



GUILDFORD
BOROUGH

www.guildford.gov.uk

Tom Horwood

Joint Chief Executive of Guildford and
Waverley Borough Councils

Dear Councillor

PLANNING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY 3 JANUARY 2024

Please find attached the following:

Agenda No Item

8. **Late Sheet - Updates, amendments, corrections/Late Representations**
 (Pages 1 - 22)

Yours sincerely

Sophie Butcher, Democratic Services Officer

Encs

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee

4 January 2024

Update/Amendment/Correction List

Planning Committee Minutes – 6 December 2023

The Committee is asked to approve the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 6 December 2023.

Policy Update

Since the publication of the Agenda, the government has issued an updated National Planning Policy Framework Document. Members are advised that whilst the reports in the Agenda refer to the older paragraph numbers and the numbering may have changed the general wording has not.

22/P/01966 – (Page 21) - 94 Potters Lane Send Woking Surrey GU23 7AL

The applicant has submitted a verified view of the proposal from the Wey Navigation Conservation Area.

22/P/01999 – (Page 55) - The Harrow Inn, The Street, Compton, Guildford, GU3 1EG

Additional condition

Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved details of all boundary treatments, and hard surface treatments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the amenities of the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area are protected and the appearance of the adjacent Listed and Locally Listed Buildings are preserved to comply with Policies D19 and D20 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan Development Management Policies March 2023 and policies within the NPPF.

23/P/00592 – (Page 99) – Westhorpe, Holford Road, Guildford, GU1 2QE

We have received confirmation from the Planning Inspectorate that an appeal against non-determination for this application was lodged by the agent for the application late yesterday (Tuesday 2 January).

This application is therefore now the subject of a non-determination appeal. The Council is therefore unable to formally determine the application. Instead, the Committee must decide what their decision would have been had they been in the position to determine this application.

As set out in the Committee Report, the application is deemed to be unacceptable and had an appeal not been lodged against non-determination, the application would have been recommended for refusal, for the reasons as set out on Pages 102 to 105 of the Agenda.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Councillor Fiona White (Chairperson)

* Councillor Vanessa King (Vice-Chairperson)

* Councillor Bilal Akhtar
Councillor David Bilbe
* Councillor Yves de Contades
* Councillor Lizzie Griffiths
* Councillor Stephen Hives
* Councillor James Jones
* Councillor Richard Mills OBE

* Councillor Patrick Oven
* Councillor Maddy Redpath
* Councillor Joanne Shaw
* Councillor Howard Smith
* Councillor Cait Taylor
Councillor Sue Wyeth-Price

*Present

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillors David Bilbé, Fiona White and Sue Wyeth-Price. Councillor Phillip Brooker attended as a substitute for Councillor David Bilbé.

PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Councillor Jo Shaw declared a non-pecuniary interest in applications 23/P/01291 Land to the rear of 168, The Street, West Horsley and 23/P/01774 Woodlands, The Warren, East Horsley owing to the fact that her father lived in East Horsley. However, both sites were not in close proximity to her father's place of address, and would not affect her objectivity in the consideration of these applications.

PL3 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 8 November 2023 were agreed and signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record.

PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the Chairman's announcements.

PL5 22/P/01966 - 94 POTTERS LANE, SEND, WOKING, GU23 7AL

Prior to the consideration of the application, the Committee agreed to the motion proposed by Councillor Pat Oven to defer the application to the next Committee meeting on 3 January, so that a site visit could be held. The motion was seconded by Councillor Jo Shaw and the Committee voted by a show of hands 9:2 with 1 abstention in support of a site visit being carried out.

PL6 23/P/01291 - LAND TO THE REAR OF 168 THE STREET, WEST HORSLEY, KT24 6HS

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of 2 detached dwellings with associated garaging.

Prior to the consideration of the application, the following persons addressed the Committee with Public Speaking Procedure Rules 3(b):

- Mr Thomas Borland (to object);
- Mr Ben Power (to object) and;
- Mr Neil Everest (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Becky Souter. The application had been referred to the Committee owing to receiving over 20 letters of objection. The Committee noted that access to the site was located between 164 and 168, The Street. The site was not set within the Green Belt. An extant permission existed for a single dwelling house approved under application 22/P/0998. The informal rear building line had been set by the surrounding dwellings. The proposed dwellings would not exceed this line and as such the properties would benefit from good sized rear gardens and helped to bridge the transition from the village to the Green Belt.

