



GUILDFORD  
B O R O U G H

**James Whiteman**  
Managing Director

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

Dear Councillor

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY 20 OCTOBER 2021**

Please find attached the following:

**Agenda No    Item**

Late Sheets - Amendments, Updates and Corrections / Late Representations /  
Questions from Councillors (Pages 1 - 26)

Yours sincerely

Sophie Butcher, Democratic Services Officer

Encs

This page is intentionally left blank

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

Item	Pg	Para(s)	Errata or Amendment
	9	Background Papers	Reference to the NPPF (March 2012) should refer to the NPPF (July 2021) (latest version).
<b>Both</b>	13		On Index Sheet: Replace items 5.1 and 5.2 with items 4.1 and 4.2 respectively
<b>Application 20/P/02173</b>			
	17		Replace for Parish 'Part of site Worpelsdon.'
	20	2 Formal Recommendation	Add new para at end  'If the application is granted regulation 30 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017, which sets a duty on the local planning authority to inform the Secretary of State, consultation bodies and the public of the final decision, shall be complied with.'
	40	Policies Section	Add after 6.5  'Burpham Neighbourhood Plan Made April 2016.  Only policies B-T 2c: Cycle Routes and BT-T 2f Foot Paths are relevant to this application. '
	20	2	New text at end to say:  'If the application be granted regulation 30 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017, sets a duty on the local planning authority to inform the Secretary of State, consultation bodies and the public of the final decision, shall be complied with.'
	61	Appendix 1 S106 Heads of Terms	The bellmouth to the main access off Clay Lane has dangerous potholes.  Add new HoT. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Improvement to bell mouth of access to Burpham Court Farm to bring to a Safe Standard.</li></ul>
	61	Appendix 1 S106 Heads of Terms	Amend HoT. Reason in italics <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Improvements to the Bowers Lane Bridge, <u>with public access granted by confirmatory deed.</u></li></ul> <i>To ensure that in return for refurbishment a right of access to Burpham Court Farm over the Wey is granted.</i>

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

			<p>Change to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of a <u>safe</u> controlled pedestrian crossing across Clay Lane</li> </ul> <p><i>Premature to determine form of crossing prior to design and safety audit</i></p> <p>Clay Lane Crossing HOT add Add '<u>and costs of any associated TRO to adjust extent of Jacobs Well speed limit</u>'</p>
<b>Appendix 2</b>	62	Condition 3	<p>Should read in condition: 'The change of use to Public Open Space (intended for SANG purposes) does not apply to the <u>following</u> areas:'</p>
	49	Condition 3	<p>Change to <u>60</u>DbA.</p> <p>Typo</p>
	63	Condition 5	<p>Linked to above a Grampian Element is needed so the SANG cannot operate until the safe access is provided.</p> <p>Correct typo 'a minimum of <u>two</u> DDA wide bays.'</p> <p>Add at end of condition.</p> <p>'In addition, the Car Park shall not be opened for public access until the planning obligation for improvement to the bellmouth has been implemented.'</p>
	49	Condition 6	<p>Amend wording: add words in underline to final sentence.</p> <p><u>The</u> management plan shall be carried out and maintained thereafter <u>in accordance with the approved details</u>.</p>
	51	Condition 8	<p>Delete first para.</p> <p>Added in error from report.</p>
	66	Condition 14	Correct Typographic Error 'Public Open <u>S</u> pace'
<b>20/P/02155</b>			
	83	Formal Recommendation	Replace with

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

			<p>'Subject to the objections of the Statutory Consultees set out below being withdrawn: - <del>Highways England National Highways</del> <del>Surrey County Council (Highways Authority)</del></p> <p>That this application be GRANTED subject to securing a planning obligation with the heads of terms as set out in Appendix 1, and subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 2, for the reasons set out in this report, with the proviso that should there be objections from the above statutory consultees that cannot be resolved, the application is returned to the Committee for redetermination.</p> <p>That the Head of Place (or person with acting authority thereof) is delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions and/or informatives), <u>in consultation with the Chairman of Planning Committee</u>, prior to a decision notice being issued, provided <u>that those persons are the Head of Place (or person with acting authority thereof)</u> is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the committee. <u>Where any such changes to the decision are made Group Leaders, the Lead Councillor for Development Management and Ward Councillors for Stoke Ward shall be notified before the final decision is issued.</u> <del>where necessary in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee and lead Ward Members for Stoke Ward.</del></p> <p>That upon completion of the planning obligation, the application be determined by the Head of Place. That if negotiations on the planning obligation are not successfully concluded within six months of the date of the committee decision the Head of Place (or person with acting authority thereof) be authorised to refuse the scheme on grounds lack of provision of the matters that would have been secured in the heads of terms set out in Appendix 1.</p>
--	--	--	--

