



PLANNING COMMITTEE

29 OCTOBER 2008

APPENDICES

<u>APPENDIX</u>	<u>REPORT</u>	<u>PAGE. NO.</u>
A	MINUTES – 24.9.2008	1
B	APPEAL DECISION – WESTWOOD,VIRGINIA WATER	18
C	APPEAL DECISION - RYEPECK, LALEHAM REACH, CHERTSEY	20
D	APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY DTS	25

Runnymede Borough Council

APPENDIX 'A'

PLANNING COMMITTEE24 September 2008 at 7.30pm

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

Members of the Committee absent: None

Councillors A J Davis, R J Edis, P A Francis and Mrs L M Gillham also attended.

227. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Group 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.

Group requesting Change	Remove from Membership	Appoint Instead
Conservative	Councillor H W V Meares	Councillor C J Chapman
Conservative	Councillor P B Tuley	Councillor C J Norman

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

228. PLANNING APPLICATION

The Committee considered a consultation from Surrey County Council, the determining Authority, on a planning application regarding land adjacent Trumps Farm, Longcross. All representations received on the application were reported and copies were made available for inspection by Members before the meeting. Mr Few, an objector, and Mr Cosky, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee on the application. In considering the application, the Committee requested Officers to request the applicant to provide certain information which had been omitted.

RESOLVED that -

the views of the Planning Committee on the application, as set out below, be forwarded to Surrey County Council:-

APP NO**LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION****RU 08/0673****Land adjoining Trumps Farm Landfill Site, Kitsmead Lane, Longcross**

Consultation application by Surrey County Council for the construction of a building to be used as an energy from waste facility including ancillary offices and a visitor centre, upgrading vehicular access onto Kitsmead Lane, parking areas, weighbridge, gatehouse, external lighting, 2.5m high security fencing and provision of ponds for water attenuation and nature conservation purposes.

DECISION: RAISE VERY STRONG OBJECTIONS for the following reasons:-

1. **The proposals represent inappropriate and harmful development in the Green Belt which would be detrimental to its openness. The applicant has failed to adequately demonstrate any very special circumstances that would outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt. In particular, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the site is well located in relation to waste arisings and has failed to consider use of alternative facilities such as the incinerator at Colnbrook. The development is therefore contrary to saved Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Policies CW6 and WD5 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008, saved Policy GB1 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001 and the advice in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 : 'Green Belts'.**
2. **The applicant has failed to demonstrate in the alternative site assessment that the application site is the most appropriate location for the development and has failed to investigate the use of the existing facility at Colnbrook. The assessment is flawed and if corrected, demonstrates that the site is less suitable and therefore more harmful, than a number of alternative sites in the County. The proposals are therefore contrary to Policies CW5, CW6 and WD5 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.**
3. **Background levels of atmospheric pollution to which this proposal will contribute have already exceeded the critical loads and levels for features existing within the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham Special Area of Conservation site. The information submitted in support of this proposal has failed to demonstrate that it will not contribute, in combination with other developments, to this effect. Accordingly, failure to carry out an appropriate assessment of these effects in combination with other plans and projects that contribute to this effect would be contrary to Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive, Regulation 48 (1) of the Habitats Regulations, Planning Policy Statement 9 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation'; ODPM Circular 6/2005 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations and their impact within the Planning System'; Policies NRM5 and NRM9 of the South East Plan and Policy WD5 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.**
4. **The site is not easily accessible by the strategic highway network. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy W16 of the South East Plan, Policy CW5 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and saved Policy DN2 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004.**
5. **The Transport Assessment in the Environmental Statement accompanying the application is inadequate in the following regard:**
 - i) **Insufficient background traffic information has been collected, particularly in respect of the junction between Kitsmead Lane and Longcross Road;**

- ii) **The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the highway improvement proposal at the junction of Kitsmead Lane and Longcross Road is practical or safe, nor that adequate sight-lines can be provided, except by removal of trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order;**
- iii) **The Transport Assessment has not adequately addressed the safety and amenity of cyclists and pedestrians;**
- iv) **No mitigation is proposed to overcome the impact of the proposals on the Green Lane and Holloway Hill roundabouts, which will be operating above capacity by 2013;**
- v) **The Transport Assessment fails to take account of the proposed major development of the former DERA site in Longcross, as set out in the South East Plan.**

The development is therefore contrary to saved Policy DN2 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 and saved Policies MV3 and MV4 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.

- 6. **The development would increase existing background noise levels to an unacceptable degree. In addition, there may be intermittent noise emissions, particularly at night and there may be tonal characteristics emitting from the site that would be readily audible outside the site. This would be detrimental to the amenity that nearby residents might reasonably expect to enjoy, in addition to noise disturbance already experienced from the M3 motorway. This would be contrary to saved Policy SE1 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Policy DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008, advice contained in Planning Policy Guidance Note 24 : 'Planning and Noise', The Environmental Noise Directive, 2002/49/EC and The Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006.**
- 7. **The Landscape and Visual Effects chapter of the Environmental Statement is deficient in that it fails to define a clear study area, consideration of character or recognition of impacts. Its rationale and justification is conflicting and it needs to consider the impact across a far wider area. This is therefore contrary to Policies DC2 and DC3 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008.**
- 8. **The proposed development would have a severely detrimental impact on landscape character both in the immediate area and from wider views; it would have an unacceptable impact on the openness of the Green Belt and on the amenity of nearby residential properties. The development would therefore be contrary to Saved Structure Plan Policies LO4 and SE8, Policies CW6 and WD5 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008, saved Policy GB1 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration**

**April 2001 the advice in Planning Policy Guidance Note
2: 'Green Belts' and Planning Policy Statement 1:
'Delivering Sustainable Development'**

229. SOUTH EAST PLAN RESPONSE TO SECRETARY OF STATE'S PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE DRAFT REGIONAL STRATEGY FOR THE SOUTH EAST OF ENGLAND

The Committee was advised of the current Consultation on the South East Plan and of the changes which had been made by Government in the light of the Panel Report, and approved a response to the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) on the amended policies.

The changes of most interest related to Housing Allocations, the Former DERA Site, and Policy Guidance on Waste Management.

Housing Allocations

The housing requirement for Runnymede, over the period 2006-2026 had been confirmed as 161 units p/a and 125 units p/a for the former DERA site, giving a total of 5720 units over the Plan period.

A fundamental part of the existing Development Plan was that housing land was released on a phased basis (e.g. 1991-2001 and 2001-2006) to ensure that there was some control in meeting the requirements over the whole period. However, this did not form part of the current policy approach and reference would need to be made to other planning advice to clarify the proposed policy approach. It was essential that the release of land was guided by the ability of the local social and physical infrastructure to accommodate the additional development.

