



GUILDFORD
BOROUGH

www.guildford.gov.uk

Pedro Wrobel
Joint Chief Executive of Guildford and
Waverley Borough Councils

Dear Councillor

PLANNING COMMITTEE – WEDNESDAY 6 NOVEMBER 2024

Please find attached the following:

Agenda No Item

8. **Late Sheets - Updates/Amendments/Corrections and Late Representations**
 (Pages 1 - 38)

Yours sincerely

Sophie Butcher, Democratic Services Officer

Encs

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee

6 November 2024

Update/Amendment/Correction List

Planning Committee Minutes – 9 October 2024

Please find attached a copy of the planning committee minutes from the 9 October 2024 meeting.

23/P/00139 – (Page 21) - 176 Epsom Road, Guildford, GU1 2RR

Additional comments have been received from the Council's tree officer who recommends the following condition be attached

No development related works shall take place on site until an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP), in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction, are submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The approved Arboricultural Method Statement must be adhered to in full, and may only be modified subject to written agreement from the LPA. No development shall commence until tree protection measures, as set out in the AMS and TPP, have been installed and a site meeting has taken place with the site manager, the retained consulting arboriculturist and the LPA Tree Officer.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure the protection of the trees to be retained on the site.

24/P/00441 (Page 41) – Land west of Blackwell Farm, Hogs Back, Guildford, GU3

Amendments and additions in *italics* and deletions ~~strikethrough~~.

1.0 Key information:

(page 42)

1.3 The proposal has an installed capacity of 12.21MWp and would have an annual generation of *approximately* 8.25GWhr/yr for use by the

University of Surrey as part of its net zero strategy to be carbon neutral by 2030. *(The annual generation from solar is subject to a range of factors and is not constant).*

RECOMENDATION

3.1 Revised and additional conditions (page 44-59)

9.	<p><u><i>Great Crested Newt Mitigation Principles</i></u></p> <p><i>No development shall commence except in accordance with Part 1 of the Great Crested Newt Mitigation Principles, as set out in the District Licence (WML-OR146, or a 'Further Licence') and in addition in compliance with the following:</i></p> <p><i>a) Works to existing ponds onsite may only be undertaken during autumn/winter, unless otherwise in accordance with the Great Crested Newt Mitigation Principles. Works which will affect likely newt hibernacula may only be undertaken during the active period for amphibians;</i></p> <p><i>b) Capture methods must be used at suitable habitat features prior to the commencement of the development (i.e., hand/destructive/night searches), which may include the use of temporary amphibian fencing, to prevent newts moving onto a development site from adjacent suitable habitat, installed for the period of the development (and removed upon completion of the development).</i></p> <p><i>c) Amphibian fencing and pitfall trapping must be undertaken at suitable habitats and features, prior to commencement of the development.</i></p> <p><i>The measures shall be implemented and maintained for the course of the development works.</i></p> <p><u><i>Reason:</i></u> <i>To safeguard the on great crested newts and their habitats which are a protected species and provide suitable mitigation and enhancements. This is required to be a pre-commencement condition as these matters need to be agreed before development commences, in order to minimise impacts on habitats and biodiversity.</i></p>
----	---

20.	<p><u>Archaeology</u></p> <p>Prior to the commencement of any development on the cable route <i>a programme of archaeological work on the site in accordance with a written scheme of investigation shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved <i>Written Scheme of Investigation.</i></i></p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To ensure archaeological investigation(s) are carried out before any archaeological remains are disturbed by the approved development.</p>
-----	---

4.0 Proposal:

(page 67)

4.45 *Most of the landscape and biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures would remain. For example, the grassland areas within the three solar array fields themselves would be removed.*

8.0 Planning policies:

(page 83)

8.11 *Other strategies*

Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan 2020-2025

Planning Management Policies – P6

11.0 Planning considerations:

(page 88)

11.1.16 The University of Surrey has a ‘Net-Zero Strategy’ (2030), this is two-fold with measures to reduce demand and to decarbonise the energy supply. The University has a consumption of approximately 23GWh/yr, and this is

expected to increase in the future due to the need for data centres (to support their people-centred AI) and electric vehicle (EV) charging *to approximately 28GWh/yr (equivalent to the power for approximately 4.38 million households for one year)*. The University has a strategy that involves using roof mounted solar panels and decarbonising energy consumption.

(page 92)

11.2.20 Furthermore, where ducting is laid, other utilities required for the residential site allocation *could theoretically be laid, this would depend on the routing and timing of utilities for the Blackwell Park development which has not been progressed following its allocation.*

(page 96)

11.3.1 *NE commenced a 12 week consultation on 16.09.2024 to include the additional land.* There is no timetable for submitting the Order to the Secretary of State. At this time, whilst the application is not in the SHNL it is in the candidate area and therefore this designation has growing weight in decision making. So it would not be unreasonable to give relative weight to the relevant development plan policies and NPPF considerations. *There is no moratorium in place for determining planning application in the candidate areas.*

11.3.2 *However, it is still relevant to consider "The scale and extent of development within all these designated areas [National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty] should be limited, while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas." As required by the para. 182 of the NPPF. This is also reflected in policy P6 of the AONB Management Plan Development, which resists development that would spoil the setting of the AONB by harming public views into or from the AONB.*

(page 99)

11.3.16 It is possible to see that the proposal would be situated within a mixed and managed landscape. Whilst there is a predominance of what most

people would recognise as 'countryside' visible within the views recognised in its designation as an AGLV. This is a rural-urban fringe location with built settlement to the *east* comprising the Guildford town and the University (as identified by the GLCA), as well as being visible in wider views with vantage points including the ridge of the Hog's Back, which is the current boundary of the SHNL.

(page 100)

11.3.26 The fencing would be *2.4m in height*, the proposed post and wire mesh design would not be visually dominant and would over line blind in with the enhanced planting. When seen from the PROWs and permissive paths adjoining the field boundaries.

(page 101)

11.3.28 From the fields themselves, the extent and 3.0m height of the solar array, would not unduly obstruct outward views and so would not cause harm to the candidate area of the SHNL. However, as there would be some harm to views from the existing SHNL, the AGLV and landscape character area *due to the development on Little Misley*, this would be contrary to policy P1(3) and (5) of the LPSS, which states that development should be conserved and enhanced to maximise its special landscape qualities and scenic beauty and must have regard to protecting its setting *and policy P6 of the AONB Management Plan as there would be some harm from public views*. Then partially conflict with P1(1) due to the impact on the SHNL candidate area.

