

# Runnymede Borough Council

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

### A D D E N D U M

#### Wednesday 6th January 2010 : AGENDA ITEMS

1. Item 6 Page 6

REVENUE ESTIMATES FOR 2010/11 (DF)

Proposed revision to the recommendation set out on page 7 as follows:

Padd Farm Inquiry

On 28 October 2009, it was reported to the Planning Committee that £60,000 would be required to fund the Padd Farm Inquiry. On 26 November, the Corporate Management Committee agreed to finance this by way of a virement from the provision for the Trumps Farm Incinerator Appeal.

Based on expenditure to date, the likely cost of external legal and other fees is now £120,000. The Committee is requested to approve the financing of the extra £60,000 by way of a further virement of £20,000 from the Incinerator Appeal budget, with the other £40,000 met from SANGS endowment funds. This will leave an estimated balance of SANGS 'endowment' funds of £86,000 at 31 March 2010, of which £49,700 is committed in 2010/11.

The draft estimates and the accompanying report will be amended accordingly.

The revised set of Officer Recommendations is

**OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –**

- i) the draft Revenue Estimates for 2010/11 be approved as submitted and the Corporate Management Committee be requested to make provision accordingly;**
- ii) the proposed fees and charges for 2010/11, as set out in Appendix 'A' to the estimates, be approved and be implemented with effect from 1 April 2010; and**
- iii) the Corporate Management Committee be requested to approve a further virement of £20,000 for the costs of the Padd Farm Inquiry from the provision for the Trumps Farm Incinerator Appeal, and a the use of £40,000 from the SANGS endowment fund.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

## Amendments to the report in Appendix A of the Agenda

There are a few other developments and amendments to note since the Agenda for the meeting of 6 January 2010 was published:

1. Paragraph 2.9: LDF Consultancy work: The reference should be to the 2009 Annual Pay and Workforce Plan (not 2008).
2. Paragraph 3.3: Clarification that the total of income from Housing and Planning Delivery Grant (HPDG) in the original budget was £179,100, of which £120,900 was assumed to be revenue income and £58,200 for capital purposes. The actual award for 2009/10 is £213,100, all of which can be treated as revenue income. Therefore, the extra HPDG is £34,000 more than estimated in total (i.e. £213,100 less £179,100). The increase in revenue income is £92,200 (i.e. £213,100 less £120,900).
3. Paragraph 4.6: SANGS: Replace the sentence "It will be necessary for the Council to identify further SANGS to accommodate the statutory housing requirements of the South East Plan" with "It will be necessary for the Council to identify further SANGS to accommodate the housing targets set out in the South East Plan".
4. Paragraph 6.3: Development Control Fees: On 20 January 2010, the Planning Minister, John Healey, announced that he would freeze planning fees on applications. The 2010/11 estimates makes no allowance for an increase in any case.

---

## 2. Item 9 Page 9

### Surrey Bus Review – Phase 1: Consultation by Surrey County Council

The Economic Development Committee at its meeting on 21 January 2010 considered the above item.

The Committee was particularly concerned that the consultation lacked clarity, had no data regarding passenger numbers, timetables and connectivity of services. It did not explain why particular options had been selected by them.

It was therefore unanimously

**RESOLVED that –**

***"Surrey County Council be advised that objection is raised to the reduction in the level of the bus transport network for the following reasons:***

1. ***For the impact on the local users of the services as the reduction in the service available to the public and school users will inevitably give rise to an increase in car-generated journeys, particularly at peak times, giving rise to increased congestion on the local road network.***
2. ***The loss of local public transport services to both the Chertsey and Ashford campuses of Ashford and St Peters' Hospital Trust is of particular concern. This is contrary to the objectives of the Surrey Local Transport Plan 2006, particularly Objective 1 (Tackling Congestion) and Objective 2***

***(Increasing Accessibility to Key Services and Facilities).***

- 3. The reduction of local bus services would also be [contrary to guidance on Planning Policy Note 13: Transport, that seeks to reduce the need to travel by car and provide accessibility to jobs, retail, leisure and services.***
- 4. The consultation lacks clarity, in that no data regarding passenger numbers (including paying passengers) on routes nor information regarding connectivity of services and timetabling forms part of the consultation. Availability of this information would have informed the public as to why particular options had been selected. It would also have been helpful if a schematic plan of routes unaffected by the proposals could have formed part of the background information."***

Comment

Post Economic Development Committee note: Data was received on 26 January 2010 setting out passenger numbers, in response to reason 4. The additional data sets out part of the information requested by the Economic Development Committee but does not enable a full understanding of the technical reasons for withdrawing the identified services.

- 
- 3. Item 11 Page 13**

**Planning Applications Determined by Director of Technical Services**  
**Appendix E Page 75 Application RU.09/0918**

To note the address of Rondane is Shepley End, Virginia Water, not Ascot, Berkshire.

---

## **Wednesday 27th January 2010 : PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

1. Page 1

**RU.09/1058 - 11 Osborne Road, Egham**

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

---

2. Page 10

**RU.09/1007 – Land Adj. East Lodge & Hamilton House, Lyne Lane, Lyne**

An additional letter of representation has been received raising the following matters:

- Concerns are raised that if the proposal is granted permission, it would lead to the sale of the plot, which in turn would lead to the creation of further stables and storage yards, with associated noise and nuisance.

Comments

- The sale of the plot is not considered to be a planning matter.
- 

3. Page 20

**RU.09/1091 - Land adj. 30-38 Heathervale Way, New Haw, Addlestone**

**Officers'  
Recommendation:**

Additional Informative:

The applicant is advised that the consent of the landowner must be obtained before any of the trees (annotated as T4, T5, T9 and T11 on the location plan) are felled. This decision notice to carry out works to the above trees does not convey rights of access over land not in the applicant's ownership without the landowner's consent to do so.

---

### **Appendix D**

Pages 19-27

**Planning Applications Determined by Director of Technical Services**

Location of sites should be added to the following applications:

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| 09/0908 | Runnymede Hotel and Spa, Windsor Road, Egham – page 19                  |
| 09/0919 | Chertsey Railway Station Car Park, Guildford Street, Chertsey – page 19 |
| 09/0942 | 15 Sayes Court, Addlestone – page 20                                    |
| 09/0996 | 3 Almnors Road, Lyne, Chertsey – page 24                                |
| 09/0997 | 4 Crosslands, Chertsey – page 27  |
| 09/1049 | 9 Helvellyn Close, Egham – page 27                                      |

The decision should be added to the following applications:

- |         |                 |
|---------|-----------------|
| 09/1060 | Grant – page 25 |
| 09/0965 | Grant – page 26 |
-