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

			<p><u>If the application is granted regulation 30 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017, which sets a duty on the local planning authority to inform the Secretary of State, consultation bodies and the public of the final decision, shall be complied with.</u></p> <p>Replace 'Highways England' through rest of report with 'Highways England (Now National Highways).' Other than in consultation replies section.</p>
	40	6.5.1	<p>Add to list of saved policies</p> <p>CF1, CF2, CF3, CF4 Community Facilities</p>
	89	5.1.7	<p>Replace with <u>Royal Surrey NHS Foundation Trust 23.6.2021</u> (No objection subject to acute care contribution) 'The Weyside Urban Village will have a significant impact on our GP and community services in the area as we estimate at this stage it will create an additional 3100 patients once fully developed. In General Practice terms this equates to c1.9 FTE GPs plus associated supporting clinical and admin staff.' Contribution required of £3,185,854.50.</p> <p><u>NHS Surrey Heartlands Clinical Commissioning Group</u> The CCG and local Guildford and Waverly Integrated Care Partnership (ICP) has already initiated business case development to address a number of existing and emerging GP and Community services premises issues for the local GP Primary Care Network impacted, and this included the Weyside Urban Village area. An initial CCG feasibility study 2019/20 has identified an option to develop our NHS Property Services site – the Jarvis Centre - as a suitable location to create new GP and Community services capacity. The key GP Practices impacted will be Woodbridge Hill Surrey, Guildowns Group, and to a lesser extent Fairlands Surgeries. The NHS (ICP/CCG) is looking to commence our OBC stage to consider our 'North Guildford' GP premises requirement in the next few months. It would be good to discuss if there are alternative sites within the proposed development area that provide good access and</p>

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

			<p>good value and how best for the future Weyside growth can be accommodated. We will include engagement on WUV within our project brief to ensure the essential factors are included.'</p> <p>They have suggested a figure for capital provision towards primary, intermediate and mental health provision – capital only – which is included in the appendix 1 proposed Heads of Terms.</p>
	80	1.3.4	Typo - Reference to SDF SDP should be to SDF SPD
	81	1.4.1	<p>Amend to</p> <p>'</p> <p>The scheme complies with the requirements of site allocation A24 <u>(considered as a whole)</u> within the development plan.</p>
	81	1.4.4	<p>This should read 'The scheme complies with the development plan in all other respects, and as a whole; however, policy compliance is subject to the application of the planning obligation heads of terms, and the planning conditions, as set out in Appendices 1 and 2 of this report respectively.'</p>
	85	3.1.1	<p>This paragraph should read –</p> <p>'Planning applications were approved in May and June 2020 for the provision of new allotment facilities at Aldershot Road and North Moors respectively to accommodate allotment holders who would be displaced from Bellfields Allotments (refs: 20/P/00197 and 20/P/00478). Taken together with the allotment plots proposed to be re-provided at Bellfields, these new facilities have the capacity to facilitate re-provision of the allotments in their entirety and at reasonably accessible locations. However, Secretary of State consent under section 8 of the Allotments Act 1925 is also necessary prior to any change of use or disposal of statutory allotment land (section 8). '</p>
	168	7.8.11	Replace with

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

		<p>'Planning deals with land uses not land users and conditions are proposed on both the club and cycle facility to ensure replacement provision of the land use, temporary where necessary in order to comply with saved policy CF2 and the paragraph 93 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Regarding the Bike Hub . Clear legal advice has been received that Bike Project Surrey provides a community facility as a Bike Hub and that both local plan policy CF2 and NPPF para 93 apply. As the Councils website states "It provides a range of <u>other community benefits</u> too, for example the supply and service of cycles for disabled children, opportunities for those with learning difficulties, bikes for those in need of transport for work and Duke of Edinburgh volunteering placements".</p> <p>Paragraph 93 of the NPPF would be engaged in any event regardless of arguments put forward by the applicant, because it also separately refers to "other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments" — which this clearly is as— and to "valued facilities and services" — which this, again, clearly is. Paragraph 93 requires the council to "plan positively for the provision and use of community facilities" and to "guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services".</p> <p>CF2 says that the council will resist the loss of community buildings or uses unless it is demonstrated that the retention of the building has been fully explored; or, adequate alternative provision exists or is made available. Officers consider the applicants suggested gap in provision for the bike hub (from 2022 when the current use has to cease due to new sewer works and 2027/8 when the local centre and a new mobility hub opens to breach policy CF2 due to a 5-6 year gap in alternative cycle hub provision. Officers are not satisfied that a site search has not been undertaken to find alternate site premises and hence a condition is needed to make the scheme national policy and local plan compliant. Hence the need for a temporary replacement for the use, proposed by condition 17.'</p>
--	--	--



## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

			<p>To deal with applicants late challenge to this condition and following legal advice on the response.</p>
	174	7.9.1	<p>The following should be added to the start of paragraph 7.9.1 – <u>‘As stated in paragraph 6.1.2 of this report, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires local planning authorities, in determining planning applications, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.</u></p> <p><u>In addition, the NPPF includes Chapter 16, ‘Conserving and enhancing the historic environment’, which sets out a framework for decision making in planning applications relating to heritage assets (which includes conservation areas) and has been taken into account by officers in preparing this report.</u></p> <p><u>Paragraph 195 of the NPPF states that ‘Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.’</u></p> <p><u>Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states that, in determining applications, LPAs should take account of (a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; (b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic viability; and (c) the desirability of new development in making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.</u></p> <p><u>Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states that ‘When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any</u></p>

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

			<p>potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.’ Paragraph 200 goes on to note that ‘any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification’. Paragraph 201 of the NPPF sets out guidance where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset and paragraph 202 of the NPPF states ‘Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.’ Conservation areas are designated heritage assets and this guidance therefore applies to the Wey &amp; Godalming Navigations Conservation Area. (new wording underlined)</p>
	176	7.9.22	<p>A sentence should be added at the end of this paragraph to read – <i><u>‘In line with paragraph 203 of the NPPF, the effect of this application on the significance of this non-designated heritage asset has been taken into account by officers in determining the application and a balanced judgement formed having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset in reaching the recommendation to approve the application.’</u></i></p>

