

PLANNING COMMITTEE

- * Councillor Fiona White (Chairman)
- * Councillor Colin Cross (Vice-Chairman)

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

*Present

Councillors Tim Anderson, Bob McShee, Julia McShane, Ramsey Nagaty, Jo Randall, John Redpath, John Rigg and Catherine Young, were also in attendance.

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

No apologies for absence were received.

PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

19/P/01479 - Rudge Cottage, Perry Hill, Worplesdon, Guildford, GU3 3RE - Councillor Ruth Brothwell declared a non-pecuniary interest in the above application as she is a priest at St. Mary's Church which is the Grade I Listed Heritage Asset located in close proximity to the proposed scheme. Councillor Brothwell confirmed that this would not affect her objectivity in relation to this matter.

PL3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2020 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the procedures for determining planning applications.

PL5 DRAFT HOUSING DELIVERY ACTION PLAN

The Committee received an overview of the Draft Housing Delivery Action Plan 2020 from the Lead Councillor for Climate Change, Jan Harwood. The Action Plan identified actions to increase housing delivery in Guildford Borough and demonstrated how it had continued to deliver the actions required despite Covid-19. The Action Plan is reviewed and updated on an annual basis. Councillor Harwood confirmed that he would release a supplementary statement on this item that would be circulated to all councillors.

**PL6 19/P/01479 - RUDGE COTTAGE, PERRY HILL, WORPLESDON, GUILDFORD, GU3
3RE**

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

- Ms Janet Ashton (to object);
- Ms Maria Cowie (to object) and;
- Mr Colin Kiely (Agent) (in support)

The Chairman permitted ward Councillor Bob McShee and non-ward Councillor Ramsey Nagaty to speak in relation to this application.

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of a new detached house and car port in the garden area of Rudge Cottage.

The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which detailed a summary of three further letters of objection which had been received including officer's comment. The description of the proposal had also omitted reference to the carport which was removed from the proposal following negotiations with the Local Planning Authority during the course of the application. Three policies had also been incorrectly omitted from the planning report, G1(3), H4 and HE10, however, the considerations dealt with by these policies had been clearly assessed under the relevant sections of the committee report namely; impact on heritage assets and impact on neighbouring amenity.

The application site was located in the Green Belt, in the Worplesdon Conservation Area and was located within the 400m to 5km buffer zone of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). The application site was formerly part of the garden of Rudge Cottage. Ground levels rose up gradually from north-west to the south-east towards Lavender Cottage. A Grade I listed Church was located to the north-east of the site. Between Rudge Cottage and Lavender Cottage a new barn had been recently constructed following the demolition of the former Bonsai site, a new dwelling was also under construction to the west and a new dwelling to the south of the new barn had been approved but not yet implemented.

The proposed new dwelling would have a private driveway, a new hedge and the existing Beech tree would be retained. In the planning officer's opinion, the proposed development represented appropriate development within the Green Belt and fell within the exception of limited infilling within a village. It was important to note that an extant permission existed for a dwelling on the site already which was approved in 2017 and had a similar footprint to the proposed dwelling before the committee. The proposal would respect the ridge heights of the adjacent dwellings and was considered a good design. It would comply with the listed space standards, respect the character of the area, have no material impact on the designated heritage assets, would not impact upon trees, have no adverse impact upon neighbouring amenity or have a significant impact upon highways.

The Committee considered concerns raised that note should be taken of the significant objection raised by residents to the proposed scheme. The proposed dwelling would be located only seven metres away from Lavender Cottage when the existing Rudge Cottage was located approx. 30 metres away. Lavender Cottage would be adversely affected by the proximity of the development particularly in terms of the enjoyment of their amenities and lack of privacy and lack of light, contravening the 45-degree angle. In addition, the Committee considered whether the development was appropriate in consideration of its proximity to the Grade I Listed Heritage Asset, St. Mary's Church and related views. Concerns were also raised regarding the effect of the development upon tree roots and whether an ecological survey had been undertaken.

