

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

12th March 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 1** **Former DERA Site, Chobham Lane, Longcross – RU.05/0538**
- Application:** **Paragraph 3.9**
Delete last sentence of last bullet point relating to 2770 car parking spaces.
- Consultations:** **Paragraph 4.3**
Three additional letters of objection, including one from the British Horse Society, which state:
- The development of the enormous floor area of this site will demand local housing, which is partially forthcoming in the proposals for the housing development on the Longcross Barrowhills site. Together they will be a huge conglomeration which, if looked on as part of Virginia Water, would completely swamp the infrastructure and services of the Virginia Water/Trumps Green village. They must be viewed together as an independent 'New Village' and must be developed as such. It is impossible to approve the plans for the North DERA site without proper outline plans for the Barrowhills site. Please, therefore, defer a decision on this application until there has been a proper public inquiry on the combined development.
 - Please ensure that the development does not detract from the public use of the access via the Burma Road to the Ship Hill part of Chobham Common. This is a well used access for residents of Virginia Water and Longcross and from further into Runnymede.
 - If you are so minded as to approve the application please make it conditional on the maintenance of the bridle way along the railway boundary from the Kitsmead Bridge to the Longcross station and thence to Chobham Common. Although this path does not presently enjoy R.O.W. status, it has been used by horse riders and pedestrians for very many years, and the vastly increased traffic and the additional roundabout resulting from this application will preclude the use of the Chobham Lane for any social pursuits.
 - To find that the applicant wishes to completely seal the site to prevent access by pedestrians and riders. This means access to Chobham Common is only possible by transport as Chertsey Lane is too dangerous to walk or ride along. An absolute disgrace, we have had permitted use of the footpath since war ended.
 - People should have equal rights to the protected birds to use the common.

- Closure of access via Wentworth Golf Course is disgraceful.
- Council has a duty to residents who pay taxes.
- Traffic lights at Wellington Avenue is a further attempt to urbanise our country village.
- The British Horse Society is concerned that the needs and safety of local horse riders may not have been considered when considering the application. (Paragraph 5.267 of the report addresses the original objection from Runnymede Riders on behalf of local horse riders.)

Paragraph 4.3.6:-

Third line, delete “relatively”.

Paragraph 4.3.8:-

The County Highway Authority would prefer their final comments on the application to be summarised in the following way. “If the application is granted permission the County Highway Authority recommend that the following package of transport related measures should read:-

- Section 278 for off-site highway works.
- Improvements to Longcross Station including ‘kiss and ride’ facility.
- At least 30 minute stopping serving at Longcross Station every day except Sundays.
- Shuttle bus service to Woking, fully funded by developer for 5 years from first occupation and thereafter funded by TMA.
- Review car parking regime if demand, but insufficient income.
- On-site employee only health and fitness facility, crèche, retail café/restaurant facility.
- Network of pedestrian and cycle routes.
- Regular view of off-site parking on the highway and use of the surrounding car parks on the Chobham Common etc, following first occupation.
- Full funding of Traffic Regulation Orders.
- A commitment to fund prior to development commencing, the microsimulation of the junction of M3/A322 and A322/New Road, with associated links; to design any necessary improvements to that part of the network arising from the additional development impact; and the full implementation of those improvements.
- A commitment to fully fund prior to development, a review, design; consultation and the implementation of a traffic calming scheme that might be derived from that process to discourage development traffic from using Windlesham Village roads as a means of access to the development.
- The contribution of a sum not exceeding £100,000 (indexed to September 2007 prices) towards the cost of closing Staple Hill Road in the event that a Road Closure Order is obtained.

- The provision and maintenance of unfettered non site access for all modes to Longcross Station.
- Travel Plan to include parking charge of 15% of the initial provision 1/30 sq.m. and the increase by 2% per year for each occupier of % of spaces charged for so by end of year 5 each occupier will be charged for using 25% of its total allocated spaces – provide greater fiscal support for TMA.
- Monitoring of Travel Plan required.
- Establishment and permanent maintenance of TMA.
- Junction improvements at A30 junctions to be fully implemented no later than occupation of 25,000 sq.m. of floorspace.
- No other means of access to Chobham Lane or Burma Road.
- Provision of 3,019 car parking spaces (maximum)
- Provision of at least 725 cycle spaces.