11.3.29 *No adverse impacts have been predicted, and therefore, no mitigation is deemed necessary.*

(page 106)

11.4.27 A Soils and Agricultural Quality assessment has been submitted with the planning application. This notes that land of grades 2, 3 and 4 have been identified at the site. The total application site area of *37.7 hectares* comprises the following:

Grade / Subgrade	Area (Ha)	% of application site
Grade 2	<i>1.6</i>	<i>4</i>
Subgrade 3a	<i>11.8</i>	<i>32</i>
Subgrade 3b	<i>19.9</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>Other land (non-agricultural)</i>	<i>1.0</i>	<i>3.5</i>
<i>Unsurveyed land</i>	<i>2.5</i>	<i>7.5</i>
Total	<i>37.7</i>	<i>100</i>

11.4.28 Based on the results of this survey, *approximately 36% of the study area is considered to be BMV and this would not be available for arable farming for up to 35 years for the development. This would include parts of the buried cable route that would not affect agricultural land use.*

(page 111-112)

11.5.26 *The County Archaeologist states that the geophysical survey results do not preclude archaeological remains being present on the site as some types of archaeological features do not produce a significant magnetic signature and so may not show up on a survey. So they are not satisfied that this constitutes a full survey. The applicant has clarified that both Big and Little Miskey fields were subject to recorded scanning and detailed gradiometer survey in 2014. The 2014 survey report is noted in footnote 5 (page 9) within the submitted desk-based heritage assessment and heritage statement and the targeted survey in these fields is shown as Figure 5b of the submitted assessment report.*

(page 117)

11.6.4 The application has been supported by the following documents:

- ... Ecological Impact Assessment (ECIA), prepared by ECOSA, March 2024
- ... Ecological Impact Assessment (ECIA) Addendum, prepared by ECOSA, August 2024
- ... Habitat management and monitoring plan (HMMP), prepared by ECOSA, March 2024
- ... Hazel Dormouse Survey Report, prepared by ECOSA, January 2024

- ... Biodiversity Net Gain Stage Report and Metric Rev 2, prepared by ECOSA, August 2024
- ... Confidential Badger Report Rev 1, prepared by ECOSA, August 2024
- ... Ecological Mitigation Strategy – Rev 4, prepared by ECOSA, August 2024
- ... Responses to Ecological Consultations, prepared by ECOSA, August 2024

(page 130)

11.9.10 In terms of glint and glare the submitted Solar Photovoltaic Glint and Glare Study assesses the possible effects of glint and glare from the development on road safety, residential amenity, PROWs and SHNL and railway operations and infrastructure. ~~For this section the impact on residential amenity WOULD be discussed. The impacts of glint and glare on the other possible receptors would be (have already been) discussed in other sections of the report.~~

(page 131)

11.9.14 In terms of privacy, it is noted that the facility would *not have operatives* onsite on a daily basis – the activity associated with the operational phase has been explained above.

(page 133)

11.10.13 These have been assessed above and that alternatives were considered and discounted based on an evidence based approach. It has been acknowledged that whilst third parties *do not* agree with the conclusions made. There is no evidence to suggest that the approach taken is not sound.

(page 135)

11.10.29 The University has a consumption of approximately *23 GWh/yr, and this is expected to increase to 28GWh/yr due to the* expected to increase due to the data centres for the growth of AI and EV charging. Energy efficiency measures and roof mounted solar panels would not enable them to reach their net zero target by 2030.

(page 135)

11.11.3 The export cable would comprise a Copper Triplex HV; cable size - 630sq.mm single core XLPE Cu and cable voltage - 11kV. ~~2.4.286.~~

(page 139)

11.12.8 The scale of the proposal would represent a significant contribution (*approximately 36%*) towards energy needs of the University from a renewable source and is predicted to deliver a saving of 1,122,000 kg CO₂e of emissions annually.

(page 142)

11.13.5 Wildfields Farm is a locally important heritage asset, relatively speaking there is a lower value associated with its significance. Therefore, the relative harm is given lesser weighting and consequently the *public* benefits to outweigh this harm *do* not have to be as great.

11.14.1 Firstly, by virtue of the inappropriate development of the solar arrays on the fields and harm to the openness from the access track on the Green Belt there would be conflict with policy P2. Secondly, due to the harm to the landscape qualities of the AGLV and setting of the existing SHNL caused by the solar array on Little Misley as there would be conflict with policy P1(3) and (5) of the LPSS, *policy P6 of the AONB Management Plan* and partial conflict with P1(1) due to the limited weight afford to this policy from the *solar arrays* being *located on* a candidate area. Thirdly, the temporary loss of *13.4 ha of BMV (approximately 36% of the study area)* would be contrary to E5(3) of the LPSS. Fourthly, the proximity of Wildfields Farmhouse to the proposed solar array on the Wildfields field and the access track spur would result in less than substantial harm at the lower end of spectrum to the setting of this designated heritage asset. This would be contrary to policy D3 of the LPSS and policies D18(3) and D19(1) and (2)(d) of the LPDMP.

**24/P/00563 (Page 145) – Surrey County Constabulary Police Headquarters
Mount Browne, Sandy Lane, Guildford, GU3 1HG**

2.0. *Conditions*

- 2.1. For clarity, condition 8 of application 24/P/00563 is proposed to be amended as follows.

No development shall commence until, a Biodiversity Net Gain Statement and ~~Habitat management and~~ Monitoring Plan (HMMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The ~~HMMP~~ Biodiversity Net Gain Statement and Monitoring Plan shall be based on the proposed impact avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures specified in the Ecological Impact Assessment and should include, but not be limited to the following:

- (a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed.
- (b) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
- (c) Aims and objectives of management.
- (d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.
- (e) Prescriptions for management actions, together with a plan of management compartments.
- (f) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a 30-year period.
- (g) Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan.
- (h) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.
- (i) Legal and funding mechanisms by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the applicant with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery.
- (j) Monitoring strategy, including details of how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme.
- (k) Timetable for the implementation of the works.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Net Gain Statement and Monitoring Plan. The measures to secure biodiversity net gain shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable of works.

Reason: to ensure the delivery and management of the specified biodiversity net gain in accordance with national and local requirements.

2.2. The amendments to this condition do not change the reason, only serve to clarify the purpose further being to secure biodiversity net gain.

3.0. *Amendments to the reports*

3.1. It is prudent to note that the case officer for both application 24/P/00563 and 24/P/00564 is Morgan Laird. It is evident that this was not recorded within the Officer's Report.

3.2. Paragraphs 8.4.19 and 8.9.11 of application 24/P/00563 refers to an area of 7,000sqm woodland planting. This should read as 700sqm as this refers to the area of planting at the top of the proposed access road. This does not change the consideration of the report as the proposal was assessed on the basis that 700sqm is proposed.

3.3. *Furthering the Purpose of protected landscapes*

3.4. The AONB Planning Advisor sent an email to the Planning Officer following the agenda being published. This email was with respect to application 24/P/00563 (access road) and was received on Wednesday 30th October.

3.5. In their email it was noted that the Officer's Report did not make note that the Local Planning Authority should also be considered as a relevant authority for the purposes of the new The Levelling-Up and Regeneration Act 2023 (LURA) duty. The LPA must therefore also be satisfied that as a relevant authority, this has been met.