The proposed plans and elevations for plot 1 of the dwelling would utilise traditional styling and materials, incorporating pitched roofs and some modern architectural details of materials which were to be secured by condition, but the indicative palette provided was considered acceptable. The proposed plans and elevations for plot 2 demonstrated a dwelling which was a good example of Arts and Crafts architecture characterised by its two projecting symmetrical gables with a brick entrance porch nestled beneath them. The dwelling had been designed to respect the local vernacular and varied character and appearance of the surrounding area. Each dwelling would benefit from a detached garage and would also provide secure cycle storage.

The Committee noted the layout for a previously refused application in 2020, which was for the construction of five dwellings. This was refused as a result of its overall height, layout and small plot sizes, access and layout. The extent of hardstanding, all resulted in a development that was at odds with the context and character of the surrounding area. It did not provide the appropriate transition between the village and the Green Belt. This was also dismissed at appeal. The current application had been submitted to address those issues particularly by increasing the separation to the Green Belt edge.

Overall, planning officers had concluded that the application would not cause any harmful impact on the scale and character of the site or surrounding area. No impact had been identified either on neighbouring amenity, highways, parking, biodiversity, ecology, trees or surface water flooding. The development provided appropriate amenity standards and met with the sustainability policy. The proposal was therefore recommended for approval subject to a S106 agreement to secure the SANG and SAMM mitigation as well as the conditions as set out.

The Chairperson, Councillor King permitted Councillor Catherine Young to speak in her capacity as Ward Councillor for three minutes. The Committee noted concerns raised regarding the proposals impact upon the local character, which was akin to a back garden development that broke the ribbon pattern of development of the street. The existing dwellings are located on spacious plots fronting the road and had long rear gardens backing onto the countryside edge. This preserved the open and spacious character and the gentle transition between the edge of the village and the countryside beyond. It was important that this rural transition was maintained and was a key reason for refusal for the previous application and appeal on this site. The application was therefore in conflict with Neighbourhood Plan Policy WH2 which stated that the development must maintain an attractive rural edge and maintain countryside views. The proposal was also in conflict with Local Plan Policy D1.4 as it did not reflect the distinct local character or reinforce locally distinct patterns of development and the landscape setting. Neither did it accord with the development management policy D3 which focussed on the need to contribute to local distinctiveness and demonstrate a clear understanding of place. These policies were designed to protect and enhance the character of the village and if the proposal was allowed it would harm the character of West Horsley and ruin the landscape setting of the rural village. The properties proposed were also 3-4 bedroom dwellings and did not meet the need for smaller dwellings in the area.

The Committee discussed the application and agreed that overall the application represented a significant improvement upon the previously refused application

that was also dismissed at appeal. The two homes proposed were set in large plots with good access from the road. They were also well designed, good quality houses that were in keeping with the surrounding area. The Committee considered that the two houses were discretely positioned and would have relatively little impact upon the character of the area.

A motion was moved and seconded to approve the application which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Howard Smith	X		
2	Yves de Contades	X		
3	Richard Mills	X		
4	Steve Hives	X		
5	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
6	Philip Brooker	X		
7	Maddy Redpath	X		
8	Patrick Oven		X	
9	Bilal Akhtar	X		
10	Joanne Shaw	X		
11	Vanessa King	X		
12	Cait Taylor	X		
13	James Jones	X		
	TOTALS	12	1	0

In conclusion, having taken consideration of the representations received in relation to this application, the Committee

RESOLVED to approve application 23/P/01291 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

**PL7 23/P/01774 - WOODLANDS, THE WARREN, EAST HORSLEY,
LEATHERHEAD, KT24 5RH**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed erection of a two storey replacement dwelling with retention of existing garage together with alterations to parking and vehicular access arrangements to provide for an in/out access way.

Prior to the consideration of the application, the following persons addressed the Committee with Public Speaking Procedure Rules 3(b):

- Mr Gavin Teague (in support) and;
- Mr Gary Lonie (in support)

The Committee received a report from the Senior Planning Officer, Becky Souter. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which detailed an error in the report relating to the width and depth of the proposed dwelling. The application had come to the Planning Committee owing to receiving more than 20 letters/emails of support which were contrary to the officer's recommendation.