The housing requirement in the Plan was regarded as a minimum and the approach in the Plan would therefore be read in conjunction with PPS3 to provide the advice on regulating housing supply. Whilst PPS3 says that the LDF should set out the arrangements for managing the release of land, the emphasis in PPS3 was upon maintaining a five year supply and a further 10-15 year supply. However, PPS3 also stated that very good reasons had to be demonstrated for not allowing permission on a suitable site that came forward even if the 5 year requirement was satisfied. Therefore even if a 5 year supply of land had been demonstrated, sites that had previously been regarded as constrained (such as reserved sites) might be released if otherwise suitable. The Committee expressed concern at this as it potentially illustrated a conflict between PPS3 Housing and PPG2 Green Belts (that set out the policy on reserve sites which were to be retained until required to meet housing requirements should it not be possible to satisfy the planned requirements). Members were concerned that the housing figures supplied by the NHPAU had not been the subject of consultation and their validity had not been tested or commented upon.

The Former DERA Site

The policy guidance in H1, LF3, LF6 and SP5 made specific reference to the redevelopment of the former DERA site to accommodate a mixed use development with 65,000sqm of commercial development and a residential scheme comprising 2500 units. There was a need to ensure that the requirement of the Thames Basin Heath SPA and other environmental matters were fully satisfied. In addition, reference was made to the need to review the Green Belt boundary of the site.

The SE Plan was clear that future development on the former DERA site had to recognise the environmental constraints whilst providing the social and physical infrastructure to support this scale of development. The Committee considered that if the policy was to remain then it should be strengthened to ensure that development should only proceed once all social physical and environmental infrastructure issues including an assessment of the impact on Chobham Common were satisfactorily addressed as part of the preparation of the Local Development Framework. Concern was also expressed over the lack of full and proper public consultation on the development of the DERA site.

Guidance on Waste Management

Policy W17 on Waste Management had been amended to remove a criteria based approach for locating waste facilities within the Green Belt. The policy now stated that the provision of such facilities should not be precluded from the Green Belt.

The Committee noted that the policy had been relaxed to more easily locate waste management facilities in the Green Belt. This was in direct conflict with PPG2 which set out what constitutes acceptable development in the Green Belt and this did not include waste facilities. The Committee considered that the deleted paragraphs which sought to test the harm of the facility on the objectives of the Green Belt designation should be reinstated.

The responses set out in Appendix 'A' which were endorsed by the Committee, subject to some drafting changes sought changes to policies relating to these three areas.

RESOLVED that:-

the above mentioned comments and recommendations set out in Appendix 'A' on the Proposed Changes to the South East Plan be submitted to the Government Office for the South East.

230. SOUTH EAST ENGLAND REGIONAL ASSEMBLY CONSULTATION ON GYPSY & TRAVELLER SITE PROVISION IN THE SOUTH EAST

The Committee was advised of the current distribution options for Gypsy and Traveller site provision within the South East and considered a response to the South East of England Regional Assembly's (SEERA) consultation exercise on its review of site provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.

The Government had required the South East Regional Assembly (SEERA) to review the needs assessments (the GTAA) for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople that had been undertaken by the Boroughs of Runnymede, Spelthorne, Elmbridge and Woking and the arrangements for provision across the whole of the south east. SEERA was also required to determine total pitch requirements at a regional level and then to allocate these between Local Planning Authorities.

SEERA had informed Local Authorities in December 2006 that, in addition to providing copies of the GTAA, they required authorities to provide advice on the required level of pitch provision for permanent and transit caravan sites and for Gypsies, Travellers and travelling showpeople.

SEERA required that the advice submitted should contain at least two options for pitch distribution. The first option (A) was to assume pitch need would be met in the Borough where it arose on a pro rata basis. The second option (B) was to take into account 'planning principles' to reflect existing opportunities and constraints.

The previously agreed pitch distribution, included in the October 2007 advice to SEERA had, however, been subsequently amended. Following submission of the Advice to SEERA it became clear from comparisons made between individual Boroughs/Counties that there had been differences in the approach taken to the treatment of the information contained within the GTAA. The majority of Authorities had accepted their GTAA advice. However, some authorities had questioned the assumptions and made adjustments to their pitch requirements. There were a range of adjustments made and SEERA subsequently gave all Districts an opportunity to revise their GTAA results in the light of the new information.

One particular factor that other Authorities had included in their assessments that had not been included in the North Surrey study was an adjustment to the pitch requirement to take account of vacancies arising within the existing stock of Gypsy and Traveller sites. The adjustments made for vacancies had led to a new estimate of pitch need from North Surrey of 44 pitches for gypsies and travellers and 22 for travelling showpeople.

In March SEERA offered a wider range of distribution options than Options A and B. A further two pitch distribution options were proposed by SEERA i.e. options C and D:

Option C allowed for 50% of the pitch need that was generated within the region to be redistributed across all Districts on the basis of available land (free of major environmental constraints) and population forecasts for 2016.

Option D was very similar to Option B but proposed that the redistribution was for 25% of the pitch need.

The resulting distribution for Surrey of the above options for gypsies and travellers (not showpeople) was as follows:

County grouping and Authority	Option A Need as arises	Option B Local sustainability	Option C 50% reallocated	Option D 25% reallocated
Elmbridge	9	13	11	12
Epsom & Ewell	7	6	7	7
Guildford	32	33	19	26
Mole Valley	7	6	6	6
Reigate & Banstead	4	8	8	8
Runnymede	18	11	8	9
Spelthorne	7	9	7	8
Surrey Heath	20	19	13	16
Tandridge	10	8	7	7
Waverley	39	39	23	31
Woking	10	11	9	10
Surrey	163	163	118	140

Although there was no option B distribution for travelling showpeople an option B was proposed for 42 families that had no geographic link with a particular Borough. The resulting distribution for travelling showpeople was as follows:

County grouping and Authority	Option A Need as arises	Option B With 42 families	Option C 50% reallocated	Option D 25% reallocated
Elmbridge	2	1	2	2
Epsom & Ewell	1	0	2	1
Guildford	15	1	9	12
Mole Valley	0	0	1	1
Reigate & Banstead	4	1	3	4
Runnymede	13	0	7	10
Spelthorne	7	0	4	6

Surrey Heath	10	0	6	8
Tandridge	4	0	3	4
Waverley	2	0	2	2
Woking	0	0	1	1
Surrey	58	3	40	51

Distribution proposals had not been formulated for transit site provision. SEERA had proposed that Regional policy should encourage a wide-ranging approach to meeting transit requirements and not just formal site provision, including tolerated stopping places and a proportionate approach to enforcement.

The Review was subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) in compliance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the Act) to assess the impact of the Options on the community, the environment, and the economy.

Comment

The Committee considered that the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) undertaken for the Review had taken a subjective view of Options A-D. The emphasis of the appraisal had been to take Option A as the baseline and then to assess how the other options compared with this option. This was fundamentally flawed in that each option should be assessed on its own merit. It was doubtful that the conclusion of the SA in favour of Option A could therefore be considered as satisfying the statutory requirements set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive 2005.