3.6. In considering whether this duty has been met, regard has been had to the Policies within the Surrey Hills Management Plan. Specifically, one of the aims is for the Surrey Hills to be enjoyed and cherished as an Area of

Outstanding Natural Beauty for its own intrinsic qualities and in ways that contribute to people's health and wellbeing. Notable policies to achieve this aim include:

- ... RT1 – Visitors and facilities that enhance people's health, enjoyment and understanding of the Surrey Hills will be encouraged, whilst conserving or enhancing the landscape character and biodiversity.
- ... RT2 – Information will be made accessible for a diverse range of potential visitors in order to foster a greater understanding and enjoyment of the Surrey Hills AONB.
- ... RT4 – The design and development of new visitor facilities, and the maintenance of existing facilities, will have regard to the needs of people of all abilities to access and enjoy the Surrey Hills landscape.

3.7. The AONB Management Plan also aims to conserve and enhance the biodiversity resources of the Surrey Hills. Relevant policies to achieve this aim include:

- ... B4 – The enhancement of biodiversity will be maximised through the targeting of advice and grants, and applicants for planning permission will be expected to deliver biodiversity gains as part of their proposals secured through planning conditions or legal agreements where appropriate.

3.8. As set out in paragraphs 8.4.18 – 8.5.20 of the Officer's Report, the scheme includes the installation of a signboard and additional planting within the site which would increase the biodiversity gain achieved on site. It should be noted that these measures were provided in consultation with the LPA and the AONB Planning Advisor. The LPA have considered the measures proposed, and the justification provided as to why other measures would not be appropriate and are satisfied that as a relevant authority, appropriate justification has been sought by the LPA and provided by the Applicant. It is further considered that the measures proposed would be supported by the above mentioned policies within the AONB Management Plan.

3.9. The LPA have considered these comments and are satisfied that this duty has been met by the LPA with respect to both applications 24/P/00563 and 24/P/00564.

- 4.0. The LPA are aware that a memo/document was sent to the members by a resident on the 5th November 2024. The document was noted to be sent on behalf of a number of local residents. The following is a summary of the points raised, as well as comments addressing these concerns by the Case Officer.
- 4.1. Lack of Transparency / misleading nature of application description. The document sets out that the application description is not correct and does not include reference to the relocation of emergency response vehicles to the site. It is noted that the closure of the Police Station within the Guildford Town Centre and relocation to Mount Browne could occur without planning permission. It is therefore is not included within the description of the development.
- 4.2. The document raises concern about the number of conditions, noting that residents should be given the change to comment on the documents when considered by the LPA. The Case Officer considers the number and contents of the conditions to be appropriate and necessary.
- 4.3. Specific reference is made to condition 2 of 24/P/00564 with an image attached. It should be noted that the image attached is a reference to a different plan, and not the plan conditioned (drawing no. MTB-SBR-SW-XX-DR-A-01120 Rev P01). This is therefore a misleading comment.
- 4.4. Further reference is made to conditions 30 and 27 of 24/P/00564 and condition 14 of 24/P/00563 which relate to droppable bollards on Sandy Lane and The Ridges. It should be noted that as the red line boundary of the access road application does not extend to Sandy Lane, it was not possible to require the bollards under this condition. It has therefore been included within the main site application to ensure these are provided.
- 4.5. Further reference is made to condition 26 of 24/P/00564 which requires the provision of a cycle lane along Old Portsmouth Road, noting (rightfully) that areas of Old Portsmouth Road are narrow and it would not be possible to provide a cycle lane. In discussions between the County

Highway Authority and the Applicant's transport consultant that the cycle route could be extended from the Artington Roundabout north, to tie in with the shared ped/cycle way introduced as part of the adjacent residential development of The Ridges. The details would be secured by condition 26. The cycle lane would therefore not be situated within the narrow section of Old Portsmouth Road.

- 4.6. Condition 24 of 24/P/00564 is reference where it was requested that the condition should include provision of finished floor levels and building heights. This is not considered appropriate or necessary with condition 24 requiring landscaping details.
- 4.7. Requests that condition 12 of 24/P/00564 include Phase 1. This is not considered reasonable as it is unlikely that vehicle headlights would cause an unacceptable impact on surrounding properties. It is further noted that the valley bottom is not absent from development or car parking as there is existing formal and informal car parking in this area. Accordingly, there would be no greater impact from vehicle headlight glare.
- 4.8. The letter refers to a condition requiring all internal roads and paths to be street lit. While specific reference is not made to a condition, it is assumed this relates to condition 20 of 24/P/00564. It is noted that this condition requires the submission of details of timing of delivery and a phasing plan for provision of pedestrian and cyclist routes within the site, as well as priority crossing points at internal junctions. It does not require all internal roads and paths to be lit. Notwithstanding this, the site is already developed with internal roads and pathways and is not a dark skies setting. This condition along with condition 11 of 24/P/00564 would allow the LPA to consider the details.
- 4.9. The document raises concerns with the dog school location and need, noting that alternative sites have not been adequate considered, including land within Guildford Borough Council's ownership. The assessment of alternative locations undertaken by the Applicant considered land within the Police's ownership. It is not considered

appropriate or reasonable to also consider all land within the Council's ownership. The Officer's Report appropriately considers the points raised in terms of consideration of alternative sites and the need for and scale of the dog school.

- 4.10. The final comment made in the document refers to the noise generated by the dog school in the new location, noting that an inadequate assessment of the noise impact assessment has been made. The Officer considers that appropriate consideration has been had to this, as outlined in the Officer's Report.

**24/P/00564 – (Page 199) – Surrey County Constabulary Police Headquarters
Mount Browne, Sandy Lane, Guildford, GU3 1HG**

5.0. *Air quality*

- 1.1. The Air Quality assessment within paragraphs 8.8.1 – 8.8.6 is to be amended following further comments from both the Applicant and the Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) addressing the impact on the Town Centre Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The Applicant in their response explained that the air quality assessment takes into account the gross traffic movements from the proposed development at 2028 and it is important to note that this is not all new traffic being introduced into the area. Guildford Police Station currently operates from within the AQMA where all existing traffic utilising the Police station will currently travel through the AQMA. It has been advised that the majority of current operations within Guildford Police Station would be relocated to Mount Browne with a counter service remaining within the town centre. This would mean that existing traffic within the AQMA would move to Mount Browne which is outside the AQMA and has been demonstrated in the air quality assessment will have a negligible impact on air quality within 300m radius of the site.
- 5.1. The applicant's transport consultant notes that *circa 6,100 pass through the junction during the AM peak hour and 5,700 during the PM peak hour. In terms of percentage impact, the proposed development flows would equate to 1.5% of these flows during the AM peak and 2% during the PM*

peak hour. These impacts would reduce by circa 1% if the existing traffic generated by Guildford Police Station were to be netted off.

