



GUILDFORD  
BOROUGH

**James Whiteman**  
Managing Director

**[www.guildford.gov.uk](http://www.guildford.gov.uk)**

Dear Councillor

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY 6 JANUARY 2021**

Please find attached the following:

**Agenda No    Item**

9.    **Late Sheets - Amendments and Corrections and Late Representations - 6 Jan 2021 (Pages 1 - 6)**

Yours sincerely

Sophie Butcher, Democratic Services Officer

Encs

This page is intentionally left blank

## Planning Committee

6 January 2021

### Amendment/Correction/Update List

#### **19/P/01460 – (Page 23) – Land east of Ash Railway Station and Foreman Road and south of Guildford Road, Ash, GU12**

Members are respectfully asked to consider the following corrections and amendments to the Officer Report:

1. Officers would like the opportunity to amend the last bullet point on page 47 of the agenda (comments from Ash Green Residents Association). Members should now read this bullet point as:
  - the residents association note that at their EGM in October, only three residents, of the 60 which attended, were in favour of the application [Officer Note: This represents only the views of those who attended the above meeting].
2. Officers would like to clarify and correct the main heights of the proposed bridge as follows:
  - the distance from top of rail to underside of bridge is 4.78m;
  - the distance from top of rail to top of road level is 6.7m;
  - the embankment height (between ground and top of embankment) would be c.7.8m high at its peak;
  - 1.8m barriers are present on the road over rail bridge and are rail parapets, which comprise a safety restraint system installed on the edge of a bridge to protect against falls.
3. Officers would like to clarify that the heritage harm to Ashe Grange is at the lower end of the less than substantial scale.
4. It is noted that the second bullet point on page 52 of the agenda is incomplete. It should read as follows (correction underlined):
  - proposed road layout or layouts to provide connections between both the individual development sites within this site allocation and between Ash Lodge Drive and Foreman Road, providing a through road connection between Ash Lodge Drive and Foreman Road, in order to maximise accessibility and to help alleviate congestion on the A323 corridor.
5. Officers would like to clarify a particular point relating to the section entitled 'Impact on heritage assets'. Members will be aware that Officers have concluded that the harm to a number of the statutory listed buildings has been noted as being 'negligible'. For the avoidance of doubt, Officers would clarify that as some harm has been identified (albeit only negligible) in NPPF terms it must be classified as less than substantial harm. In each case, the harm would fall at the very lower end of that

scale. Members should take this harm into account as directed through the NPPF and as already set out on pages 68-69 of the agenda and should give such harm considerable importance and weight in accordance with the statutory duty imposed pursuant to section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

To assist Members on this matter, the final section of page 68 of the agenda should be amended to read as follows (additions underlined):

*It has been concluded above that the proposal would result in the following harms to surrounding heritage assets:*

- *Ash Manor complex (Grade II\* and II) - less than substantial (at higher end of scale)*
- *Ash Grange (Grade II) - less than substantial (at lower end of scale)*
- *St Peters Church (Grade II\*) - less than substantial (at lower end of scale)*
- *Parker Chest Tomb (Grade II) – less than substantial (at very lower end of scale)*
- *Hartshorn (Grade II) – less than substantial (at very lower end of scale)*
- *Memorial Chapel (Grade II) – less than substantial (at very lower end of scale)*
- *Ashmead House (Grade II) – less than substantial (at very lower end of scale)*
- *The Old Rectory (Nos 1, 2 and 3) (Grade II) – less than substantial (at very lower end of scale)*
- *York House (Grade II) – less than substantial (at very lower end of scale)*

In terms of the balancing exercise required through paragraph 196 of the NPPF, which can be found on pages 94-98 of the agenda, it is noted that taking into account the impact on all of the designated heritage assets, the cumulative harm is still considered to be less than substantial and at the upper end of that scale. This has not changed from the published agenda. Therefore, the balancing exercises carried out on pages 94-98 and pages 98-104 remain valid, even when factoring in the great weight and considerable importance which must be afforded to any heritage harm.

#### Updates and Clarifications following Member's Site Visit

6. At the virtual site visit, Members queried how the proposal may impact on Ash station car park. It is noted that access to this car park would remain the same and there are no plans to increase its capacity (which according to the operator website currently has 20 spaces). The proposal which is before Members does not require any changes to the existing station car park or its enlargement to make the application acceptable in planning terms.
7. At the virtual site visit Members queried the impact the proposal would have on on-street parking, particularly at the northern end of Foreman Road. It is noted that there are currently approximately 14 informal car parking spaces along the western side of Foreman Road. These would be removed as part of the proposal. However, it is noted that once the crossing is closed to vehicles, an additional 22 formalised car parking spaces would be provided along Guildford Road on the northern side of the crossing. It is noted that these spaces would have better access to the station and their provision is controlled through condition 13 (see page 32 of the agenda).
8. At the virtual site visit a question was raised regarding the proposed lighting on the bridge and embankments. A total of nine lighting columns will be provided on the

bridge and its embankments and these will be approximately ten metres tall. New and replacement lighting columns are also proposed along other sections of the new route. As regards lighting it should be noted that condition 24 (see page 36 of the agenda) requires full details to be submitted and agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