The Committee was concerned that Option A was the preferred Option, namely that gypsy and traveller needs should be met where the need exists. This was contrary to the views mentioned by individuals interviewed for the North West Surrey survey who, by virtue of their nomadic lifestyle and for reasons of choice, indicated that they were happy to have their need met generally rather than solely in the area where they were currently located.

Meeting needs in current locations would exacerbate and intensify the use of existing sites and might also be unsustainable for a range of reasons such as limited and competing employment opportunities and strained existing resource/ support networks. Unless these issues were considered it was not felt that a true SA had been undertaken.

Runnymede was subject to a number of development constraints such as, flooding, Thames Basin Heath SPA, and Green Belt. These limited the options for additional site provision and should be considered as part of the SA.

The SA should also have regard to the impact of provision on other plans, one of which would be the Regional Housing Strategy which acknowledged the rapidly growing demand for affordable housing. Pitch provision for gypsies and travellers, although acknowledged as a need, would directly compete with the supply of affordable housing. A continuing supply of affordable housing was necessary to reduce homelessness. The impact of site provision on opportunities to assist vulnerable homeless people also living in unsatisfactory housing should therefore be considered as part of the SA.

These comments, in the view of the Committee, raised sufficient doubt to challenge the conclusions of the SA that option A should be the preferred option.

A significant increase in housing numbers was expected from the South East Plan and this may provide potential competition for suitable and sustainable sites. The Council had already enabled a significant number of sites to be provided within the Borough and was committed to making some further provision. It was, however, reasonable to suggest that the final allocation be undertaken both on an equitable and sustainable basis. The Committee

supported Option C, which achieved a wider distribution and greater equity and choice in the South East.

This matter had also been considered by the Housing and Community Services Committee who had endorsed Option C. The Director of Housing & Community Services in consultation with the Chairman of Planning and Chairman of Housing & Community Services Committees would approve the final response.

Officers were currently developing the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) which would include a strategic policy on Gypsies, Travellers and travelling populations. A draft consultation version of the Core Strategy was anticipated early in 2009 with final adoption in late 2010. A Housing and Commercial Sites DPD, which would include the specific provision and allocation of sites for Gypsies, Travellers and travelling populations was programmed to start later this year. The anticipated adoption date for this DPD was October 2011. In the interim it was proposed to explore different options for provision including the extension of existing authorised sites; authorisation of existing illegal encampments; and provision within new areas.

RESOLVED that:-

- i) the content of the consultation documents be noted and the proposed response suggesting Option C as the way forward be adopted; and**
- ii) the Director of Housing & Community Services in consultation with the Chairmen of the Housing & Community Services Committee and the Planning Committee be authorised to approve the final response to SEERA.**

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 10.16pm)

Appendix 1

Schedule of responses to the South East Plan (SOS Proposed changes)

Secretary of States proposed change number	Panel's recommendation	Officer Response	Recommendation
Chap.4 (14)	<p>Policy SP5 Greenbelts The policy has been amended to include a line stating that a boundary review will be required in the area of the former DERA Site Chertsey.</p>	<p>Review of the greenbelt is only necessitated in Runnymede as the DERA site has been inserted into the South East Plan. Although Officers have concerns over the sustainability of this site, its location so close to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and the noise and air quality issues associated with the M3, these issues will be dealt with by the Council in subsequent Development Plan Documents (DPD).</p>	<p><i>The Council has concerns about the sustainability of the DERA site, its location so close to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and the noise and air quality issues associated with the M3. To endorse the need to renew the greenbelt, if the plan maintains the former DERA site as a strategic mixed-use development.</i></p>
Chap.7(2)	<p>Policy H1 Housing Provision Increase the regional housing provision levels by 10% and revise level for the sub regions. The largest levels should occur in the London Fringe. (48,620 new units over the plan period)</p>	<p>Runnymede received an additional 2800 new units which is the highest proportion increase in the region. (Mainly through the allocation of the former DERA site). It is anticipated that this is an achievable number to plan for and is consistent with the Panel Report recommendations already reported to Committee.</p>	<p>To accept the requirement for Runnymede to provide 161 units per annum (excluding the former DERA site). However a Strategic phasing policy should be introduced to regulate the release of housing throughout the plan period. This will need to reflect the ability to provide additional social and physical infrastructure to accommodate the new growth in housing numbers.</p>
Chap.7(4)	<p>Policy H1 Housing Provision The policy has</p>	<p>The plan as currently drafted takes away the ability for local</p>	<p>Object to the reference of a minimum average</p>

Appendix 1

	introduced a new opening para that outlines that the housing figures should be regarded a minimum average targets.	authorities to effectively Plan, Monitor and Manage housing delivery through the plan period.	target in the opening paragraph and suggest removal of the word minimum to enable effective delivery of a known level of housing through the plan period.
Chap.7(4)	<p>Policy H1 Housing Provision</p> <p>The policy increases the district housing provision levels in accordance with table 7.2. It states that the largest increases should be in the economically buoyant parts of the region and related to strategic scale opportunities. This suggests that Runnymede increases its annual allocation from 146 per annum to 286 per annum with a total number of net additional units over the period of 5720. This is accompanied by a footnote that the figure for Runnymede includes 2500 for the reuse of the DERA site at Chertsey to be divided between Runnymede and Surrey Heath.</p>	<p>The policy outlines that Runnymede should provide 286 additional houses on an annual basis. This figure includes the 161 annual figure as well as the 2500 proposed for the former DERA site. Clarity is required in the plan that the Council will not be penalised for meeting a figure lower than the 286 per annum as it is likely that the former DERA site will not come forward until the later half of the plan period. The footnote states that the 2500 figure will be split between Runnymede and Surrey Heath. However all of the allocation is clearly located in Runnymede as such the footnote is misleading. It should also be noted that with the current "Credit Crunch" and possible recession even the lower levels maybe hard to achieve.</p>	<p>That footnote 8 of the policy be amended to read "The figure for Runnymede includes 2,500 for the reuse of the former DERA site at Chertsey to be divided between provided in Runnymede and Surrey Heath subject to further study including master planning to ensure the incorporation of SANGS. <i>This allocation will be delivered in the period between 2016-2026. Between 2006-2015 the annual requirement will be 161 dwellings per annum</i>" This provides clarity and enables Runnymede to properly programme the appropriate Development Plan Document though the Council's Local Development Scheme.</p>
Chap.7(4)	<p>Policy H1 Housing Provision</p> <p>The final two paragraphs of the original policy which</p>	<p>The final paragraphs of the original policy provide flexibility to the delivery of the housing requirement by</p>	<p>That the final two sentences of the policy are reinstated to enable local</p>

