

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, Dennis Booth and Diana Jones, were also in attendance.

PL15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from the following councillors; David Bilbé, Susan Parker, Caroline Reeves and Paul Spooner for whom Councillors Richard Billington, Ramsey Nagaty, Pauline Searle and Graham Eyre attended as substitutes respectively.

PL16 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

20/P/00353 – 244 London Road, Guildford, GU1 2DE – Councillor Gunning declared a non-pecuniary interest in the above application owing to knowing a neighbour located in close proximity to the proposed scheme. Councillor Gunning confirmed that this would not affect her objectivity in relation to this matter.

PL17 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 July 2020 were approved subject to an amendment by Councillor Ruth Brothwell in relation to application 19/P/01479 – Rudge Cottage where it stated that she had contemplated a complete deferral of the application and requested this text was replaced with text which reflected the fact that this request had been overridden by a request for a site visit.

PL18 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the procedures for determining planning applications.

PL19 19/P/01003 - LAND TO THE NORTH OF, HEATH DRIVE, SEND, GU23 7EP

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

- Councillor Pat Oven (Send Parish Councillor) (to object);
- Ms Linda Parker-Picken (to object) and;
- Mr Chris Frost (Agent) (in support)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned outline application for 29 residential dwellings including means of access, layout and scale (appearance and landscaping to be reserved).

The application was subject of a non-determination appeal. Had the Council been in a position to determine this application, the recommendation would have been to approve subject to the terms and conditions and the completion of a s106 Agreement. The Committee were requested to determine the application had they been in a position to do so.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the site was located to the north of Heath Drive and was bound to the north and west by the River Wey Navigation. To the east of the site was Vision Engineering, a large commercial premise. The site was identified as open space in the Local Plan which reflected its visual amenity value. However, the land was also privately owned and there were currently no lawful public rights of access.

The development proposed was comprised of a mix of houses and flats with 40% of the units allocated as affordable. The layout included large areas of open space which would be made publicly accessible and maintained in perpetuity through a legal agreement. The site was currently allocated as open space and policy ID4 of the Local Plan stated that open space should be protected in accordance with the policies set out in the NPPF. However, one instance where development may be permitted was where open spaces were replaced by better quality or quantity of provision or provided an improved function.

In terms of scale, all the buildings, except for the garages would be two-storey in height and the houses arranged around a new road off the north end of Heath Drive leading to a T-Junction. The Council's Waste and Recycling Team had raised no objection to the vehicle tracking scheme proposed and the County Highway Authority had no objections in relation to highway safety or capacity grounds. In addition, the National Trust raised no objection to the proposed development as a significant tree and landscape buffer would be retained adjacent to the river.

Whilst the development would result in the loss of part of the open space, in officer's opinion, the remaining open space would remain better managed and remain accessible to the public, secured through a legal agreement in perpetuity. The development would not harm the character of the area or the amenities enjoyed by residents. The benefits of the scheme therefore outweighed the disadvantages and officers recommended the application for approval.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that despite the County Highway Authority not objecting to the scheme, the A247 was very busy and the prospect of having potentially sixty more cars trying to pull out of the T-Junction was concerning. The Committee considered the proposal also represented a considerable loss of open space which was in contradiction to policy ID4 of the Local Plan which sought to protect open space. The Committee was not convinced that the benefits of the development, such as making the remaining public space accessible in perpetuity was sufficient enough to overcome this policy conflict including the effects of the development upon the biodiversity of the site. In relation to the legal agreement, it was not clear who this would be with and if it would remain with the same body in ten years-time. The Committee noted that it would have been preferable if the land had been given to a separate Trust or another organisation whose sole responsibility was to protect and manage the land. The Committee was also concerned regarding the fact that the site was subject to a woodland Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and the development would result in the removal of a much-valued amenity and ecological asset.

The Committee noted that the amenity assessment of the site had been given a medium value in the Local Plan which should be respected otherwise the Council ran the risk of having windfall sites developed when there was already too much development in Send. The Committee also queried whether there was a turning circle provided in the layout. The Committee agreed that the development was out of character with the surrounding area.

