone
Erection of a single storey side/rear extension incorporating rooflights following demolition of existing garage
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0328 284 Woodham Lane, New Haw, Addlestone
Installation of satellite dish on rear flat roof extension
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0329 33 Oak Tree Close, Virginia Water
Erection of single storey side extension and rear conservatory
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0335 2-4 London Street, Chertsey
Erection of 2 non-illuminated fascia signs and one non-illuminated projecting sign
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0344 Land adj. 93 Kings Road, New Haw, Addlestone
Proposed erection of a detached three bedroom dwelling (follows outline planning application RU.07/0346)
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0347 Pear Tree Cottage, 16 South Avenue, Egham
Erection of detached garage to rear of property
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0350 12 Bourne Road, Virginia Water
Erection of a single storey rear extension with insertion of rooflights following demolition of existing rear element
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0359 25 Church Road, Addlestone
Erection of a replacement entrance lobby with pitched roof extending over existing garage
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0365 1 Rhodes Court, Pooley Green Close, Egham
Erection of a two storey side extension
DECISION: GRANT

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

08/0395 St. Paul's Primary School, School Lane, Addlestone
Consultation by Surrey County Council for installation of demountable
classroom unit comprising two classrooms, ancillary toilet and store and
external canopy
DECISION: NO OBJECTION

DELEGATED DECISIONS IN CONSULTATION WITH CHAIRMAN & VICE CHAIRMAN

<u>APP. NO.</u>	<u>LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION</u>
08/0259	9 Virginia Drive, Virginia Water Demolition of existing dwelling, garage and outbuildings and replacement with new two storey dwelling with roof accommodation and integral garage, relocation of driveway to include new gates and pillars and separate pedestrian access DECISION: GRANT
08/0270	109 Bourneside Road, Addlestone Erection of two storey rear and side extensions incorporating a Juliette balcony to the side and construction of a detached garage to the rear following demolition of existing side and rear element and garage DECISION: GRANT
08/0292	156 Woodham Lane, New Haw, Addlestone Erection of a single storey side and rear extension with insertion of 1 rooflight and 1 sunken lantern style rooflight DECISION: GRANT
08/0315	6 Inglewood, Chertsey Erection of a single storey side extension with insertion of a raised rooflight following demolition of existing side element DECISION: GRANT
08/0316	14 Bittams Lane, Chertsey Erection of part two storey, part single storey side extension following demolition of outside store DECISION: GRANT
08/0323	16 Laburnum Road, Chertsey Erection of a single storey rear and side extension DECISION: GRANT
08/0333	Honeycomb Chemists, 100 Guildford Street, Chertsey Replacement shopfront DECISION: GRANT
08/0348	Savill Court Hotel, Wick Lane, Englefield Green, Egham Advertisement consent for two non-illuminated plaques one to each gate pillar and another non-illuminated sign (0.8m x 0.6m) to be inlaid into proposed brick wall on left hand side of entrance gates DECISION: GRANT
08/0360	27 Church Road, Addlestone Construction of a pitched roof over existing entrance and garage DECISION: GRANT

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

08/0371 55 Woodham Park Road, Woodham, Addlestone
Erection of single storey front and rear/side extension incorporating rooflights to the side elevation and lantern style rooflight to the rear and changes to fenestration
DECISION: **GRANT**