In response to comments made by the public speakers, ward and non-ward councillors, the Applications Team Leader confirmed that officers were content that the scale-drawings were accurate for the purposes of the application and a decision could be made upon that basis. Concern had been raised regarding the retention of trees which would be managed via Conservation Area control. If there was a requirement to remove trees in the future, it would be subject to an approval process dealt with by the Council's tree officer. The extant permission was still a material consideration despite being assessed prior to the new Local Plan being adopted. Paragraph 7 of the NPPF had been referenced and was specifically related to making policies for specific matters and therefore not appropriate to use it in relation to formulating reasons for refusal. In relation to the sites proximity to the TBHSPA, in line with Natural England guidance and the Council's own Avoidance Strategy and policies, new residential development could be accommodated where appropriate mitigation requirements were in place. The extant permission already granted onsite in 2016 was determined as appropriate development at that time and the lack of a 5-year housing supply added weight to that. The Council's Tree Officer had also confirmed that the proposed development would not significantly impact upon the Beech tree to be retained.

The Committee debated the merits of undertaking a site visit which had been requested by ward Councillor Ruth Brothwell. The Committee noted that the concerns were in relation to the number of objections received, accuracy of measurements as well as the size of the proposed property which was 33% larger than the extant application. The Parish Council had also objected in relation to the detrimental effects caused by the scale, bulk and mass of the property as it was 3.6 metres larger in footprint. The proposed property was too close to Lavender Cottage and would impact upon the designated heritage assets.

The Committee also noted that whilst it was sympathetic to the concerns raised, the benefits of a site visit were questioned, given an extant permission already existed onsite and whether the proposed scheme was significantly different to warrant deferral on that basis. The Committee was also advised by the Planning Lawyer that deferral could put the Council at risk of appeal by the applicant for non-determination.

A motion was moved and seconded to undertake a site visit which failed.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jan Harwood		X	
2	Caroline Reeves		X	
3	Maddy Redpath	X		
4	Fiona White		X	
5	Ruth Brothwell	X		
6	Paul Spooner			X
7	Chris Blow	X		
8	David Bilbé		X	
9	Susan Parker	X		
10	Jon Askew		X	
11	Marsha Moseley		X	
12	Christopher Barrass	X		
13	Angela Gunning		X	
14	Colin Cross	X		
15	Liz Hogger		X	
	TOTALS	6	8	1

The Committee discussed the proposed application and the maintained concerns that the proposed development remained bigger than the extant permission. The Committee noted that Historic England had intimated that the proposal would adversely affect the setting of the Grade I listed Heritage Asset, St. Mary's Church. The Applications Team Leader confirmed that the drawings for the proposed development were to scale and was incumbent upon the applicant to build them out as such. Historic England were consulted in relation to this application and made no comment. The planning officer recalled an email that had been sent from Historic England which had referenced this application as being the closest to the heritage asset, amongst other applications, and therefore would have the most impact, however was not necessarily judged as so harmful to warrant commenting on the application.

The Committee considered on balance that the changes that had been made between the extant permission and current proposal were not sufficiently harmful. The new proposal was in fact further away from the boundary and the rear elevation would not harm the setting the of the Grade I listed church and was in fact preferable to the extant permission.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	David Bilbé	X		
2	Chris Blow		X	
3	Jon Askew	X		
4	Fiona White	X		
5	Colin Cross		X	
6	Maddy Redpath		X	
7	Ruth Brothwell		X	
8	Caroline Reeves	X		
9	Liz Hogger	X		
10	Paul Spooner	X		
11	Marsha Moseley	X		
12	Jan Harwood	X		
13	Susan Parker		X	
14	Angela Gunning	X		
15	Christopher Barrass		X	
	TOTALS	9	6	0

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

RESOLVED to approve application 19/P/01479 subject:

- (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.