Appendix 1

	<p>enable the Local Authority to plan monitor and manage its housing delivery in a phased manner have been deleted. There appears to be no specific explanation.</p>	<p>enabling a phased approach. This has now been deleted, without commentary as to why. Officers believe that the original paragraphs are important to enable proper delivery of sites over the period of the plan and that without such a paragraph we could be open to large number of sites coming forward early in the plan period leading to much larger number of houses being provided over the period than our allocation suggests. This could lead to the using up of urban land putting more pressure in the future on the Council to allocate housing sites within the Greenbelt.</p>	<p>authorities to effectively manage and monitor the delivery of housing throughout the plan period.</p>
<p>Chap.7(6)</p>	<p>Policy H2 Managing the Delivery of the Regional Housing Provision This is an additional policy which sets out the way in which authorities should deliver the regional housing requirement. This includes the need to maximise development on previously developed land. The main area of importance is the supporting text which talks about the need for the housing numbers to be treated as minimums and that higher housing levels should be tested through Local Development Documents.</p>	<p><i><u>The supporting text of the policy suggests that increasing the district housing numbers will be dealt with through a review of the plan at a later stage. This statement also relies on the NHPAU figures which have not be subject to any public scrutiny. Any review must be accompanied with an appropriate assessment of where additional housing can be achieved at a district level and the additional social and physical infrastructure that will need to be secured to make additional housing work. The use of the word minimum in the policy appears as a backdoor way of achieving higher</u></i></p>	<p>Object to the references to the housing allocation being a minimum requirement, as increasing the district housing numbers this will be dealt with through a review of the plan at a later stage. This should be accompanied with an appropriate assessment of where additional housing can be achieved at a district level and the additional social and physical infrastructure that will need to be secured to make additional housing work. <u>Suggest the removal of Para 7.8 of the supporting</u></p>

Appendix 1

		<p><u>numbers without proper testing. As such reference to minimum housing figures should be removed and a proper assessment of housing numbers undertaken when the plan is reviewed as suggested in the supporting text.</u></p> <p>This is a new policy and is a further requirement for local authorities to treat the housing numbers in the plan as a minimum. It states that they should be seeking to provide a higher requirement through their own local development plan documents. The supporting text also makes reference to the review of the plan to respond to the higher figures set out by the National Housing and Planning Advice Unit (NHPAU) which will be required in the near future. This approach places local authorities in a weaker position in rejecting sites in less sustainable locations, on the basis that they are not needed (the reserve sites for example). As such it is suggested that this policy along with similar changes to policy H1 should be challenged.</p>	<p><u>text.</u></p>
Chap.7 (11)	<p>Policy H3 Affordable Housing The main change to this policy of note for Runnymede is with regard to the emphasis on local authorities to demonstrate that the levels of affordable</p>	<p>This policy now places the burden on local authorities to identify the financial viability of their affordable housing thresholds and quantum. This will require the Council to undertake such a study</p>	<p>To note the policy approach</p>

Appendix 1

	<p>housing that they are requiring from new development are financially viable. Previously the emphasis was on applicants to provide this information.</p>	<p>to enable the further progression of the Core Strategy. This requirement is already set out in Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3).</p>	
Chap.9(23)	<p>Policy NRM 6 Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area The regional policy on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area has been re-positioned to the Natural Resources Management chapter of the South East Plan the main changes relate to clarification that the policy relates to residential development. It states that Local Authorities should take a leading role as the competent authorities and that the zone of influence should be established where measures will need to be taken to ensure the integrity of the SPA is protected. In the interim this is set at 5km linear distance from the SPA.</p>	<p>These changes have implications for our Interim strategy which is currently based on the 5.2km drive-time standard which will need to be amended in the near future</p>	<p>To note the policy approach <u>and comment that the DERA site is in close proximity to the SPA. The implications of this allocation and the impact it may have on the SPA have to date not been fully assessed.</u></p>
Chap.10(32)	<p>Policy W17 Location of Waste Management Facilities The main change to this policy has been the removal of elements of a paragraph relating to the location of waste facilities in the Green Belt. This previously set out that facilities such as these in the greenbelt should not be precluded as long as there were no alternative sites and that the proposal would not cause harm to the objectives of this</p>	<p>The reason for the suggested change is stated as "for consistency with Green Belt policy and the other policies in the RSS". However officers believe that this is in conflict with PPG2 which sets out in paragraph 3.4 what constitutes acceptable development in the Green Belt this does not include waste facilities and as such we recommend that the deleted paragraph</p>	<p>Objection requesting the following paragraph to be reinstated "<i>Where this is the nearest appropriate location, where there are no alternative sites and provided that the development would not cause harm to the objectives of the designation.</i>"</p>

Appendix 1

	designation. The revised version states that waste management facilities should not be precluded from the Green Belt.	should be reinstated.	
Chap.11 (15)	Policy C7 The River Thames Corridor This is a new policy This is a new policy which has been added as recommended in the panel report. This seeks that local authorities should work together to establish a coordinated policy framework for the river and its valley corridor	This policy places further requirements on the riparian local authorities in the region. This will require further explanation through Runnymede's Local Development Framework.	To note the additional policy change
Chap.20 (2)	Policy LF1 Core Strategy This policy sets out the main approach to development in the London Fringe area. The policy has been amended to more positively promote the economy and the need to provide housing. To this end the emphasis about protecting the Green Belt have been watered down to enable small scale greenbelt review and to enable the development of the DERA site at Chertsey.	Review of the greenbelt is only necessitated in Runnymede as the DERA site has been inserted into the South East Plan. Although Officers have concerns over the sustainability of this site and its location so close to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area these issues will be dealt with by the Council in subsequent Development Plan Documents. (DPD's)	To note the policy change
Chap.20 (4)	Policy LF2 Economic Development The thrust of this policy remains the same with the aim to use existing land for employment use and that Local Authorities should collect relevant evidence of employment land availability. The policy makes specific reference to where the existing stock of land is considered insufficient new land will be	A Planning Permission already exists for new office development at the DERA site as such the suggested policy in the RSS reflects a situation already accounted for through the Development Control Process.	To note the policy approach

Appendix 1

	allocated in Development Plan Documents as part of sustainable urban extensions and on the former DERA site at Chertsey.		
Chap.20 (6)	<p>Policy LF3 Broad Amount and Distribution of future housing development</p> <p>The policy sets out the provision of additional housing in each of the London Fringe authorities. Consistent with policy H1. This states that Runnymede's annual rate is 286 with a footnote that the figure includes 2500 new dwellings at the former DERA site.</p>	<p>The plan as currently drafted outlines that Runnymede Borough should provide 286 additional houses on an annual basis. This figure includes the 161 annual figure as well as the 2500 proposed for the former DERA site. Clarity is required in the plan that the Council will not be penalised for meeting a figure lower than the 286 per annum as it is likely that the former DERA site will not come forward until the later half of the plan period. Also within this policy and in others it states that development of the DERA site will be undertaken in conjunction with Surrey Heath yet no allocation of housing is made against them in policy H1. It is therefore suggested clarity is provided and that other uses and mitigation measures are provided in the Surrey Heath element of the site.</p>	<p>That footnote 1 of the policy be amended to read "The figure for Runnymede includes 2,500 for the reuse of the former DERA site at Chertsey to be divided between <i>provided in Runnymede and Surrey Heath.</i> The precise housing contribution from this site will be tested in accordance with Policy LF6 <i>This allocation will be delivered in the period between 2016-2026. Between 2006-2015 the annual requirement will be 161 dwellings per annum</i>" This provides clarity about which authority is delivering the allocation and enables Runnymede to properly programme the appropriate Development Plan Documents through its Local Development Scheme. It also provides clarity as to the number of houses to be provided annually through the first</p>

