

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 Joss Bigmore, Nigel Manning and John Redpath were also in attendance.

PL60 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

No apologies for absence were received. [Councillor David Bilbé was not online for the start of the meeting and arrived later owing to work commitments.]

PL61 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

No disclosures of interest were declared.

PL62 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 4 November 2020 were approved, subject to the amendment as detailed on the supplementary late sheets and signed by the Chairman as a true record.

PL63 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the procedures for determining planning applications.

PL64 19/P/01994 - SAFEGUARD BUS DEPOT, 7 RIDGEMOUNT, GUILDFORD, GU2 7TH

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

- Mr Peter Watts (to object)
- Mr James Lowe (to object)
- Mr Giles Bruce (Architect) (In Support)
- Mr Andrew Halliday (Managing Director of Safeguard Coaches) (Applicant) (In Support)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for redevelopment of the site for 19 residential units (11 x 1 bed, 3 x 2 bed and 5 x 3 bed) and associated access and landscaping. As amended by plans received on 26 November 2019 and 28 February 2020 and 16 November 2020.

The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which included amendments to conditions 2 and 11. The presentation had also been updated to include additional photographs which had also been updated on the Council's website. The application site was the old Safeguard bus depot for Safeguard Coaches who moved to a more suitable site in 2018. More recently the site had been leased for a short-term period. Planning permission had been granted in 2008 for 13 flats and planning permission was extended for a further period of time in 2011. The application site now included a bungalow. The site was located within the Guildford urban area, outside of the town centre boundary, within 400 metres to 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA buffer zone. The site was also located within a residential area with commercial properties to the south. The land rose steeply to the north leaving a difference in land levels of 3.5 metres. The site was in a sustainable location, within walking distance of the train station, bus station and town centre.

The proposal was for 19 residential units that would be set within three storey blocks around an internal communal landscaped space. A total of thirteen onsite parking spaces would be provided which were accessed directly from Ridgemount, six of the spaces accessed from a newly created access with the provision of twenty-eight cycle spaces. The proposal would also benefit from a communal bin store. The development was comprised of three blocks. Block one was set over three storeys and had three one-bed studio unit on the ground floor and four duplex units 4x1 and 4x3 beds which had their own private balconies. Block 2 had 4x1 bed, 3x2 bed, plus 1x3 bed units. Block 2 was located parallel to the boundary with 9 Ridgemount whilst maintaining a separation of 13.8 metres to the boundary. The building was three storeys in height and faced 9 Ridgemount. Block 3 had 3x1 bed units. The existing bus depot building stretched the length of the boundary with Lynwood. The proposed scheme would significantly improve upon the relationship with Lynwood in terms outlook and reduced bulk. The scheme had also been amended to reduce the height from four-storeys to three storeys.

The Committee noted that the proposal for 19 units, of which five would be affordable. An independent appraisal of the viability assessment had been undertaken and the principal of development was therefore considered acceptable by planning officers. The scheme provided a bold and well-designed development. The majority of the units benefitted from their own private amenity space in addition to the communal space. The development was not considered to have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity. It was sited in a sustainable location and residents could access local car share clubs.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that the elevations were creatively designed with good articulation. The Committee queried how big the gap was between the proposed buildings that backed onto the gardens of the adjoining properties at Lynwood. In terms of the reduced number of parking spaces provided, the Committee accepted that the development site was in a sustainable location with good connections to public transport and the car share clubs. The Committee welcomed this type of development owing to the number of smaller units it offered to people and therefore gave them an opportunity to purchase an affordable home in Guildford. The Committee was concerned regarding the potential for flooding and wanted to confirm that the appropriate conditions had been applied in terms of SUDs and drainage.

The Committee was also concerned regarding the apparent lack of private amenity space given to some of the residents. The communal space was perceived as not being conducive to families who wished to sit outside as it was intersected with pathways being used by other residents. The Committee wanted to confirm which units would be affordable.