In response to queries raised regarding the legal agreement, the planning solicitor confirmed that the report referred to open space provision on the site in perpetuity. There would be restrictions on the land and management provisions as well as an ongoing obligation to maintain the land via a management plan attached to the proposed s106 agreement.

The planning officer confirmed that in terms of infrastructure, the scheme did include financial contributions towards education, provision of play space as well as the provision of publicly accessible open space. The Council did have a 5-year housing land supply, but 5-years was an absolute minimum. In officer's opinion, it was therefore not a question that the borough did not need the housing but rather it was about finding suitable sites for any additional housing. In relation to windfall sites, just because this site was not allocated in the Local Plan did not mean that the proposal should not be assessed against the Local Plan and other material considerations. The benefit of additional housing was not the only factor which outweighed the loss of the open space, but the benefit of securing the management and accessibility of the rest of the open space area of the site in perpetuity was a significant factor and the amenity assessment had been considered in those terms. It was also confirmed that the T-Junctions at the end of the road were turning heads and not extra spurs for development.

The Committee agreed that the benefits afforded by the open space being designated as publicly accessible in perpetuity did not outweigh the loss of the open space overall which was contrary to policy ID4 of the Local Plan. The loss of the land as open space would result in a significant adverse effect upon the biodiversity of the site caused by the development as well as its increased use by dogwalkers and human activity overall. The removal of a large part of the site which had been protected by a woodland Tree Preservation Order was also very concerning and would affect the integrity of the Special Protection Area and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). In addition, owing to the lack of a secured legal agreement, the development would fail to provide 12 affordable homes and therefore failed to mitigate against the impact of the development upon local infrastructure.

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Pauline Searle		X	
2.	Colin Cross		X	
3.	Maddy Redpath		X	
4.	John Askew		X	
5.	Marsha Moseley	X		
6.	Liz Hogger		X	
7.	Angela Gunning	X		
8.	Fiona White	X		
9.	Graham Eyre	X		
10.	Richard Billington			X
11.	Ramsey Nagaty		X	
12.	Jan Harwood	X		
13.	Chris Blow		X	
14.	Christopher Barrass		X	
15.	Ruth Brothwell		X	
	TOTALS:	5	9	1

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Ruth Brothwell	X		
2.	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
3.	Maddy Redpath	X		
4.	Graham Eyre			X
5.	Richard Billington			X
6.	Marsha Moseley		X	
7.	Pauline Searle	X		
8.	Jan Harwood			X
9.	Liz Hogger	X		
10.	Chris Blow	X		
11.	Christopher Barrass	X		
12.	Jon Askew	X		
13.	Angela Gunning		X	
14.	Colin Cross	X		
15.	Fiona White			X
	TOTALS:	9	2	4

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

RESOLVED that had they retained the right to determine this application, they would refuse application 19/P/01003 for the following reasons:

1. The development proposed would result in the loss of an area of Protected Open Space, and a number of established trees, and accordingly would be contrary to Policy ID4 of the Guildford Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034 and Policy NE5 of the Guildford Local Plan 2003 (as saved). The identified benefits of the scheme do not outweigh conflict with the development or the harm that would be caused as a result of the loss of the Open Space.
2. The site lies within the 400m to 5km zone of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). The Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that there will be no likely significant effect on the Special Protection Area and, in the absence of an appropriate assessment, is unable to satisfy itself that this proposal, either alone or in combination with other development, would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area and the relevant Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). In this respect, significant concerns remain with regard to the adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area in that there is likely to be an increase in dog walking, general recreational use, damage to the habitat and disturbance to the protected species within the protected areas.

As such the development is contrary to the objectives of policies NE1 and NE4 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (as saved by CLG Direction on 24/09/07) and conflicts with saved policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009. For the same reasons the development would fail to meet the requirements of Regulation 61 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended, and as the development does not meet the requirements of Regulation 62 the Local Planning Authority must refuse to grant planning permission.