- 5.2. Additionally, it is assumed that all traffic travelling along the A3100 would travel through the AQMA which the Applicant reasons is not realistic as police traffic could disperse in any direction through the town and beyond.
- 5.3. The proposal would introduce a number of sustainable transportation measures, which are set out in the proposed travel plan. Of note, the scheme includes provision of 151 EV parking spaces (50% of new parking spaces) along with two rapid chargers, improved pedestrian and cycle facilities and a shuttle bus. The EV charging facilities will in the long-term allow the Police and their staff the opportunities to utilise electric vehicles which combined with the other sustainable transportation measures, would further reduce emissions and associated air quality impacts.
- 5.4. The Council's EHO has considered this response and no longer raises an objection. They also note in their response that the Surrey Police have signed up to the Active Travel Scheme operated by Velocity Transport Planning on behalf of National Highways, Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council. It was therefore concluded that the development would on balance, not result in an unacceptable adverse impact on air quality. The proposed development would therefore comply with Policy P9 of the LPDMP.

6.0. Legal agreement

- 6.1. The County Highway Authority in their response requested that a contribution of £6,150 be requested for the auditing of the travel plan. This is agreed and is proportionate to the development. This is proposed to be secured via an obligation within the S106 agreement.

7.0. Conditions

- 7.1. For clarity, condition 7 of application 24/P/00564 is proposed to be amended as follows.

No development shall commence until, a Biodiversity Net Gain Statement and Habitat management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The ~~HMMP~~ Biodiversity Net Gain Statement and Monitoring Plan shall be based on the proposed impact avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures specified in the Ecological Impact Assessment and should include, but not be limited to the following:

- ~~(k)~~(l) Description and evaluation of features to be managed.
- ~~(l)~~(m) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
- ~~(m)~~(n) Aims and objectives of management.
- ~~(n)~~(o) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.
- ~~(o)~~(p) Prescriptions for management actions, together with a plan of management compartments.
- ~~(p)~~(q) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a 30-year period.
- ~~(q)~~(r) Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan.
- ~~(r)~~(s) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.
- ~~(s)~~(t) Legal and funding mechanisms by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the applicant with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery.
- (u) Monitoring strategy, including details of how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme.
- ~~(t)~~(v) Timetable for the implementation of the works.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Net Gain Statement and Monitoring Plan. The measures to

secure biodiversity net gain shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable of works.

Reason: to ensure the delivery and management of the specified biodiversity net gain in accordance with national and local requirements.

7.2. The amendments to this condition do not change the reason, only serve to clarify the purpose further.

7.3. An additional condition is proposed, which would become condition 32 of application 24/P/00564. The proposed condition would require the access road to be completed prior to the first use of any new buildings within the main site. This is required to ensure the highway safety impact is appropriately mitigated. The proposed condition would read as follows:

7.4. Condition 32.

No part of any new buildings hereby approved shall be brought into use unless and until the access road approved under application 24/P/00563 has been completed in accordance with the approved details and is open for use for all users.

Reason: in the absence of a safe access to the main site, the development hereby approved would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety. The condition ensures that the access road comes forward first to mitigate the highway impact from the increase in trip generation.

8.0. *Amendments to the reports*

8.1. It is prudent to note that the case officer for both application 24/P/00563 and 24/P/00564 is Morgan Laird. It is evident that this was not recorded within the Officer's Report.

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Councillor Vanessa King (Chairperson)

* Councillor Dominique Williams (Vice-Chairperson)

Councillor Bilal Akhtar	* Councillor Richard Mills OBE
* Councillor Joss Bigmore	Councillor Patrick Oven
* Councillor David Bilbe	* Councillor Maddy Redpath
* Councillor Yves de Contades	* Councillor Joanne Shaw
Councillor Lizzie Griffiths	* The Deputy Mayor, Councillor
* Councillor Stephen Hives	Howard Smith
* Councillor James Jones	* Councillor Cait Taylor

*Present

Councillor Fiona was also in attendance online.

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bilal Akhtar, Lizzie Griffiths and Vanessa King with no substitutes. (Councillor Dominique Williams would act as Chairperson for the meeting in Councillor King's absence).

PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest.

PL3 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 11 September 2024 were agreed and signed by the Chairperson as an accurate record.

PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS

Prior to the consideration of application 23/P/00417, Land adjacent to Ockham Lane, owing to the public interest, the Committee was asked to waive the Public Speaking Procedure Rules to extend the time permitted to speak from three to

five minutes. This extension of time would also apply to all committee members to give minutes which was agreed.

PL5 23/P/00417 - LAND ADJACENT TO OCKHAM LANE, OCKHAM, GU23 6NT

The Committee considered the above-mentioned outline application for construction of up to 70 new homes (C3), the formation of a new means of access onto Ockham Lane, new footpaths and cycle routes, the creation of areas of open space and allotments, new surface water drainage, new landscaping and habitat creation, ground works and other infrastructure.

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

- Councillor Imogen Jamieson (Ockham Parish Council) (to object);
- Mrs Frances Porter (Villages Against Wisley Town – VAWNT) (to object);
- Mr Owen Jones (LRM Planning) (in support on behalf of the applicant)

The Committee received a report from the planning officer, Hannah Yates. Changes were highlighted, as detailed in the supplementary late sheets, to a Grampian condition no.27. The proposed change was to make this a prior to commencement condition rather than a prior to occupation condition to ensure that the Hallam scheme was not delivered before the start of the Taylor Wimpey scheme. There was also a proposed change to the education contributions, in particular on primary provision. Early years and secondary provision remained the same, as outlined in the report. The Taylor Wimpey scheme was required to deliver the primary school in full and once built would fully mitigate the impact of the proposed development. The primary school must be transferred to Surrey County Council (SCC) by the occupation of 650 units of the Taylor Wimpey application. There would therefore be an interim period before there was any primary provision and SCC requires a proportionate payment to cover this interim period. Planning officers considered this was necessary to meet the CIL requirements related to the development and fairly related in scale and kind.

Additional responses had also been received from Surrey County Council Fire and Rescue and Send Parish Council. Lastly, an email had been sent from Ockham Parish Council to all councillors regarding the judicial review that the Parish Council had issued against the appeal decision on the Taylor Wimpey application. The email stated that the case officer had misrepresented the actual position of the planning appeal on the majority of the former Wisley Airfield local plan allocation A35. Ockham Parish Council believed it was important members were

aware that the appeal was subject to a S288 statutory review in the High Court. The next part of the process was on 5 December 2024 and until the judicial review process was completed, there could be no reliance upon the appeal conditions. In response to those comments, planning officers believed that until the decision was quashed by the court, which may not be the case, Taylor Wimpey had an extant permission. This was a recent and relevant planning decision that should be afforded significant weight.

The Committee noted the application proposal for which details of access were sought now, with layout, scale, appearance and landscaping reserved for consideration later. When considering the application, it was important to remember that detailed consideration was required for the use and amount of development and the means of access, which was defined as the accessibility to and within the site for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians, the positioning and treatment of access and circulation routes and how these fitted into the surrounding access network. All other considerations were deferred until a reserved matters application.