**PL7 19/P/01974 - 1-5 THE QUADRANT, BRIDGE STREET AND THE CASINO
NIGHTCLUB, ONSLOW STREET, GUILDFORD, GU1 4SQ**

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

- Mr Peter Rutter (Director, PRC Architecture and Planning Ltd) (in support) and;
- Dr Ashley Bowes (Cornerstone Barristers) (in support)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for redevelopment of the site to provide a 10 storey building plus two basement levels, for use as shop (A1), financial and professional services (A2), restaurant and café (A3), drinking establishment (A4), office (B1a), nightclub, casino (sui generis), assembly and leisure (D2 – including cinema, concert hall, and bingo hall) and student living accommodation (sui generis), ancillary cycle and refuse storage; landscaping and incidental works following demolition of all existing buildings.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application related to a collection of locally listed buildings on a prominent corner junction in the town centre, located within the Bridge Street Conservation Area and opposite a Grade II listed building, the Rodboro building. The co-joined buildings were built between 1910 and 1913 including Guildford's first picture house known as the Central Picture Palace which closed in 1956. The building was then used as a grand ballroom and was now a nightclub. The proposed development would take up the entire footprint of the existing site. The proposal was for a 10-storey building above ground with retail on the ground floor. On the top two floors a restaurant and bar was proposed. The upper floors would be cantilevered over the ground floor and would therefore not respect the existing building lines. The building would be comprised of mainly brick and glazing which was mirrored in the surrounding area however there would be very little detailing or articulation of the elevations. A double basement would have the same footprint as the ground floor with no onsite parking. It was proposed to be a car free development with cycle parking in the lower basement for the students. In terms of amenity and green space, there would be terraces provided on three of the levels. In 2004, a casino was granted permission on this site which had been granted a Certificate of Lawfulness. The last application on this site was appealed against for non-determination and was withdrawn by the applicant before the public inquiry finished. The building proposed in that scheme was 12 storeys high above ground with cladding. The surrounding buildings in the area were approx. 4-storeys in height with the tallest being up to 8-storeys high.

It was the officer's opinion that the height, scale and bulk of the proposed building was overly prominent in the streetscene. Planning officers were also concerned that the plant equipment required to service the building would be highly visible at roof level. Fully glazed elevations would therefore serve the student flats. The proposed development would fail to respect the grain and rhythm of development and would become a dominant feature destroying the relationship with the Rodboro buildings opposite, that were Victorian in character, causing harm to the heritage assets as well as interrupting views along the River Wey corridor that was also located in a Conservation Area. The proposal would also block views of green spaces when looking from Guildford Castle and affect the ability to appreciate the heritage assets of St Mary's Church and St. Nicolas. It was noted that it would be difficult to achieve suitable levels of privacy for the students occupying the flats and cause harm to the enjoyment of their amenities.

Lastly, the site was located on a flood plain and there was a lack of detail on the proposed drainage system that would meet with the requirements of the Lead Local Flood Authority, Surrey County Council. The design also failed to incorporate sufficient detail about sustainable design and construction principles.

In response to comments made by public speakers, the Principal Planner – Majors confirmed that the Council had employed an urban designer consultant to undertake some townscape analysis of the buildings when the previous application was appealed for non-determination. The consultant suggested that the proposed building could have a curved frontage and a setback upper floor but did not mean that by employing these criteria in the new design meant it was now deemed an acceptable form of development overall. Reference had also been made to an extant scheme but in the planning officers view was deemed unlikely to be built out given the permission was granted back in 2004. The scheme proposed would also have a greater impact upon the heritage assets than the extant scheme. In addition, the proposed building had not been subject to the Council's design review process despite planning officer's requests and was required given the iconic nature of the building proposed. In respect to comments made regarding the Environment Agency, it was not the Environment Agency's role to assess sequential exception tests and was rather the role of the Local Planning Authority. The previous scheme had been refused on flood risk grounds and no evidence was given at the public inquiry to counter the Council's evidence given the applicant had withdrawn the application half-way through. It was also confirmed that the Council did not have an adopted Town Centre Masterplan and therefore the application had to be considered against the adopted Local Plan.

The Committee discussed the application and agreed that the proposed development owing to its height and bulk was out of scale with the immediate area and streetscene as well as affecting the enjoyment of the nearby heritage assets. The long views would also be interrupted by the sheer elevations. The building in terms of its design lacked articulation and represented an overbearing form of development overall. The Committee also questioned the need for additional student accommodation given many students were now working remotely. The Committee noted that the applicant had undertaken their own design review but had not released the report and associated details which was disappointing. The Committee agreed that the site was primed for a landmark structure and regeneration but not at any cost.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Colin Cross	X		
2	Jan Harwood	X		
3	Chris Blow	X		
4	David Bilbé	X		
5	Christopher Barrass	X		
6	Liz Hogger	X		
7	Fiona White	X		
8	Ruth Brothwell	X		
9	Marsha Moseley	X		
10	Jon Askew	X		
11	Paul Spooner	X		
12	Angela Gunnin	X		
13	Susan Parker	X		
14	Caroline Reeves	X		
15	Maddy Redpath	X		
	TOTALS	15		

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 19/P/01974 for the reasons as detailed in the report.

PL8 19/P/02197 - LAND SOUTH OF, GUILDFORD ROAD, ASH, GU12 6BS

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

- Mr David Murray-Cox (Agent)

The Chairman permitted Councillor Jo Randall to speak in her capacity as ward councillor.

