

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

\* Councillor Fiona White (Chairman)

* Councillor Jon Askew	* Councillor Jan Harwood
* Councillor Christopher Barrass	* Councillor Liz Hogger
* Councillor David Bilbé	* Councillor Marsha Moseley
* Councillor Chris Blow	Councillor Susan Parker
* Councillor Ruth Brothwell	* Councillor Maddy Redpath
Councillor Colin Cross	* Councillor Caroline Reeves
* Councillor Angela Gunning	* Councillor Paul Spooner

\*Present

Councillors Diana Jones, Susan Parker (not attending in a committee member capacity), Jo Randall, John Redpath, Deborah Seabrook and Catherine Young were also in attendance.

### **PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Colin Cross and Susan Parker for whom Councillors Tony Rooth and Ramsey Nagaty attended as substitutes respectively.

### **PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

No disclosures of interest were declared.

### **PL3 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 February 2020 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

### **PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman reported that site visits had been requested by Councillors Catherine Young and Chris Blow for application 19/P/01913 – Drift Barn, The Drift, East Horsley, KT24 6NU, Councillor Tony Rooth for application 19/P/01980 – Land off Westwood Lane, Wanborough, Guildford and Councillor Diana Jones for application 20/P/00309 – King's Yard, Burrows Lane, Shere, Guildford, GU5 9QE.

Owing to the Covid-19 pandemic the committee was unable to go on any site visits until the lockdown was lifted, which may mean a deferral of those applications for an indeterminate period, leading ultimately to a possible non-determination appeal. Any such requests would therefore be put to the vote at the meeting.

The Committee noted the procedures for determining planning applications.

**PL5      20/P/00042 - LIVERY COTTAGE, HORSHAM ROAD, HOLMBURY ST MARY,  
DORKING, RH5 6NH**

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

- Ms Rosie Williams (objected);
- Mr Stephen Openshaw (objected);
- Mr Jason Clemons (Heritage Planning Savills) (in support on behalf of the Applicant) [3-minute speech read out by the Democratic Services Officer] and;
- Mr Gary Povey (in support)

The Chairman permitted Councillor Diana Jones to speak in her capacity as ward councillor in relation to this application.

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for creation of a new dwellinghouse following conversion of a 3.5m section of existing garden wall along the boundary between Livery Cottage and the highway pavement to create a parking platform 12 metres wide by 6 metres depth which will facilitate the parking for Felday Chapel.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application site was located in Holmbury St Mary lying within the conservation area. The former chapel on the site had been converted into ancillary accommodation to be used in connection with Livery Cottage and was granted planning permission in 2015. This application was comprised of two elements, the change of use of the converted ancillary Chapel to an independent residential unit and the creation of a parking area. The parking area would be located within the residential curtilage of Livery Cottage but used to provide parking solely for the residents of Felday Chapel and accessed directly from Horsham Road. The immediate surroundings were of historic and conservation importance with Livery Cottage flanked by Grade II listed buildings.

This application followed a proposal for a similar development refused in 2018 which raised concern over the quality and amount of space and found that the bedroom was not in accordance with the requirements of the National Space Standards. Therefore, to overcome the previous reasons for refusal internal works were proposed to increase the size of the bedroom. Subject to the extension of the mezzanine level the bedroom accommodation would be compliant.

The proposed parking area would require the demolition of a 3.5-metre-wide section of the stone boundary wall and was an important feature of the Conservation Area that ran along the Horsham Road. The fence would be made up of trellis panels, 1.2 metres in height and the vehicles parked would therefore become readily visible from the streetscene and surrounding views. In order to construct the parking area of the scale proposed would require significant engineering works and land raising that would impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal was therefore in the planning officers view to be contrary to both local and national planning policy and recommended for refusal.

The Committee considered views raised that the proposed dwelling would not result in any loss of light or privacy to neighbouring properties. The Committee also noted that Highways had not objected to the scheme and that there were places along Horsham Road which were narrow with cars parked on the road and blocking the pavement. The parking proposed was onsite and for the use of the residents of Felday Chapel. In addition, twenty-two letters of support had been submitted for the proposed scheme.