Appendix 1

			part of the period.
Chap.20 (12)	<p>Policy LF6 Development at Former DERA site, Chertsey</p> <p>This policy sets out that large scale mixed use development at Chertsey will be brought forward in the plan period to meet wider regional needs. It goes on to state that a review of the Green Belt should be carried out.</p>	<p>The inclusion of this policy and site into the plan has come somewhat late in the development of the plan and has not allowed for a full and frank discussion about the positive and negative aspects of the site. It is unlikely that the site will be brought forward in the first half of the plan and as such this should be clarified in the Policy.</p>	<p><i><u>There is some concern that the former DERA site was included without a full sustainability appraisal or adequate consultation (until now). Any development of the site should be accompanied by a full assessment of the social and infrastructure requirements and its impact on the Thames Basin Heaths –SPA. Should the policy be retained then the change in D2 should be made. Note the inclusion of the policy but request the following change. “Large-scale mixed-use development on the former DERA site at Chertsey, which lies in Runnymede and Surrey Heath districts will be brought forward during the Plan period 2016-2026 period of the plan to meet wider regional needs.” Full consideration needs to be given to the social and physical infrastructure requirements and the impact of development on the Thames Basin Heaths - SPA</u></i></p>

Appendix 1

Chap.20 (17)	Policy LF9 The Suburbs This policy has been deleted	Policy has been deleted as it replicates policy advice set out in Policy BE2	Note deletion
Chap.20 (19)	Policy LF10 Small Scale Tariff Policy to establish joint working to seek the provision of infrastructure which takes into account the cumulative impact of small scale development.	Runnymede (as part of the Surrey Collaboration Project) is already seeking contributions towards small scale projects through its tariff approach and as such is in line with this policy.	To support the policy approach



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2008

by **David Stephenson OBE**
BSc(Eng) CEng MICE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
19 September 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/A/08/2074903

Westwood, South Drive, Virginia Water, Surrey GU25 4JR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Joanne Reid against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
- The application Ref: RU.08/0210, dated 22 February 2008, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2008.
- The application sought planning permission for the erection of 2-storey replacement dwelling following demolition of the existing dwelling without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref: RU.05/1180, dated 6 February 2006.
- The condition in dispute is No 7 which states that: *The replacement dwelling hereby permitted shall not be constructed until any additional outbuildings constructed after the date of this permission have been demolished and all resultant debris removed from the site, unless permission in writing is obtained from the Local Planning Authority for their retention.*
- The reason given for the condition is: *To protect the openness of the Green Belt and to comply with Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policy GB1 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2nd Alteration 2001.*

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for the erection of 2-storey replacement dwelling following demolition of the existing dwelling at Westwood, South Drive, Virginia Water, Surrey GU25 4JR in accordance with the application Ref: RU.08/0210, dated 22 February 2008, without compliance with condition number 7 previously imposed on planning permission Ref: RU.05/1180, dated 6 February 2006 but subject to the other conditions imposed therein, so far as the same are still subsisting and capable of taking effect.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is whether condition No 7 meets the tests of Department of the Environment Circular 11/95 – *Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions*.

Reasons

3. The development concerns a replacement dwelling in the Green Belt. Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 indicates that there is a presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt, while Policy GB6 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2nd Alteration 2004 is permissive of rebuilding dwellings in the green belt so long as it would not result in an increase in the built development which would be likely to have a harmful impact on the Green Belt, or materially diminish the distance between

- the dwelling as replaced and the side or front boundaries or materially increase the overall height thus making the dwelling more prominent. It seeks exceptional circumstances for replacements in excess of 30% of the size of the dwelling in May 1986 applied to gross floor area as measured externally.
4. The original permission was granted on the basis that although the total floor area would increase by some 79%, much of the increase would be underground and not affect the openness of the Green Belt, and the visible above ground increase would be just under 30%. The original Case Officer Report dealt in detail with the main substance of the proposed development, but did not deal with any justification for imposing condition 7. Paragraph 10 of Circular 11/95 requires Authorities to state the reasons for imposing conditions, but in my view the reason quoted in the decision notice is vague and obscure in the absence of any justification.
 5. Turning to the tests as laid out in the Circular, I can understand that it could be relevant to planning to prevent additional buildings built between the time an assessment was made of the amount of built form on a site and the time new development was implemented from remaining if this could possibly harm the Green Belt by reducing openness. It is not clear to me, however, why the condition is necessary in this case.
 6. The original Case Officer Report does not mention any outbuildings, of which there are some on the site, or that they have been taken into account in the existing area of development on the site. Indeed the floor area figures quoted relate well to floor areas given on the application plans and these specifically exclude outbuildings. Yet the Case Officer Report that relates to this appeal claims that the existing outbuildings were included in the original consideration, though that does not appear to be the case. I am not persuaded by the limited justification in the Council's representations either that additional buildings erected under permitted development rights would exceed the 30% limit or that, if they were to, they would cause any harm to the Green Belt on this particular site. I consider that condition 7 is not necessary.
 7. By requiring that any buildings be removed unless written permission to retain them is obtained, the condition has the effect of removing existing permitted development rights. I consider that this does not relate to the development being permitted, and is not fair or reasonable. While there may be a logical reason for the condition I do not consider that it is justified by the nature of the development permitted.
 8. As there is no clarity as to what outbuildings currently exist I have concerns about the precision of the condition in terms of how 'additional' is to be interpreted and also what precisely amounts to an 'outbuilding'. Enforcing such a condition could also then be difficult.
 9. I consider that condition No 7 clearly fails the tests of necessity, relevance to the development permitted and reasonableness as described in Circular 11/95, and is also doubtful in terms of precision and enforceability.
 10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should succeed. I will grant a new planning permission without the disputed condition but retaining the relevant non-disputed conditions from the previous permission.

David Stephenson

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2008

by **David Stephenson OBE**
BSc(Eng) CEng MICE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email:enquiries@plins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
6 October 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/A/08/2075352

The Ryepeck, Laleham Reach, Chertsey, Surrey KT16 8RP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr J Smith against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
- The application Ref: RU.07/1039, dated 8 August 2007, was refused by notice dated 6 November 2007.
- The development proposed is a new 2-storey/1½-storey 2-bedroom house with single detached garage.

Preliminary Matters

1. A large number of drawings were submitted with this appeal, some of which although similar had material differences. At the site visit it was clear that one main application drawing, Dwg No 1306.P06, was missing from the file and this was subsequently supplied by the Council at my request. For the avoidance of doubt I am dealing with this case on the basis of the following drawings:

1306.SP01	Site Location Plan
1306.SP02	Site Layout Plan
1306.PH01	Existing Dwelling Outline Elevations & Floor Plan
1306.P06	Floor Layouts & Elevations (Analysis between the approved and refused scheme proposals)
2. As the proposed house would be better described as 1½-storey rather than 2-storey I would amend the description accordingly.

