

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday 21 April 2010 at 7.30pm

A D D E N D U M

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. **Page 1** **Pinetrees Business Park, Chertsey Lane, Staines – RU.10/0051**
- Consultations:** 4.3 Following receipt of further information from the applicant the Environment Agency has withdrawn its objection subject to the imposition of a condition (see below).
- Planning Considerations:** 5.13 The Environment Agency now agrees with officers that because the master plan relates principally to works to Unit 5a reason for refusal cannot be warranted on flooding matters but rather can be controlled at the reserved matters stage.
- Officers' Recommendation:** Delete recommendation (i)
- Amend condition 15, page 9, to read:
- No development shall take place at Unit 5, or each reserved matters planning application, until a fully up-to-date Flood Risk Assessment which takes into account the full requirements of PPS25 (or any Government Guidance updating this) and the Environment Agency Standing Advice issue at that time, along with the most up-to-date and relevant flood data and information, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Any compensation works approved under the Flood Risk Assessment must be implemented prior to first occupation of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.
- Reason:** To ensure the long term development of the site does not increase flood risk in accordance with PPS25 and saved Policy SV2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001.
-

Former Social Club Building, Stoneylands Road, Egham - RU.10/0130

Para 4.1:

Add to end of paragraph:

Two further letters have been received which add the following points to objections already listed:

- removal of the dormer window on the western rear elevation is a very minor improvement;
- trees added along the boundary are insufficient to protect the privacy and residential amenities of adjoining occupiers at the rear;
- query description and other detailed changes;
- only nominal changes made and the objectors still object on grounds set out previously. Particular emphasis is given to the development being over-intensive, overbearing, invasive, causing overlooking and overshadowing, detrimental to the amenities of neighbours, traffic hazard, capacity of pumping station, inadequate parking;
- red brick is garish and not in keeping with character of the area. Yellow stock bricks are suggested;
- any replacement building should be single storey;
- conditions attached to the replacement social club building which restricted the insertion of additional windows to protect residential amenities;
- parking could be provided underground or by using hydraulic car lifts;
- pictures and photomontages are included in the letter taken from the neighbour's property and illustrating how the development might appear from their properties;
- the development is contrary to the Government's Communities Policy with regard to protecting the environment and securing good planning; and contrary to the Council's aim of enhancing the quality of life for Runnymede's residents.

Land Rear of 212 Chertsey Lane, Staines – RU.09/0523

Consultations:

4.6 A further letter has been submitted by both Mr Newman and Mr Worley the main point being that the documents submitted between 1997 to 2000 in the opinion of Mr Worley and Newman warrant forensic analysis by an accredited company and that they are willing to pay for the work to be done. In their opinion if they are genuine the applicant should have no objection. They state that real or not the documents are not evidence of the rear garden being used as a commercial yard.

The remainder of the letter offers lengthy opinions on the evidence already submitted and also include opinions on officer's visits in 2003/2004, alleged enmity between the applicant and the neighbours, alleged similarities between Mr Newman's and Mr Worley's statements, the issue of the applicant repairing Mr Newman's roof, the applicants trading address and the costs of any appeal.

4.7 In addition a further letter from Mr Newman has been received which states that the sworn statements submitted by the applicant and himself have attached to them drawing KT01 and not KT01A which is the formal drawing for the application. He states that the affidavits are therefore legally void and should be re-sworn. He asks that the enclosed plan KT/01 be attached to his February 2010 affidavit as annex 3 to ensure its legal integrity.

Comment

The Council's legal department states it would be entirely inappropriate to have the documents carbon dated, the test is based on the balance of probabilities, the Council has requested further information and this has been supplied. It sees no justification in delaying this application any further.
