

**Runnymede Borough Council**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday 13th May at 7.30pm**

**A D D E N D U M**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

1. **Page 1** **Laleham Boatyard, Laleham Reach, Chertsey – RU.08/0915**  
(See item 3 below also)  
  
**Recommendation:** Amend Condition 7  
  
After 'the new extension hereby permitted' add 'and retained within the extension unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority'.  
  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. **Page 1** **Laleham Boatyard, Laleham Reach, Chertsey – RU.08/0915, RU.08/0916 and RU.08/0917**  
  
**Consultations:** Three letters including a 4 page letter and two letters of objection from the same property have been received which state the following:
  1. On Bank Holiday Monday (4th May) Mr Dennett Junior arrived in the morning and opened the gates. Several cars came and went from the site during the day.
  2. On the same day there was a man working on a boat overlooking the adjoining garden. He was still there at 8.50pm cleaning the outside of his boat.
  3. A man was working on a boat adjacent to 'Berea' on Monday. The writer did not think he was a boatyard employee.
  4. An advertisement for the site from a 'waterview' magazine has been forwarded which includes 'moorings' and 'storage building'.
  5. The area is green belt and as such there should be an assumption against further development unless there are exceptional reasons. The applicant claims the building is for the noisier machinery. However, the plans show doors, windows and going on their normal method of operating these will be left wide open, thus rendering any noise insulation redundant.
  6. The area is in a flood plain, surely more development will not aid any flooding situation.
  7. The applicant uses the concrete apron to use hand operated power tools.
  8. Whilst the applicant may argue the existing buildings do not provide sufficient acoustic insulation, the reality is the situation would be helped a little, if he simply shut the boathouse doors. This is rarely done.
  9. The neighbours do not want more noise, they want less.

10. I understand your planning committee set the existing operating hours some time ago. I presume this was set for very good reasons, to protect the neighbours in the locality. Nothing has changed since this condition was imposed. There are the same amount of houses. What has changed is the applicant regularly flouting the hours. During the week 6 p.m. is regularly exceeded. On Saturdays work exceeds 1 p.m. Whilst they are looking to carry out quiet work during the additional hours, the reality is that if a power tool or noise-generating tool is needed, then it will be used. They will not wait until the correct hours. In essence, at best the neighbours are possibly going to get 52 days a year of noise free existence.
11. The objection makes detailed comments about the inaccuracies and misrepresentations in the applicant's supporting documentation.
12. Any further development will lead to a loss of visual amenity.
13. Neighbours in a residential area/green belt area should be able to have some peace and quiet. Being woken at 8 a.m. by the sound of a power drill Monday to Friday is bad enough, but now we have the delight of further disturbances on a bank holiday, when he fails to keep to his quiet activities.
14. Since the initial application was made months ago, nothing has changed; there has been disturbance outside of normal working hours.
15. It should also be remembered a similar application was refused a couple of years ago.
16. If the applications are granted then I am sure most of the neighbours will be on first names with the planning department as the complaints increase.

Two letters of support have also been received, one from a retired priest (who has limited mobility) who financed the restoration of two Dunkirk Little Ships and who is the joint owner of one which was delivered to the boatyard on the Bank Holiday weekend. He spent Bank Holiday Monday evening doing a bit of cleaning and to move things to his car. He comments that there was a party going on at the adjoining house, and so he waved to them but gave them no cause for complaint. He also comments that he considers that the boatyard is of national significance, there being no comparable boatyard in the country for the maintenance and survival of our nation's Dunkirk Little Ships. He comments that the unique status and importance of Dennett's boatyard should be supported and promoted.

The other letter of support states that on the very many times he has visited the yard he has never noticed undue noise that needed to be reduced, but supports the extension application. He states that currently he is unable to visit his boat when it is in Mr Dennett's care as it is assumed that he would be working and making a noise, but this has never been the case.

**3. Page 17**

**Laleham Boatyard, Laleham Reach, Chertsey – RU.08/0916**  
(See item 3 above also)

**Consultations:**

Paragraph 4.1 – The quote in the sixth bullet point should read:

“No work of maintenance, repair or reconstruction”.

4. **Page 27** **Laleham Boatyard, Laleham Reach, Chertsey – RU.08/0917**

**Recommendation:** Condition 2 – Amend to read:

"These activities shall be carried out by Michael Dennett and/or his son Stephen Dennett. No other persons shall work on the site (including on boats moored at the site) during the hours specified in this condition."

---

5. **Page 33** **Glenfield, Hurst Lane, Egham – RU.08/1191**

**Application:** Since the report was prepared the applicant has appealed against the non-determination of this application. One further letter has been received from the applicants agent stating that:-

Surprised to see the reports, particularly as the Planning Department has chosen not to enter into any correspondence with the agent.

- The report does not make it clear that non-determination appeals have been made (see above).
- The Committee reports are fallacious and contain many inaccuracies (the agent has not quoted any examples so it is not possible to respond to this allegation).
- Seeks confirmation that his letter will be read to members of the Planning Committee and that any potential action is suspended prior to his client exercising her statutory right of appeal. (Members are free to consider the enforcement part of the report and if enforcement action is authorised by the Committee it is hoped that the current non-determination of appeals and the enforcement appeals could be considered together at the same time).

**Consultations:** One additional letter has been received from a local resident stating that the letter of support from Oakdale as described at paragraph 3.3 has been withdrawn. The report gives a misleading impression. (This letter from Oakdale has not officially been withdrawn from this application. However, the letter of support from Oakdale has been withdrawn from the second Glenfield application RU.09/0021 (see below).

It is also claimed that foundations for a storage building are currently being laid at the site (a dog kennel is being constructed within the garden area of the house).