Decision Summary

3. **The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted** subject to conditions set out below in the Formal Decision.

Main Issues

4. I consider that the main issues in this case are firstly whether the proposal would constitute inappropriate development harmful to the function and purpose of the Green Belt, secondly whether the proposal would provide for a sufficient level of energy requirements from renewable resources, and thirdly if any harm is identified whether that harm is clearly outweighed by any other considerations.

Reasons

Development in The Green Belt

5. There are discrepancies in the figures for areas of existing and proposed development both within the Appellant's submissions and between the Appellant and the Council. Using the Council's figures, the size of the dwelling that existed at May 1986 is some 109.7m² and the total proposed floor area of the replacement dwelling and garage would be 149.3m², which equates to an increase of some 36%. This would exceed the 30% increase that would normally be permitted in accordance with Policy GB6 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2nd Alteration 2004 (LP), although the policy allows some flexibility in this regard. The proposed building would also be some 6.9m high compared to the height of some 4.7m of the existing building, and this would be a material increase in overall height.
6. This is a riverside dwelling, however, and the replacement dwelling would provide contemporary standards of accommodation in comparison to the simple timber chalet style of the existing structure and limited accommodation at first floor level, which would normally be permitted in principle by LP Policy GB6. As the site is liable to flooding there is a requirement to have a finished floor level to meet the Environment Agency's most recent estimate of a flood height of 13.97m above Ordnance Datum (Newlyn) for a 1 in 100 year flood plus 20% climate change allowance, with a space under the new dwelling to accommodate flood water. This would inevitably require a greater total height for a replacement building.
7. While the proposed dwelling would be much higher, and therefore more prominent, in comparison to the small timber building of 'The Cabin' on the adjacent site, it would not be dissimilar in size and scale to the other adjacent dwelling of 'The Mallards' or to many other dwellings in Laleham Reach that I observed and which appear to have been built recently. The proposed building would be less wide than the existing, thus further away from side boundaries, particularly that with 'The Mallards', consistent with LP Policy GB6.
8. While the front elevation would be slightly closer to the front boundary, and there would be a garage adjacent to the road, this would not be much different to other properties nearby. The rear elevation would have a wide gable to provide light for, and outlook from, a gallery in the roof space, however the gable height would not exceed the height of the main roof. I consider that the proposed development would not appear unduly prominent in its setting, which LP Policy GB6 seeks to achieve.
9. I consider that the circumstances that I have identified in paragraphs 5 and 6 above are sufficient to allow an exception to the small excess above the 30% limit in floorspace that this proposal would create, and this would overcome any conflict with LP Policy GB6 in this regard. I consider that the proposal would not be detrimental to openness in the Green Belt in this situation, and that the design of the building would not be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area. While I note the decisions reached in other Appeals that have been brought to my attention these do not directly relate to this site and I have determined the main issue of this case on its own merits.
10. I conclude on the first main issue that the proposal would not be inappropriate development that would be harmful to the function and purpose of the Green Belt.

Renewable Energy and Efficiency

11. Surrey Structure Plan 2004 (SP) Policy SE2 *Renewable Energy and Energy Conservation* says that all types of development should incorporate energy efficiency best practice measures in their design and that commercial and residential development should be designed such that a minimum of 10% of the energy requirement is provided by renewable resources. The supporting text says that the policy will be implemented through LDFs which accords with the guidance in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1 Supplement: *Planning and Climate Change* that target percentages of the energy used in new developments to come from renewable sources should be set and tested through development plan policies.
12. No saved policies from the LP or any emerging LDF policies have been brought to my attention, and there is nothing in the supporting text which says that SP Policy SE2 applies for the purposes of development control, so I can give SP Policy SE2 little weight. The Council has submitted a copy of its *Renewable Energy - Interim Advice Note* dated April 2007, and this was also supplied to the Appellant before the application was accepted. This gives advice on how to comply with SP Policy SE2 and includes a flow diagram of actions to take. However I have been provided with no information as to what status it has, although I note that a document entitled *Renewable Energy Draft Policy Guidance*, which has not been provided, was put out for consultation in July 2007. I give the interim advice note little weight.
13. Nevertheless, the Appellant submitted an energy statement as part of the application, which followed the headings of the flow diagram in the interim advice note. In my opinion, however, this statement is an insubstantial document in terms of detail and it gives me little confidence that the development would be energy efficient or that it could achieve a minimum of 10% of the energy requirement provided by renewable resources. However for the reasons I have given above there is no policy support with enough weight to justify dismissing this appeal on this issue or even to require a condition in this regard.
14. In addition planning permission exists¹ for a bungalow and detached garage of similar size to this scheme on the site which does not indicate that any specific renewable energy or energy efficiency measures are to be designed in. I have no reason to believe that this could not be implemented as permitted and would be a fallback option for the Appellant. I consider that this appeal scheme would be no more harmful than the fallback option and indeed the Appellant's intention to introduce grey water harvesting could be an improvement, however slight.
15. I conclude on the second main issue that, while the proposal would not provide for a quantifiable level of energy requirements from renewable resources, it would not be in conflict with the development plan.

Other Considerations

16. Due to my conclusions on the first 2 main issues, there is no harm I have identified that would need to be outweighed by any other considerations.

¹ Ref: RU.03/1263 dated 9 December 2003

Conditions

17. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council having regard to the advice in Circular 11/95 – *Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions*, though I have received no comments on these conditions from the Appellant. In the interests of the appearance of the area it is necessary to control the materials used in the external construction. In the interests of the Green Belt it is necessary to restrict any uncontrolled additions or alterations to the development and to limit the height and size of the building to what has been permitted. In the interests of flood prevention or mitigation it is necessary to identify the existing ground level and to restrict any increase in level, and to specify the voids and flow routes for flood water under the buildings.
18. In the interests of the privacy of occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling it is necessary to require that windows be obscure glazed to prevent overlooking. As the road outside the site is narrow and difficult to negotiate it is necessary in the interests of highway safety and the convenience of road users that control is exercised over the construction phase of the development.
19. As the proposed dwelling could not be constructed unless the existing building was removed, a condition requiring this is unnecessary. The requirement to demolish any outbuildings constructed after the date of permission is not clearly related to the development permitted and is unreasonable. As mentioned in paragraph 13 above a condition cannot be justified requiring energy from renewable resources. I will not be imposing conditions in regard to these matters.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Formal Decision

21. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for a new 1½-storey 2-bedroom house with single detached garage at The Ryepeck, Laleham Reach, Chertsey, Surrey KT16 8RP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: RU.07/1039, dated 8 August 2007, and the plans identified as Dwg Nos: 1306.SP01; 1306.SP02; 1306.PH01; 1306.PO6, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 3) The windows in the north elevation facing 'The Mallards' shall be fitted with obscure glazing and retained in that condition.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no enlargements, improvements or other alterations or development within the curtilage of this dwelling shall be carried out.