3. In the absence of a completed planning obligation to secure:
 - the delivery of 12 affordable housing units (a minimum of 70% to be

affordable rent with the mix as agreed by the Housing Development Manager);

- provision of SANG and SAMM contributions in accordance with the formula of the updated tariff;
- open space provision and management on site in perpetuity
- a contribution towards play space
- contributions towards an early years project; a primary education project; and a secondary education project in accordance with the formula of the updated SCC Education Contribution Tariff;
- A contribution of £30,000 for the implementation of a traffic island between Potters Lane and Heath Drive and the erection of Vehicle Activated Signs. The VASs shall be located on either side of the existing bridge.

The development would fail to provide an acceptable provision of affordable housing and would fail to mitigate the impact of development on local infrastructure provision. For these reasons the development would conflict with Policy H1 and ID1 of the Guildford Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-34.

Informatives

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.

PL20 20/P/01011 - LAND TO THE NORTH OF, HEATH DRIVE, SEND, GU23 7EP

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

- Councillor Pat Oven (Send Parish Councillor) (to object);
- Ms Linda Parker-Picken (to object) and;
- Mr Chris Frost (Agent) (in support)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned outline application for 29 residential dwellings including means of access, layout and scale (appearance and landscaping to be reserved).

This application was a duplicate application to the non-determination appeal application 19/P/01003.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the site was located to the north of Heath Drive and was bound to the north and west by the River Wey Navigation. To the east of the site was Vision Engineering, a large commercial premise. The site was identified as open space by the Local Plan which reflected its visual amenity value. However, the land was also privately owned and there were currently no lawful public rights of access.

The development proposed was comprised of a mix of houses and flats with 40% of the units allocated as affordable. The layout included a large area of open space which would be made publicly accessible and maintained in perpetuity through a legal agreement. The site was currently allocated as open space and policy ID4 of the Local Plan stated that open space should be protected in accordance with the policies set out in the NPPF. However, one instance where development may be permitted was where open spaces were replaced by better quality or quantity of provision or provided an improved function.

In terms of scale, all the buildings, except for the garages would be two-storey in height and the houses arranged around a new road off the north end of Heath Drive leading to a T-Junction. The Council's Waste and Recycling Team had raised no objection to the vehicle tracking scheme proposed and the County Highway Authority had no objections in relation to highway safety or capacity grounds. In addition, the National Trust raised no objection to the proposed development as a significant tree and landscape buffer would be retained adjacent to the river.

Whilst the development would result in the loss of part of the open space, in officer's opinion, the remaining open space would be better managed and be accessible to the public, secured through a legal agreement in perpetuity. The development would not harm the character of the area or the amenities enjoyed by residents. The benefits of the scheme therefore outweighed the disadvantages and officers recommended the application for approval.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that despite the County Highway Authority not objecting to the scheme, the A247 was very busy and the prospect of having potentially sixty more cars trying to pull out of the T-Junction was concerning. The Committee considered the proposal also represented a considerable loss of open space which was in contradiction to policy ID4 of the Local Plan which sought to protect open space. The Committee was not convinced that the benefits of the development, such as making the remaining public space accessible in perpetuity was sufficient enough to overcome this policy conflict including the adverse effects of the development upon the biodiversity of the site. In relation to the legal agreement, it was not clear who this would be with and if it would remain with the same body in ten years-time. The Committee noted that it would have been preferable if the land had been given to a separate Trust or another organisation whose sole responsibility was to protect and manage the land. The Committee was also concerned regarding the fact that the site was subject to a woodland Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and the development would result in the removal of a much-valued amenity and ecological asset.

The Committee noted that the amenity assessment of the site had been given a medium value in the Local Plan which should be respected otherwise the Council ran the risk of having windfall sites developed when there was already too much development in Send. The Committee also queried whether there was a turning circle provided in the layout. The Committee agreed that the development was out of character with the surrounding area.

In response to queries raised regarding the legal agreement, the planning solicitor confirmed that the report referred to open space provision on site in perpetuity. There would be restrictions on the land and management provisions and an ongoing obligation to maintain the land via a management plan attached to the proposed s106 agreement.