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

	177	7.9.23	<p>The second sentence onwards of paragraph 7.9.23 should form a new paragraph (7.9.23a) and be amended read – <u>‘Officers also consider that there would be less than substantial harm to the Wey and Godalming Navigation Conservation Area. In line with paragraph 202 of the NPPF, as less than substantial harm has been identified to the Wey and Godalming Navigation Conservation Area, a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. Careful detailed design of buildings could offset some of this less than substantial harm and be considered alongside other potential public benefits such as high-quality urban design. Without detailed designs however the public benefits are those of the scheme as a whole, in particular housing delivery, employment provision and promotion of active travel measures. These public benefits as a whole outweigh the less than substantial harm to the Wey and Godalming <u>Navigation</u> conservation area.’</u> (new text underlined</p>
	219	7.14.94	<p>Replace with following. Reason, to provide a fuller explanation as requested as to the status of the non-planning Allotment Act process.</p>

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

			<p>Regarding the impact on the existing Bellfields Allotments; The applicant has stated that discussions with Guildford allotment Society (GAS) have been underway since 2004 surrounding the relocation of the allotments and discussions continued through to the local plan consultation and at GAS/GBC allotment meetings. Discussions commenced in August 2019 to establish a relocation site for the allotments. A site at North Moors was purchased for potential use as allotments. Whilst the GAS were not pleased that the allotments were to be moved, they acknowledged that if they were to be moved then they would like to be party to the design of the new facilities. GAS were involved in the design of the new facilities on both North Moors and Aldershot Road. Both sites now have planning permission.</p> <p>The Allotments Act 1924 process for loss of and relocation of Allotment Plots is not a planning matter; however, it is useful to explain the process. On the 12th February 2020 and following the design and due diligence a section 8 application was made to the Secretary of State for the relocation of Bellfields Allotments in its entirety. On 3rd September 2020, the SOS issued the decision on whether the statutory criteria had been met. Following the SOS refusal, the applicants undertook a consultation process with the intention of remedying the refusal reasons and a section 8 application allotments Act new application made on 23rd June 2021. A response from SOS is awaited on the second application. The Planning Matter here is compliance with policy on replacement allotments as open space. This is dealt with in detail later in the report.</p>
	244		No text on page 244 should be underlined apart from subheading 7.6.81 Electric Vehicles
	249	Add new para after 7.16.111	7.16.111a Following further discussion with the Highways authority about the enforceability of the above measures, and on going discussions with them concerning a review mechanism for parking, it has been agreed that the best mechanism would be as part of a wider regular review of the document what sets

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

			standard for the scheme. This would require the standards by phase to be placed in the design code (a revised design code is required by condition in any event), the code review examining the past success or failure of standards and design as a whole. This flexible, pragmatic compromise is acceptable to GBC and SCC and is recommended as part of the condition on reviewing design codes. This way members can be assured there is a back stop on parking they can control to ways, through their controlling of private road parking enforcement and the review mechanism for the design code.
	250	7.6.113	Replace final sentence with “The County have stated in the event of planning permission being granted they have recommended heads of terms and conditions. They have not issued any formal objection.”
	252	7.17.13	Should not be underlined
	272		Replace text paragraph after table with:  ‘For those strategies marked with an Asterix, revised versions of each document shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to commencement of any development other than initial site preparation and groundwork, and those revised documents as approved shall be substituted in this table. Variation shall not deviate from the scope of the permission or lead to materially different significant environmental effects to those assessed in the Environment Statement without any fresh consent/assessment required to be.’  Correction of errors.
	467	HoT 25	Replace Head of Term 25 with below

<b>25. a &amp; b</b>	a. GBC to transfer primary care	a. Primary Care Contribution towards local primary health care	a. Either on site primary Care GP surgery or alternate financial provision based on formula formula approach <b>£1,413,002 Capital £941 per unit</b> , for
----------------------	---------------------------------	--	--

**Planning Committee**

**20 October 2021**

**Update/Amendment/Correction/List**

	<p>funds to CCG,.</p> <p>b. Acute care funds to Royal Surrey Hospital NHS Trust.</p>	<p>needs of the development's new residential population.</p> <p>b. Acute Care Contribution towards Royal Surrey Hospital health care services arising from the development's new residential population</p>	<p>Primary Care, Intermediate care, and mental health capital facilities</p> <p>b. Formula approach for acute Care. based on Healthy Urban Development Unit model, Coplug Model or Equivalent (to be agreed) pro rata for population, but only accounting for primary care capital outputs of model=, and other CIL reg 122. Compliant costs to be agreed..</p> <p>Each to be paid prior to first occupation of the development for a relevant phase.</p>
--	--	--	---

**Planning Committee**

**20 October 2021**

**Update/Amendment/Correction/List**

<b>Appendix 2</b>	294	Condition 48	Add at end  'that the parking management plan shall be thereafter permanently retained and maintained, subject to any changes agreed through the agreed design code review process.'
	297	Condition 53	Replace With  'No development shall commence in any phase until a Construction Logistics Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to include details of: (a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors (b) loading and unloading of plant and materials (c) storage of plant and materials (d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management) (e) provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones (f) HGV deliveries and hours of operation (g) vehicle routing (h) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway (i) before and after construction condition surveys of the highway and a commitment to fund the repair of any damage caused (j) measures to prevent conflict with school drop off and pick up times (k) on-site turning for construction vehicles  Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development. '  As Agreed with SCC.
		New Condition	Add new condition after condition 58 Outline Section  <b>59. Odour Control From Existing STP (pre-Occupation condition)</b> Prior to the occupation of residential properties within 393 metres of the boundary of the

