

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday 10th March 2010 at 7.30pm

A D D E N D U M

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

PART A

1. **Page 1** **16-24 Bridge Road and Land adjacent 26 Abbey Road, Chertsey - RU.09/1088**

Recommendation: Delete 'Approved' and replace with 'APPROVE'.

Condition 7: Delete '48' and replace with '57'

Condition 17: Add to end of Condition:

"The approved flood risk compensation details shall be fully implemented before any dwelling hereby approved is occupied and the approved works shall be retained in perpetuity unless prior written consent is obtained from the Local Planning Authority."

Delete Condition 18 and replace with:

"Prior to the occupation of any dwelling hereby approved the safe escape route from the site to an area wholly outside the floodplain shall be fully implemented in accordance with drawing number 914-Pln-418 Rev B and thereafter retained in perpetuity unless prior written consent is obtained from the Local Planning Authority."

Delete Informative 7.

2. **Supplementary Report** **St. Peter's Hospital, Guildford Road, Chertsey – RU.09/1093**

Consultations: Paragraph 5.15 and 6.16:

The Highways Agency have reviewed the revised Transport Assessment and revised Travel Plan and lift the previous direction. The Highways Agency raise no objection subject to a condition.

Planning Considerations:

Paragraph 6.6 Page 13 of Supplementary Report
Delete the second, third and fourth sentences of paragraph 6.6 and replace with:

"The existing and proposed boundaries of different forms of development have been compared. Whilst there have been some expansion and some deletions with these various boundaries across the whole site the built envelope (spread of buildings) would reduce by 4.1 hectares from 16.2 hectares to 12.1 hectares. The developed envelope (spread of buildings plus car parking areas) would reduce by 0.8 hectares from 24.2 hectares to 23.4 hectares."

Paragraph 6.12 Page 15 of Supplementary Report
In the thirteenth line of paragraph 6.12 delete '1475' and replace with '1575'.

Page 21 of Supplementary Report

Amend (ii) to read: 'monitoring on street parking in the surrounding roads and nearby car parks within 1.5km distance of the site and to enable highway remedial action if deemed necessary'.

Add (iii) to read: 'Secure a financial payment of £15,000 to Surrey County Council to permanently close the existing layby along the Guildford Road (A320) near to the main vehicular access of the site by infilling the layby and reinstating kerbs etc.'

Recommendation: Insert additional condition:

"26. No occupation of any permanent buildings shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a travel plan for the St. Peter's Hospital site.

Reason: In the interests of promoting sustainable travel in order that the development should not prejudice the free flow of traffic, highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to meet the objectives of Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 'Transport'."

3. **Page 15**

Sir William Perkins School, Guildford Road, Chertsey

Consultations:

Paragraph 4.1 – two letters of objection have been received (including a letter from "The Chertsey Society"), and summarised below:

- Road congestion is a serious problem and the situation will worsen if the school expands further. The plans provide for no additional on-site parking.
- Conditions for sustainable urban drainage (SUDS) should be imposed.
- Problems of noise, dust and dirt relating to construction traffic and damage to surrounding roads and properties.

Comment: The applicant has confirmed that the proposals do not result in any additional staff or pupil numbers. In addition the submission of a travel plan will be secured by condition in order to reduce vehicular movements within and surrounding the site.

A condition (8) has been proposed to deal with SUDS.

Paragraph 4.11 – the County Archaeological Officer raises no concerns.

Planning

Considerations:

Paragraph 5.4 - note typing error – amend figure 12,672 square metres to read 12,762 square metres.

Recommendation:

Condition 4 – amend phase 3 height from 12 metres to 8 metres.

Condition 9 – delete . . . and completed before the last house hereby approved is occupied.

Add following Informative:

4. The applicant is advised that there may be opportunities to enhance wildlife within the site as outlined in the Ecological Survey Report received on 13th January 2010.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

PART B

3. **Page 31** **Ten Acre Farm, Stonehill Road, Ottershaw – RU.09/0809**
- Enforcement Considerations:** In the first sentence of paragraph 6.8 delete 'Plan 1' and replace with 'Plan 2'.
- Recommendation:** Additional Informative 5:
The applicant is advised that in the event of no valid planning applications being submitted by 31st May 2010 then enforcement action against the unauthorised development described in Informatives 2, 3 and 4 above will be considered by the Planning Committee.
-
4. **Page 47** **Land adjacent 93 Simplemarsh Road, Addlestone – RU.09/1105**
- This application has been **WITHDRAWN** by the applicant.
-
5. **Page 57** **13 Basset Close, New Haw, Addlestone – RU.10/0068**
- Application:** Section 3 Page 58:
To note that the applicant has also applied to render the exterior of the property and paint it white.
Comment
This would not require planning permission and would constitute Permitted Development under Class A, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2008.
- Section 4 Page 59:
An additional letter of representation has been received raising concerns about the first floor side extension's set back from the front elevation and that a 0.9 metres set back is not acceptable and that the conservatory extending beyond the building line is unacceptable.
Comment
The concerns raised have been addressed in the application report.
- Page 61 Add Paragraph 4.3:
Comments have been received from the Council's Lighting Consultant regarding the lighting effect of the proposed conservatory at 13 Basset Close. He advises that the conservatory lighting will only have a minimum effect on the houses near to the site and that they receive far more light from the existing street light than will be the case from the conservatory.