The planning officer confirmed that in terms of infrastructure, the scheme did include financial contributions towards education, provision of play space as well as the provision of publicly accessible open space. The Council did have a 5-year housing land supply, but 5-years was an absolute minimum. In officer's opinion, it was therefore not a question that the borough did not need the housing but rather it was about finding suitable sites for additional housing. In relation to windfall sites, just because this site was not allocated in the Local Plan did not mean that the proposal should not be assessed against the Local Plan and other material considerations. The benefit of additional housing was not the only factor which outweighed the loss of the open space, but the benefit of securing the management and accessibility of the rest

of the site in perpetuity and the amenity assessment had been considered in those terms. It was also confirmed that the T-Junctions at the end of the road were turning heads and not extra spurs for development.

The Committee agreed that the benefits afforded by the open space being designated as publicly accessible in perpetuity did not outweigh the loss of the open space overall which was contrary to policy ID4 of the Local Plan. The loss of the open land would result in a significant effect upon the biodiversity of the site caused by the development as well as its increased use by dogwalkers and human activity overall. The removal of a large part of the site which had been protected by a woodland Tree Preservation Order was also very concerning and would affect the integrity of the Special Protection Area and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). In addition, owing to the lack of a secured legal agreement, the development would fail to provide 12 affordable homes and therefore failed to mitigate against the impact of the development upon local infrastructure.

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Maddy Redpath		X	
2.	Jon Askew		X	
3.	Chris Blow		X	
4.	Graham Eyre			X
5.	Jan Harwood			X
6.	Ruth Brothwell		X	
7.	Marsha Moseley	X		
8.	Ramsey Nagaty		X	
9.	Richard Billington			X
10.	Fiona White			X
11.	Christopher Barrass		X	
12.	Pauline Searle		X	
13.	Colin Cross		X	
14.	Liz Hogger		X	
15.	Angela Gunning	X		
	TOTALS:	2	9	4

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Graham Eyre			X
2.	Chris Blow	X		
3.	Fiona White			X
4.	Ruth Brothwell	X		
5.	Marsha Moseley		X	
6.	Jan Harwood			X
7.	Maddy Redpath	X		
8.	Liz Hogger	X		
9.	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
10.	Richard Bilington	X		
11.	Christopher Barrass	X		
12.	Pauline Searle	X		
13.	Angela Gunning		X	
14.	Colin Cross	X		
15.	Jon Askew	X		
	TOTALS:	10	2	3

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 20/P/01011 for the following reasons:

1. The development proposed would result in the loss of an area of Protected Open Space, and a number of established trees, and accordingly would be contrary to Policy ID4 of the Guildford Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034 and Policy NE5 of the Guildford Local Plan 2003 (as saved). The identified benefits of the scheme do not outweigh conflict with the development or the harm that would be caused as a result of the loss of the Open Space.
2. The site lies within the 400m to 5km zone of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). The Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that there will be no likely significant effect on the Special Protection Area and, in the absence of an appropriate assessment, is unable to satisfy itself that this proposal, either alone or in combination with other development, would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area and the relevant Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). In this respect, significant concerns remain with regard to the adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area in that there is likely to be an increase in dog walking, general recreational use, damage to the habitat and disturbance to the protected species within the protected areas.

As such the development is contrary to the objectives of policies NE1 and NE4 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (as saved by CLG Direction on 24/09/07) and conflicts with saved policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009. For the same reasons the development would fail to meet the requirements of Regulation 61 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended, and as the development does not meet the requirements of Regulation 62 the Local Planning Authority must refuse to grant planning permission.

3. In the absence of a completed planning obligation to secure:
- the delivery of 12 affordable housing units (a minimum of 70% to be affordable rent with the mix as agreed by the Housing Development Manager);
 - provision of SANG and SAMM contributions in accordance with the formula of the updated tariff;
 - open space provision and management on site in perpetuity
 - a contribution towards play space
 - contributions towards an early years project; a primary education project; and a secondary education project in accordance with the formula of the updated SCC Education Contribution Tariff;
 - A contribution of £30,000 for the implementation of a traffic island between Potters Lane and Heath Drive and the erection of Vehicle Activated Signs. The VASs shall be located on either side of the existing bridge.

