



GUILDFORD
B O R O U G H

www.guildford.gov.uk

Tom Horwood
Joint Chief Executive of Guildford and
Waverley Borough Councils

Dear Councillor

PLANNING COMMITTEE – MONDAY 21 MARCH 2022

Please find attached the following:

Agenda No Item

7. **Late Sheets - Planning Committee - 21 March 2022 (Pages 1 - 10)**

Yours sincerely

Sophie Butcher, Democratic Services Officer

Encs

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee

21 March 2022

List of Public Speakers

In accordance with the Council's adopted scheme to allow the public to address meetings of this Committee on planning and related applications and on site specific matters, the following persons have given notice of their wish to speak at this meeting on the applications/matters listed in the table below.

These applications/matters will be considered ahead of the other applications/matters on the Agenda and will be taken in the order indicated. Unless stated otherwise, the page number in the first column of the table refers to the page number on the List of Planning and Related Applications on the Agenda (Item 5).

In each case where an objector has given notice to speak, the applicant (or the applicant's agent) will have been informed and offered the opportunity to address the Committee in accordance with the scheme.

The Committee will deal with tonight's applications in the following order:

ITEM 6 – Planning and Related Applications

PAGE NO(s).	APPLN. NO	SITE	DETAILS OF SPEAKERS
25.	20/P/01057	White Horse Yard, High Street, Ripley	1. Mr Richard Bartholomew (to object) 2. Mr Paul Willis (to object) 3. Mr Mark Hendy (Agent) (In Support)
65.	20/P/01058	White Horse Yard, High Street, Ripley	[No public speaking]
75.	21/P/00428	Howard of Effingham School	1. Mr Ian Symes (Chairman of Effingham Parish Council) (to object) 2. Ms Vivien White (Chairman of Effingham Resident's Association) (to object) 3. Mr David Gilchrist (Agent) (In Support)
113.	21/P/00976	Lot 3, Land to the West of Manor Farm Cottages, Wanborough	1. Mr Oscar de Chazal (to object) 2. Ms Mary Adkins (to object)
121.	21/P/01456	Land at Poyle Road, Tongham	1. Mr David Neame (Agent) (In Support)

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee

21 March 2022

Update/Amendment/Correction/List

Planning Committee Membership

Councillor Jan Harwood now replaces Councillor Richard Billington as a substitute member on the Planning Committee.

21/P/01057 – (Page 25) – White Horse Yard, High Street, Ripley, GU23 6BB

Please find attached the Schedule of Accommodation for Amended Scheme Space Standards in relation to the above application.

In addition, an amendment to condition 10 has been made and read as follows:

No residential development, excluding demolition, shall take place until written confirmation has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority that Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) to mitigate the impact of the development has been secured and no dwelling shall be occupied before written confirmation has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority that the works required to bring the land up to acceptable SANG standard have been completed.

Reason: This is required as a pre-commencement condition as the development is only acceptable if the impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area can be mitigated. This is reliant on the provision of SANG. Avoidance works associated with development need to be carried out prior to the occupation of the development so that measures can cater for increased number of residents to avoid adverse impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.

Policy Clarification

Policy H2 (3) is applicable 'in Designated Rural Areas, the threshold for providing affordable housing is on sites providing more than 5 dwellings'.

Ripley is a Designated Rural Area.

Market Housing Mix

The Lovelace Neighbourhood Plan policy LNPH2: Housing for All sets out a housing mix for affordable housing only.

21/P/00428 – (Page 75) – Howard of Effingham School, Lower Road, Effingham, Leatherhead, KT24 5JR

Corrections / Amendments:

Since the Committee Report was published, the applicant has agreed to a number of further amendments to the scheme. The amendments are mainly submitted to overcome concerns identified through the public consultation process. These changes will be set out below.

Page 103 of the Committee indicates that the southern boundary of the site would be open with only a small knee-rail fence to separate it from the King George V recreation grounds. While the southern boundary would remain open, it would now be formed of a 1.5 metre high metal fence. The fence would be open, allowing views between the sites. There is the possibility of creating a pedestrian link between the site, if an agreement can be reached between the relevant landowners. The new details for the treatment of the southern boundary would be acceptable as they still allow views between the sites, allow the possibility of a through connection and be in keeping with the significance of the conservation area.

As regards the eastern boundary of the site, the applicant has now indicated the provision of a foot and cycle way which would link Lower Road to the public footpath which runs through the King George V recreation area. This link is shown on the access parameter plans which were agreed by the Planning Inspectorate. Further detail has been provided which shows that the proposed route would be flanked by a 1.5 metre high metal fence and close boarded fencing along the back of the residential properties. This would provide a defensible boundary to the land to the east.

The route would be accessed from the development between the parking area for the apartments and plot number 66. However, it is considered that one of the benefits of this route will be for pupils and parents who will be travelling to the new school from the south of the village. The County Council has been consulted on this change and they raise no objection to either the main foot / cycle way or to its access from the development.

It is noted that this route and the indicative boundary treatment would not give rise to any harm to the significance of the heritage assets in the area or to the character or appearance of the surroundings.