Without prejudice to the County's formal response to the consultation on the draft South East Plan following the August 2007 Panel Report the CHA have the following comments on the Panel's findings:

Notwithstanding the inconclusive debate as to whether or not a free standing development in the middle of Surrey's unpopulated heathlands, straddling one of Europe's busiest motorways, comprising 2,500 residential units and 65,000 sq.m. of B1 uses and other supporting facilities constitutes a "sustainable community" (however that might be defined), the proposed development comprising over 90,000 sq.m. of B1 with no residential is significantly worse in sustainable transport terms. Not only is the development an uplift on the South East Plan's proposed 65,000 sq.m. of B1 (40%) but it is also an uplift on the CLEUD of 77,320 sq.m. (17%). The siting of this significant increase in B1 development in this location with little other community facilities and none of the housing which appears to be deemed necessary by the South East Panel in their decision to override other policies within the draft plan, makes it even more unacceptable. Although the County do not necessarily agree with the Panel's report in respect of the application site, its findings do demonstrate how unacceptable the quantum of development within the proposal therefore must be.

Notwithstanding the above comments in respect of the South East Plan's findings that 65,000 sq.m. of B1 could be justified provided that it was part of a "community" with housing, the existence of a CLEUD for 77,320 sq.m. B1, establishes a base which we cannot diminish. For this reason, were an application to be submitted for an amount of B1 development commensurate to the CLEUD of 77,320 sq.m. with a similar transport package, although there would still be serious concerns about the sustainability of such a development, the County Council would probably reconsider its recommendation to refuse.

The review of the applicants transport assessment by Parsons Brinkerhoff, on behalf of Surrey County Council, sets out the likely impacts on relevant junctions. The important point to understand is that all modeling of the development scenario is set upon the base of the potential travel demand arising from the already granted CLEUD's. In other words, the impact of the development of 90,626 sq.m. of B1 has been compared with the situation that would potentially prevail were the CLEUD of 77,320 sq.m. implemented.

That situation could prevail without any highway improvements, so the required junction improvements associated with the development proposals would partially mitigate that otherwise uncorrected impact. It is clear from the Parsons Brinkerhoff report that the modelled queue lengths on some junctions will be excessive. These however, are primarily a result of the established lawful development, and something that alone cannot be corrected.

Paragraph 5.94:-

First sentence - delete 'Chertsey Lane' and replace with 'Chobham Lane'.

Paragraph 5.179:-

Delete third sentence of paragraph 5.179 relating to 2770 spaces.

Paragraph 5.180:-

Delete last two sentences of paragraph 5.180 relating to 2770 spaces.

Paragraph 5.181:-

Delete second part of second sentence from 'and a further reduction to 2770 spaces' to 'reduction of 1095 spaces'.

Paragraph 5.182:-

The applicant and the CHA agree to a 25% parking penalty charge after 5 years providing there is no further reduction in car parking spaces below 3079 car parking spaces.

Paragraph 5.232:-

Add at end of paragraph 5.232:

'The applicant intends to relocate Building 10 off site. The structure would be taken apart and rebuilt as is in its new relocation which is most likely to be Brooklands Museum, although it could be relocated to a similar type of location subject to the agreement with the Local Planning Authority. Building 10 will not be retained on site.'

Paragraph 5.271:-

On the last line replace '125' with '725' to read '725 cycle spaces'.

Paragraph 5.353:-

Delete last sentence of paragraph 5.353 and replace with "The aim of the travel plan will be to reduce the number of single occupancy car trips by 12.2% over 5 years (from 89% to 76.8%) and to charge for 25% of the total parking spaces after 5 years."

Paragraph 6.6:-

On the first sentence of paragraph 6.6 after 3079 spaces delete 'with ongoing reductions to 2770 within 5 years of the offices being completed'.