The development would fail to provide an acceptable provision of affordable housing and would fail to mitigate the impact of development on local infrastructure provision. For these reasons the development would conflict with Policy H1 and ID1 of the Guildford Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-34.

Informatives

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.

PL21 20/P/00757 - UNIT 3A, KINGS YARD, BURROWS LANE, THERE, GUILDFORD, GU5 9QE

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

- Mr Peter George (to object);
- Mr Luke Margetts (Applicant) (in support) and;
- Mr Stephen Openshaw (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 5 of 06/P/00548 and condition 4 of 18/P/01775 to vary the operating hours of Unit 3A (rear section of Unit 3 to the north end) from 7:30am – 7pm Mondays to Fridays (inclusive) and 9am – 4:30pm on Saturdays and no operating on Sundays or Bank or National Holidays to the

proposed operating hours starting the working day at 6am on weekdays, and operating on Sundays and Bank Holidays from 7am – 4pm. No working on Saturdays.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the main consideration was whether the change of condition proposed would result in a development that was unacceptable where the previous development was found to be acceptable. In particular, whether to occupy that unit at the time proposed would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area or residential amenities. It was the officer's opinion that the proposal would not have an adverse impact. The Committee was also referred to a previous appeal, as detailed in Item 6 of the agenda, where the appeal to vary the opening hours was allowed and costs awarded against the Council.

The Committee considered concerns raised that the application would create a dangerous precedent that could be used in the future by the developer or another tenant. Whilst the proposal would enable only two workers on Sundays and all Bank Holidays it still represented a significant change in operating hours given that the site was already in operation 365 days a year including Christmas Day and Easter Day. Workers would be arriving onsite from 6am in the morning Monday – Friday. There was inadequate parking onsite to accommodate the additional hours of operation. In addition, concerns were raised that the proposal would lead to more light pollution during the winter months which could be seen across the Tillingbourne Valley and located within the AONB and contrary to the dark sky's initiative. The extended hours of operation would also exacerbate traffic flows along a narrow country lane with passing places that made driving hazardous.

In response to comments made by public speakers, the planning officer reiterated that the Committee was only required to consider the changes proposed which was the difference between opening up at 6am as opposed to 7:30am on weekdays and the proposed working hours on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays.

The Committee noted that in current times where businesses were suffering owing to the stresses caused by covid-19 such applications should be supported so that people could retain their employment. The Committee also noted condition 5, which required the hours of operation for the unit in question to revert back to what had originally been agreed. The Committee also recognised that businesses could operate more flexibly by working from home and was not absolutely critical anymore to have a main base. However, Eiger Trading had requested a personal permission to work at the unit at the time proposed owing to the nature of their business.

The Committee was concerned that the proposed change in hours of operation eroded the validity of the previous approved condition. The planning officer confirmed that legislation permitted people to apply to vary conditions and the Council had enforcement powers should applicants not adhere to the hours agreed. The Committee also noted that the delivery hours had contracted by half an hour but would be controlled by a new condition.

The Committee considered that the impact of two additional persons onsite at the new times proposed would not result in such a significant impact upon residential amenities to warrant refusal of the application. The Committee was also mindful of the fact that if the current tenants left the site, condition 5 required the hours of operation to revert back to that which had been previously agreed.

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Richard Billington			X
2.	Fiona White	X		
3.	Ruth Brothwell		X	
4.	Angela Gunning	X		
5.	Chris Blow		X	
6.	Jon Askew	X		
7.	Ramsey Nagaty		X	
8.	Maddy Redpath	X		
9.	Jan Harwood	X		
10.	Christopher Barrass		X	
11.	Pauline Searle	X		
12.	Colin Cross			X
13.	Graham Eyre	X		
14.	Marsha Moseley	X		
15.	Liz Hogger	X		
	TOTALS:	9	4	2

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/00757 subject to the reasons and conditions as detailed in the report.

PL22 19/P/02195 - 12-15 MIDLETON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU2 8XW

The Committee considered the above-mentioned application for redevelopment of part of existing industrial estate to form 15 new units following demolition of plots 12-15.