To account for these changes, the following amendments are proposed to the conditions: Condition 14 re-worded as follows:

Before the occupation of the development hereby approved, full details of the treatment of the southern boundary of the site, which is in general accordance with drawing number A315-LA02 A shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed details shall be implemented in full prior to the first occupation of the development and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: *In order to ensure that the amenity of the site and the surroundings are protected and to make attempts to facilitate permeability between the site and its surrounds.*

New condition to read as follows:

Before the first occupation of the development hereby approved, full details of the design, treatment and finish of the new shared foot and cycle way provided along the eastern boundary of the site, as well as the link into the development to the west (between the apartment parking area and plot 66), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall be in general accordance with drawing number A315 LA03 A and shall include the proposed materials, method of lighting (if needed) and boundary treatments. The agreed details shall be implemented in full prior to the first occupation of the development and retained with full public access in perpetuity.

Reason: *In order to ensure that the amenity of the site and the surroundings are protected and to make attempts to facilitate permeability between the site and its surrounds.*

Finally, it is noted that the summary of the Effingham Residents Association comments (page 94 of the Committee Report) state that they do not confirm whether the objection to the proposal or not. This is incorrect. The letter from the residents association does state that it is an objection to the proposal.

21/P/00976 – (Page 113) – Lot 5, Land to the West of Manor Farm Cottages, Westwood Lane, Wanborough, Guildford, GU3 2JF

Site description

There is an error in the site description which states that the site is within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The site itself sits outside of the AONB. The southern boundary of the site adjoins the AONB which runs to the south of the site.

As set out in the officer's report, the site is within the Green Belt and an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). There is an Article 4 Direction covering the site.

Further correction to site description as follows:

The site itself is a narrow strip of land accessed via a track running to the **south** of the application site towards Westwood Lane to the east. The land is currently a field and remains undeveloped. The site is relatively flat, with the fields on the opposite (southern side of the access track) sloping up southwards to the Hogs Back.

Consultations:

Non-statutory consultees

Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Officer:

(Response received 26 May 2021) As the Planning Committee granted permission this month (May 2021) for a water tap and manhole on the neighbouring Lot 4 and had considered any implications for the Surrey Hills AONB, I see this application to be no different.

Planning considerations:

The application site itself sits outside of the AONB with its southern boundary adjoining the edge of the AONB which runs to the south (across the northern slopes of the Hogs Back). The site is within the AGLV.

The proposal consists of a standalone water tap on a wooden post which will be no more than 1m above ground level and the manhole will have a cover measuring 600mm by 450mm which will be flush to the ground. The position of the tap and manhole would be towards the northern end of the site, approximately 170m from the southern boundary with the AONB.

The proposed development would therefore be minimal in terms of its scale and would therefore not be a prominent feature in the landscape. Furthermore, the provision of taps within the countryside to meet the water needs of livestock would not be out of character in this rural landscape. It is considered that the proposed development would continue to conserve and enhance views to and from the AONB and would not result in any harm to the

distinctive character of the AGLV. The proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable in this regard and to comply with policy P1 of the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015 - 2034.

Schedule of Accommodation for Amended Scheme _03.03.22

JOB NO.:

1366_PLN_200

SITE ADDRESS:

White Horse Yard, High Street, Ripley

PLOT NO.	TYPE (H/F)	NO. OF BEDROOMS	NO. OF PERSONS	REQUIRED AREA (M2)	ACTUAL AREA (M2)	AREA (SQFT)	REQUIRED BUILT IN STORAGE (M2)	ACTUAL BUILT IN STORAGE (M2)
plot 1	End Terrace	2	4	79	81.0	872	2.0	2.9
plot 2	Mid Terrace	2	4	79	81.0	872	2.0	2.9
plot 3	End Terrace	2	4	79	81.0	872	2.0	2.9
plot 4	Detached	3	6	102	119.0	1281	2.5	3.0
plot 5	Semi Detached	3	6	102	106.0	1141	2.5	2.6
plot 6	Semi Detached	3	5	93	108.0	1163	2.5	2.7
plot 7	Semi Detached	2	4	79	81.0	872	2.0	2.9
plot 8	Semi Detached	2	4	79	81.0	872	2.0	2.9
plot 9	Semi Detached	2	4	79	81.0	872	2.0	2.9
plot 10	Semi Detached	2	4	79	81.0	872	2.0	2.9
plot 11	Detached	3	6	102	114.0	1227	2.5	2.6
plot 12	Detached	3	6	102	114.0	1227	2.5	2.6
plot 13	Detached	3	5	93	100.0	1076	2.5	2.8
plot 14	Detached	4	7	115	146.0	1572	3.0	3.8
plot 15	Detached	3	6	102	119.0	1281	2.5	2.9
plot 16	GF Flat	2	4	70	72.3	778	2.0	2.2
plot 17	GF Flat	2	4	70	74.0	797	2.0	2.2
plot 18	FF Flat	2	4	70	72.3	778	2.0	2.2
plot 19	FF Flat	2	4	70	74.0	797	2.0	2.2
plot 20	SF Flat	1	2	50	56.0	603	1.5	1.5
plot 21	SF Flat	1	2	50	56.0	603	1.5	1.5
plot 22	Detached	4	7	115	132.0	1421	3.0	3.0
plot 23	Detached	4	7	115	132.0	1421	3.0	3.0
plot 24	Semi Detached	4	7	121	143.0	1539	3.0	3.1
plot 25	Semi Detached	4	7	121	143.0	1539	3.0	3.1
plot 26	Detached	4	7	115	159.0	1711	3.0	3.6
TOTAL		69	130		2606.6	28057		