The Committee also considered concerns raised that the scheme proposed would have a clear impact upon the Conservation Area and the proposed removal of the stone wall would have a

significant and detrimental effect upon the streetscene. The construction of the parking platform would obscure views of the Grade II listed building nearby and green space in front of Hilda Cottage and the neighbouring amenities would be affected by vehicles manoeuvring at bedroom height.

The Committee wanted clarification that the purpose of the creation of the additional parking was to enable Felday Chapel to become a separate dwelling as well as whether the stone wall was a designated heritage asset or whether it just fell within a designated heritage area.

The planning officer confirmed that in terms of parking, adequate parking had to be provided in order for the Chapel to become an independent dwelling. Planning officers had not had a proposal put before them whereby they have had to assess the conversion of the chapel to an individual dwelling in its own right. Planning officers had not been able to look at whether there were any alternatives to parking before. The heritage status of the wall and its significance was associated with the fact it was located within the Conservation Area and mentioned in the Conservation Area Appraisal and was therefore an important part of the local character of the area.

The Committee considered the proposal and on balance agreed that the proposed creation of a new dwellinghouse and conversion of garden wall along with parking platform would result in a significant engineering operation which would fail to preserve the openness of the Green Belt. It would also result in a detrimental effect on the setting, appearance and character of the Conservation Area and less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset and setting.

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

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 20/P/00042 for the reasons as detailed in the report.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jon Askew	X	-	-
2	Christopher Barrass		X	
3	David Bilbé	X		
4	Chris Blow		X	
5	Ruth Brothwell	X		
6	Angela Gunning	X		
7	Jan Harwood	X		
8	Liz Hogger	X		
9	Marsha Moseley	X		
10	Ramsey Nagaty (Sub) for Cllr Susan Parker	X		
11	Maddy Redpath	X		
12	Caroline Reeves	X		
13	Tony Rooth (Sub) for Cllr Colin Cross	X		
14	Paul Spooner	X		
15	Fiona White	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>

**PL6      20/P/00045 - 9 GREENSIDE CLOSE, GUILDFORD, GU4 7EU**

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

- Mrs Margaret O'Brien (objected);
- Mr Graham Langley (objected) [3-minute speech read out by the Democratic Services Officer];
- Mr Slava Rapoport (Applicant in support) and;
- Ms Teresa Rapoport (in support)

The Chairman permitted Councillor Deborah Seabrook to speak in her capacity as ward councillor in relation to this application.

The Committee considered the above-mentioned for proposed raising the overall roof height by one metre to facilitate a loft conversion to habitable accommodation with installation of two pitched roof dormers to the rear elevation and two rooflights to the front elevation.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application site was located within the urban area of Guildford. The property was a detached two storey dwelling set in relatively small plots. The ridge height would be approximately 1.5 metres. Two modest roof lights were proposed to the front elevation and the proposed rear dormer windows would be set down from the new ridge line and set in from the sides and would be proportionate to the scale of the roof and sympathetic to the style of the existing house. Owing to the arrangement and design of the neighbouring dwellings in particular the different roof orientations and the prevailing ground slope the raising of the ridge height would avoid any sense of a loss of uniformity. The proposal was not considered to have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing property or the character of the surrounding area. The proposed ridge line and increase in dormer windows would be set at a high level and would not result in any significant loss of light or overbearing impact on neighbouring properties.

The planning officer noted that concerns had been raised in terms of overlooking arising from the proposed rear dormer windows and that whilst the concerns were understood it was considered that some level of mutual overlooking of residential gardens was likely to occur in dense urban environments. In this instance there was already mutual overlooking from the upper floor rear windows into rear gardens and the addition of two dormer windows in the roof would not result in any significant materially harmful impact on privacy and as such would not warrant refusal.