The application had been referred to the Planning Committee because this was a major application and the applicant was Guildford Borough Council.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application site was located within the wider Midleton Industrial Estate which was designated in the Local Plan as a Strategic Industrial Estate. The site was bounded by the railway to the east and south western boundaries and was being redeveloped in phases. The existing site was comprised of five buildings the largest of which was used by Airhop as a trampoline park whilst the others were used for industrial businesses. All of the buildings had permission to be demolished established via a prior notification application submitted last year and units 13 and 15 had already been demolished. The fifteen new units proposed would be served by a new access road leading from Midleton Industrial Estate road. The fifteen units would be arranged in three blocks offering four different sizes of unit. The number of parking spaces proposed exceeded the standard requirement and unit 8 would have a loading bay and space to accommodate associated vehicles. The proposal would create consistency in design, providing modern units to assist industrial operations. In the planning officer's view, it would not have a material impact upon the character of the area, neighbouring amenities nor would it pose a flood risk, have a harmful impact upon highways, trees or vegetation and was therefore recommended for approval.

The Committee fully supported the application and agreed that Guildford needed more sites such as this to support industrial enterprises.

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Chris Blow	X		
2.	Christopher Barrass	X		
3.	Graham Eyre	X		
4.	Liz Hogger	X		
5.	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
6.	Colin Cross	X		
7.	Marsha Moseley	X		
8.	Jan Harwood	X		
9.	Angela Gunning	X		
10.	Jon Askew	X		
11.	Ruth Brothwell	X		
12.	Fiona White	X		
13.	Richard Billington	X		
14.	Maddy Redpath	X		
15.	Pauline Searle	X		
	TOTALS:	15	0	0

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

RESOLVED to approve application 19/P/02195 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL23 20/P/00141 - LEXICON HOUSE, 10 MIDLETON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU2 8XW

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed change of use of the existing building from a flexible use for B1(b) (Research and Development), B1(c) (Light Industrial) and B8 (Storage and Distribution) to D2 (Leisure and Assembly), minor external alterations to fenestration.

The application had been referred to the Planning Committee because it was intrinsically linked to application 19/P/02195 for 12-15 Midleton Industrial Estate.

The application site related to a large industrial building located within Midleton Industrial Estate. The premises had been vacant for approximately two years. The application to change the use of the building to Leisure and Assembly was required to accommodate the trampoline park operated by Airhop whose previous premises would be demolished as part of application 19/P/02195. The site would also create more parking spaces than offered by its current premises. In the planning officer's view, the proposal was in scale and character with the surrounding area and would have no impact on neighbouring amenities, highways or parking. The loss of employment floor space was mitigated through the grant of the personal permission secured by a S106 agreement and the application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Committee discussed the application and was satisfied that sufficient parking would be provided for the trampoline park. On that basis, the Committee fully supported the proposal for the change of use of the building to Leisure and Assembly which would ensure the trampoline parks future operation.

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
2.	Jan Harwood	X		
3.	Fiona White	X		
4.	Marsha Moseley	X		
5.	Ruth Brothwell	X		
6.	Richard Billington	X		
7.	Graham Eyre	X		
8.	Chris Blow	X		
9.	Liz Hogger	X		
10.	Colin Cross	X		
11.	Jon Askew	X		
12.	Pauline Searle	X		
13.	Maddy Redpath	X		
14.	Christopher Barrass	X		
15.	Angela Gunning	X		
	TOTALS:	15	0	0

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/00141 subject:

- (i) That a S106 Agreement be entered into to secure:
- The use of the building to Airhop Ltd alone and no other individual or corporate person and
 - An obligation to reinstate the former use if the operation and occupation by Airhop Guildford Ltd ceases.

If the terms of the S106 or wording of the planning conditions are significantly amended as part of ongoing S106 or planning condition(s) negotiations 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 Planning Development Manager.