**Recommendation:** (1) Altered to read:-

The applicant has appealed against the non-determination of this application. If the Council were the determining Authority, it WOULD HAVE DETERMINED the application as follows:-

**REFUSE** a Certificate of Existing Lawful Development for the use of the land and buildings for the manufacture of ice; storage and distribution of ice and ancillary associated uses on the grounds that on the balance of probability the land and buildings have not been used for such a period in excess of 10 years.

**Reasons for issuing Enforcement Notices:**

On the eleventh line of Reason 1 insert 'openness of the' between 'the' and 'Green Belt' to read:

'...which are detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt and to the visual amenities of the Green Belt...'

---

**6. Page 49**

**Glenfield, Hurst Lane, Egham – RU.09/0021**

**Application:**

Since the report was prepared the applicant has appealed against the non-determination of this application. One further letter has been received from the applicants agent stating that:-

- Surprised to see the reports, particularly as the Planning Department has chosen not to enter into any correspondence with the agent.
- The report does not make it clear that non-determination appeals have been made (see above).
- The Committee reports are fallacious and contain many inaccuracies (the agent has not quoted any examples so it is not possible to respond to this allegation).

Seeks confirmation that his letter will be read to members of the Planning Committee and that any potential action is suspended prior to his client exercising her statutory right of appeal. (Members are free to consider the enforcement part of the report and if enforcement action is authorised by the Committee it is hoped that the current non-determination of appeals and the enforcement appeals could be considered together at the same time).

**Consultations:**

Omitted from the summary of local residents' comments was a letter from the owner of 'Eaglehurst', Hurst Lane, which advises that her husband's brother lived at Glenfield going back some 36 years. There was always a garage and gate at the side of the property and it was only when these were taken down that a driveway was put in to the bottom of the garden and there were no caravans in the garden until then.

Paragraph 4.3 One additional letter has been received from a local resident stating that the letter of support from Oakdale as described at paragraph 3.3 has been withdrawn. (Members should note that at the top of page 50 there is a re-submitted objection letter from Oakdale. Officers are currently liaising with the Police regarding the allegations that have been made in respect of documentation on this application).

It is also claimed that foundations for a storage building are currently being laid at the site (a dog kennel is being constructed within the garden area of the house).

**Recommendation:**

(1) Altered to read:

The applicant has appealed against the non-determination of this application. If the Council were the determining Authority it WOULD HAVE DETERMINED the application as follows:

**REFUSE** a Certificate of Existing Lawful Development for the use of the land and buildings for the stationing of 11 mobile homes at the rear of Glenfield on the grounds that on the balance of probability the land and buildings have not been used for such a period in excess of 10 years.

---

7. **Page 63**

**15 Gorse Hill Lane, Virginia Water – RU.09/0221**

**Considerations:**

Add to the end of Paragraph 5.3:

In response to the published committee report and recommendation (subject to conditions), the applicants have since written in to further express that they do not consider that the velux windows would enable any serious degree of overlooking and request that Conditions 4 and 5 be deleted. In light of the reasons outlined in paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3, it is not considered that the revised amendments would be satisfactory without the imposition of the aforementioned Conditions. It should also be noted that the applicant is still able to revert to the scheme as approved under RU.08/0082.

---

8. **Page 71**

**The Iguana, 19 The Avenue, Egham – RU.09/0223**

**Consultation:**

Paragraph 4.1 – one additional letter of objection has been received from the Englefield Green Residents' Association which repeats the traffic congestion concerns already summarised in the report.

Paragraph 4.5 – at the end of the paragraph add: 'Since publication of this report the applicants have held a meeting with Surrey Police, who are now satisfied with the security proposals and management and maintenance programme to be put in place to prevent and reduce the opportunity for crime at the site.'

---

9. **Page 81**

**Otto Bock Healthcare Plc., 32 Parsonage Road, Englefield Green – RU.09/0269**

A total of 4 letters have been received.

**Additional  
Comments:**

Additional comments received since the report was written that express concern about the following issues and including comments from the Englefield Green Village Residents' Association:

- Drawing attention to the fact that the office is located in a predominantly residential area (photographs provided).
- The low key nature of the commercial activity that hitherto has not required using illuminated signs.
- The excessive impact of the downlighters.

**Comment**

These matters were taken into account in the Officer report.

## AGENDA ITEMS

1. Item 7 Page 6

**Land to rear of Southbeck, Ruxbury Road, Chertsey - Enforcement**

**Consultation:**

The County Highway Authority has advised that they cannot support the enforcement action in terms of highway safety. The access is inadequate due to restricted sightline in the trailing direction (to the left) but this is caused by the neighbours having encroached onto highway land and therefore the County Highway Authority is able to pursue their own enforcement action against this encroachment.

---

2. Item 8 Page 14

**Land at Hurst Lodge, Hurst Lane, Egham**

A letter has been received from an individual on behalf of Hurst Lane Residents Group summarised as follows:

- There are two buildings in residential use (Buildings B and J) shown on the plan but there is no mention of them in the report. Are they lawful? Are four residential buildings acceptable?

Comment

Buildings B and J are referred to at the bottom of page 19 inviting an application for both buildings. There is no current evidence that these buildings are unlawful.

- Business rates paid since 2000
- Reports made by residents about breaches of planning since the owner moved to the site have not been acted upon.

Comment

Complaints have been investigated from 2000. Recent complaints have been acted upon which resulted in the serving of a recent enforcement notice and this report.

- Calor gas is being sold in the middle of a residential area from a business on the site.

Comment

The Calor gas is ancillary to the retail use of Building J. No licence is required from Runnymede Borough Council to sell Calor gas. There may be some requirements from Surrey Trading Standards regarding the storage of Calor gas.