The Committee considered the above-mentioned reserved matters application pursuant to outline planning permission 16/P/01679 for 154 units, including 54 affordable units with associated internal access, streets, car parking and landscaping. Matters to be considered: Appearance, Landscaping, Layout, Scale and the details of accesses within the site. (Amended plans received 05.03.2020 with revised landscaping, house design, street design, refuse collection strategy and parking).

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that outline planning permission had been granted for the access to the site, including a new roundabout however the Ash Road Bridge was still pending consideration. A public right of way ran through the site and provided a clear viewing corridor towards the church spire. This had influenced how the site was laid out. A number of trees on the western boundary were subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and would therefore be retained. Greater gaps between the buildings had been created along with a continuous street frontage. No overspill parking had been provided onsite however twenty parking spaces had been allocated which was in excess of the parking standards requirements. Accessible homes had also been provided and the design quality across the site would be the same for all tenure types. A mix of two storey homes and some bungalows were also proposed. Following a review of the proposal by the Design Review Panel and the Council's Urban Design Officer, it was recommended that brick and tile was used as it was a locally distinctive material with variation created through the use of detailing on the chimneys and tile hanging. Large scale detailed plans were required as per condition 6. The footpath would be retained providing a form of surveillance as well as adopting a naturalistic look with planting. Dean Close adjoined the site and condition 9 specified suitable screening and boundary treatments to protect the amenities for those residents. A number of ecological improvements had been agreed in partnership with Surrey Wildlife Trust. In addition, a 20% reduction in carbon emissions would be achieved via the installation of solar panels on forty-seven of the houses, whilst eight of the houses would have air source heat pumps (ASHPs). The site layout would successfully mitigate against road noise. Lastly, the developer had made a commitment to provide public art as the site fronted Guildford Road to the station.

The Committee discussed the application and noted concerns raised in relation to the need for more landscaping to mitigate against the effects of air pollution. The development to the west of the site was only separated from the road by narrow green areas and pavements. Additional tree planting was therefore recommended to the western boundary behind the new dwellings. Concern was also raised that the boundary treatments were robustly implemented to between the development and Dean Close. Lastly, that the development lacked a conventionally equipped play area for children.

In response to comments raised by the public speaker and ward councillor, the planning officer confirmed that she was unable to identify the area which was of concern in relation to a perceived lack of landscaping. It was also noted that the access road would become an adopted highway. Lastly, any additional tree planting proposed had to be treated sensitively.

The Committee discussed further concerns raised that the road was not safe and was a highways risk. The Committee also queried whether the properties would have solar panels installed and if the bungalows to be built could be retained in perpetuity. In terms of accessibility, the site was accessible by all forms of transport, including three separate bus services that ran locally. Lastly, that in terms of the effects of the development in relation to climate change the Council needed a robust climate change SPD.

The Committee received clarification from the planning officer that in relation to sustainability and use of renewable fuels this was dealt with in the outline planning permission which required 10% carbon reduction. The developer had provided a Sustainability and Energy Statement and has gone beyond that by providing a 20% carbon reduction. In terms of which houses would have solar panels fitted, this would be directed by the appropriate sustainability expert. If the Committee was concerned about the appearance of the solar panels a condition could be added in that regard. The Committee noted that the outline application was determined prior to the adoption of policy D2 so it would be unreasonable to retrospectively apply this in relation to climate change. However, a Climate Change SPD was currently being devised by the Council which had gone to consultation earlier this year but had not yet been adopted. In relation to the retention of bungalows, the Local Planning Authority could not prevent future applications for development and the Committee had to deal with the application before it.

The Committee considered that the scheme had been significantly improved over time and on balance could be considered acceptable.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Christopher Barrass			X
2	Jan Harwood	X		
3	Jon Askew	X		
4	Paul Spooner	X		
5	Maddy Redpath			X
6	Fiona White	X		
7	Angela Gunning	X		
8	Liz Hogger	X		
9	Ruth Brothwell	X		
10	Chris Blow	X		
11	Marsha Moseley			X
12	Caroline Reeves	X		
13	Susan Parker			X
14	David Bilbe	X		
15	Colin Cross	X		
	TOTALS	11	0	4

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

RESOLVED to approve application 19/P/02197 subject to the reasons and conditions as detailed in the report.