- 5) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of the existing and proposed levels of the application site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in complete accordance with the approved details.
- 6) There shall be no raising of existing ground levels on the site within the area of the site liable to flood.
- 7) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans.
- 8) No development shall take place until details of the provision to be made for the parking and turning on site of operatives and construction vehicles, loading and unloading of plant and materials and storage of plant and materials during the contract period have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such measures shall be retained for the duration of the construction period.
- 9) The voids under the dwelling shall be constructed such that openings extend from the ground level to the 1 in 100 year plus 20% climate change level of 13.97 metres above Ordnance Datum (Newlyn) and have a total width of at least 1000mm, or 20% of the length of the wall (whichever is greater).
- 10) The garage shall be constructed with the floor slab finished at the existing ground level and with any soil arising from excavation removed from the flood plain. The apertures in the side and rear walls should extend from ground level up to the 1 in 100 year plus 20% flood water level of 13.97 above Ordnance datum (Newlyn) to allow free entry and egress of flood water. There should also be a gap of at least 150mm left under the main garage entry doors for the same purpose.

David Stephenson

INSPECTOR

PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY

 DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES

22ND SEPTEMBER TO 10TH OCTOBER 2008

<u>APP. NO.</u>	<u>LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION</u>
08/0693	67 Guildford Street, Chertsey Proposed change of use from offices (Use Class A2) to Use Class D1 (non-residential institutions) DECISION: GRANT
08/0739	16 St Ann's Road, Chertsey Erection of first floor rear extension DECISION: REFUSE
08/0748	30 Strode Street, Egham Erection of a two storey rear extension following demolition of existing single storey structure DECISION: GRANT
08/0759	Caelo, Knowle Grove, Virginia Water Erection of two detached two storey dwellings with accommodation in the roofspace and integral garages following demolition of the existing bungalow (amendment to RU.07/0971 to provide two vehicular crossovers and raised timber decking at the rear of each dwelling) (Amended description 07/08/08) DECISION: GRANT
08/0760	Little Echoes, The Orchard, South Road, Englefield Green Retention of canopy over front entrance DECISION: GRANT
08/0769	St John's Beaumont School, Priest Hill, Old Windsor Details pursuant to Condition 10 (Bat and Bird Survey) of permission RU.08/0138 for erection of detached two storey sports hall building DECISION: APPROVE
08/0774	33 Simons Walk, Englefield Green Erection of part two storey, part single storey rear extension DECISION: REFUSE
08/0775	4 Church Cottages, Weybridge Road, Addlestone Erection of a two storey side extension incorporating a balcony at first floor level following removal of existing detached garage DECISION: REFUSE

<u>APP. NO.</u>	<u>LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION</u>
08/0781	32 Orchard Avenue, Woodham Erection of two storey side/rear extension, single storey side/rear extension incorporating a lantern style rooflight and formation of pitched roof over existing attached garage DECISION: GRANT
08/0783	22 Paddocks Way, Chertsey Erection of single storey rear/side extension DECISION: GRANT
08/0788	14 Fairway, Chertsey Certificate of Proposed Lawful Development for erection of single storey rear extension with three rooflights DECISION: GRANT CERTIFICATE OF PROPOSED LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT
08/0790	Clarina, Laleham Reach, Chertsey Certificate of Existing Lawful Use for the stationing of a mobile home to the north of the dwelling for use as an independent dwelling DECISION: GRANT CERTIFICATE OF EXISTING LAWFULNESS
08/0791	43 Victoria Street, Englefield Green Erection of two storey rear extension DECISION: REFUSE
08/0797	Land r/o 38-56 and including 40 and 48 Pinewood Avenue, New Haw Application to discharge Planning Conditions 4, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 19 of Planning Permission RU.08/0095 DECISION: SPLIT DECISIONS FOR DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS
08/0798	Bedford Library, Royal Holloway University of London, Egham Hill, Egham Alterations to front elevation comprising new entrance and replacement of 2 No. windows with 2 No. fire escape doors DECISION: GRANT
08/0800	Land r/o 6-11 North Street and adj 8A and 9 Clarence Street, Egham Erection of 3 No. x 3 bed detached dwelling, double car park at the rear of 8A Clarence Street and detached garage for No. 9 Clarence Street and new vehicular access between 8A and 9 Clarence Street DECISION: REFUSE
08/0801	Anchor House, Longcross Road, Longcross Erection of single storey side and rear canopy extension DECISION: REFUSE
08/0802	Anchor House, Longcross Road, Longcross Listed Building Consent for erection of single storey side and rear canopy extension DECISION: REFUSE

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

- 08/0803 St Anne, Firwood Road, Virginia Water
Erection of bungalow with dormer accommodation and basement following demolition of existing two storey dwelling
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0804 Birchwood, Pipers End, Virginia Water
Construction of four dormer windows, in the front and rear elevations, of the existing detached garage for use of roof area as a home office with the provision of an external staircase (Amendment to RU.07/1334)
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0805 Waverley, Gorse Hill Road, Virginia Water
Discharge of Condition 2 (Materials) of planning permission RU.08/0471
DECISION: APPROVE
- 08/0806 The Iguana, 19 The Avenue, Egham
Certificate of Proposed Lawful Use for The Iguana (19 The Avenue) (A4) to restaurant (A3)
DECISION: GRANT CERTIFICATE OF PROPOSED LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT
- 08/0810 112 Meadow View, Chertsey
Erection of an orangery to rear of property with insertion of raised roof lantern (Amended plan received 4th September 2008 to reposition extension)
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0812 Vicarage Wood House, Longcross Road, Longcross
Erection of two storey front extension following demolition of existing front porch
DECISION: REFUSE
- 08/0814 Unit 4, Pine Trees Estate, Chertsey Lane, Staines
Refurbishment of existing building including cladding and glazing, addition of 2 No. external staircase enclosures, new reception extension and glazed link to Unit 3 and reconfiguration of Unit 4 plant enclosure
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0817 Lucia Angelis, Thorpe Lea Road, Egham
Construction of a pitched roof over existing flat roof and alterations
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0818 Commoners, Barley Mow Road, Englefield Green
Details pursuant to Condition 3 (Boundary Treatment) of permission RU.08/0617 for extensions to dwelling
DECISION: APPROVE
- 08/0821 Willow House, Bundys Way, Staines
Erection of a two storey side and single storey rear extension incorporating rooflights
DECISION: GRANT