The Committee noted that the application related to a property known as Woodlands located within the Warren which was a private road in East Horsley. The site was located within the Green Belt and had been subject to a number of applications for a replacement dwelling in the last five years. The impact on the Green Belt has always been the primary reason for refusal over the course of the previous four applications. There have also been two planning appeals dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate. A parcel of land to the south of the site had been developed during this time and was subject to an appeal decision in 2019 which permitted the construction of a large single dwelling house. Reference had been made to the site by the applicant and in third party comments. However, the site was subject to a different Green Belt test as limited infill and under that was not considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt. In the last planning appeal on the application site, reference was made to this neighbouring dwelling, where the Inspector noted that the neighbouring situation was not comparable to the replacement dwelling proposed and as such should be given limited weight in any balance.

For the purposes of this application, we must take the starting point that the development was inappropriate in the Green Belt unless it meets one of the exceptions set out in paragraph 149d. The relevant exception in this case is in relation to the replacement of a building, provided that the new building was in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces.

The Committee noted the proposed site layout and footprint of the dwelling. The existing garage was to be retained and the alterations to the vehicular access would consist of the creation of an in and out driveway with a new access point. To facilitate the access, trees would have to be removed and no objection was raised to their loss. With regard to the existing and proposed front elevations, the design was considered to be appropriate to the character of the surrounding area and the dwelling would respect the existing streetscene. The indicative material palette was considered acceptable. The open sided wooden frame structures were constructed using permitted development rights in 2020. The existing elevation has a much narrower first floor which falls away to a single storey element. This was where the proposal would add significant bulk. When comparing the existing and proposed ground floor plans, the wooden frame structures are not taken into account for the purposes of the Green Belt assessment when considering the extent of the existing building. The applicant had accepted this position. It had been established from the many refusals and in the appeal decision for the 2021 application that these cannot be taken to be comparable to brick built form and were constructed artificially to increase the scale of the building for the purposes of gaining a planning permission. The proposed dwelling was greater in every respect compared to the existing property, with the most substantial uplift at first floor level where significant bulk would be created with over a 46% increase in floor area. The proposed dwelling would be 32% greater in volume and in the previous appeal decision, the Inspector had concluded that a 20% volumetric increase would be significant.

The main issue in relation to this application was that it represented inappropriate development in the Green Belt which was not outweighed by any very special circumstances and as such was recommended for refusal.

The Chairperson, Councillor King permitted Councillor Catherine Young to speak in her capacity as ward councillor for three minutes. The Committee noted concerns raised that the application should not be refused. It had support from all of the local neighbours as well as East Horsley Parish Council who were a statutory consultee and did not object. The applicant had addressed the concerns that had been raised previously and now produced plans for a family home that significantly minimised any harm to the openness of the Green Belt. As stated in the applicant's planning statement, the floor area had been reduced from 372sqm to 299sqm, which was a reduction of 73sqm with an original building size of 2 to 7sqm. The increase was just over 30% which represented a minimal increase. At Guildford anything above 40% was unacceptable but this was well below that. Therefore the application should be approved as it met the tests of paragraph 149d of the NPPF, being a replacement dwelling in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces. It also satisfied the local

plan policy whereby the application for the new home met the definition of a replacement dwelling as it would be delivered on virtually the same footprint as the original. The proposal, taking into consideration its compliance with numerous other planning policies on balance outweighed any perceived harm to the Green Belt.

The Senior Planning Officer, Becky Souter, in response to comments made by public speakers confirmed that the volumetric figure of 32% was what was provided by the planning agent for the application and was also in the Planning Statement.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that it was very unusual to have an application where there was mass support from the neighbours and parish council for a proposal. Given there was already a house onsite, according to the NPPF and local policies, it could not be considered as inset to the Green Belt. However, the neighbouring house which had been built was considerably larger than that proposed. It was considered that the proposal on balance did not represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposal would not materially harm the Green Belt or cause any difficulties to any of the neighbours.

The Committee also noted comments that the current application had to be looked at on its own merits and that the officer recommendation to refuse was the right one given that the proposal would impact upon the Green Belt owing to the material increase over the existing property.

The Council's legal advisor, Angela Watson drew members back to the wording of NPPF 149. This was the starting point and to note that this application was contrary to the definitions as laid out in the NPPF and Guildford's own policies. Members were cautioned against putting too much weight on the support the application had received from neighbours given that another similar application received in the future may have no support for it by neighbours. Members were reminded to be consistent in the planning decisions that they took.