PL9 20/P/00346 - LAND AT BRITAINS FARM, 42, THE STREET, WEST HORLSLEY, KT24 6AX

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

- Ms Catherine Young (West Horsley Parish Councillor) (to object);
- Mr John Joyce (to object);
- Mr Paul Galgey (Agent) (in support) and;
- Mr Tony Thompson (Applicant) (in support)

The Chairman permitted Councillor Tim Anderson to speak in his capacity as ward councillor in relation to this application.

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of five dwellings and associated access and landscaping.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the officer's report had not been updated to reflect the number of representations actually received however the matters summarised reflected the points raised in the thirty-two letters of objection.

The Committee noted that the site was located within the settlement boundary of West Horsley, was within the buffer zone of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA) and the West Horsley Conservation Area. The site was roughly triangular with reduced screening on the southern boundary. To the south of the site was an open field which was granted planning permission in November 2019 for twenty-three houses and was also in close proximity to a listed building. The proposal sought to provide five distinct dwellings using a mix of design with brick render and thatched roofs. In the planning officer's view, the principle of development was acceptable. Whilst it did not meet all the requirements of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, it was for guidance only, and the proposal would still provide a mix of properties, 1 x 2 bed, 1 x 3 bed and 3 x 4 bed units. An increase in the number of smaller units onsite would conversely result in a dense urban form of development that would not sit well in a Conservation Area or comply with the design policies as well as the neighbourhood plan. The proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, heritage assets, neighbouring amenities or highway issues. The proposal was also considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on trees, ecology and sustainability.

The Committee considered concerns raised that the development did not sit well in the Conservation Area resulting in an increasingly urbanised environment. The East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan had not been given sufficient consideration. The development would also result in a high level of traffic down a small country lane. The development would also impact upon local biodiversity and the lack of a lighting strategy to prevent light pollution was concerning.

In response to comments made by the public speakers and ward councillor, the planning officer confirmed that the site had been inset from the Green Belt and was part of planning policy and the application had to be considered in those terms. Planning officers also disagreed that insufficient weight had been given to the assessment of the West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan and that it had been given due weight.

The Committee considered that whilst the site was inset from the Green Belt, the development proposed was not appropriate. This was owing to concerns regarding the housing mix proposed which conflicted with West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan, specifically WH4 and the number of four-bedroom units proposed. The Committee considered that it was not necessarily

an urbanising form of development by replacing two larger houses with two semi-detached cottages. The houses were also considered to be too close to each other. The Committee considered that the design was of a high standard, but the proposal was lacking a choice of smaller units.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Chris Blow		X	
2	Ruth Brothwell		X	
3	Angela Gunning	X		
4	Paul Spooner	X		
5	Liz Hogger		X	
6	Jon Askew			X
7	Susan Parker		X	
8	Fiona White	X		
9	Jan Harwood			X
10	Maddy Redpath		X	
11	Christopher Barrass		X	
12	David Bilbe	X		
13	Colin Cross		X	
14	Caroline Reeves	X		
15	Marsha Moseley	X		
	TOTALS	6	7	2

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Angela Gunning		X	
2	Maddy Redpath	X		
3	Fiona White		X	
4	Jon Askew	X		
5	Christopher Barrass	X		
6	Susan Parker	X		
7	Chris Blow	X		
8	David Bilbe		X	
9	Paul Spooner		X	
10	Jan Harwood			X
11	Ruth Brothwell	X		
12	Caroline Reeves		X	
13	Marsha Moseley		X	
14	Colin Cross	X		
15	Liz Hogger	X		
	TOTALS	8	6	1

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 20/P/00346 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would, by virtue of the housing mix and especially the number of four-bedroom units, fails to accord with the provisions of policy WH4 of the adopted West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan. Furthermore, having regard to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the site size, location and characteristics the proposal fails to provide an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes and as such fails to accord with the provisions of Policy H1 of the adopted Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034.

Informatives:

1. This decision relates expressly to drawing(s) 19202_S101 - Site Location Plan, 19202_S102 - Site Survey and 19202_P118 - Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations Garages received 24 February 2020; 19202_P101 Rev. C - Proposed Site Plan Ground Floor Level, 19202_P110 Rev. B - Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations Plot 1, 19202_P111 Rev. B - Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations Plot 2, 19202_P112 Rev. A - Proposed Floor Plans Plot 3, 19202_P114 Rev. B - Proposed Floor Plans Plot 4 and 19202_P116 Rev. A - Proposed Floor Plans Plot 5 received 16 April 2020; 19202_P102 Rev. C - Proposed Site Plan Roof Level, 19202_P113 Rev. B - Proposed Elevations Plot 3, 19202_P115 Rev. C - Proposed Elevations Plot 4 and 19202_P117 Rev. C - Proposed Elevations Plot 5 received 21 April 2020; 19202_P105 Rev. D - Street Scenes, 19202_C101 Rev. D - Coloured Site Layout, and 19202_C102 Rev. E - Coloured Street Scenes received 22 April 2020.

