

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday 11th March 2009 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** **100-106 Church Road, Addlestone RU.08/1206**
- Application:**
- Para 3.4:** The number of car parking spaces proposed comprises 8 parking spaces to the rear of the main building and 3 parking bays to the front of the building within a new layby.
- Consultations:**
- Para 4.1:** Two additional letters of objection have been received reiterating previous concerns relating to insufficient parking provision and concerns over safety upon the shared vehicular access which is used by mothers, toddlers and the elderly.
- Informatives:** Amend drawing numbers to include:
- | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| Design and Access Statement | 17.12.08 |
| CR/001/08/Rev C | 05.02.09 |
| CR/005/12/Rev A | 05/02/09 |
2. **Page 11** **Great Grove Farm, Murray Road, Ottershaw RU.08/1221**
- Consultations:**
- Para 4.2:** 4 additional letters of representation have been received. This comprises 3 letters of support which reiterates the following:
- 1) Significant reduction in traffic movements
 - 2) Residential more in keeping with Green Belt - removal of eyesore
 - 3) Safety improvements to existing vehicular access
 - 4) Retention of farmhouse
 - 5) Improvement to existing damaged site - landscape improvement
 - 6) Greener development
 - 7) Retention of paddocks
 - 8) Provision of affordable housing
 - 9) Residents' views have been taken into account
- In addition 1 letter of objection has been received outlining the following concerns:
- 1) The proposed safety improvements to the vehicular access will be minimal
 - 2) Increased traffic due to new houses
 - 3) Threat to Green Belt remains
 - 4) Concerned over future expansion into surrounding open land
- Para 4.11:** Further comments have been received from Natural England in respect of the Phase 2 Ecological Report. They raise no objections subject to conditions.

**Planning
Considerations:**

Para 5.29: In respect of the Geo-Environmental Assessment submitted by the applicant, this has been reviewed. The report concludes that further investigations would be needed and further monitoring of gas emissions required. In the absence of completed investigations, the Assessment does not currently include sufficient information to conclude that the site is suitable for residential development. An additional reason for refusal is therefore recommended.

**Officers'
Recommendation:**

Additional reason for refusal:

8. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the site is suitable for the proposed use and that future occupiers would not be at risk from contamination and that contamination would not spread to surrounding land. The proposal is therefore contrary to Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control.

Informatives:

<u>Drawing Numbers:</u>	<u>Date Received:</u>
Unilateral Undertaking	19.01.09

3. Page 33 **299-303 & Land to Rear of No. 297 Green Lane, Chertsey RU.09/0047**

Consultations:

A consultation response has been received from the Surrey Wildlife Trust which raises no objection but recommends that a protected species survey be carried out and measures to enhance biodiversity be incorporated in the scheme.

A letter has been received advising of a factual error in the report.

Para 5.17:

Factual Correction: Plot 3 would have a first floor flank window to a landing which would face No. 12b Jersey Close, not a bathroom.

**Officers'
Recommendation:**

Reason for Refusal 2 - penultimate line should refer to 305 Green Lane not 205 Green Lane.

4. Page 49 **105 Crockford Park Road, Addlestone RU.08/1213**

Consultations:

A supplementary letter has been received in respect of the content of the report. Members will have already received full copies of this letter and the previous letters to which the objector is referring. For Members' assistance, the following is a summary of the points raised in the most recent letter:

- It is considered that the officer's report is fundamentally flawed and that the application should be refused for the reasons stated in a previous letter on the grounds of overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring properties from windows in the roof, impact from general disturbance, overlooking overbearing impacts, and loss of sunlight, daylight, overshadowing and loss of privacy; proposal would also be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene.
- The report fails to adequately relay the 19 pages of objection.

Comment: the letter has been copied to Members of the Planning Committee in full

- The report provides no evaluation or explanation as to whether or not the development is or is not consistent with the provisions of the development plan; the report does not apply the policies

Comment: The relevant Local Plan policies are stated at the top of the report; Section 5 Planning Considerations identifies and discusses the main planning issues and concludes in paragraph 5.7 that the proposal complies with the relevant identified policies. The second informative also states the relevant development plan policies.

- The report does not make reference to Government advice; the objector considers the proposal is of poor design, lacks recreational space and amenity space, and that the applicant should be requested to provide a Green Travel Plan.

Comment: The application proposes the re-use and alteration of an existing building within the curtilage of an existing residential property. The application of all national planning policies has to be balanced against the scale of the development and any potential impact; in this case, it would be unreasonable to require a Travel Plan for a single dwelling already in residential use. The curtilage of the dwelling is generous in comparison with other dwellings in the locality providing amenity and recreational space for the occupiers.

- All Permitted Development rights should be withdrawn.

Comment: Members are advised that existing Permitted Development rights enjoyed by a dwelling cannot be withdrawn unilaterally by the Council.

- The provision of an external metal staircase would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and to neighbouring residential amenity.

Comment: The report addresses this point.

5. Page 55

Egham Arboretum Royal Holloway University of London, Harvest Road RU.09/0059

Consultations:

A further comment has been received from a household that has already commented requesting that:

- each removed tree to be replaced by similar specimen;
- all work done under supervision;
- each tree to have an individual TPO.

Comment: The first two matters are addressed in the report and by condition. The request to create individual TPO's would be a time consuming exercise and your Officers are satisfied that the group TPO provides the necessary protection for a responsible landowner such as the University of London.

Officers' Recommendation:

Add informative:

The applicant is encouraged to plant unusual exotics to preserve and enhance the character of the Arboretum.