



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 - TUESDAY 22 NOVEMBER, 2022

Please find attached the following:

Agenda No Item

- c) Late Sheets - Amendments/Corrections and Late Representations (Pages 1 - 4)

Yours sincerely

Sophie Butcher, Democratic Services Officer

Encs

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee

22 November 2022

Update/Amendment/Correction/List

21/P/02232 – (Page 25) – Debenhams, Millbrook, Guildford

Amendments / Corrections:

Page 31 – First paragraph says that the number of dwellings has neem reduced from 215 to 184. This should be 185.

Page 32 – Bullet five should read: *“that the Civic Square and access between the buildings (in part) remain publicly accessible for the lifetime of the development”*.

Page 57 – Paragraph under the table. Last sentence should read ‘It would be the larger of the two buildings with a maximum height of eight storeys but stepping down with roof terraces to six storeys at the southern end of either wing’.

Page 59 – For clarity, it is noted that Historic England object to the proposed application. Members will be aware that the HE comments on the application are provided in full in the appendices to the Committee Report.

Page 69 – It is noted that the National Trust Guidance referred to is dated September 2011 and therefore predates the first iteration of the NPPF.

Pages 73 and 75 – The figures quoted as being GIA are in fact GEA.

Page 76 – Fourth paragraph. ‘demonstrated a return of 5.70 profit....%’. This should be 5.8%.
and

‘The BLV used was £7.9m, which was considerably lower...’. The BLV used was £10.3m comprising EUV of £7.9m and a Premium of £2.4m.

Page 87 – First paragraph. The second reference to AONB should read AGLV.

Page 101 – The open space areas should be as follows:

- the Civic Square: 686 sqm (including 68sqm of play space).
- the Riverside Walk: comprising 995sqm (an increase of 249sqm from the submitted scheme (October 2021)).
- the Pocket Park: 573sqm (including 277sqm of play space).
- the Residential Street: comprising 390sqm...
- Podium Terrace: 580sqm...

Page 144 – Air quality benefits second paragraph – 20% should read 100%.

Page 150 – The last sentence should read ‘The Local Planning Authority has agreed with the applicant that two landing points on the application site will be safeguarded (subject to reasonable time limitations) for a bridge in the future’.

Page 151 – Second last paragraph says that the number of dwellings has neem reduced from 215 to 184. This should be 185.

Clarification:

Guildford Society email to Members - Officers are aware that an email has been circulated to Members on Monday morning by the Guildford Society.

With specific regard to the image at the bottom of the email, Officers would note that they have not been able to verify its accuracy. Indeed, it does appear that the relationship between the new proposed building, and for example, St Marys Church has not been drawn correctly. The separation distance between the two is, in reality, greater than depicted. In addition, the section taken through the proposed building is not on the same line as the southern elevation of the current building and as such, the comparison between the two buildings is inaccurate at the point shown on the plan.

Members are advised that they should base their decision only on the drawings which have been supplied by the applicant and which Officers know to be accurate. These drawings are on our website and will be shown as part of the Committee presentation.

Planning Committee

22 November 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/02232 – (Page 25) – Debenham’s, Millbrook, Guildford, GU1 3UU

Since the publication of the Committee Report on 15 November, a further four letters of objection have been received. The following points are noted:

- this development will define Guildford for the next century;
- the proposed building will become the dominant feature of Guildford’s gateway to the River Wey, towering over the bottom of the High Street;
- the developers could deliver us something better, taking into consideration the natural aesthetics, heritage and sensitivity of the site;
- the current application has extraordinary mass, bulk and an unremitting largely red brick façade;
- the developers having overpaid for the site will have to persevere at this scale to get their money back. Their build costs have rocketed since they bought the property. There are probably many unforeseen expenses which will emerge as they undertake the construction and will need to be provided for;
- the development is driven by economics, not aesthetics;
- does the Planning Committee have a complete view of how the town centre is going to be developed? The proposed redevelopment of the Debenhams site lies within the plans for the Council’s long-term vision for the town centre, but there are conflicting issues meaning that they are not fully joined up;
- the proposal is still too big and bulky and would have an adverse impact on its sensitive surroundings;
- the space around the buildings has been poorly thought out;
- 4 St Mary’s Terrace further comments regarding daylight and sunlight. GIA state 'reasonable assumptions can be made as to the internal layouts of the rooms behind the fenestration'. I should highlight that Point2 had assumed two of my rooms broadly 33% of their actual size which is hardly a reasonable assumption. Point2 say they have updated their measurements but have not disclosed the revised SqFt measurements of my rooms. In order for this to be verified, I ask that you request Point 2 provide this information;
- 3 St Mary’s Terrace further comments regarding daylight and sunlight. GIA write 'the results of the technical analysis are not found within the application documents therefore it is recommended that this is supplied by Point2'. Point2 subsequently supplied these measurements on 3 November - screenshot attached. Point2's SqFt measurements of 3 St Marys Terrace are also inaccurate;

- Given GIA conclude there would be some daylight and sunlight transgressions to both properties, one would think it would be even more imperative for room analysis to be accurate to ensure the impact categorisation is correct. We have repeatedly given Point2 every opportunity to measure in person to ensure accurate results but they continue to refuse. As highlighted by Right Of Light Consulting in their recent correspondence to you, it is ultimately your responsibility to ensure all data is accurate in order to make a valid decision on this application. Should it be approved using incorrect information then please understand residents may seek legal advice to challenge any decision by way of a Judicial Review.

Further, an additional 33 letters of support have been received. These note that the revised plans would regenerate this prime town centre location with a new, residential-led mixed use development of 185 new homes, shops, cafes and bars. The plans will also deliver a wide range of benefits for the local area. Most significantly opening up the river side and improving the appearance/ street scape and public realm at the bottom of the high street. Hope this project will be the catalyst the spur further investment into improving this area of the town, dismantling the gyratory system, prioritising spaces for people and making the most of the river as an asset to the community.