The Committee noted a map which showed the key constraints of the A35 allocation. Flood zones 2 and 3 ran along Stratford Brook along the periphery of the site. The Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA) was located to the north as well as a SSSI area. Located close by was also the SNCI and part of those areas also formed the Ockham and Wisley Local Nature Reserve. The Green Belt surrounded the whole site. Ockham Conservation Area was located to the west of the site. A Tree Preservation Order (TPO) which was relatively new was located along the access to Little Upton. There are also many footpaths running through and adjacent to the site.

The A35 allocation was split into three different land ownerships; Taylor Wimpey, Hallam the subject of this application, and CBRE. This application site formed the smallest part of the allocated site under policy A35 of the local plan strategies and sites. There was an area of SANG above the application site and fell outside of the allocation as it was within the zero to 400 metre buffer of the TBHSPA which was to the north.

Taylor Wimpey recently had a hybrid application, on the A35 allocation, approved at appeal subject to a S106 and a large number of conditions. There is an ongoing judicial review, but the permission still stands at this time and is a relevant material consideration.

The Committee noted various photos taken of the site at various stages over the past two years. The access point that would be created to the site was located

beyond an oak tree which was in the hedge line and just in front of where the speed limit changed from 40mph to 30mph as you moved into the village. This part of the site had the best visibility. The existing access points into the site were of substandard visibility. Ockham Lane did consist of dense hedgerow, however, there were some gaps.

The Committee noted the plans that had been submitted for approval as part of the outline application. The vehicle access would be in the form of a simple priority junction off Ockham Lane to the western side of the site at 6 metres wide reducing in width as you enter the site. This width was sufficient to allow two large vehicles to pass and was consistent with the advice contained in the manual for streets. It was proposed that the junction radius had been provided to accommodate the swept path of the largest design vehicle that accesses the site on a regular basis e.g. a large refuse vehicle. The visibility requirements were 2.4 metres by 70 metres both ways. Road users waiting to turn right into the proposed site access from Ockham Lane could see beyond the required stopping site distance. Vegetation within the visibility splays would be removed and cut back to ensure the displays were not obstructed. Pedestrian access to the site would be provided via a new link to the western end of the site. The submitted plan shows the original scheme containing works to Ockham Lane, which the applicant was no longer intending to provide following discussions with the County Highway Authority. A condition had therefore been recommended which required an updated scheme to be submitted and agreed prior to occupation. The scheme would need to include pedestrian and cycle access. This would ensure the proposal aligned with the traffic calming works on Ockham Lane, which are approved and required as part of the mitigation on the Taylor Wimpey site.

The proposed access point was just to the west of the existing change in speed limit. There was some tree and hedge removal required as shown on the extract of the tree retention plan. The bigger category B tree, with the biggest canopy, is being retained.

Paragraph 8.4.8 of the strategic development framework SPD stated that the site would have two principal points of access, talking about the A35 site as a whole, from Wisley Lane, and from Old Lane. Minor access points from Ockham Lane may be permissible where they served a limited number of dwellings to be agreed with Surrey County Council, and where there was no onward vehicle connection to the site. Surrey County Council no longer objected to the access onto Ockham Lane following the receipt of further information. The access was therefore in accordance with the SPD in this regard.

The Committee noted the land use and building heights parameter plan. The proposed areas of residential development comprised of residential uses and associated infrastructure, which included roads, car parking, pedestrian cycle links, open space, landscaping, and drainage systems. Building heights were capped at a maximum of two stories.

The Committee noted the access and movement parameter plan and were shown the key vehicle movement corridor. There would be a footway and cycleway along the northern half of the lane. The secondary movement corridor formed a loop background connecting to the primary route. The proposed principal pedestrian and cycle connection routes ran along the frontage and up into the Taylor Wimpey scheme to the north. A key pedestrian cycle route ran east to west across the A35 as a whole and connected all the land parcels across the allocation. There was also a connection zone to be used for potential emergency access. Surrey County Council Fire and Rescue commented that an emergency access here would not be essential. However, condition 30 did allow for this matter to be revisited if necessary, during the discharge of this condition.

The Committee noted the green and blue infrastructure parameter plan. This showed the location of the different typologies of open space and the broad locations for SUDS solutions. The proposed allotments and play area were shown. In order to demonstrate that the parameter plans were acceptable, illustrative material had been submitted to show a potential way the site parameters could come forward delivering the numbers of dwellings applied for. This illustrative material takes the form of an illustrative master plan. This illustrative plan had a number of positive aspects. It showed an acceptable relationship to the adjacent broadwalk and the public open space area. Any relationship with Beacon Park, which was acceptable, with footpath and cycle link offset from the boundary hedge and a tree lined overlooked by build frontages. There was a positive use of open space responding to the constraints of the site. The western open space here provided the green pause between the site and the Conservation Area. The central green space was a positive space, and the soft edges were considered to be responsive to the context of the site. Whilst the response to Ockham Lane was less successful, it was considered that the parameter plans would be able to guide a better response at the reserved matters stage. This plan was illustrative and was not being approved as part of this submission.

The submitted material also includes a site wide master plan in accordance with policy D1. This was to ensure a coordinated approach and the creation of a legible new settlement. The applicants, along with Taylor Wimpey and CBRE, had jointly agreed an illustrative master plan for the entire allocation. This was based

on the principle of one new settlement, consisting of three different neighbourhoods. From west to east, these were Stratford View, Upper Ockham, and Upton End. The application site formed a distinct part of Upton End, transitioning to Ockham Village. The design concept of this neighbourhood was a transition to the open countryside, having a more rural character than the other neighbourhoods. In addition to the parameter plans for approval, there would be sufficient design control over the site as it moved forward through to delivery, with an approved design principles document and the requirement for a site wide and neighbourhood design code, which were covered by planning conditions recommended at 13 and 14.

For context, the Committee noted the approved parameters for the Taylor Wimpey site. Of particular note was the local centre in the middle and the primary school provision. The local centre would also include the community building. The Committee noted the access and movement parameter plan and the sustainable movement corridor moving through from west to east. The Committee also noted the green and blue infrastructure parameter plan which showed the location of two of the main parks between the neighbourhoods and the SANG that surrounds the development.

The Committee noted that the Grampian condition was a key aspect of the proposal, as this application was only acceptable as part of the wider A35 allocation. It was the Taylor Wimpey scheme that would deliver infrastructure to make the place sustainable. This Grampian condition would not allow any commencement of the Hallam proposal until the delivery of the offsite cycle infrastructure, which would be delivered by Taylor Wimpey. In relation to Grampian conditions, the PPG noted that even a limited or some prospect of the action being performed within the time limit of the permission, then the Grampian condition could be appropriate in principle. Whilst it was acknowledged there was still some uncertainty until the statutory review process is concluded on the Taylor Wimpey permission, that permission is extant and still held significant weight. Given this was the case, it could not be argued that there was no prospect at all of the works required under the Grampian condition coming forward in the relevant time scales.