COMMUNALS	AREA (M2)	AREA (SQFT)
Plots 16-21 - GF	20.9	225
Plots 16-21 - FF	20.9	225
Plots 16-21 - SF	13.5	145
Bin Store	17.5	188
Cycle Store	9.9	107
TOTAL	82.7	890

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee

21 March 2022

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

21/P/00428 – (Page 75) – Howard of Effingham School, Lower Road, Effingham, Leatherhead, KT24 5JR

Five additional letters of objection have been received. The following comments are noted:

- strongly object to the totally unnecessary removal of the ancient hedge along the parish boundary, with the resulting loss of biodiversity and habitat;
- object to the unnecessary installation of a footpath (in the parish of Effingham), fenced on either side, running in parallel to the Public Right of Way;
- strongly object to unnecessary removal of the hedge on the southern side of the site, and replacement by ugly fencing;
- the drawing has marked "Cemetery". This is misleading as the land is not currently been used as burial land. It is designated a future extension to the existing burial grounds;
- concerns regarding the effect of this development on the designated graveyard of All Saints Church and the heritage asset of All Saints Church and the Little Bookham Conservation Area beyond;
- the amended have included the piece of land that was intended for the pedestrian/cycle route back into the development site but have not designated it as such [Officer Note: The provision of this route is secured by the new condition set out on these Late Sheets];
- note that no fencing has been proposed for the eastern boundary of the site that borders the church's designated graveyard [Officer Note: Amended plans have now been received which show the proposed boundary treatments];
- development to become an impermeable barrier that blocks the direct routes that cyclists and walkers would wish to take between key trip destinations;
- site layout completely severs the only off road cycle route used by pupils going to their schools and clubs. It also adds lengthy detours for pupils and other pedestrians;
- condition one of the proposed Highways Conditions seeks to close a disputed Right of Way adjacent to the western boundary of this site. Until such time as the agreed works are completed in full, no diversion of the original route has taken place. The appropriate course of action is the removal of the blockages as an enforcement action [Officer Note: This is a matter for the County Highway Authority].

Effingham Parish Council have provided the following additional comments:

- development as proposed will create an over development unlike anything currently in Effingham. The developer proposes a largescale development of 99 dwellings of all sizes and the result has the feel of an urban estate, which is completely inappropriate to its village setting and abutting two conservation and heritage areas;
- serious concerns about the scale, layout and setting of the proposed development for this rural village;

- the amended plans for the southern boundary still propose inadequate border fencing in the Conservation Area. Fencing is required to restrict people from shortcut access to the King George V (KGV) grounds and to encourage them to go through the usual entrances. This fencing must be robust enough to also restrict pets, especially dogs and cats, moving unhindered from the development to the KGV fields and woods, and to stop possible traveller incursions;
- the footpath to the south of the development, FP 118, needs appropriate shielding from the development;
- concerns that the Lower Road street scene will be inappropriate to one of the major entry roads into the village;
- development as currently portrayed is not a 'proportionate development,' as it is substantially bigger than any other development in the village. There should be more green space and open areas with development broken down into smaller discrete settlement areas; and
- concern about bonus rooms affecting the Housing Mix and in contravention of Policy ENP-H2, Housing Mix.

Effingham Residents Association has provided the following additional comments:

- the amended plans do not deal with the major issue of the overdevelopment of the site where the buildings have much more bulk than in the outline plan. Nor do they deal with the related issue of the lack of open space;
- the amended plans also do not include the pedestrian/cycle route required in the Movement and Access Parameter Plan 742347, include appropriate boundary treatments or address the impact on the designated graveyard of All Saints Church, the heritage asset of All Saints Church and the Little Bookham Conservation Area {Officer Note: The pedestrian / cycle route is now included in the plan as discussed elsewhere on the late sheets};
- southern boundary treatment now more appropriate than the former design proposed. This fencing should meet safety requirements of being impenetrable to small children and dogs [Officer Note: Appropriate fencing is proposed along the southern boundary];
- no boundary treatments specified for the western boundary;
- strip of land on the eastern boundary of this site has now been reinstated into the site. Whilst the strip of land has been reinstated in the site, it is still not designated on the amended plans as a pedestrian/cycle route as required [Officer Note: This is controlled by condition] and
- no boundary treatment or landscaping and screening proposed on the actual eastern boundary of the development, even though the southern half of this boundary is onto the All Saints designated graveyard and overlooks the heritage asset of All Saints Church and the Little Bookham Conservation Area [Officer Note: The latest amended plans show the proposed boundary treatments].