**Planning Committee**

**20 October 2021**

**Update/Amendment/Correction/List**

			<p>existing Guildford Sewage Treatment Works (STW), alongside the reserved matters application for the part of the site currently occupied by allotments or the Council Depot or the former sludge lagoons, a written statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, alongside the aforesaid reserved matters application(s) for appearance, which shall either demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i) that no significant adverse odour impacts from the existing Guildford Sewage Treatment Works (STW) will arise that are likely to harm future occupants of these residential properties; or</li><li>ii) if any temporary significant odour impacts are identified which are likely to be present until such time as the odorous elements of the STW are decommissioned, or are the subject of mitigation in accordance with regulatory requirements in relation to the existing STW then:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) either appropriate mitigation measures shall be secured and will be implemented for the duration of any such impacts, or</li><li>b) the decommissioning of the odorous elements of the existing STW have been completed or are the subject of mitigation in accordance with regulatory requirements in relation to the existing STW prior to occupancy of such residential properties.</li></ul></li></ul> <p>Reason: To ensure residential amenity of future residential properties.</p> <p>Add one to numbering of all subsequent conditions and correct (condition x to condition y) Text of Sections one of four inclusive conditions sections</p>
	304	Condition 72	<p>Change first sentence to</p> <p>‘As part of the Reserved Matters application for layout of each phase, details shall be provided of secure and covered storage accessible to, for</p>



**Planning Committee**

**20 October 2021**

**Update/Amendment/Correction/List**

			apartments, or within the curtilage of, each dwelling that does not have access to a garage.'
	305	Condition 73	<p>Replace with</p> <p>No phase of the development hereby approved shall be first unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for vehicles to be parked within that phase. Thereafter the parking areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purpose.</p> <p>No phase of the development hereby approved shall be occupied unless and until at least 75% of the available parking spaces within that phase are provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p>
	305	Condition 74	Replace second bullet with '20% of unallocated car parking spaces, or whatever % per phase is agreed through the agreed design code mechanism, to be fitted with 1 fast charge socket'
	310	Condition 85	<p>Replace with</p> <p>'The proposed Woking Road access shall be right turn in only with no egress, and right turn in only for buses, as shown on drawing 18179-ma-im-depo-dr-c-0100 rev p03. The revised access shall be fully implemented before occupation of any part of the former Sewage Treatment Works site.'</p> <p>Change to correctly describe bus turning restriction agreed with Highways Authority.</p>

**Planning Committee**

**20 October 2021**

**Update/Amendment/Correction/List**

	310	Condition 86	<p>Details of the bus gate (which shall allow for the passage of buses, pedestrians and cyclists), including its position in relation to access to adjacent uses shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to occupation of the new industrial area off Moorfields Road or the residential areas accessed off Slyfield Green. The bus gate shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before any part of the new industrial area or Gypsy and Travellers site is occupied. ‘</p> <p>Clarification sought by SCC</p>
--	-----	--------------	---

20/P/02155 Appendix 1 Weyside Urban Village s106 Heads of Terms

Item	Page	Para(s)	Errata or Amendment
4.2	261	HOT ref: 4	Detail column: remove “pursuant to the” Remove square brackets from 100 units
4.2	261	HOT ref: 4	Detail column: Remove square brackets from 100 units
4.2	262	HOT ref: 11	Requirement: Off-site playing pitch and outdoor sports provision Detail column: “a minimum provision of 5.3ha for a playing pitch and outdoor sports to be provided by the applicant at a location to be agreed with the LPA”
4.2	263	HOT ref: 16	Insert into detail column: “To submit for approval by the LPA a site-wide plan which sets out the parameters for the scheme in principle” prior to first occupation of the development” Remove square brackets from number of car club spaces: 3 Correct typo so that obligation reads “covenant restricting on site residents from applying...”
4.2	264	HOT ref: 17	Detail column to read: “An appropriate contribution is necessary to aid the funding of sustainable transport schemes in the vicinity of and relating to the use of the site to help improve the accessibility of the site by modes alternative to the private car”.
4.2	264	HOT ref 19:	Detail column to read: “trigger for delivery will be prior to occupation of a specified number of residential units on the whole site. Where necessary, this will include obligation to use reasonable endeavours to enter into a s278 agreement. SCC to confirm the appropriate trigger to be approved by the LPA”

**Planning Committee**

**20 October 2021**

**Update/Amendment/Correction/List**

4.2	264	HOT ref 20:	<p>Requirement column: “A public transport contribution towards provision and operation of a new bus route”</p> <p>Detail column to be updated to read: “A public transport contribution of £1,541,482 towards provision and operation of a new bus service payable in instalments prior to First Occupation of the Development and at subsequent milestones for a defined period, such contribution to be applied towards continued operation of the bus service. In respect of longer term funding, inclusion of a mechanism to assess the need for and to contribute to ensuring continuity of provision via a Sustainable Funding Mechanism for a defined period, or an annual payment by the Owner for a defined period, in either case to be agreed in the s106 agreement subject to an appropriate cap.”</p>
4.2	265	HOT ref 21:	<p>Note: numbering to be updated. Offsite Highway Works to become HOT ref 22.</p> <p>Requirement column: remove “n” typo in final bullet point</p> <p>Detail column; amend to read “obligations to enter into a s278/38 agreement with SCC to deliver the relevant works prior to commencement of development of a relevant phase in accordance with a phasing plan for the Off-site Highways Works. Phasing plan to be approved by the LPA and Off-Site Highways Works to be approved by CHA”</p> <p>Note: relevant works to be carried out prior to the commencement of development on each phase.</p> <p>Remove “Final bullet point relates to crossing referred to in condition.”</p>
4.2	266	HOT ref 22	<p>Note: amend Early Years Contribution to be HOT ref 23</p> <p>Detail column to read: “Early Years Contribution (taken from the SCC pupil yield calculator and currently estimated at £1,043,228) or appropriate works in kind to a specification (proportionate to the number and housing mix of units) to be agreed with SCC and approved by the LPA. Financial contribution to be paid to SCC which is proportionate to the number and housing mix of units prior to Commencement of Development of each residential phase”</p>