In response to queries raised by the Committee, the planning officer confirmed, in respect of flooding, Surrey County Council who are the Local Lead Flood Authority had recommended condition 6 in which it required a verification report to be undertaken by a qualified engineer to show that the drainage system had been implemented correctly. In terms of the viability appraisal, when originally submitted, the applicant had concluded that the scheme proved

unviable to provide any affordable housing. Planning officers therefore engaged consultants to review that decision which resulted in the provision of five affordable homes. In addition, the level of profit generated by the scheme was challenged by officers and reduced from 20% to 17.5%. The affordable homes were identified to be units 1-5 in block 1 and all units had private amenity space apart from unit 8.

The Committee considered the scheme represented a sustainable form of development which offered people the opportunity to buy affordable homes within the town centre.

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

| RECORDED VOTES LIST | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| | Councillor | FOR | AGAINST | ABSTAIN |
| 1. | Caroline Reeves | X | | |
| 2. | Jon Askew | X | | |
| 3. | Angela Gunning | X | | |
| 4. | Fiona White | X | | |
| 5. | Colin Cross | X | | |
| 6. | David Bilbé (not in attendance) | | | |
| 7. | Paul Spooner | X | | |
| 8. | Ruth Brothwell | X | | |
| 9. | Liz Hogger | X | | |
| 10. | Susan Parker | X | | |
| 11. | Maddy Redpath | X | | |
| 12. | Chris Blow | X | | |
| 13. | Christopher Barrass | X | | |
| 14. | Marsha Moseley | X | | |
| 15. | Jan Harwood | X | | |
| | TOTAL | 14 | 0 | 0 |

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

RESOLVED to approve application 19/P/01994 subject to a Section 106 agreement securing the following Heads of Terms and amendments to the following conditions:

- Condition 2 to add drawing no. A271 received 2.12.20
- Condition 11 should read drawing no. A202 rev 3

A contribution of £70,000 to go towards road safety improvement schemes within the vicinity of the development;

SANG and SAMM mitigation with the formula of the updated tariff;

A contribution to recreational open space provision in accordance with the tariff;

5 of the units shall be affordable housing (affordable rent units);

A contribution towards early years education and;

A contribution towards primary education.

If the terms of the S106 or wording of the planning condition are significantly amended as part of ongoing S106 or planning condition(s) negotiations or any changes shall be agreed in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee and lead ward member.

(ii) That upon completion of the above, the application be determined by the Director of Planning and Regeneration.

PL65 20/P/01059 - 12 ALBURY ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 2BU

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

- Mr Roger Bowen (to object);
- Mr Simon Potter (to object) and;
- Mr Sati Panesar (Planning Consultant) (In Support)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of 7 x two-bedroom flats over three storeys, following demolition of the existing house and outbuildings.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions and a legal agreement to secure the necessary financial contributions towards the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). The Committee also noted the supplementary late sheets which included the details of an updated condition 15, updated recommendation and two additional letters of representation.

The Committee noted that the site was located in the urban area of Guildford and 400m to 5km buffer zone of the TBHSPA and was characterised by residential developments with a mix of single dwelling houses and flatted developments. A previous application had been submitted for the site in 2019 for 8x2 bed units which was refused owing to its overall density. The Committee noted that planning officers had no in principle objection to the proposed development which was in keeping with the character of the area, would not result in any material adverse impact to neighbouring amenities, highways or protected species or trees and was therefore recommended for approval subject to a S106 Agreement.

The Committee discussed the application and received confirmation from the planning officer that the proposed development would be no closer than the existing house in terms of its relationship with Albury Court. The Committee also considered whether it was possible to remove the side access gate to alleviate concerns regarding the build up of traffic waiting to enter and exit the site. In addition, whether a condition could be added to require the windows on the north-west elevation were secured shut and glazed. The Committee was advised by the Applications Team Leader that there was no substantial material harm caused by the gates to warrant their removal. In addition, it was the planning officers view that no loss of privacy would be caused to the residents of Albury Court to necessitate the glazing of the windows on the north-west elevation of the building.

The Committee considered that the application was in keeping with the neighbouring properties and would provide much needed housing in the urban area.