<u>APP. NO.</u>	<u>LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION</u>
08/0822	The Bungalow, Ruxbury Road, Chertsey Erection of a single storey side extension following demolition of existing conservatory DECISION: REFUSE
08/0823	33 Warwick Avenue, Thorpe Erection of a part two, part single storey rear extension DECISION: GRANT
08/0824	7 Lambly Hill, Virginia Water Erection of part two storey, part single storey side and single storey rear extensions DECISION: GRANT
08/0827	Land adj 1 Wren Crescent, Addlestone Amendment to permission RU.07/0443 (for two storey dwelling) to include attached single storey garage and utility DECISION: GRANT
08/0831	87 Green Lane, Addlestone Creation of a vehicle crossover DECISION: REFUSE
08/0832	1-8 Slade Court, Slade Road, Ottershaw Erection of mansard roof over Nos. 1-8 Slade Court DECISION: GRANT
08/0835	43/43A Guildford Street, Chertsey Erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear extension to enlarge ground floor restaurant and kitchen and to provide 5 en-suite bed and breakfast rooms DECISION: GRANT
08/0836	43 & 43A Guildford Street, Chertsey Listed Building Consent for erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear extension to enlarge ground floor restaurant and kitchen and to provide 5 en-suite bed and breakfast rooms DECISION: GRANT
08/0837	Bar 163, London Street, Form Town Hall, London Street, Chertsey Advertisement Consent for the erection of externally illuminated projecting sign DECISION: REFUSE
08/0838	Bar 163, London Street, Form Town Hall, London Street, Chertsey Listed Building Consent for the installation of an externally illuminated projecting sign and decorative works to all external doors and windows DECISION: REFUSE

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

- 08/0839 38 Armstrong Road, Englefield Green
Amendments to planning permissions RU.04/1306 and RU.08/0532 for a single storey extension to front entrance area
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0840 16 Row Hill, Addlestone
Erection of a single storey side extension (Revised plans received 1st September 2008 increasing the width of the extension from 4.6 metres to 7 metres)
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0841 Curlhawes, Village Road, Thorpe
Felling of trees and works to 3 trees located within the Thorpe Conservation Area
DECISION: NO OBJECTION
- 08/0844 Milton Park, Stroude Road, Egham
Construction of new entrance to the north of the site including new walls and 3m high gates
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0848 21 Western Close, Penton Park, Chertsey
Installation of three solar panels on the roof
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0869 St John's Beaumont School, Priest Hill, Old Windsor
Installation of new door to west elevation of internal quadrangle building and new external steps and two doors to north elevation of Nicholas Owen Block
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0887 61 Bishops Way, Egham
Lawful Use Certificate for a proposed loft conversion with hip to gable roof and rear dormer
DECISION: GRANT CERTIFICATE OF PROPOSED LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT
- 08/0901 Little Ravenswell, Vicarage Lane, Laleham
Consultation by Spelthorne Borough Council for erection of a pitched roof on existing single storey extension and erection of replacement conservatory
DECISION: NO OBJECTION
- 08/0903 Little Ravenswell, Vicarage Lane, Laleham
Consultation by Spelthorne Borough Council for the erection of a pitched roof on existing single storey extension. Erection of a replacement conservatory, internal alterations to include new additional staircase and modifications to first floor bathroom, alteration to two windows to form opening for new bi-fold doors and removal of two modern fire surrounds
DECISION: NO OBJECTION

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

- 08/0926 Former Freemantles School, Pycroft Road, Chertsey
Discharge of Conditions 7 (Hardstanding), 12 (Renewable Energy) and 13
(Archaeological Investigation) relating to planning approval RU.08/0325
DECISION: SPLIT DECISIONS FOR DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS
- 08/0936 Coworth Park House, London Road, Sunninghill
Change of use of main building from office to form 30 room hotel with
function facilities, replacement extensions, change of use of stables to form
29 No. guest suites with restaurant with mezzanine and energy centre with
associated short rotation coppice (Amendments to permission 06/01919)
DECISION: NO OBJECTION
- 08/0937 White Walls and adjoining Land to the rear of Firslea, Lanes End, Oakleigh
and Styger House, Spratts Lane, Ottershaw
Approval of details pursuant to Conditions 4 (Materials), 5 (Surface
Materials), 9 (Tree Protection), 10 (Soft Landscaping), 13 (Contamination),
17 (Surface Water) of planning permission RU.08/0662
DECISION: APPROVE
- 08/0985 Castle Hill Farm, Englefield Green
Removal of one Oak tree covered by Tree Preservation Order 168
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0994 White Walls and adjoining Land to the rear of Firslea, Lanes End, Oakleigh
and Styger House, Spratts Lane, Ottershaw
Discharge of Condition No. 2 (Sangs) of planning permission RU.08/0662 for
the erection of three dwellings
DECISION: APPROVE

DELEGATED DECISIONS IN CONSULTATION WITH CHAIRMAN & VICE CHAIRMAN

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

- 08/0698 Milland, Thorpe Lea Road, Egham
Erection of single storey side extension following demolition of existing garage, rear extension and enlargements to existing roof with loft conversion and side veranda and creation of new porch
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0738 Norlands Lane Landfill Site, Norlands Lane, Egham
Erection of 2.5m high entrance gates off Norlands Lane
DECISION: REFUSE
- 08/0756 Fullbrook Secondary School, Selsdon Road, New Haw
Full planning permission for the siting of a single storey portakabin for use as a canteen area where children can eat their packed lunches for a period of 3 years only
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0758 Spring Cottage, 420D Woodham Lane, Woodham
Retrospective application for single storey side and rear extensions
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0777 Longwood, Waverley Drive, Virginia Water
The erection of a two storey replacement dwelling with basement and car lift following demolition of existing dwellinghouse
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0782 9 Chaworth Road, Ottershaw
Erection of two storey rear extension and single storey side extension
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0785 100 Larchwood Drive, Englefield Green
Retrospective application for the retention of two single storey rear elements
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0795 7-9 Station Road North, Egham
Advertisement consent for internally illuminated fascia sign and projecting sign
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0796 Heathergate, Christchurch Road, Virginia Water
Amendments to permission RU.07/0119 (Erection of two storey dwelling with attached garage following demolition of existing) to include erection of pool cover and associated plant/changing accommodation
DECISION: GRANT

APP. NO. LOCATION AND PROPOSAL FOLLOWED BY DECISION

- 08/0811 54 Selbourne Avenue, New Haw
Erection of single storey extensions to both side elevations incorporating rooflights to the northern elevation and a conservatory to the rear
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0826 Moat Court, Shaw Close, Ottershaw
Crown lift large Yew tree to 3 metres above ground level marked T1 on submitted plan, crown lift row of Beech trees to 3 metres above ground level marked G1 on submitted plan and fell Copper Beech marked T2 on submitted plan protected by Tree Preservation Order No. 18
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0852 7 Helvellyn Close, Egham
Erection of a two storey side, single storey front and single storey side/rear extensions following demolition of existing garage and porch
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0861 28 The Crescent, Egham
Erection of a part two storey, part single storey side and single storey rear extensions
DECISION: GRANT
- 08/0881 Ten Acre Farm, Stonehill Road, Ottershaw
Certificate of Existing Lawful Development for siting of mobile home and erection of garden shed and oil tank
DECISION: GRANT CERTIFICATE OF EXISTING LAWFULNESS