In conclusion, it was the planning officer's view that less than substantial harm had been identified in relation to a number of heritage assets. Although great weight and considerable importance had been afforded to the heritage harm, it was considered that the public benefits of the housing, both market and affordable, along with the other identified benefits were sufficient to outweigh the identified heritage harm. The application was broadly consistent with the current development plan policies, and it was concluded that the proposal was in

accordance with the development plan when read as a whole. The benefits were considerable and clearly and demonstrably outweighed the harm identified, which includes heritage harm. The recommendation was therefore to approve the application subject to a section 106, securing the heads of terms and conditions which are set out on pages 23 to 44 of the agenda and the updated condition on the late sheets.

Councillor Catherine Young, Ward Councillor for Clandon and Horsley, was invited to speak for five minutes. Councillor Young acknowledged that the site was allocated with presumption in favour of development. However, in her view severe harm would be caused to the gentle and tranquil hamlet of Ockham, which in the planning balance provided sound justification for refusal of the application, given the harm caused to the local road network, the increased risk to highway safety, and the impact on the Conservation Area and the ribbon development of old cottages that make up Ockham. In the 10 years that this site A35 has been looked at, it was never intended that there would be an access point from this site onto Ockham Lane. Indeed, Surrey County Council originally objected to the application and there were no strong reasons as to why they had changed their mind. The access for this site must be through the main site, if allowed, as this new proposal was unsustainable and would severely impact highway safety. There was no doubt that the continued extra flow of construction traffic and the future number of cars from new residents would cause harm by way of vibrations on the foundations of these old houses and roads. Increased congestion would also impact air quality and public health.

Councillor Young observed that Ockham Lane was a narrow, winding, rural country lane with limited traffic capacity and no passing places. Cottages and farms line the road and the rest was flanked by very tall, mature hedgerows, making sight lines for oncoming traffic tricky at best. There may as yet have been no fatalities but that was because locals take extreme care. The highway proposals therefore did not meet the tests of the NPPF, Chapter Nine at paragraph 115, nor did they satisfy the requirements of Guildford's policies, A35, ID3 and D1.

Councillor Young suggested that harm to the local character must be seen as a second substantive reason for refusal. This development of 70 homes would permanently change the little hamlet beyond recognition. Why was this piece of valuable farmland accepted into the local plan? It provides such an important buffer between the Taylor Wimpey new town development planned for the Wisley airfield and the tiny hamlet of Ockham. This area is extremely rural and is the setting and gateway to Ockham, tucked away amongst green fields and farmland. Notably, Historic England still raised issues of harm to the conservation

area at page 66-71 of your report, recommending a further reduction of dwellings and increased buffer zones. The conservation officer also raised significant concerns on page 74 at point 100, noting the harmful impact of a strong and suburban like development. It was in breach therefore of policy D1 place shaping as it does not reflect or respond to the distinct local character or respond to the local pattern of development and the landscape setting. None of the policies in D4 listed on page 127 were adhered to giving further cause of concern.

Councillor Young made the final point that there will be a harmful impact on the local landscape setting. Policy A35, criteria 24, required sensitive design at site boundaries that had significant regard to the transition from village to green field. This was explained on page 126. All those consulted recommend a wider buffer zone along Ockham Lane. This had not been delivered by the applicant despite several plan amendments, and it was too important to leave to reserved matters. The NPPF paragraph 180 states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognizing the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. This application failed to do that. It therefore failed to deliver the principles of policy A35. Councillor Young concluded that the harms that she had identified during her comments, as well as all the objections submitted from and spoken about by local residents, provide strong reasons for refusal.

The Committee discussed the application and noted concerns raised that the application was premature given that the judicial review was still to be heard. However, in response to a suggestion that the application should be deferred until after the end of the statutory review, concerns were expressed that the applicant would likely lodge an appeal against non-determination, and there may be a risk of associated costs being awarded.

The senior planning officer, Hannah Yates was commended by members for providing an exceptionally comprehensive report.

The Committee noted views that the positive aspects of the proposal were that 40 % of the proposed houses were affordable, which was considerably more than normal. Also, the mix of housing was that at least 75 % of the houses would be three bedroomed or less. The Committee noted that the report also drew on the conclusions of the Inspector's decision on the Taylor Wimpey proposal with regards to air quality and ecology, including the effects on the SANG and TBHSPA, as well as the potential damage to heritage assets. However, this was in relation to the Taylor Wimpey site and, although very limited or less than substantial harm to several of the features in the locality were identified and the Conservation Area itself, they were considerably further away from the Taylor

Wimpey site than they were from this site. The Committee noted concerns that these conclusions related to the adjacent site and they should form their own assessment of the application impacts on these elements for the application currently under consideration.

The Committee noted comments that the conclusions from Historic England were important, as they indicated that the harm to the Conservation Area had not been minimised by this proposal and therefore was in breach of National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 195, and questioned whether the impacts were both justified and outweighed by public benefit, which would therefore put it in breach of paragraphs 200 and 202 of the NPPF. The Council's Conservation Officer had made a recommendation to lessen the impact of the proposed scheme by removing a number of dwellings along the southern boundary to the site. Then the amended proposals, whilst adjusting the layout of dwellings across the site, with a very slightly enlarged buffer, did not appear to address the concerns raised by Historic England, with even more dwellings proposed along the southern road. The Committee noted comments made that Historic England had therefore maintained their concerns about the impact of the proposals on the Conservation Area and continued to recommend a meaningful reduction in dwellings along the southern boundary road of the site so that deep planting along Ockham Lane can effectively screen houses to the north. It would therefore have a harmful effect on the significance of the area.

The Committee noted comments that the proposal was located in an allocated site of the local plan. The statutory consultees final responses from County Highways, Natural England and the Flood Authority did not provide a sufficient basis for the Committee to refuse the application. If the application went to appeal for example, it was considered that the balance of harm against need would be difficult to prove.

The Committee noted further comments that this site was the least sustainable one in the local plan A35 allocation. Given it was the last site to be submitted should we therefore hold it to a higher standard. In terms of weighing the harms and benefits, this part of the site is the buffer and did not provide a gentle transition to an increased density as anticipated on the Taylor Wimpey site and appeared to be an extension of it. Concern was again expressed at how the County Highway Authority had removed their original objection to the access now proposed onto Ockham Lane by this application. When the site was adopted by the Local Plan it was never envisaged that there would be access onto Ockham Lane. Whilst this was not part of the proposal, concern was also expressed if an access to the main site was put in at a later date therefore creating a rat run onto Ockham Lane. The application could not be supported on that basis.

The Committee noted comments that the original view of Surrey County Council as Highway Authority was that the road system, particularly Ockham Lane and its immediate roads running into it, could not be cost effectively developed sufficiently to make it sustainable in transport terms, which was a really critical consideration. Nevertheless, support was offered for the proposal.