9. Members and residents have previously raised queries regarding a footbridge crossing over the railway line and when such a scheme would be delivered. Officers understand that the strategy for the footbridge is following a separate path because it has a longer implementation timescale. The footbridge cannot be installed and the full stopping up of the level crossing cannot take place until the road bridge is in place because the workspace needed to construct the footbridge requires motor vehicles to be diverted away from the level crossing.

The applicant has noted that good progress is being made in discussing and agreeing the design of the footbridge with Network Rail. However, the planning application for the footbridge is not ready to be submitted yet, but the applicant believes that an application will be submitted by summer 2021. Assuming that both projects receive planning consent, it is the applicant's intention that the footbridge and subsequent closure of the Ash level crossing will closely follow the opening of the road bridge in 2023.

Finally, as already set out in the Officer Report the current application stands on its own merits and is not predicated on the delivery of the footbridge. Both Network Rail and the County Highway Authority have made clear that their support for the application is not conditional on delivery of the footbridge. Network Rail in their latest response to the application dated 9th December 2020 note that "Network Rail recognises that this is a unique and one-off opportunity to work collaboratively to remove risk to both highway and rail users, as well as meet the housing development plans required of GBC in their local plan. We are actively working together to progress the footbridge proposals and closure of the level crossing. Network Rail therefore supports the delivery of the road bridge scheme and the associated planning application, which, upon completion, will allow for Guildford Road (A323) to be closed to vehicles and construction of a footbridge to commence".

**20/P/00968 – (Page 121) – The Hayloft, Water Lane Farm, Water Lane, Albury, Guildford, GU5 9BD**

Amended plan received 14 December 2020:

An amended site location plan has been submitted which now includes the parking area associated with the building outlined in blue.

Additional conditions:

- 1) Within one month of the date of this permission the operator must provide a Noise Management Plan which must:
  - a) Identify all the activities associated with this permission that is likely to generate noise audible beyond the premises boundary (deliveries, restoration works etc)
  - b) Propose mitigation measures scheme to reduce the noise from the activities identified above and submitted for approval by the planning authority

- c) Carry out implementation of approved mitigation measures within two months of their approval. Any changes to the mitigation scheme shall not be carried out without prior approval from the planning authority
- d) Nevertheless to the scheme proposed:
  - All the repairs/restoration work must be carried out with doors shut
  - The building fabric must be such insulated to prevent the transmission of noise beyond the premises boundary so as to be clearly audible at the curtilage of nearest noise sensitive property. Noise from the operations shall therefore not exceed the existing background noise level (LA90) at any time.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity

- 2) Within one month of the date of this permission a scheme for enhancements to the boundary treatment at the entrance to the application site shall be submitted in writing to the Local Authority for approval. The approved scheme shall then be implemented within two months of its agreement.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

Additional informatives:

- 1) It is understood that the business is not likely to require an Environmental Permit to carry out vehicle respraying as the usage of solvent is unlikely to exceed the limit of 1 tonne in any 12 months period. However a number of best practices from the process guidance will help to avoid causing odour nuisance to the nearby residential properties  
[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/583923/respraying-of-road-vehicles-process-guidance-note-6-34\\_11\\_.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/583923/respraying-of-road-vehicles-process-guidance-note-6-34_11_.pdf).
- 2) If asbestos is suspected, the vehicle decontamination and restoration work must be carried out in compliance with Health and Safety regulation and guidance:  
<https://www.hse.gov.uk/asbestos/regulations.htm>

## **Planning Committee**

**6 January 2021**

### **Late Representations**

Since the last date for the submission of views on applications/matters before the Committee this evening, representations in respect of the under mentioned applications/ matters have been received. The letters, copies of which will be available for inspection by councillors at the meeting, are summarised below.

#### **Item 5 – Planning Applications**

##### **19/P/01460 – (Page 23) – Land east of Ash Railway Station and Foreman Road and south of Guildford Road, Ash, GU12**

Two additional letters of objection have been received. The following additional points are noted:

- issues regarding the flow of the northern end of Foreman Road which is sometimes restricted to a single lane due to parked vehicles;
- commuter parking will be pushed off main roads and into residential areas;
- loss of trees and wildlife;
- there is nothing wrong with stopping at the level crossing to wait for a train to pass;
- bridge is not needed; and
- mass housing is not needed.

This page is intentionally left blank