The Chairperson, Councillor King stated that it had become apparent through the course of the debate that committee members did not support the officer recommendation.

Councillor Patrick Oven therefore moved a motion to approve the application which Councillor Maddy Redpath seconded and was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Howard Smith	X		
2	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
3	Patrick Oven	X		
4	James Jones	X		
5	Cait Taylor		X	
6	Maddy Redpath	X		
7	Vanessa King	X		
8	Philip Brooker	X		
9	Bilal Akhtar	X		
10	Yves de Contades	X		
11	Steve Hives		X	
12	Richard Mills		X	
13	Joanne Shaw	X		
	TOTALS			

In conclusion, having taken account of the representations received in relation to this application, the Committee

RESOLVED that delegated authority was given to the Executive Head of Planning to grant application 23/P/01774 subject to the addition of appropriate conditions as detailed below.

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1502-108C; 1502-110A; 1502-111A; 1502-112A and 1502-113A received on 23/10/2023.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in the interests of proper planning.

3. Prior to the commencement of development, a SAP output document shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall demonstrate the Dwelling Fabric Energy Efficiency (DFEE) value is at least 10% lower than the Target Fabric Energy Efficiency (TFEE) value set

by Building Regulations. The approved details shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development and retained as operational thereafter.

Reason: To reduce carbon emissions and incorporate energy efficiency in accordance with the Council's 'Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy' SPD 2020.

4. No development shall commence until a Site Waste Management Plan has been submitted to an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority that demonstrates how waste generated from construction and excavation activities would be dealt with in accordance with the waste hierarchy. The Site Waste Management Plan will subsequently be kept up-to-date throughout the development process in accordance with the established methodology.

Reason: To ensure that the development takes waste hierarchy into account to manage waste. It is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition because waste will begin to be generated as soon as any development commences on the site.

5. No development, above slab level, shall take place until details and samples of the proposed external facing and roofing materials including colour and finish have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and samples.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory.

6. No development, above slab level, shall take place until a scheme to enhance the nature conservation interest of the site has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented in full prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved.

Reason: To increase the biodiversity of the site and mitigate any impact from the development.

7. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless and until the proposed dwelling is provided with a fast charge socket (current minimum requirements - 7kw Mode 3 with Type 2 connector - 230v AC 32

Amp single phase dedicated supply) in accordance with a scheme to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of sustainability.

8. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until facilities for the secure, covered parking of bicycles and the provision of a charging point with timer for e-bikes by said facilities have been provided within the development site in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the said approved facilities shall be provided, retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users.

9. The development hereby permitted must comply with regulation 36 paragraph 2(b) of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended) to achieve a water efficiency of 110 litres per occupant per day (described in part G2 of the Approved Documents 2015). Before occupation, a copy of the wholesome water consumption calculation notice (described at regulation 37 (1) of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended)) shall be provided to the planning department to demonstrate that this condition has been met.

Reason: To improve water efficiency in accordance with the Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy SPD 2020.

10. No external lighting shall be installed on the site or affixed to any buildings on the site unless the local planning authority has first approved in writing details of the position, height, design, measures to control light spillage and intensity of illumination. Only the approved details shall be installed.

Reason: In the interests of minimising the impact of development on protected species.

**PL8 20/P/02173 - LAND AT BURPHAM COURT FARM, CLAY LANE,
GUILDFORD, GU4 7NA**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for the change of use of the site to 45.9 hectares of land to publicly accessible open space and Nature Reserve to facilitate a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). Amended details submitted 12 July 2023.

The Committee received an presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Jo Chambers. The Committee noted that the application had been submitted on behalf of Guildford Borough Council, acting in its capacity as landowner, in support of the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project which was now referred to as Weyside Urban Village.

The application was first considered by the Planning Committee at its meeting on 20 October 2021, when the Committee resolved to grant permission subject to a legal agreement. Changes had subsequently been made to the scheme for which planning permission was resolved to be granted and fell outside of the delegated authority granted by the Committee. As a result, this decision was being reported back to the Planning Committee.