The Principal Planning Officer Hannah Yates was invited to comment on what had been said so far by the Planning Committee. The Committee noted that in relation to points made about the access point onto Ockham Lane, the Strategic Planning Development Framework stated that minor access points from Ockham Lane may be permissible where they served a limited number of dwellings to be agreed with Surrey County Council and where there is no onward vehicle connection to the wider site. There was also a condition included that ensured there would be no through route between the site and the wider A35 site. A further point raised by the Committee was about the proposal being contrary to D3 and the heritage harm caused. It was important to reiterate that this did need to be weighed against the public benefits when considering heritage harm. With regard to traffic modelling, the applicant had submitted a transport assessment as part of the application which included traffic modelling. The Taylor Wimpey scheme did model the entire allocation, which included the 2000 dwellings, and this was considered to be acceptable by both National Highways and the County Council in terms of impact on strategic and local road network.

The Joint Assistant Director for Planning, Claire Upton-Brown also stated that any comments about whether development should or should not happen here and whether or not the A35 site was sustainable, had all been rehearsed through the plan making process. The Planning Committee could not therefore revisit the principle of development on this site. The SPD enabled an access point on Ockham Lane and there was no technical support for there being a highway safety issue with the access as proposed. If members were minded to move towards a refusal, they should therefore consider that in the full knowledge that there was no technical support for that from a highway safety point of view. In relation to the judicial review process, this was not a decision around whether or not the right decision was made at appeal, it was about whether procedurally the right process was followed. If a judicial review was successful, then the decision would revert to the Secretary of State and the appeal would be re-run.

The Legal Advisor, Angela Watson, commented that there was a statutory challenge against the Inspector's approval of the Taylor Wimpey application currently lodged with the court and listed for a hearing. However, it was important to emphasise to members that there was currently an extant planning

approval on the major proportion of the site and that carried weight as a material consideration in members' determination of this application. She also observed that the extant permission for the Taylor Wimpey site had been granted following a lengthy and detailed public inquiry before an experienced Inspector. She stated that a lot of points in objection that had been raised before the Committee were not linked to the grounds of challenge against the Taylor Wimpey approval. The Committee had to decide the planning merits of this application, whereas the issues before the Court were not matters of planning merits, but rather issues around the legality of the Inspector's decision.

It was apparent that some Committee members did not support the officer's recommendation to approve the application. The Chairperson, Councillor Williams, therefore asked if any Committee member wished to propose a motion contrary to the officer's recommendation.

Councillor Pat Oven indicated that he wished to propose a motion to refuse the application and suggested the following reasons for refusal: By virtue of its effect on the Conservation Area adjacent, the proposal would fail to meet paragraph 195 of the NPPF, in that harm to the Conservation Area was not minimised, and that there was insufficient public benefit to meet paragraphs 200 and 202 of the NPPF. By virtue of that effect as outlined by various experts (being the Historic England representative, the Council's Conservation Officer and the GBC consultant on landscape) the effect on the area was such that D14 would not be met. The development would not reflect the distinctive local character, would not respond to and reinforce the distinct local pattern of development, including landscape setting, and would also be in breach of paragraph D4 of the local plan development management policies which required development to achieve high quality design and respect local distinctiveness. Developments were required to be sympathetic to local character and history and establish or maintain a strong sense of place and that policy D4 was not accordingly met.

The reasons for refusal were discussed at length between Councillor Oven and the Joint Assistant Director for Planning, Claire Upton-Brown.

A member of the public approached Councillor Oven during the discussion taking place regarding the reasons being put forward for refusal. The Legal Advisor, Angela Watson, asked Councillor Oven to confirm what had been said to him, for transparency reasons, so that a view could be taken as to whether what was said was relevant or irrelevant and whether it may have affected Councillor Oven's views. Councillor Oven said that he had no idea of being approached until he was touched on his left shoulder. At no point did Councillor Oven speak to the member of public, it was not a conversation just a monologue. Councillor Oven

stated that the member of the public had said to him 'If you want to go on Highways grounds Pat, we will back you.' Councillor Oven confirmed that he was not going to use highways grounds as one of his reasons for refusal and therefore what was said had no bearing on his motion. The Legal Advisor, Angela Watson, explained that in light of Councillor Oven's explanation, and if the remaining committee members were satisfied with that, Councillor Oven's proposed motion to refuse could stand and the committee could continue to discuss the reasons for refusal being put forward.

The Chairperson, Councillor Williams advised that given Councillor Stephen Hives had left the meeting he therefore could not participate in the vote.

The Chairperson, Councillor Williams asked for a seconder of the motion to refuse the application. Councillor Joss Bigmore seconded the motion to refuse.

For clarification, the Joint Assistant Director for Planning, Claire Upton-Brown read back to the Committee the reason for refusal being put forward which was: 'That the proposed development would neither preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area and would have less than substantial harm on the heritage assets, which was not outweighed by the public benefit and would be contrary to the relevant policies.'

A vote was then taken on the proposed reason for refusal, by a show of hands:

In favour of the reason for refusal: For: 4; Against: 5; Abstain: 1. (1 councillor did not vote). The vote on the reason for refusal was therefore lost.

The committee considered whether any further reasons for refusal could be advanced to support Councillor Oven's motion to refuse the application, however none were forthcoming. Officers therefore advised that the motion to refuse could not be progressed and Councillor Oven was asked if he wished to withdraw his motion. He reluctantly did so and no dissent to that withdrawal was signified by the meeting.

Councillor David Bilbé requested a deferral of the application as he felt that the reasons for refusal could not be constructed in Committee. The Chairperson, Councillor Williams confirmed that Councillor David Bilbé would need to provide a reason for deferral which he did not pursue.

The Chairperson, Councillor Williams therefore moved the officer's recommendation to approve application 23/P/00417 subject to a S106 and Councillor James Jones seconded that motion which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
		FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Patrick Oven		X	
2	James Jones	X		
3	Cait Taylor	X		
4	Howard Smith	X		
5	Yves de Contades	X		
6	Joanne Shaw	X		
7	Maddy Redpath		X	
8	Dominique Williams	X		
9	Richard Mills		X	
10	Joss Bigmore		X	
11	David Bilbé			X
	TOTALS	6	4	1

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

RESOLVED to approve application 23/P/00417 subject to the updated condition no.27 as detailed in the supplementary late sheets, and to the following:

- (i) That delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director of Planning to grant permission and make minor amendments to the wording of conditions subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to secure:

- Provision of a contribution towards Local Highway Network Safety and Resilience Improvements
- Provision of a contribution towards Access for All Improvements at Horsley and Effingham Junction Stations
- Provision of a Car Club
- Provision of E Bike hire
- Provision of SANG and its management and maintenance in perpetuity
- Contributions towards SAMM and the SAMM+ package
- The provision of 40% affordable housing – inclusive of first homes
- Provision of a contribution for early years, primary and secondary education facilities
- Provision of a contribution to a health facility
- Provision and maintenance of all open space typologies
- Management of BNG for 30 years
- Provision of a contribution towards the Local Centre
- Details on stewardship

(ii) That upon completion of the above, the application be determined by the Joint Assistant Director of Planning. The recommendation is to approve planning permission subject to conditions.