The Committee considered the application and concerns raised with regard to the potential for loss of privacy created by the additional storey which by virtue of its increased height would increase visibility into neighbouring gardens as well as reduce access to sunlight and daylight. The Committee also considered whether it would be possible to obscure both of the rear windows. The planning officer confirmed that this had been looked at and had concluded that they did not feel that obscure glazing both windows was necessary to make the application acceptable.

The Committee considered that the proposal was not out of character with the surrounding area and the roofline was consistent with its neighbouring dwellings. The Committee accepted on balance that in an urban environment such as this there would always be a degree of overlooking and that the proposal would not affect the amenities of neighbouring properties adversely.

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

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/00045 subject to the reasons and conditions as detailed in the report.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jon Askew	X	-	-
2	Christopher Barrass		X	
3	David Bilbé	X		
4	Chris Blow		X	
5	Ruth Brothwell	X		
6	Angela Gunning	X		
7	Jan Harwood	X		
8	Liz Hogger	X		
9	Marsha Moseley	X		
10	Ramsey Nagaty (Sub) for Cllr Susan Parker			X
11	Maddy Redpath	X		
12	Caroline Reeves	X		
13	Tony Rooth (Sub) for Cllr Colin Cross	X		
14	Paul Spooner	X		
15	Fiona White			
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

**PL7 20/P/00309 - KINGS YARD, BURROWS LANE, SHERE, GUILDFORD, GU5 9QE**

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

- Ms Katie Westbrook (objected) and;
- Mr Luke Margetts (Applicant in support)

The Chairman permitted Councillor Diana Jones to speak in her capacity as ward councillor in relation to this application.

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for variation of condition 3 and 16 of application 06/P/00548 approved 25/04/06 to improve landscaping and alter window treatments, including insertion of 6 rooflights to Unit 3. (Amended description 30 April 2020).

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the site had a long and complex planning history, the details of which were outlined in the report. The changes proposed to the landscaping scheme were modest, for example a previously proposed laurel hedge had been replaced with a native hedge as well as proposing to plant more native species. A change was also sought in the implementation of the landscaping scheme.

The window treatments had been altered in size and positioning, including reductions in the width and height of some of the windows in order to meet fire regulations and improve insulation, to meet the bracing requirements to the steel frames and to improve natural light.

Six rooflights were proposed to the roof of the front projection to Block 3, to give better ventilation and to improve natural light levels. Two small additional windows were also proposed to the rear elevation of Block 3 to improve natural light levels.

The Committee noted that it was the planning officer's view that the changes proposed were overall minor and would not have a greater impact than the existing approved development. The changes proposed were only alterations to the landscaping and windows and the principle of the development had already been established. The changes would not have any greater impact on the character of the area, the openness of the Green Belt or the landscape character.

The Committee considered concerns raised regarding the cumulative effect of the proposed development that had incrementally increased since 2005. The original proposal had permitted 23 windows in the roof and 41 windows above ground when previously there were none. Concern was also raised in relation to the proposal contravening the Surrey Hills and Dark Skies policy which could be affected by the additional six rooflights.

The Committee discussed the merits of undertaking a site visit. The Committee considered whether a site visit would be beneficial to observe and appreciate the incremental effect of the development increasing over time. The Committee were also concerned about the narrow country lane the site was located off and the number of workers travelling to and from the site. The Committee also considered that the scheme was only for some additional skylights, windows and landscaping changes and the merits of the site visit were not accepted overall given the existing development had already been approved.

A motion was moved and seconded so that a site visit could be carried out which failed.