The Committee noted that the application site was wholly within the Green Belt and was located approximately 3km north-east of the centre of Guildford. The site was an irregular shape and divided by the River Wey and Clay Lane. To the south, the area was allocated for mixed use development, including approximately 1500 new homes at Weyside Urban Village. Other land uses in close proximity included the Riverside Park local nature reserve and existing SANG, allotments and the community of Jacobs Well. The site boundary had been amended to exclude the Bowes Lane Bridge which was in the ownership of the National Trust. The bridge was not essential to the establishment of a SANG but would facilitate public access from areas to the site. The applicant was encouraged to work with the National Trust to secure the opening and use of the Bowes Lane Bridge by pedestrians in the future and an informative was proposed to this effect. The amended boundary did not alter the capacity for a SANG and biodiversity net gain.

The existing character of the site was currently green field land, comprising areas of pasture and marshy grassland grazed by cattle to the south of Clay Lane and to the north was an area of marshy grassland and woodland. The southernmost part of the site was defined as a local nature reserve and a site of nature conservation importance. There were many trees and hedges within the site with a dense tree belt on the western boundary. The River Wey was a dominant feature of the site which had existing wetland features. A large proportion of the site fell within flood zone 3 and parts of the site were used by wintering wildfowl. An updated SANG concept design had been submitted. This application did not

seek approval of those works but would be secured by condition subject to additional consultation. The SANG concept design had been prepared to demonstrate how Natural England SANG criteria and the concerns raised by the Environment Agency regarding flood risk could be satisfactorily addressed.

The main amendments made to the scheme related to the relocation of the car park from land immediately adjacent to the farm buildings on Clay Lane with an increase in the number of parking spaces to 32. The figure included a reduction in the normal requirement because Weyside Urban Village was within walking distance.

There were currently no public rights of access or rights of way across the site and the proposal would provide improved access and land management. A circular walk could be introduced as part of the site south of Clay Lane with three entry points to walkers. Various areas would be planted up and included hedgerow restoration. Restricted public access would also be in place in some areas in order to enhance biodiversity net gain.

In the planning officer's view, the proposed amendments were considered acceptable and the extensive work undertaken since the application was reported to Committee in October 2021 had addressed the concerns raised by the Environment Agency regarding flood risk. Full details of the SANG including layout boundaries, vehicular access and parking, landscape walkways, boundary works and associated works would be secured by condition. The future management would be subject to a detailed SANG Management Plan about biodiversity which was approved in consultation with Natural England. Preparation of the unilateral undertaking, and subject to planning consent being granted, procurement was programmed to commence early in the New Year with a target start onsite in June 2024.

In conclusion, the proposal would result in significant public benefits in terms of access to a recreational resource for existing and future residents, which would also bring significant environmental benefits, helping to reduce recreational pressures on the Thames Basin, which in accordance with local and national policy, the proposed development was recommended for approval.

The Committee discussed the application and agreed that the proposed represented a good sustainable form of development via the creation of a SANG and welcomed the increased biodiversity net gain overall.

A motion was moved and seconded to approve the application which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Patrick Oven	X		
2	Vanessa King	X		
3	Howard Smith	X		
4	Maddy Redpath	X		
5	Ruth Brothwell	X		
6	Joanne Shaw	X		
7	Philip Brooker	X		
8	Richard Mills	X		
9	Steve Hives	X		
10	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
11	Cait Taylor	X		
12	James Jones	X		
13	Yves de Contades	X		
14	Bilal Akhtar	X		
	TOTALS	14	0	0

In conclusion, having taken consideration of the representations received in relation to this application, the Committee

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/02173 subject to a S106 Agreement as detailed in the report and associated conditions.

PL9 22/P/01682 - 59 SHAWFIELD ROAD, ASH, GUILDFORD, GU12 6QX

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for conversion of 2 existing and dilapidated bungalows into a single family 4 bed, wheelchair accessible property.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Rebecca Souter. The Committee noted that the application had been referred to them as the applicant was Guildford Borough Council. The existing dwellings were in a dilapidated state and in need of repair. The new property proposed would have four bedrooms and be fully wheelchair accessible with appropriately landscaped external space. The existing dwellings were comprised of two bedrooms each and therefore no loss of bedrooms would result. Planning officers considered that the proposal was acceptable and would provide a much needed fully accessible family dwelling and was therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

The Committee discussed the application and supported the proposal to improve upon the existing run down bungalows through the provision of a four bed dwelling that was fully accessible for wheelchairs.