PL6 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee discussed and noted the appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 9.40 pm

Signed

Date

Chairman

Planning Committee

6 November 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/00139 (Page 21) – 176 Epsom Road, Guildford, GU1 2RR

One additional letter of representation has been received raising the following concerns

The proposal would result in increased traffic into an area which is already busy with roads in close proximity to application site

The proposal would result in an increase in noise and disturbance to the occupiers of the adjacent neighbouring properties from the additional residential units.

Trees need to be protected and not felled.

Officer comment – The concerns have been addressed in the report.

24/P/00563 (Page 41) - Land west of Blackwell Farm, Hogs Back, Guildford, GU3

7.0 Consultations:

External consultees

(page 71)

7.6 Surrey Hills AONB Planning Adviser (on behalf of the Surrey Hills National Landscape Board): additional comments and have raised the following new matters:

- LPA should be satisfied the development would seek to further the statutory purposes of the SHNL, under Section 245 (Protected Landscapes) of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act (LURA) 2023

[Officer comment: none of the application is in the SHNL however is in a candidate area see para. 11.3.30-37]

- Weight to the Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan and its policies
[Officer comment: this is a material consideration, see para. 8.11 and policy P6 is referenced in these late sheets]
- Weight to 'public disbenefits'
[Officer comment: see para. 11.2.40-41, 11.3.28, 11.4.29, 11.5.15-17, 11.14.1-2 and Appendix 1]

Parish councils

(page 75)

7.26 Worplesdon Parish Council: additional objection and have raised the following matters:

- defer a decision until Surrey Hills National Landscape boundary review has "reached its natural conclusion".

[Officer comment: The second round of consultation expires on 10.12.2024 this is limited to additions and deletions to the proposed extension areas for the SHNL. There are a number of statutory steps for NE to carry out before the amendment Order is confirmed by the Secretary of State (SoS), who has discretion to call a Public Inquiry, before deciding whether or not to confirm the Order. There is no published timescale for this process and neither Natural England or the SoS have requested planning applications are deferred until confirmation occurs. The most relevant material consideration is in the Written Ministerial Statement of 30.07.2024 from the Deputy Prime Minister which increases the weight that planning policy gives to benefits associated with renewable energy generation see para 11.1.7]

Amenity groups

(page 75-78)

7.28 Save Surrey Countryside: additional objection and have raised the following new matters:

- Limited BNG benefits

[Officer comment: see para 11.6.48-54, in excess of the policy requirement for 20% would be delivered and Surrey Wildlife Trust are satisfied]

- Retained agricultural use

[Officer comment: the grazing of sheep would constitute 'agriculture' as defined by Section 336 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990]

- Change to previously developed land

[Officer comment: see conditions 2 – temporary development, 32 (now 33) – decommissioning scheme and 33 (now 34) – soil management plan. The three fields do not meet the current definition of 'previously developed land' in Annex 2: Glossary of the NPPF and this is for a temporary use followed by decommissioning, any other development would require planning permission in its own right]

7.40 Surrey Chambers of Commerce: in support and have raised the following matters:

- Energy security
- Financial security
- Importance to Guildford's economy
- Supports internationally renowned research
- Very special circumstances demonstrated
- Facilities decarbonisation and net zero strategy

Third party comments

(page 78-80)

One additional objection and have raised the following new matters:

- Alternative proposal preferred – remove Little Misley from proposals, PV panels at Onslow park and ride, route of access track

[Officer comment: all the alternatives have been assessed at section 11.10, the identified planning harms have been identified and an overall balancing exercise has been carried out at section 11.14; this park and ride is owned by Surrey County Council; see para. 11.5.43-46 and the applicant's Transport Statement for justification for the route proposed]

**24/P/00563 (Page 145) – Surrey County Constabulary Police Headquarters
Mount Browne, Sandy Lane, Guildford, GU3 1HG**

2.0. *Additional letters of representation*

2.1. 27 additional letters of representation have been received since the agenda was published raising the following objections and concerns:

- Highway safety concerns.
- Response times will be higher which makes it more dangerous to people within the community [*Officer note: a key purpose of the proposed access road would be to improve response times by up to two minutes*].
- Consultation on applications not adequate [*Officer note: The Local Planning Authority consider that consultation on both 24/P/00563 and 24/P/00564 has been undertaken in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement*].
- Holding objection as insufficient time to consider

2.2. The Officer considers that these concerns have been addressed within the report.

**24/P/00564 (Page 199) – Surrey County Constabulary Police Headquarters
Mount Browne, Sandy Lane, Guildford, GU3 1HG**

24/P/00564:

1.0. *Additional letters of representation*

1.1. 31 additional letters of representation have been received since the agenda was published raising the following objections and concerns:

- Highway safety concerns
- Proposed flats at the Old Law College will add significant road usage.
- Time taken around Guildford one way will increase.
- Health and wellbeing impact from 24/7 sirens.
- Damage to Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- Noise pollution.
- Speed of Portsmouth Road cannot be greater than 30mph due to blind junctions.

- Response times will be higher which makes it more dangerous to people within the community [*Officer note: a key purpose of the proposed access road would be to improve response times by up to two minutes*].
- Consultation on applications not adequate [*Officer note: The Local Planning Authority consider that consultation on both 24/P/00563 and 24/P/00564 has been undertaken in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement*].
- Holding objection as insufficient time to consider
- Relocation of emergency response to Mount Browne has not been included within the description of development [*Officer note: the Police Station within Guildford Town Centre could be closed anytime and relocated to Mount Browne without planning permission*].
- Emergency Response base is inappropriate adjacent to Conservation Area and within Surrey Hills National Landscape and Green Belt.
- Not appropriate in St Catherine's Village heritage of ancient Pilgrims Way at its crossing point of River Wey and St Catherine's Chapel, ancient monument.

1.2. The Officer considers that these concerns have been addressed within the report.

1.3. It should be noted that an objection was received from the Artington Parish Council, which was only recorded on application 24/P/00563. It has been brought to the LPA's attention that this letter and the contents should apply to application 24/P/00564 also. Accordingly, paragraph 6.4 of 24/P/00563 shall also apply to 24/P/00564.

24/P/00855 (Page 323) – 88 Linden Way, Ripley, Woking, GU23 6LP

A representation has been received setting out the following concerns:

- neighbour's were not informed of the changes to the plans (Officer note: Amended plans were submitted showing a reduction to the proposed works. Therefore, it was not considered necessary to re-consult)

- the neighbour's front porch and rear extension have not been accurately represented on the submitted plans. (Officer note: A site visit to both the application property and neighbouring property has been carried out – an accurate assessment of the proposal has been made on this basis).
- additional water run-off should be dealt with within the application site (Officer note: Any downpipes/guttering should be contained wholly within the application site)
- application description is misleading (Officer note: Following the receipt of amended plans, the application description has been changed to accurately reflect the alterations)
- comment regarding ownership of the application property (Officer note: Officers are satisfied that the correct Certificate of ownership has been completed)
- concerns regarding parking (Officer note: This has been addressed in the officer's report)