**Planning Committee**

**20 October 2021**

**Update/Amendment/Correction/List**

4.2	266	HOT ref 23	<p>Note: amend Primary Education Contribution to be HOT ref 23</p> <p>Detail column to read: "Formula approach to be used. Primary education contribution (taken from the SCC pupil yield calculator and currently estimated at £3,260,400 based upon average pupil yields) to be recalculated and based upon actual pupil yields when the housing mix is agreed with LPA. Financial contribution to be paid to SCC which is proportionate to the number and housing mix of units upon Commencement of Development of 601st unit on the Site"</p>
4.2	267	HOT ref 25	<p>Note: amend to HOT ref 26 a) and 26 b)</p> <p>a) GBC to transfer primary care funds to CCG Requirement: Primary Care Contribution towards local primary health care needs of the development's new residential population Detail: Formula approach for primary care. Either on site primary Care GP surgery or alternate financial provision based on Healthy Urban Development Unit model, Coplug Model or equivalent (to be agreed) pro rata for population, but only accounting for primary care capital outputs of model.</p> <p>b) Acute care funds to Royal Surrey Hospital NHS Trust Requirement: Acute Care contribution towards Royal Surrey Hospital health care services arising from the development's new residential population Detail: Formula and appropriate contribution to be approved by the LPA pursuant to delegated authority pending detail review of the NHS Trust request relating to operational expenditure in order to ensure compliance with regulation 122.</p>

## **Planning Committee**

**20 October 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**

**20/P/02173 – (Page 15) – Land at Burpham Court Farm, Clay Lane, Guildford, GU4 7NA**  
**Worplesdon Parish Council** wishes to reiterate its objection to planning application no: 20/P/02173 for the following reasons:

A Road Safety Audit is required for the proposed pedestrian crossing due to (a) the flooding of the highway that occurs near the entrance to Safeguard, Clay Lane (see attached photos) and (b) the dense, lingering fog which forms over the highway at the same location.

1. A detailed design for the footpath crossing access is required, as the land drops steeply away from the highway on the northern side of Clay Lane.
2. Due to the known, and repeated flood events which occur at Burpham Court Farm/Clay Lane details of the walkways within the SANG need to be provided, otherwise the SANG will be inaccessible throughout certain times of the year. See attached photograph.
3. Who will manage the SANG, once created?
4. Who will own the freehold of the SANG, once created?
5. What is the cost of the management of the SANG over the 125 year period? Has this been comprehensively costed?
6. A S106 Agreement for the associated SANG management costs is required to be entered into, to ensure that the funding to manage the site will be available over the 125 year period.
7. Has Climate Change been taken into account when assessing the viability of the SANG at Burpham Court Farm?
8. No visibility splays have been provided for the potential crossing points – at a location which is a known traffic accident blackspot.
9. Swept paths of a box van have been provided which is welcome and acceptable, however, it would have been expected that the largest vehicle to access the SANG would be a maintenance vehicle and trailer. This should have also been assessed.
10. There is no mention of a height barrier to prevent inappropriate parking at the SANG car park. This should be secured by a planning condition.
11. Provision of a SANG car park is integral to the suitability of the SANG site. It would be wholly inappropriate for motorists to park on the verges along Clay Lane.

**20/P/02155 – (Page 71) – Weyside Urban Village (Slyfield Regeneration Programme), Slyfield Green, Guildford, GU1**

#### **Additional Representations**

Name: Mrs Fiona Dunn

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Summary below, full comments on Public Access

I would support development of the area however not to the scale being proposed. I feel there are fundamental issues with planned access and parking that have been overlooked

and make this development feel as though it will significantly cause a negative impact on our Slyfield area.

Point 1 - They are not allocating enough parking for the new home owners within the plan

Point 2 - There is no planned access road onto the development from Burpham side all access is Slyfield / Stoke Road.

Point 3 - Negative impact of increase buses causing Woodlands road to shake.

Point 4 - Current prohibitive cost of taking a bus short distances.

Point 5 - Impact on road traffic and congestion.

Point 6 - Current GP Crisis

**Name: Mr Jim Allen**

**Summary below, full comments on Public Access**

I remain concerned that even at this late stage in respect of the Weyside Urban village planning application and proposals.

1. A satisfactory entrance to this site is still far from being displayed - the use of estate streets to get around the problem of this 'dead end canyon' development -

2. It is becoming more of a canyon, the more accommodations units being added, the more Ghetto like it becomes

3. This canyon is going to end up a slum, ghetto, overcrowded without water or parking.

4. Should we even be considering this development until a more certain longer lasting water supply is discovered.

5. No method of transport out of the site save 'buses on a wet day' with nowhere for the buses to park when not in use.

Yet this proposal is over 400 metres to a bus stop with little opportunity to get to a bus stop.

6. Failure to provide facility to turn Right at the main entrance on the A320 will lead to increased accidents on the A320.