A motion was moved and seconded to approve the application which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Yves de Contades	X		
2	Bilal Akhtar	X		
3	Joanne Shaw	X		
4	Richard Mills	X		
5	Maddy Redpath	X		
6	Patrick Oven	X		
7	Philip Brooker	X		
8	James Jones	X		
9	Cait Taylor	X		
10	Vanessa King	X		
11	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
12	Howard Smith	X		
13	Steve Hives	X		
	TOTALS	13	0	0

In conclusion, having taken consideration of the representations received in relation to this application, the Committee

RESOLVED to approve application 22/P/01682 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL10 23/P/00392 - STANFORD COTTAGES, ALDERSHOT ROAD, PIRBRIGHT, WOKING, GU24 ODQ

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for vehicle crossover (Dropped Kerbs) to plots #2-6, Stanford Cottages.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Justin Williams. The application had been called to Committee by Councillor Keith Witham who disagreed with the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

Properties 2-6 wished for a dropped kerb to be installed the front of their properties. Some of the dwellings had already converted their front gardens to two parking spaces. The County Highway Authority had been consulted and raised an objection to the proposal on the grounds of highway safety. Despite several discussions with the applicant, the Highways Authority have maintained their objection.

The Chairperson, Councillor King permitted Councillor Keith Witham to speak in his capacity as Ward Councillor for three minutes. The Committee noted concerns raised that common sense should prevail by permitting these residents to have their kerbs dropped. Whilst residents currently had the legal right to park outside of their properties, owing to the location of the road it would no doubt increase the number of road traffic collisions. By enabling parking via a dropped kerb would increase safety.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that it was a fast road. If dropped kerbs were permitted then it could enable cars to get onto their front driveways and off them safely. The Committee also considered the merits of attending a site visit so that the situation could be fully assessed.

Councillor Richard Mills moved a motion which was seconded by Councillor Pat Oven so that a site visit could be carried out which was lost 4:7.

The Committee considered that whilst the driveways had been in place for a number of years, safe access and egress from the driveways had not been demonstrated in accordance with CHA's requirements and the standards set out within the Manual for Streets. The applicant had been unable to provide adequate information to show the required visibility splays at the proposed access points to enable safe access/egress to the parking areas.

A motion was moved and seconded to refuse the application which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Howard Smith	X		
2	Philip Brooker		X	
3	Richard Mills		X	
4	James Jones	X		
5	Bilal Akhtar		X	
6	Cait Taylor	X		
7	Steve Hives	X		
8	Yves de Contades	X		
9	Patrick Oven		X	
10	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
11	Joanne Shaw	X		
12	Vanessa King	X		
13	Maddy Redpath	X		
	TOTALS	9	4	0

In conclusion, having taken consideration of the representations received in relation to this application, the Committee

RESOLVED to refuse application 23/P/00392 subject to the reasons detailed in the report.

PL11 23/P/01424 - 36 RAILTON ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU2 9LX

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for variation of condition no.2 (drawing numbers) of application 21/P/00812, approved on 11/08/2021 for a single storey rear conservatory extension and enlargement of 2nd floor rear dormer. Amendments to glazing and roof structure.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Justin Williams. The Committee noted that the application had been referred to them for determination as the applicant was a member of staff. The revisions proposed included the removal of a high level obscure glazed window in the side elevation facing the attached neighbour. The proposal was not considered to have an impact upon the amenities or the streetscene or neighbouring properties and the application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Committee agreed that the amendments were in keeping with the neighbouring properties and would result in a some minor changes to a conservatory extension and enlargement of a second floor dormer.

A motion was moved and seconded to approve the application which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Yves de Contades	X		
2	Steve Hives	X		
3	Howard Smith	X		
4	Maddy Redpath	X		
5	Bilal Akhtar	X		
6	Vanessa King	X		
7	Patrick Oven	X		
8	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
9	Philip Brooker	X		
10	James Jones	X		
11	Joanne Shaw	X		
12	Richard Mills	X		
13	Cait Taylor	X		
	TOTALS	13	0	0

In conclusion, having taken consideration of the representations received in relation to this application, the Committee

RESOLVED to approve application 23/P/01424 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL12 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee considered and noted the appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 9.20 pm

Signed

Date

Chairman

Planning Committee

3 January 2024

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

23/P/00592 – (Page 99) – Westthorpe, Holford Road, Guildford, GU1 2QE

8 additional letters of objection have been received, reiterating the original objections.

This page is intentionally left blank