

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday 14 July 2010 at 7.30pm

A D D E N D U M

A G E N D A I T E M S

1. Page 13 Item 9 Government Changes and Implications for Runnymede Core Strategy

Since writing the report the Government has now revoked the South East Plan. This took immediate effect on 6 July 2010. This means that the South East Plan no longer forms part of the Development Plan used to inform Local Development Frameworks and in making decisions on Planning Applications.

It is becoming clearer that authorities should now determine their own housing figures and as such will need to do this considering housing need in the local area, environmental constraints and public opinion. These elements will need to be addressed in the evidence that underpins the Council's Core Strategy and will inform the Council's decision-making regarding the potential need for the release of the former DERA site at Longcross.

The Government has announced that Councils will be incentivised to build new housing in their local area. The package of incentives will be launched later in the year but it is suggested that these will be related to giving Councils money for each new home built in their area.

Due to these changes and the unclear nature of the incentives that will be given to Councils, recommendation (ii) of the Committee Report has been removed and will be the subject of a further Committee Report as these elements become clearer.

Recommendation to read:

- i) The Committee reverse the decision to publish the LDF Core Strategy this summer pending coalition government clarification of the issues set out in this report;**
- ii) Committee note the government changes as set out in this report and the intention to bring these matters to Committee when considering relevant planning applications.**

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1. Page 17 **The Brow, Amberwood and The Marlings, Ongar Hill, Addlestone - RU.10/0496**
- Consultations:**
- Para 4.1:** One neighbour has submitted a second letter of objection raising further concerns with regard to:
- loss of privacy, loss of light and overbearing to No. 51 Ongar Hill;
 - lack of on-site car parking.
- Para 4.2:** The County Highways Authority raise no objection subject to conditions in terms of highway safety and traffic generation. The County Highways Authority are satisfied that the required sight lines can be achieved but would require a significant number of trees and vegetation to be removed. Today, the applicant has submitted a speed survey to try to establish the exact dimensions of the visibility splays and hence what trees can be retained. The County Highway Authority accept the sight lines as shown on the current drawing but this will still require the loss of some vegetation but not as much as previously thought.
- Para 4.5:** The Council's Parks and Amenities Officer comments that it would be possible to carry out the development but raises concerns about the close proximity of the trees to the proposed houses and the loss of light issues to the properties.
- Planning Considerations:**
- Para 5.12:** Delete last sentence of paragraph 5.12 and replace with 'However it is considered that Plot 4 would be sited too close to the site boundary which represents a cramped form of development but would not have a serious impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring property currently under construction'.
- Para 5.14;** At end of paragraph 5.14 delete 'could have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of Plot 3' and replace with 'would have some impact on the amenities of Plot 3 but is not considered to be seriously detrimental to the amenities of the proposed occupiers of Plot 3'.
- Officers' Recommendation:** In the reason for refusal delete the reference to 'Policy BE6 of the South East Plan 2009'.
-

Please add the following points:

A letter has been submitted on behalf of the applicant in response to the letters of objection which have been received. The points made in this letter are summarised as follows:

- the only variation to the approved design under RU.10/0451 relates to the inclusion of a modest side dormer and addition of a further dormer within the eaves line of the rear elevation;
- the applicant contends the assertion that the current application proposals would have an imposing effect upon the street and those properties next to and across from it due to the fact that the side dormer would be virtually imperceptible in the streetscene and would not appear unbalanced with the adjoining property at 17 Northcroft Villas;
- the applicant does not agree with the assertion the application seeks to utilise the existing footprint to an absolute maximum as the proposal would not alter the internal configuration of the extension;
- the applicant refutes the claim that there is insufficient parking provided at the front of the property to reflect the increase in accommodation. Up to 3 cars can currently be parked at the property with provision being increased to allow for the parking of two further vehicles as part of the application;
- although concern has been raised about the balcony, following discussions with the case officer, the proposed elevations have been amended and represent the scale of screens approved under application RU.09/0898;
- the applicant reiterates that it is their intention to retain the existing trees along the site frontage in perpetuity;
- while reference is made to the hedge between numbers 15 and 16 Northcroft Villas, it is considered that this is not materially relevant to the application;
- the position and orientation of the gable within the southern elevation is such that it would not have any direct impact on the adjoining property.

An additional letter has also been received from the owner at 10 Northcroft Villas which has also been submitted on behalf of the neighbours at 15 and 17 Northcroft Villas. The main points raised in this letter are summarised as follows:

- it is understood that the balcony remains the same as previously approved and no alterations are proposed. The fact that this element is listed in the application description implies that an alteration is intended;
- concern that a balcony was approved at all as planning policy guidance until recently has prohibited them at upper floor levels. Explanation sought as to how and why such guidelines have been relaxed and if other Councils are operating similarly revised policies. The screening of the balcony on both sides is of paramount importance;
- both the Bennetts (at no. 15) and the Scotts (at no. 17) object to the two proposed gable ends as these elements increase the bulk and impact of the roof from the road and rear gardens;
- the revisions to the original scheme were made and accepted as resolving this by a planning approval. They are now being adjusted to dilute the effect achieved and should not be approved;
- request that letter is read in its entirety to make Committee Members aware of how policy relaxation can affect people and lead to the belief that they are the victims of policies that can be applied to some and not others.

An additional letter has been received from the residents of 17 Northcroft Villas. The main points made in this letter are as follows:

- concerns about loss of privacy and issues of overlooking from the balcony;
 - Concerns about noise and disturbance-particularly more music and people/children on the balcony.
-

3. **Page 36** **Land r/o 83 London Street, Chertsey - RU.10/0493**

Application:

Para 3.4: A revised site plan has been received showing changes to the visibility splays onto Willow Walk.

Consultations:

Para 4.1: One letter of representation has been received regarding the revised site plan stating that the revised site plan has been considered but the contents of the original objection letter from No. 89 London Street still stands. The applicant has met the neighbour to discuss the objector's concerns.

**Planning
Considerations:**

Para 5.16: The last sentence of paragraph 5.16 should read 'The applicant has been advised that this should be received prior to the Committee meeting'.

A unilateral undertaking has been received but requires some minor revisions. The applicant has agreed to make the necessary revisions and submit the unilateral undertaking shortly.

Informatives:

Informative 3:

Add drawing number BP1A received on 5.7.10.

Additional Informative 5:

The applicant is advised that the site plan shown on drawing number T637/1B is superseded by the site plan shown on drawing number BP1A received on 5.7.10.