7. No provision for workers travelling by bus to Woking, as no facility to turn right at main entrance to the estate. And it appears buses will 'go round a circle clockwise' only going to Guildford but nowhere else

8. No provision for delivery vehicles to cross to Stoughton From Weyside without 180 degree turn at head of A3 Northbound on A320. Or going through 'estate roads' unsuitable for large vehicles

9. Inadequate parking for private vehicles

10. Road surfaces inadequate to cope with Fire Engines which need to access all buildings especially over 3 stories high by Ariel platform equipment.

11. 'Matador' Square – poor name.

12. Total and utter failure to accept the SANG proposal is zone 3B flood plain in fact this application is so out of kilter an outline detail for 'full application is clearly very wrong.

13. Will Flood as Zone 1 area next to Zone 2 area

13. Net average density of 116 dph - is extremely high for the urban area in comparison the highest density in Burpham is 52dph the lowest 16dph I believe the proposed density is simply too high for safe, crime free, comfortable 'happy living'

14. Garden Mews look like Barracks

15. The Wharf looks like something out of Miami Florida

16. Green Lanes - are forgetting the need to access by fire engines and delivery vehicles

17. Woking road gateway is highly restrictive and in the wrong place for an all access all direction entry / exit.

18. Slyfield Green is not a suitable access for 3565 people or part thereof.

19. There does not appear a turning provision within the roads design for delivery vehicles to turn around.

20. I believe the access to the site should be directly in/out off Bellfield's roundabout - you want the omelette time you accepted you have to break the eggs.

22. Page 194 Bellfield's road is indicated as a 'temporary' access clearly indicating the failure to ascertain a proper access from day one.

23. Can GBC actually afford to move to the new site -

24. Page 20 claims 3,000 residents yet with an increase to 1550 accommodation units the number must actually be greater than 3565 than 3,000 thus is misleading

25. The SMC 'principle' has not been tested in the court of public opinion,

26. Page 217 discusses walking distances but takes the fit able person under 55

27. Repeats same point on flooding

The proposal is fundamentally flawed at all levels. From financial viability, using residents money to move the STW, to the density of properties and lack of parking provision. All are very bad planning to the Nth degree

**Name: Mr & Mrs S Kale**

Summary below, full comments on Public Access

1. A re-consultation period of 14-days is not enough for this type of complex planning application.
2. There is a clear conflict of interest as the application is being sponsored and decided by Guildford Borough Council. The application should be put to a local referendum.
3. Development is too close to and will result in further congest an already overcrowded road network. Proposal will result in major impact on the flow of traffic in and around Guildford. It is noted that a possible solution would be the provision of a Clay Lane link road and improvements to the A3 Burpham junction.
4. No decision should be taken on this planning application until road traffic modelling has been completed.
5. The changes to the access at the depot entrance introduce further problems and should warrant refusal. It will greatly increase queues and result in noise, disruption, air pollution and enjoyment of garden, as well as those using Riverside Nature Reserve.
6. Buses will be running in close proximity to residential properties.
7. The proposed pedestrian crossing will create an additional pinch point along Woking Road.
8. Loss of on-street car parking spaces.
9. Impact from construction noise, disturbance, dust etc

**Name: Mr Douglas Clare**

Summary below, full comments on Public Access

1. Object as this development offers minimal sustainable transport improvements for Guildford. The development should be contributing at least £1M in Section 106 payments.
2. This funding should go towards cycling infrastructure improvements to achieve a completed cycle network connecting the site to Guildford Upper High St, Guildford Station, Jacobs Well and Stoughton.

**Name: Mr David Wilson**

Summary below, full comments on Public Access

1. Development represents an opportunity to plan world class non-motorised transport options, such as are being achieved in Holland and Denmark. And yet no effort is being made to do this.
2. The traffic reports promote a ridiculous circular argument which will eternally result in only making provision for motorised traffic, and never strive to achieve improved active travel, such as walking and cycling.
3. The design changes being implemented should have the objective of improving active travel and significantly increasing the number of pedestrians and cyclists. The mitigations described in the TA do not adequately segregate cyclists, so it is possible that there will be an impact on the microsimulation model.
4. The proposals are woefully inadequate in this respect. For example, the Stoke Crossroads and A3 exit slip includes no fewer than five Toucan crossings in order to get from the north to the south sides. Whereas motorised traffic crossing is optimised with only a single stop.

**Name: Miss Laura Curtis**

Summary below, full comments on Public Access

1. There is a lack of parking on the site. Public transport is not adequate or cheap enough to encourage sustainable travel.
2. Access off the A320 is a concern in terms of highway safety and congestion.
3. Buildings too tall and out of keeping with the area.
4. Taller buildings will result in a loss of privacy.
5. Noise and disruption during construction and impact on amenity.
6. Increased flood risk.
7. Increased pressure on local infrastructure and facilities such as hospitals, GPs and schools. Increased pressure on River Wey towpath.
8. Increased noise, air and light pollution.

**Name: Nicola Harding.**

Summary below, full comments on public access.

1. the feature formerly identified as a possible branch of the Wey Navigation has now been confirmed as a section of the New Flowing River. This is tremendously important historically. It is the first such development in England and possibly in Europe. As such it is certainly nationally, and probably internationally, important.
2. This new information has resulted in it being reappraised as being high in terms of historic interest and rarity. Its current condition does not reduce its historical importance or significance; its loss would be considered Significantly Adverse, not a Minor Adverse loss.
3. Strongly urge the Planning Authority to protect this section of the New Flowing River as the historically important feature that it is. It is unique, adds character and makes the area distinctively different from others. It is a privilege and national responsibility to have it in our area and it should be preserved.