RECORDED VOTE LIST			
COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
Jon Askew		X	
Christopher Barrass	X		
David Bilbé		X	
Chris Blow		X	
Ruth Brothwell		X	
Angela Gunning			
Jan Harwood		X	
Liz Hogger		X	
Marsha Moseley		X	
Ramsey Nagaty (Sub) for Cllr Susan Parker	X		
Maddy Redpath	X		
Caroline Reeves		X	
Tony Rooth (Sub) for Cllr Colin Cross		X	
Paul Spooner		X	
Fiona White			
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>

The Committee continued to note the concerns raised in relation to the incremental nature of the development, increased traffic on a narrow road, the increased number of windows causing light pollution and its overall effects upon the surrounding area. The Planning Officer confirmed

that there was no planning policy in place which stipulated a maximum number of windows or restrict the number of windows permitted. The implication was that additional windows would in turn increase the number of staff using the site. Parking standards were generally worked out in spaces per square metre and it would be difficult to argue that six rooflights would increase the number of people who could potentially be employed onsite to such a degree that it would render the parking for the development previously found to be acceptable, now to be found unacceptable. In terms of the AONB Management Plan, the Committee would need to demonstrate how the rooflights would have such a significant impact, such as light pollution on its surrounding environment, over and above those windows already approved, that they should be refused.

The Committee considered whether a condition could be applied whereby blackout blinds were attached to the rooflights. The Planning Officer confirmed that blinds were not possible as it had to be part of the building, not part of its internal fixtures and fittings. The Committee also noted that the hours of use restriction would mean that the building would not be in use during night-time hours.

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

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/00309 subject to the reasons and conditions as detailed in the report.

RECORDED VOTE LIST			
COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
Jon Askew	X		
Christopher Barrass		X	
David Bilbé	X		
Chris Blow		X	
Ruth Brothwell	X		
Angela Gunning	X		
Jan Harwood	X		
Liz Hogger	X		
Marsha Moseley	X		
Ramsey Nagaty (Sub) for Cllr Susan Parker		X	
Maddy Redpath		X	
Caroline Reeves	X		
Tony Rooth (Sub) for Cllr Colin Cross	X		
Paul Spooner	X		
Fiona White			
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>

**PL8 20/P/00176 - PIT FARM TENNIS CLUB, HILLIER ROAD, GUILDFORD**

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

- Mr I Sugunasingha (objected);
- Mr William Marsh (objected);
- Ms Gillian Blackburn (Chair of Pit Farm Tennis Club and local resident in support) and;
- Mr Peter Childs (in support) [The Democratic Services Officer read out Mr Child's 3-minute speech].

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of floodlighting to court 1.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application site was located on the north eastern side of Hillier Road and was in the urban area of Guildford. The tennis courts had existed for over one hundred years in this location and was in a protected open space. Residential properties were located on all boundaries. Courts 3, 4 and 5 already benefitted from floodlights and had controlled hours of operation. Similarly, any new floodlighting to Court 1 would be controlled hours of use in line with the adjacent courts. The six floodlights proposed for Court 1 would be set back by a substantial distance of 22 metres and set in from the boundary so to avoid any undue impact on the neighbouring property to the west. The front elevations of the tennis club demonstrated that the proposed floodlights would be lower than the roof of the clubhouse. The immediate residential neighbour's garden would be located 1.5 metres from Court 1.

The Planning Development Manager wished to clarify that conditions 3 and 4 had been applied to ensure residential amenities were protected by restricting hours of use and applying shields / screens as well their maintenance for the lifetime of the installation.

The Committee discussed the application and considered whether it would be possible to review the operation of the floodlights in 18 months-time or give a temporary permission in light of residential concerns regarding the effect upon their amenities. The Committee noted that the floodlights were permitted to be in operation until 21:00 hours Monday to Friday. However, the Committee also recognised that this was consistent with the fact that the existing floodlights onsite operated until this time already and was located below the roofline of the clubhouse. The Committee were also concerned regarding the new technology employed in these floodlights which would make them brighter than what currently existed and therefore affect neighbouring amenities. The Senior Lawyer advised that the six floodlights were required for operational development and associated costs in terms of installing them were likely to be considerable. The policy framework was therefore against the imposition of a trial period in these circumstances. The Committee was also advised by the Planning Development Manager that if the applicant breached the conditions attached to this development then planning enforcement would investigate upon receipt of a complaint.

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

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/00176 subject to the reasons and conditions as detailed in the report.