**Officers'
Recommendation:**

- (1) After '(Green Belt) Direction 2005' add 'and Circular 07/99 The Town and Country (Development Plans and Consultation) (Departures) Directions 1999'.
- (2) First bullet point – add at end 'or to be paid back to the developer'.

Second bullet point – first line delete 'approximately £1m-£1.45million to be index linked' and replace with 'not to exceed £1.45 million'.

Second bullet point - add 'provision for appropriate disabled access at the station'.

Third bullet point – second and third sentences alter to read ‘The privately run service will come into operation at the trigger date above and shall be maintained only for such time as the occupancy exceeds 25,000 sq.m. As an alternative and at their sole discretion, the developer.....’.

Third bullet point - delete ‘stations’ and replace with ‘station’.

Fourth bullet point – at the beginning add ‘To develop and agree with the Highway Authority a travel plan strategy’

Fifth bullet point – second line should read 25,000 sq.m. B1 offices not 5,000 sq.m.

Seventh bullet point – delete building No. 10.

Add eighth bullet point to read ‘management and maintenance of building No. 10.

- (3) The Director of Technical Services in conjunction with the Chairman and Vice Chairman to make changes and alterations to the proposed conditions listed below following discussions with the applicant and statutory consultees, where appropriate :-

Condition 5: Second line delete ‘1 to 5 above’ and replace with ‘1 to 4 above’.

Condition 19: to read ‘725 cycles’ not ‘125 cycles’

Condition 21: third line delete ‘as’ and replace with ‘and’

Reasons for Conditions 24 46 and 59 to read: Condition C17 of Appropriate Assessment.... And Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.

Reasons for Condition 26 to read: ‘Special Protection Area’

Condition 28: Sub-section (b) nine lines down should read ‘carried out fully in accordance with the scheme’.

Reason for Condition 28 to read: ‘Planning and pollution Control and Annex 2 of Planning Policy Statement 23 (PPS23) Development on Land Affected by Contamination.’

Condition 48: Third bullet point delete ‘or management of access to’.

Condition 49: Tenth bullet point – add ‘significant’ to read ‘measures to prevent significant disturbance to wildlife and habitats during the demolition and construction phases’.

Reasons for Condition 49 and 56: Add ‘Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998’.

Condition 60 – Add ‘related to the relevant reserved matters application’ after ‘demolition works’ and before ‘a management plan’

First bullet point replace ‘location’ with ‘relocation’.

Informatives:

Additional informative No. 15 :-

15. In conjunction with proposed Condition 34 (contamination) the applicant is requested to deal with local concerns relating to the previous military testing on the site involving radioactive material.
-

2. Page 157 **40-44 High Street, Egham - RU.08/0007**

WITHDRAWN

3. Page 173 **40-44 High Street, Egham - RU.08/0009**

WITHDRAWN

A G E N D A I T E M S

1. Page 6 Item 7: **Tree Preservation Order 374 - Abbey Walls, Abbey Gardens, Chertsey**

When the application for removal of part of the hedge was reported to Committee last December, a total of nine letters of objection had been received raising the following points which were reported to the Committee :-

- object to formation of access in a designated conservation area which will increase traffic;
 - harm to amenity of No. 17 Abbey Gardens;
 - object strongly to works to ancient yew hedge;
 - no works are necessary because the existing access is adequate at the top end of Abbey Gardens;
 - permission would lead to a further application for a new house;
 - existing hedge creates pleasing boundary between the houses and creates a sound barrier; removal to create a new driveway is unnecessary and detrimental to the environment;
 - impact on Scheduled Ancient Monument; this should not be disturbed;
 - yew hedge should be regularly maintained but not removed;
 - yew hedge does not need care and attention but does not justify removal of two trees leaving a gap in the historic hedge;
 - loss of two further trees following loss of other trees is detrimental to nature conservancy;
 - harm to amenity of No. 16 Abbey Gardens;
 - hardstanding would cause heavy rainwater flows into 16 Abbey Gardens;
 - unsympathetic development in a Conservation Area;
 - recommend a condition of any planning consent that any hardstanding is constructed in accordance with SUDS principles;
 - recommend an archaeological brief whilst trees are removed.
-