PL24 20/P/00353 - 244 LONDON ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU4 7LD

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of a detached three-bedroom dwelling.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application site was located in a sustainable location within the urban area of Guildford. The proposed new dwelling would be located to the side of no.244 London Road and would not extend beyond the existing building line and a 1 metre gap would be retained between the sides of the new dwelling. A traditional design had been proposed with a pitched roof. The neighbouring dwellings were varied both in style and size however were predominantly traditional in character and therefore aligned with the property design proposed. Three car parking spaces would be retained for the existing dwelling and two spaces provided for the new house. The new dwelling would not extend beyond the front and rear elevations of the adjacent neighbouring properties. The upper floor window in the side elevation was conditioned to be obscure glazed and non-opening. It was the planning officer's view that the proposed development would respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would not result in a detrimental impact on residential amenities of the neighbouring properties or result in any parking or highways issues and the application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Committee noted a concern raised that the house would be slotted in and was not in character with the surrounding area as well as being located close to a major strategic site. The Committee considered nevertheless that the development proposed overall was in keeping with neighbouring properties, would not be detrimental to local amenities and had incorporated sufficient parking and on that basis should be approved.

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Fiona White	X		
2.	Christopher Barrass			X
3.	Graham Eyre	X		
4.	Jon Askew	X		
5.	Pauline Searle	X		
6.	Ruth Brothwell		X	
7.	Ramsey Nagaty		X	
8.	Chris Blow	X		
9.	Marsha Moseley	X		
10.	Liz Hogger	X		
11.	Angela Gunning		X	
12.	Richard Billington	X		
13.	Maddy Redpath	X		
14.	Colin Cross			X
15.	Jan Harwood	X		
	TOTALS:	10	3	2

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/00535 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.

PL25 20/P/00746 - 14A TANGIER ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DE

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of a two-storey side extension, single storey front extension, creation of hard standing to front and raising the height of the roof to create habitable accommodation and dummy pitch roof, white rendering throughout, addition of windows (revision of planning permission 19/P/01039, approved on appeal on 20/01/2020).

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application site was located within the urban area of Guildford and comprised a two-storey detached house with plain clay tiled pitched roof with brick elevations. A steeper pitched roof was proposed with a flat roof section however no changes were proposed to the height of the roof eaves. Minor changes were also proposed to the depth of the single storey front extension. Whilst the addition of a flat roof was not ideal, its overall size was relatively limited. In the planning officer's view, the proposal would not result in a loss of light, have an overbearing effect upon the adjacent neighbouring properties, was not materially harmful and the application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Chairman permitted Councillor Joss Bigmore to speak in his capacity as ward councillor in relation to the application.

The Committee noted concerns raised that the steepening of the pitch of the front and rear rooves across the whole width of the extension would form a 7-foot deep flat roof between them. It would increase the roof mass significantly with five dormer windows. The small skylights were also proposed to become three large windows which were the same height as those in the first-floor bedrooms and re-introduce a fourth window in the second floor of the front gable extension. The scheme would remove sympathetic elements of the approved scheme such as a traditional apex-pitched roof, porch, and bay window. It would build further out from the front elevation eroding more space from the front garden the remainder of which would be hard surfaced for parking. White render was also proposed as opposed to brick and tile. The Committee noted in addition concerns that it would create an incongruous form of development owing to its excessive roof scale and size and was out of character with the surrounding area.

The Committee also considered that the property in question was originally an infill dwelling and was already quite different in character from the surrounding houses. The proposal for the two-storey side extension and other additions would therefore not create a property that was out of character with the streetscene. Whilst the Committee accepted that the roof was steeper with a bulky dormer in the roof, there were already other examples of such extensions on properties opposite the dwelling in question. The Committee considered overall that the development proposed was acceptable in the streetscene and the concerns raised were not sufficient to support refusal of the application.

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Liz Hogger	X		
2.	Ramsey Nagaty			X
3.	Richard Billington	X		
4.	Christopher Barrass		X	
5.	Jan Harwood	X		
6.	Colin Cross			X
7.	Angela Gunning	X		
8.	Ruth Brothwell		X	
9.	Pauline Searle	X		
10.	Fiona White	X		
11.	Marsha Moseley	X		
12.	Chris Blow		X	
13.	Graham Eyre		X	
14.	Maddy Redpath			X
15.	Jon Askew	X		
	TOTALS:	8	4	3

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/00746 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL26 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted the appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 9.32 pm

Signed

Chairman

Date