RECORDED VOTE LIST			
COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
Jon Askew	X		
Christopher Barrass		X	
David Bilbé	X		
Chris Blow	X		
Ruth Brothwell	X		
Angela Gunning	X		
Jan Harwood	X		
Liz Hogger	X		
Marsha Moseley	X		
Ramsey Nagaty (Sub) for Cllr Susan Parker			X
Maddy Redpath			X
Caroline Reeves	X		
Tony Rooth (Sub) for Cllr Colin Cross	X		
Paul Spooner	X		
Fiona White			
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>

**PL9 19/P/01913 - DRIFT BARN, THE DRIFT, EAST HORSLEY, KT24 6NU**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for change of use of the existing vacant building to provide a 4-bedroom dwelling and creation of cycle store.

The Chairman permitted Councillor Catherine Young to speak in her capacity as ward councillor in relation to the application.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the original building was permitted in 1974 as a storage unit for the gold club. The footprint of the existing building would remain unchanged and was approx. 60 metres from the application building. There were two Grade II listed buildings in the immediate area. The Conservation Team had been consulted and concluded that the amendments to the fenestration, existing external facing and hardstanding would not result in unacceptable harm to the area given that the building already existed. The vegetation acted as a buffer between the host site and the two heritage assets. The building would not increase in size and would be timber clad with grey window frames. A condition was proposed which required the details and samples of the materials to be used.

The Committee discussed the application and noted concerns raised that the proposed change of use of the building was not in keeping with the established character of East Horsley. The new structure proposed to use the existing steel frame would constrain its overall design and was out of keeping with the traditional local materials of chalk and flint which was used on the Grade II listed cottages. The Committee also considered concerns raised that the development would be clearly visible from the Drift Golf Club which was just twelve metres away and detrimental to the local street scene. The proposed property did not represent the scale, height and materials used in the surrounding environment and would have a negative impact on the setting of the Grade II listed buildings.

The Committee debated the merits of a site visit so to able to consider the proposed application in the context of the points raised above, its effect upon the village setting ancient woodland and the Green Belt which could not be achieved by looking at additional photographs alone.

The Committee wished to confirm when it was likely they would be permitted to undertake site visits in person. The Planning Development Manager stated that there was nothing to stop councillors from undertaking site visits alone. However, the Council was not in a position to undertake site visits currently owing to Covid-19 and the associated restrictions in place. It was anticipated it could be approx. 6-8 weeks before we could look to arrange these again.

A motion was moved and seconded so that a site visit could be carried out which failed.

RECORDED VOTE LIST			
COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
Jon Askew		X	
Christopher Barrass	X		
David Bilbé		X	
Chris Blow	X		
Ruth Brothwell		X	
Angela Gunning		X	
Jan Harwood		X	
Liz Hogger		X	
Marsha Moseley		X	
Ramsey Nagaty (Sub) for Cllr Susan Parker	X		
Maddy Redpath	X		
Caroline Reeves		X	
Tony Rooth (Sub) for Cllr Colin Cross		X	
Paul Spooner		X	
Fiona White			
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>

The Committee continued their consideration of the application and concerns raised in relation to the proposed structure that was unsympathetically designed surrounded by ancient woodland, in a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) and 400m – 5km buffer zone of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). The proposed dwelling would overlook two Grade II listed buildings that was out of character with the surrounding area. The Committee noted concerns that the existing structure was ugly and should be torn down and wanted clarification if the materials used on the building such as cladding could be reviewed.

The Committee also recognised that it must determine the change of use application before it and not whether or not the existing building should be demolished. Given the structure already existed it was therefore permissible under the NPPF to convert into a residential dwelling. The wooden cladding and new windows would improve the attractiveness of the existing structure. The Committee considered whether permitted development rights could be removed so that the property could not be extended thereby protecting the conservation area from unnecessary encroachment. The height of the building would also remain the same and therefore not be obtrusive.