Name: Kirsten Rosslyn-Smith (Vicar), St Peter's Shared Church Stoke Hill Guildford  
St Peter's has no specific objections to the WUV development. We would like to ensure that people have access to Worship in their local community by easy access to St Peter's, their parish church, with regard to transport. We are in the process of developing our site to better serve the increased number of residents, providing worship and more community space, and would ask that planners ensure that the church would also be able to serve WUV by officially permitted use of community spaces to offer various worship and events on the development. The aim is to spiritually care for all in the area and foster integration with the existing community in this area.

**Historic England:** No further comments on the amended plans.

**Thames Water:** Thames Water confirms it is fully supportive of the planning application and is working to deliver the relocation of our existing works to enable the WUV housing development. In addition to their comments on (26th January 2021), Thames Water have suggested a condition which if imposed would require the submission of details which confirm that the proposed dwellings would not be impacted by odour from the existing sewage treatment works or that mitigation can be put in place if odours will be noticeable.

**Surrey County Council, Waste:** No further comments on the amended plans.

**Surrey County Council, County Archaeologist:** No objections, subject to condition.



## Questions from Councillors:

### 20/P/02155 – Weyside Urban Village

**1.Cllr Chris Blow:** Have really struggled to understand vehicle circulation. Drawings not available and references on page 246-7 are not clear. A picture or plan is better than words – note page 247. If the presentation before the debate, as is normal at PlanCom, does not include a plan showing vehicle routes, bus-gates, one-way SMC, etc, can the late sheets please have one.

**Answer:** the presentation has one – it's called the Access and Movement Parameter Plan. Our system does not allow you to send a URL – however if you look for it on Public access you'll see it. It's in the report but it's an A3 plan shrunk to A4 so it's hard to read the text.

**2.Cllr Ruth Brothwell:** I would like to ask whether we can just adjust the motion so as not to land Dan with the whole responsibility of decision as per the motion?? There are those of us who feel that any final tweaks should be brought before a cross party group of PlanCom before the very final final decision is made. I and I am sure others are being bombarded with emails about the issues and fear for an incomplete decision even though we support the plans in principle. A simple change to the motion wording would solve many issues. I look forward to hearing from you.

Follow ups from Cllr Spooner, Cllr Young, Cllr Gunning, Cllr James Walsh and Cllr Ramsey Nagaty on the same point

**Answer:** recommendation updated on the late sheets to include consultation with Chairman and review with groups leaders/ward councillors/lead councillor for DM

**3.Cllr Gunning:** Is it too late for a decent index for this massive document?

**Answer:** A contents page has been circulated to councillors via the late sheet.

**4.Cllr Gunning:** Could we have a colour-coded diagram to show the heights of all the buildings surrounding the site. For example dwg 01715 [jtp] . currently showing only bdg hgts within the site – in various shades of orange/yellow/brown.

**Answer:** We don't have this information, asking for all buildings surrounding the site is excessive. The Design and Access Statement includes some images of nearby buildings

### 5. Cllr George Potter:

Paragraph 7.5.7 of the report states (in relation to parts of the site unsuitable for use as SANG due to noise pollution and flooding):

*"With these changes it seems certain that Burpham Court Farm would be too small alone to fully mitigate Weyside Urban Village as a SANG, until the pedestrian crossing on clay Lane is built, however as the report on Weyside Urban Village explains Tyting Farm is also available as a SANG."*

Given that Tyting Farm is located south of Guildford, below Merrow Downs and Pewley downs, how can it be considered available as SANG for Weyside given that Tyting Farm is accessible only by car and that Weyside is being envisaged as a development where the majority of residents will not need (and will not have room to have) a car?

**Answer:** Tyting Farm is available and within the English Nature pre-approved scheme for SANG for the Thames Basin Heaths, but you are right would be far less accessible to residents of this application site, it nevertheless meets the requirements of distances from

development sites to be acceptable. Should also be noted that the scale of the WUV development means it will come forward in phases, therefore whilst the full SANG amount needs to be available at the outset later phases will take some time to deliver giving more time for the pedestrian crossing element to be put in place.

Paragraph 7.5.8 states that:

*"The confirmed area considered suitable for SANG is 27.9ha (note exclusion zones identified for noise, wintering bird interest and anticipated likely odour plume ('unpleasant intrusions') from the Thames Water proposed new Sewage Treatment Works)"*

Given that this paragraph does not mention exclusions for flooding, does the calculation of the 27.9ha figure involve excluding the areas which flood, or have these areas not been taken into account in reaching the figure? If the latter, then what is the relevant figure for usable SANG area once areas which flood have been excluded?

**Answer:** No the 27.9ha excludes all areas of flood risk (non flood zone 1). A major reduction given total farm area of over 40Ha

## **7.Councillor Tony Rooth**

5.5.2(page 36)-when and with what result are National Trust objections to be resolved?

**Answer:** The Trust has sold the site to the applicant. Though a key stakeholder they hold no veto over the no limited range of differences other than works to the River Wey. The only change to the Wey proposed in the draft management plan is the Eel passes which the trust supports. On ecology issues the Trust appears to have misread a paragraph in the ecology surveys on where protected species lie on the site. The other big issue is North of Clay Lane where a condition is proposed on pedestrian access improvements to make crossing Clay Lane safe. There is agreement with the Trust on almost all farm management plan issues. Finalising stakeholder agreement with the Trust depends on them replacing the area manager who has left. GBC is struggling to find a person at the Trust to speak to on local matters.

