

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday 26th August 2009 at 7.30pm

A D D E N D U M

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. Page 1

Land at Southbeck, Ruxbury Road, Chertsey - RU.09/0467

Consultations:

Two additional letters of objection have been received making the following comments:

- Concerned regarding the degradation of this Green Belt land and the impact of the developments on the site and views from the houses.
- The buildings and the fencing undoubtedly compromise the openness of the Green Belt.
- If the site is to be used for the correction of difficult horses then it would not be providing "essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation" as required by PPG2 Green Belts.
- Concerns are raised over the landowners control as to how the site is used and whether the horses will always be sick and lame.
- Concerns are raised regarding the number of daily vehicle movements to the site given that the application documentation claims that the site "does not involve daily visits from horse owners". There is no explanation as to why permission is sought for 10 parking spaces.
- Ruxbury Road is designated as having a 30mph speed limit which is not enforced. The most recent statistics (2000) show that only 13.6% of traffic observes this limit and the 85 percentile speed is 43 mph. The lane emerging from the site is extremely narrow with obscured vision of on-coming traffic. Larger vehicles have to slowly take a wide turn blocking both directions of Ruxbury Road and any additional usage would further compromise road safety as well as causing disruption to the residents of nearby properties.
- Floodlighting will have a significant effect on the quality of darkness and cause visual intrusion on the outlook from nearby properties and will be damaging to the rural quality of the area and the Green Belt.

One letter enclosing a number of photographs of vehicles has also been submitted. The photographs show the number of vehicles on the site, on the public highway close to the site and show one horsebox exiting the access to the site by taking a wide turn on Ruxbury Road.

Recommendation:

Page 12: (2) Further Recommendation

A new point (ii) is added to the recommendation requiring "(ii) the cessation of the use of land for the siting of portacabins/flat roof structures, 2no buildings in the triangular shaped piece of land, the storage container and the items adjacent to stable block 2." All other following points to be re-numbered.

The reason for the change is to also require the use of the land for the siting of these structures to cease in addition to requiring them to be removed from the land.

2. Page 24

6 Lynwood Avenue, Egham – RU.09/0485

An e-mail has been received from the applicant advising that he is unable to attend the committee meeting. He confirms that it was always his intention to demolish the garage and paid builders in 2008 to carry out this work. He advises that demolition of the garage can start within 24 hours of confirmation that he can retain the extension as erected.

3. Page 34

19 The Avenue, Egham – RU.09/0536

Consultations:

Two additional letters of objection have been received. The points raised in these letters are summarised as follows:

- Concern is raised regarding the level of illumination of the signs, specifically in regard to the impact on motorists. It is stated that there is a step change in the light level between the signs and the streets lighting, dazzling motorists. A safety assessment of the lights is requested by the writer.
- The light fixtures which have been installed direct light away from the building and shine light directly into the front rooms of properties adjacent to the site. It is requested that the lights are either removed or changed so the lighting only illuminates the site, not the street and houses.
- The signs are currently illuminated until midnight whilst the restaurant closes at 10pm or 11pm at weekends. Therefore the signs are causing light pollution for no good reason after these times.

In addition a revised plan of the speaker post and menu board have been submitted (162 Rev A). This plan indicates that the speaker post is smaller than originally proposed. The speaker post is now shown to have the following dimensions:

Height: 1.25 metres
Width: 0.45 metres
Depth: maximum of 0.35 metres

The revised plan also shows that the menu board is not as wide as originally proposed. The width is now shown to be approximately 2 metres. All other dimensions remain the same.

4. Page 44

Land at Trumps Farm, Kitsmead Lane RU.09/0555, RU.09/0561 and RU.09/0543

Location Plan:

The most accurate site location relating to these three applications is shown on page 60. The whole site within the applicant's control is shown on page 44.

Consultations:

Paragraph 4.2 on RU.09/0543 (page 49) and Paragraph 4.2 on RU.09/0555 (page 58)

The Head of Environmental Protection wishes to add the following comment to applications RU.09/0543 and RU.09/0555:

'Whilst the principle of the eco pods, and the recycling of green waste within Runnymede is to be supported there are some fundamental concerns about the impact of this relatively new technology. Particular concern is expressed about the potential impact of odours emitted during the decomposition process. In the absence of any detailed evidence on the mechanism for assessing and controlling odours escaping from the site there are concerns that the experiences from the Lyne Lane green recycling site may be repeated and take some time to remedy. This took many years to resolve and gave rise to strong local resentment. The current applications would need to demonstrate, by undertaking a temporary small scale trial that explored and assessed the impact of odour emission before granting permission for the current application. The Head of Environmental Protection would object to the current application in the absence of the assurances outlined above.'

Page 63

Paragraph 4.2 of RU.09/0561

The Head of Environmental Protection wishes to revise the response and object to the current application. Whilst the consultant's report deals with the input of green waste, it inadequately deals with the odours that are emitted from the matured product. Insufficient information has been supplied to adequately assess the impact of odour emission and accordingly request that the County Council seek firm assurances from the applicant relating to odour management on the site both for the inputted material and the maturing product.

Recommendation:

RU.09/0543

Add: 'Policy CW6 of the Surrey Waste Plan 2008' to both objections numbered 1 and 2 on page 52 of the agenda.

RU.09/0561

Recommendation 1(d), Condition 16 – delete and replace with:

"The Head of Environmental Protection states that whilst the consultant's report deals with the input of green waste, it inadequately deals with the odours that are emitted from the matured product. Insufficient information has been supplied to adequately assess the impact of odour emission and accordingly request that the County Council seek firm assurances from the applicant relating to odour management on the site both for the inputted material and the maturing product."