The Planning Development Manager confirmed that the applicant was simply applying for a change of use of the building given it was no longer being used by the golf club. Condition 3 detailed the materials and planning officers would get to see samples of the materials prior to their use and could review the use of cladding. The removal of Permitted Development (PD) Rights in relation to extensions and outbuildings would be applied. The Committee was warned that the Council had been challenged previously on removal of (PD) and lost. It was also

clarified that the condition on the original permission for the building did not prevent an application for planning permission for a different use being made. The applicant had followed the correct route and the condition did not prevent them from putting an application in.

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

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

RESOLVED to approve application 19/P/01913 subject to the removal of permitted development rights and:

- (i) That a S106 agreement be entered into to secure:

A SANGs contribution and an Access Management and Monitoring Contribution in accordance with the adopted tariff of the SPA Avoidance Strategy to mitigate against the impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.

- (ii) That upon completion of (i) above, the application be determined by the Planning Development Manager. The preliminary view is that the application should be granted subject to conditions.

RECORDED VOTE LIST			
COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
Jon Askew	X		
Christopher Barrass		X	
David Bilbé	X		
Chris Blow		X	
Ruth Brothwell		X	
Angela Gunning		X	
Jan Harwood	X		
Liz Hogger	X		
Marsha Moseley	X		
Ramsey Nagaty (Sub) for Cllr Susan Parker		X	
Maddy Redpath		X	
Caroline Reeves	X		
Tony Rooth (Sub) for Cllr Colin Cross	X		
Paul Spooner	X		
Fiona White			
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>

**PL10 20/P/00478 - ALDERSHOT ROAD, ALLOTMENT SITE, WOODSIDE ROAD, GUILDFORD**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed change of use of land to provide an extension to the existing Aldershot Road Allotments site to provide 35 new allotment plots (287 Rods), landscaping and associated cycle storage and car parking.

The application had been referred to the Planning Committee as the Council was the applicant and, in the opinion of the Planning Development Manager, the proposal was not 'minor' development.

The Chairman permitted Councillor James Steel to speak in his capacity as ward councillor in relation to this application. [The Democratic Services Officer read out Councillor Steel's three-minute speech on his behalf as he was unable to attend].

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the land in question was currently covered by self-generated woodland which would need to be removed to accommodate the new plots. The woodland on the site was within the Council's ownership. An area had also been proposed for replacement planting to mitigate the impact of the trees and woodland lost from the application site required by the development. The Committee also noted the history of the site which demonstrated that the site now covered in woodland had been previously used as allotment plots back in the 1950's. As the plots had become disused the woodland had reclaimed the land.

The Committee discussed the application and agreed that the creation of the additional allotment plots would encourage and promote healthy living whilst also providing greater biodiversity and encouraging wildlife. The Committee was also concerned regarding the loss of the self-generated woodland and wanted to confirm how well utilised the existing plots were. The Planning Officer confirmed that there was a waiting list for the plots and existing plots were well managed. The Committee was mindful that any removal of the self-generated woodland would be compensated by the replacement planting scheme proposed.

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

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/00478 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

RECORDED VOTE LIST			
COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
Jon Askew	X		
Christopher Barrass	X		
David Bilbé	X		
Chris Blow	X		
Ruth Brothwell	X		
Angela Gunning	X		
Jan Harwood	X		
Liz Hogger	X		
Marsha Moseley	X		
Ramsey Nagaty (Sub) for Cllr Susan Parker	X		
Maddy Redpath	X		
Caroline Reeves	X		
Tony Rooth (Sub) for Cllr Colin Cross	X		
Paul Spooner	X		
Fiona White			
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**PL11 19/P/01980 - LAND OFF, WESTWOOD LANE, WANBOROUGH, GUILDFORD**

The Committee agreed that given the meeting was unlikely to conclude at 10:30pm and in order to give the application a full and comprehensive consideration it was agreed to defer it until the next meeting of the Committee on 17 June 2020.

**PL12 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS**

The Committee deferred noting the appeal decisions until their next meeting on 17 June 2020.

The meeting finished at 10.40 pm

Signed .....

Chairman

Date .....