

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday 28 October 2009 at 7.30pm

A D D E N D U M

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. Page 1 **Burgan House, The Causeway, Staines – RU.09/0618**

Recommendation: Conditions 2 and 18 should be removed as this is relevant to standard unilateral undertakings. In this case the applicant has signed a bespoke legal agreement to cover the unilateral tariff rather than the template, therefore Condition C201 is not relevant. Informative 3 advises of the legal agreement relevant to the planning application.

2. Page 11 **Land R/O 21-23 Victoria Street, Englefield Green – RU.09/0771**

Proposal: Description amended to read:

‘Erection of two storey building comprising 2 no. ground floor A1/A2 retail units, 7 no. 1 bed flats with amenity space and parking to the rear following demolition of the existing buildings (amended parking layout from 2 to 4 parking spaces).’

Application: 3.1 Delete ‘three storey’ and insert ‘two storey’.

Consultation: A total of 29 letters of objection (from 17 households) have now been received. These additional 9 letters (from 7 households who had already commented on the proposal) reiterate those concerns already reported on the agenda and in particular concerns over insufficient parking. The following additional concern has been raised that the refuse collection arrangements do not comply with adopted policy and that no disabled parking is proposed.

Response: The County Highways Authority raise no objection to the parking layout including the location of the bin stores.

3. Page 21 **87 & 89 Spinney Hill, Addlestone – RU.09/0810**

Consultations: 4.7 Council's Drainage Engineer states that the applicant proposes to dispose of surface water through the main sewer. This is not acceptable and the applicant should consider alternative methods of discharging surface water, preferably a sustainable urban drainage system.

Comment

This is not considered to warrant a reason for refusal. If the application was to be granted permission, this issue could be controlled by condition.

4. Page 33 **24 Pond Road, Egham – RU.09/0824**

Recommendation: Additional Informatives are recommended in accordance with the advice of the Environment Agency:

1. The Environment Agency recommends that developers should follow the risk management framework provided in CLR11, Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, when dealing with land affected by contamination.
 2. The applicant is advised to refer to the Environment Agency Guidance on Requirements for Land Contamination Reports for the type of information that we require in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site. The Local Authority can advise on risk to other receptors, e.g. human health. Further information can be found at www.environment-agency.gov.uk
 3. In addition, the planning application states a soakaway will be used for dealing with surface water draining. Approved Document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SIDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.
-

Consultations:

Two further letters of objection received regarding RU.09/0536 and RU.09/0546. The main points raised in these letters are summarised as follows:

- Whilst the emissions from the bulk headlights have been reduced, the fascia signs are currently not lit. With these lights turned on, concern is raised about the total light emissions from the site.
- Whilst the 14 bulk headlights do not require planning permission as they are for security purposes, the author of the letter agrees with the Lighting Engineer's statement in 5.7 that the lights are not fit for purpose and therefore the author questions whether the lights should be addressed through some other means?
- Although monument signs existed at the site previously, the previous signage on the building was not as heavily branded as the current proposal (or as instantly recognisable as a household name). Taking this into account, along with the additional signage on the bins, the signage on the site would be excessive.
- If the Planning Committee decides to approve the application, the monument signs should be limited to the size of the previous monument signs at a maximum, as the incremental increase in their size is making the site over lit and over signed.
- Concern is also raised regarding a light at the rear of the premises which has not had its light fitting changed in line with the rest of the security lighting. This light is still very bright and continues to shine light onto the street and through the windows at 47 The Avenue.

Officer's Response: In response to the point raised about the security light at the rear of the premises which has not been adjusted in the same manner as the rest of the security lighting, the agent has confirmed that this light will have its light fitting altered in line with the works carried out to the rest of the bulk headlights by the end of the week commencing 9 November 2009.

A G E N D A I T E M S

1. Page 6 Item 7

Cost of Public Inquiries

Recommendation:

To note the comment in paragraph 4.3 that anticipates the cost of the Padd Farm Inquiry for this year as £60,000. This figure should be included in the recommendation. It would replace the figure of £50,000 in Recommendation i) first line.

2. Page 8 Item 8

Community Infrastructure Levy

Add to Section 4 as new paragraphs 4.5 – 4.8 Page 11.

4.5 With regard to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) The Council supports the following comments made on behalf of the Joint Strategic Partnership Board to the Community Infrastructure Levy

Transition Period and restriction on use of s106 agreements

4.6 Section 106 agreements are the mechanism currently used to collect developer contributions for mitigation. It is unlikely that a two year transition period will be sufficient for necessary arrangements (adopted plans and infrastructure schedules) to be in place across the 11 local planning authority areas affected by the SPA. Because of the need to continue to collect developer contributions to protect the SPA, the use of Section 106 agreements should only be restricted in areas that have chosen to adopt CIL and only once mechanisms for collecting the levy are put in place. Even if one authority proceeds down the CIL route, there may still be a need to still allow it to also collect S.106 contributions to fund access management and monitoring.

Coverage of CIL

4.7 The avoidance and mitigation measures necessary to protect the SPA include providing Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and strategic access management measures, as set out in the Delivery Framework and Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. A level of tariff has been set to ensure funding for both of these measures will be delivered and funded in perpetuity. It is not clear at present whether the proposals for the CIL could be used to fund these measures, or whether the level of contribution to fund them would be able to continue to be at an adequate level.

Prioritisation

4.8 There is a danger that other types of infrastructure with competing calls on funding may be prioritised over avoidance and mitigation measures required to protect the SPA, resulting in delivery of housing being delayed or even halted. If one authority decides to prioritise CIL money away from SPA related measures, it could affect housing delivery within its own administrative area but also hinder strategic mitigation provision across all 11 authorities.