5. Page 68

Coopers Hill Recreation Ground, Coopers Hill Lane, Englefield Green - RU.09/0556

Consultations:

Add to end of paragraph 4.1

"The neighbours and objectors were reconsulted on the reduction in the lamp wattage. Twelve further objection letters have been received, largely re-iterating objections as itemised on the agenda. Twenty-one letters of support have also been received.

With regard to the objections, additional detailed points have been made by one objector who suggests that the Leisure and Environment Committee should be formally approached regarding reduced rates for a children's club at the Leisure Centre. He argues that the current pricing excludes one of the most important sections of the community for whom the facilities have been provided; that the

Leisure Centre is in a more sustainable location that would be more accessible to the teams and that more harmful green belt development might be the direct result of the unaffordability of their use. He also suggests that Bishopsgate School should be approached to fulfil their Annual Report commitment (and in accordance with their charitable status) to give other children's organisations to use their facilities free of charge. The writer quotes a court judgement which gives advice as the interpretation of "very special circumstances" and suggests that the case is of direct relevance to the current application, and that such "very special circumstances" do not exist in this case. He asks that the application be refused or at least the alternatives rigorously re-explored. Other writers also suggest that evening training should use other available floodlit venues.

Concerns have also been raised by objectors that the bulbs could be changed to a higher wattage, and that this would be difficult to verify; and an increase in traffic pollution; impact of parking on the green area next to the car park; and questions the Council's Local Plan commitment to protect the character and amenity of established residential areas. The 21 letters of support raise the following points:-

1. The Manorcroft Football Club has done a great deal for children in the local community for many years and approval will strengthen their commitment to the development of youth football in a safe and protective environment.
2. Importance of youth participation in sport and high standard of the club in relation to management, youth care, safety and standards.
3. Concern that there would be nowhere to train in the evenings if the application is refused, leading to the closure of the club.
4. Light pollution and noise for local residents will be minimal and very limited in terms of the time that they would be in use.
5. The concerns of the few should not outweigh the needs of the many and the Council should support youth development in the Borough.
6. Importance of opportunities for young people in stopping them from taking alternative paths into crime, anti-social behaviour and drugs, and helping to instil a sense of belonging, discipline and pride in community values.
7. Unacceptable cost of alternative options."

Add to paragraph 4.3:

The Council's lighting engineer has reviewed the technical specifications submitted in connection with the 1000 watt lamps, and comments that the calculations of light spill and glare give a worse-case scenario; that the glare towards the houses at the bottom of the field is peaking at 1136 candela, which is low and acceptable – even if the area were a national park; that the vertical illumination is very low at the bottom fence before the houses. Overall he comments that the scheme is acceptable and should cause only very minimal interference to residents; and furthermore that there would be no light reaching the RAF memorial site.

Add additional paragraph:-

4.6 The Head of Leisure Services was asked to provide a comment. He states that whilst discounts can be offered at off-peak times at Egham Sports Centre, the demand at peak hours means this isn't possible. However, junior teams do use the pitches at Egham in the evening and pay the going rate. He states that the pitches are due to be leased to a private operator in September but he doubts that they would be more flexible because they are operating as a business unit.

He disagrees that the proposed floodlights would provide what is available at Egham and Bishopsgate and points to the convenience of having facilities at their home ground since all the equipment will be there and suggests that it will be cheaper in the long run and helps the club by the facilities being more extensively used, and to survive financially and develop as a club. He doubts that Bishopsgate School would be interested in accommodating the club on a permanent basis. Lastly, he states that the Government is also actively promoting the 5 hour sport offer for children which relies on clubs being able to provide out of school hours sports activities as schools themselves cannot provide this level of provision.

A plan showing the extent of the illumination from the proposed floodlighting is attached to this addendum.

6. Page 78

54 Cobs Way, New Haw – RU.09/0578

This application has been **WITHDRAWN** by the applicant.

7. Page 85

4 Chaworth Close, Ottershaw, Chertsey – RU.09/0603

The applicant has requested that this application should be deferred from the Committee as he is abroad and is not able to attend the Committee Meeting.

**Planning
Considerations:**

The applicant has also queried the increase in floorspace to the property, raising specific reference to the dormer additions approved in 2004 (RU.04/0724).

If the whole of the loft area granted permission in 2004 plus the dormer windows and the proposed extension is calculated as floor area, the proposal results in an increase in floor area of approximately 41%. The previous appeal decision in 2005 resulted in a 32% increase in floor area.

In recent years, providing there is sufficient internal headroom in the loft, only the floor area created by any additional works such as dormers has been calculated for floor area purposes and not the whole loft area. If this method is used for this proposal the total floor area increase is approximately 29%.

Recommendation: Reason 1 should read:-

The proposed ground floor extension by reason of its scale, depth, width and increase in floor space, would be inappropriate and harmful development within the Green Belt, over and above the size of the original dwelling as built, which would be detrimental and harmful to the openness and visual amenities of the Green Belt, contrary to Policies SP5 and LF1 of the South East Plan 2009, saved policies GB1 and GB6 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001 and Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance, and advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance Not 2 : 'Green Belts'.

A G E N D A I T E M S

1. Item 7 Page 6

Partial Review of South East Plan

Paragraph 3.3

Bullet point 1 – add in second line after "75%", 'pro rata assessment of'

Bullet point 3 – add in fourth line after "no illegal", 'transit'