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

| RECORDED VOTES LIST | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|
| | Councillor | FOR | AGAINST | ABSTAIN |
| 1. | Caroline Reeves | X | | |
| 2. | Jon Askew | X | | |
| 3. | Liz Hogger | X | | |
| 4. | David Bilbé (was not present for the entire consideration of the application) | | | |
| 5. | Chris Blow | X | | |
| 6. | Colin Cross | X | | |
| 7. | Paul Spooner | X | | |
| 8. | Jan Harwood | X | | |
| 9. | Angela Gunning | X | | |
| 10. | Ruth Brothwell | X | | |
| 11. | Christopher Barrass | X | | |
| 12. | Fiona White (was not present for the entire consideration of the application) | | | |
| 13. | Susan Parker | X | | |
| 14. | Marsha Moseley | X | | |
| 15. | Maddy Redpath | X | | |
| | TOTAL | 13 | | |

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/01059 subject to:

- 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 Director of Planning and Regeneration. The preliminary view is that the application should be granted subject to conditions.

Amended condition 15 to correct an error:

- Condition 15:

The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until each of the available parking spaces are provided with a fast charge socket (current minimum requirement: 7kw Mode 3 with Type 2 connector - 230 v AC 32 amp single phase dedicated supply) in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

PL66 20/P/00585 - COMMERCIAL YARD, HEREFORD CLOSE, GUILDFORD, GU2 9TA

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of a building containing 1 one-bedroom dwelling and 1 one bedroom flat with bin and cycle stores. (amended plans received 14 August 2020, amended description).

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application was recommended for approval subject to the completion of a legal agreement to secure the necessary mitigation against the impact of the proposal on the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). The site was located within the urban area of Guildford, located in a cul-de-sac that was characterised by two-storey semi-detached properties. The site had been previously used as a commercial yard from 1960-2018. The site would be accessed off Hereford Close with one-bedroom dwelling, two storeys' in height with the one-bedroom flat proposed, single storey. Parking would be created for one car, two motor bikes as well as bike storage. The building would have brick rendered elevations and grey slate. The shower room which was located in the north-east elevation facing 6 Hereford Close was conditioned to have its window obscure glazed and fixed shut.

In conclusion, it was the planning officer's view that the proposed development would deliver two small units of accommodation within a sustainable location. It would not result in any detrimental impact upon the character or appearance of the site or surrounding area and would not cause a significant impact on neighbouring amenities. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to the S106 agreement.

The Committee discussed the application and noted their regret and not being able to undertake a site visit currently owing to Covid-19. The Committee noted that planning officers were to be commended for negotiating a reduction with the applicant in the number of dwellings proposed for the site which was originally set at three. The Committee agreed that two dwellings on this site was still too much owing to the reduced amenity area and only one car parking space in an already congested road. Whilst the Committee was not averse to development on this site, the existing proposal represented an over-development of a very small area which was incongruous with the character of the surrounding area.

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 20/P/00585 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would, by virtue of the extent of the built form, position of the building within the site in close proximity to both the south-west and north-west boundaries of the site in combination result in an unacceptably cramped form of development. The built form would be highly visible in the street scene and would also fail to respect the established character of the area. Furthermore, the cramped development would result in a limited amount and poor quality external amenity area provided for future occupants of the site. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to saved policies G1 (3), G5 (2) and G5 (3) of the Local Plan 2003 and policy D1 of the Local Plan: Strategy and Site 2015-2034 and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informatives:

1. This decision relates expressly to drawings: P20-010-P-001 REV A, P20-010-P-002 REV B, P20-010-P-101 REV B, P20-010-P-102 REV C, P20-010-P-103 REV B, P20-010-P-301 REV B, P20-010-P-302 REV B received on 14 August 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.

Pre-application advice was not sought prior to submission and whilst alterations to the application were sought through the course of the application the Council were not satisfied that these addressed the concerns raised.

PL67 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee discussed and noted the appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 9.00 pm

Signed

Chairman

Date