2. This statement is provided in accordance with Article 35(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. Guildford Borough Council seek to take a positive and proactive approach to development proposals. We work with applicants in a positive and proactive manner by:

- Offering a pre application advice service
 - Where pre-application advice has been sought and that advice has been followed we will advise applicants/agents of any further issues arising during the course of the application
 - Where possible officers will seek minor amendments to overcome issues identified at an early stage in the application process
- However, Guildford Borough Council will generally not engage in unnecessary negotiation for fundamentally unacceptable proposals or where significant changes to an application is required.

In this case pre-application advice was sought and provided which addressed initial issues, the application has been submitted in accordance with that advice, however, further issues were identified during the consultation stage of the application. Officers have worked with the applicant to overcome these issues, however, Planning Committee Members remain unhappy with the housing mix and considered that the application should be refused on this basis.

PL10 19/P/01003 - LAND TO THE NORTH OF, HEATHS DRIVE, SEND, GU23 7EP

The Committee,

RESOLVED to defer application 19/P/01003 to the next meeting of the Planning Committee scheduled on 19 August 2020.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jan Harwood		X	
2	Liz Hogger			X
3	David Bilbe	X		
4	Colin Cross	X		
5	Angela Gunning	X		
6	Jon Askew			X
7	Chris Blow	X		
8	Caroline Reeves			X
9	Christopher Barrass	X		
10	Susan Parker	X		
11	Marsha Moseley	X		
12	Paul Spooner	X		
13	Maddy Redpath	X		
14	Fiona White			X
15	Ruth Brothwell	X		
	TOTALS	10	1	4

PL11 20/P/01011 - LAND TO THE NORTH OF, HEATH DRIVE, SEND, GU23 7EP

The Committee,

RESOLVED to defer application 20/P/01011 to the next meeting of the Planning Committee scheduled on 19 August 2020.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jan Harwood		X	
2	Liz Hogger			X
3	David Bilbe	X		
4	Colin Cross	X		
5	Angela Gunning	X		
6	Jon Askew			X
7	Chris Blow	X		
8	Caroline Reeves			X
9	Christopher Barrass	X		
10	Susan Parker	X		
11	Marsha Moseley	X		
12	Paul Spooner	X		
13	Maddy Redpath	X		
14	Fiona White			X
15	Ruth Brothwell	X		
	TOTALS	10	1	4

PL12 19/P/02195 - 12-15 MIDLETON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU2 8XW

The Committee,

RESOLVED to defer application 19/P/02195 to the next meeting of the Planning Committee scheduled on 19 August 2020.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jan Harwood		X	
2	Liz Hogger			X
3	David Bilbe	X		
4	Colin Cross	X		
5	Angela Gunning	X		
6	Jon Askew			X
7	Chris Blow	X		
8	Caroline Reeves			X
9	Christopher Barrass	X		
10	Susan Parker	X		
11	Marsha Moseley	X		
12	Paul Spooner	X		
13	Maddy Redpath	X		
14	Fiona White			X
15	Ruth Brothwell	X		
	TOTALS	10	1	4

PL13 20/P/00141 - LEXICON HOUSE, 10 MIDLETON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU2 8XW

The Committee,

RESOLVED to defer application 20/P/00141 to the next meeting of the Planning Committee scheduled on 19 August 2020.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jan Harwood		X	
2	Liz Hogger			X
3	David Bilbe	X		
4	Colin Cross	X		
5	Angela Gunning	X		
6	Jon Askew			X
7	Chris Blow	X		
8	Caroline Reeves			X
9	Christopher Barrass	X		
10	Susan Parker	X		
11	Marsha Moseley	X		
12	Paul Spooner	X		
13	Maddy Redpath	X		
14	Fiona White			X
15	Ruth Brothwell	X		
	TOTALS	10	1	4

PL14 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee deferred the noting of the planning appeals to its next meeting scheduled on 19 August 2020.

The meeting finished at 10.45 pm

Signed

Date

Chairman