5.1.10- (page 95) ditto re Highways England" ask that the application (is not determined other than a refusal) until such time as we have resolved our concerns in order to provide a Formal Recommendation "

**Answer:** National Highways (formally Highways England) and recommended the approach in the recommendation to us. Lawfully the application cannot be determined until the holding objection is withdrawn anyway, so there is no risk of prematurity of decision.

Response from Cllr Rooth: Not sure I follow. Can cttee approve these applications before NH give formal or has to be subject to condition?

**Answer:** No decision can be issued prior to NH withdrawing objection, however they have stated it is a matter of when not if and recommendation the broad structure of the recommendation in the report to allow members to RESOLVE to approve and then delegated authority etc. to issue decision later, subject to briefing process. They will make a decision subject to Grampian conditions which they have powers to direct e apply – these are usually technical, such as no works to A3 until x and Y etc.

5.1.16(page110) and 7.10(181-183) comments on energy provision in light of tonight's announcement of Support for alternative heat sources [Plan to drive down the cost of clean heat - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/plan-to-drive-down-the-cost-of-clean-heat)

**Answer:** GBC could bid for the £60 million innovation fund to help fund water sourced heat network. Report conditions entirely compatible with driving down high cost of air and ground sourced pumps (by not needing them).

Response from Cllr Rooth: Are we going to install any heat pumps, when and in how many homes. GBC will never get GOVT funding for 1500 homes x £ 5k each total £7.5m?

**Answer:** The application proposes Ground/air source heat pumps in energy strategy, we propose requiring they review these to consider water source heat pumps (water from Wey) as these are far cheaper per unit and more carbon efficient. The funding to local authorities is for innovation, not for bridging the gas-Ground Source heat pump cost differential – which will go to either householders or developers I understand but the subsidy process is not yet entirely clear or if the subsidy allies to all types of heat exchanger technologies. Apologies we all need to see the details of the government strategy, all we have so far is an unclear press release.

7.1.8(page 148) -is this application subject to approval of STW and CRC application and vice versa -not reviewed conditions)?

**Answer:** No, are reg 3 county matters. However, Phase 4 of the project needs the STW and CRC to move (somewhere) to be deliverable. Phases 1-3 and 5 are not affected.

Response from Cllr Rooth: Understand STW and CRC move to North /west of site subject to planning permission but moves have to be scheduled to provide STW/CRC to WUV and borough -all aspects of plan are connected so when can planning apps for SWT(to SCC) and CRC (GBC) be expected?

**Answer:** We have asked – no timescale as yet. Of course it has to be within Weyfield programme to avoid delaying phase 4.

7.4.101(221) - are these figures really accurate about population numbers eg 4bed homes with occupancy rate of 3?!

**Answer:** GBC policy in Thames Basin Heaths SPD, based on 2011 Census. Difference caused by under occupation of homes by empty nesters and elderly.

Noted although question whether WUV population underestimated

7.17-(page 250)-likewise accuracy of children numbers and education demands –3 bed homes often mean 4 -parents and 2kids (with education needs ) ?

**Answer:** Same issue – pupil yield county data based on census data and agreed approach county wide on many scheme. 'Often' doesn't mean 'always' or the mean (same issue with car ownership levels).

#### **Further comments from Cllr Rooth:**

1. Understand first home can't be occupied until SANG is operational-only appropriate SANG is alongside WUV so is SANG miles away at Tyting Farm worth bothering with? Answer: Tyting Farm is an existing SANG, WUV sits within the catchment area of this SANG so it can be taken into account
2. Understand vehicular access to 1550homes etc is only via  
A-single access off Woking Road currently used to get to GBC depot

B - Slyfield industrial estate which links to Woking Road through traffic lights where existing traffic levels already cause long tailbacks On Woking Road and into Slyfield itself

**Answer:** Traffic considerations are set out in the report

3. Number of vehicles and parking on site /overflow outside WUV-is it realistic to allot only one car per home to estimate future parking -desirable but realistic?

**Answer:** Parking considerations are set out in the report including the reasons for the level of parking set. This is considered a sustainable location so lower parking should be considered and model shift encouraged. Significant measures are included around cycling provision, encouraging bus usage etc. There is also provision within the Design Code requirements to revise the parking arrangements throughout the RM stages

4. Sec Of State has still to decide whether allotments should stay in Situ-if so overall housing numbers reduced and need to provide more on WUV or elsewhere

**Answer:** The outline consent includes a condition that the allotments cannot be built on until provision elsewhere. If consent does not come through the rest of the scheme can still be built out. It will be up to RM to decide whether numbers can be spread around the site to make up for it or whether they need to be dropped. The outline is for 'up to' amounts.

## **8. Councillor Spooner:**

I am more worried about the short length of time members have been given to work through the amount of material presented. That would appear to prejudice the process tomorrow evening. Your thoughts on that please?

### **Answer: Response from legal officer**

I have discussed with colleagues and the conclusion is ;-

- there appear to be no legal issues arising, on the amount of time to consider matters
- the Agenda of 20 October has been published within legal timescales under Schedule 12 Local Government Act 1972
- the application has been advertised and consulted upon in accordance with legal requirements
- the Report needs to be as comprehensive as it is to address all legal issues and so defend against any challenges
- late submissions need to be submitted and circulated to meet legal requirements to consider material considerations
- case law requires a fair-minded decision-maker prepared to take on board points that differed from their preliminary view -which means a willingness to consider these submissions
- finally specialist planning counsel is engaged to advise on any issues arising at debate