

PLANNING COMMITTEE

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

- * Councillor Jon Askew
- * Councillor Christopher Barrass
- * Councillor David Bilbé
- * Councillor Chris Blow
- * Councillor Ruth Brothwell
- * Councillor Angela Goodwin
- * Councillor Angela Gunning
- * Councillor Liz Hogger
- * The Mayor, Councillor Marsha Moseley
- * Councillor Ramsey Nagaty
- * Councillor Maddy Redpath
- * Councillor Pauline Searle
- Councillor Paul Spooner

*Present

Councillor George Potter was also in attendance.

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

An apology was received from Councillor Paul Spooner for whom there was no substitute.

PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

No disclosures of interest were declared.

PL3 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 20 May 2021 were approved and signed by the Chairman as a true record.

PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the procedures for determining planning applications.

PL5 WITHDRAWN: 18/P/02456 - LAND AT ASH MANOR, ASH GREEN ROAD, ASH GREEN, GUILDFORD, GU12 6HH

The above application has now been withdrawn. Additional information was received from the Council's Tree Officer relating to the status of T67 and its possible categorisation as a veteran tree. This information will now need to be assessed by Planning Officers.

PL6 WITHDRAWN: 20/P/01461 - LAND AT ASH MANOR, ASH GREEN ROAD, ASH GREEN, GUILDFORD, GU12 6HH

The above application has now been withdrawn. Additional information was received from the Council's Tree Officer relating to the status of T67 and its possible categorisation as a veteran tree. This information will now need to be assessed by Planning Officers.

PL7 21/P/00039 - LAND AT STOKE AND DISTRICT HORTICULTURAL SOCIETY, CLUB HOUSE, BELLFIELDS ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 1QG

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed construction of a single storey temporary building (Use Class F2) for the "Aggie Club" along with associated servicing, drainage, storage, landscaping, access and car parking.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application had been referred to the Planning Committee by the Head of Place, Tim Dawes owing to the fact that Guildford Borough Council was the applicant. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which outlined further correspondence received from the Agent.

The proposed building would serve as a replacement facility for the existing Horticultural Society until its long-term replacement building was delivered through the Weyside Urban Village redevelopment. To the east of the site was the Guildford Borough Council depot and the Thames Water treatment facility. Residential properties along Parsons Green were located close to the site. 24 parking spaces were to be provided and a new vehicular access provided from Bellfields Road with a pedestrian zone in front of the garages. Owing to the proximity of the building to residential properties, significant mitigation measures had been secured by condition in order to prevent any harmful impact on neighbouring amenities. This consisted of defensive planting including Hawthorn and Holly which would prevent people from gathering close to the boundary. A 2.4-metre-high acoustic fence was also proposed to be installed along the western boundary. A noise management plan was required and acoustic insulation would be incorporated into the building. The building would be comprised of modular construction. A small alleyway separated the residential properties from the application site with a site level difference of approx. 1 metre, meaning that the site sat higher than its surroundings to the west. From the property at 34 Parsons Green and due to the land level differences, it was possible to see into the dwelling and its private garden which would be partly alleviated by the acoustic fence to be installed. In conclusion, it was the planning officer's view that the application was recommended for approval subject to the package of mitigation measures to be put in place.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that the existing premises, known locally as the 'Aggie Club' was widely used by the community and was a real asset. However, it was unfortunately located in the way of the Weyside Urban Village redevelopment. The current building was of no architectural merit. The negative aspect of the building being used for community events was the prospect of loud music at anti-social hours which could harm the enjoyment of the amenities for the residents of Parsons Green. The Committee asked if more information could be provided regarding the acoustic fence, the hours of operation of the premises, particularly on Saturday nights and what parking provision had been allocated to staff.

The Senior Specialist for Environmental Control, Gary Durrant confirmed that in respect of the acoustic fence, this would only be effective for people in close proximity to it. It did provide a useful barrier and had been successfully used elsewhere. With regard to the opening hours, the controls on licensing did not cover outside areas and only covered the building itself. The effective controls on hours of operation were directed by good management of the premises ultimately. The planning officer also confirmed that the maximum number of parking spaces required was 21 and therefore an additional 3 parking spaces had been provided and staff parking was incorporated as part of that. The Development Management Lead, Dan Ledger also confirmed that the insulation of the building and acoustic fence were all part of a package of management controls and conditioned so to limit people's ability to congregate closely to the residential properties.

The Committee also queried how high the acoustic fence would be and if its height would cause an overbearing effect upon residential properties in terms of shadowing over their gardens. Also, the Committee wished to confirm what the purpose was of the small alleyway which separated the site from the residential buildings. What access requirements had been incorporated into the building such as provision of an accessible toilet in a modular building, what safety and security measures had been put in place and if there were plans to install an electric car charging point?

The planning officer confirmed that the acoustic fence would be 2.4 metres in height and whilst there was the potential for some over shadowing it was limited with the alleyway already in situ. The alleyway had been constructed some time ago to give residents access to their rear gardens. One disabled parking space had been provided and in terms of security measures, it was up to the occupiers to install CCTV and ensure its good management. An electric vehicle charging point had not been incorporated but could be raised with the applicant. In terms of accessibility, that detail had not been provided and was subject to separate legislation. The Committee also noted that the building was subject to a noise management plan as detailed in condition 6.

The Committee considered whether it would be possible to have hours of operation stated separately from the licensing requirements and to state those hours clearly as part of the conditions. This could help prevent people from congregating in the car park. In addition, the Committee was concerned that when large events like weddings were held, the parking provision proposed onsite would not be sufficient and in turn place pressure upon residents parking spaces.

The Development Management Lead, Dan Ledger confirmed that government guidance was strict in that planning controls should not be used in addition to licensing controls in terms of managing operating hours. The effective management of parking for large events could be controlled through the discharge of the condition related to that. However, in terms of the number of parking spaces, it was in excess of the parking standards and could not be increased any further.

The Committee expressed concern regarding the wording of the text included in the informative detailed on page 130 'Pre-application advice was not sought prior to submission and the Local Authority has worked with the applicant....'. When the applicant was the Local Authority, how could the Local Authority be seen to be working with itself and that this needed further clarification.

The Development Management Lead, Dan Ledger that handling arrangements were in place which meant that an agent had been employed rather than being directly handled through the council offices.

The Solicitor confirmed that that informative on page 130 was in his mind sufficient given that in the last paragraph it stated that there were two teams, the applicant, and the decision-making side of the authority. Case law had established that handling arrangements must be recorded as two separate teams which had been followed and applied.

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

| RECORDED VOTE LIST | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| | COUNCILLOR | FOR | AGAINST | ABSTAIN |
| 1 | Pauline Searle | X | | |
| 2 | Angela Goodwin | X | | |
| 3 | Ruth Brothwell | X | | |
| 4 | Maddy Redpath | X | | |
| 5 | Liz Hogger | X | | |
| 6 | Angela Gunning | X | | |
| 7 | Chris Barrass | X | | |
| 8 | Ramsey Nagaty | X | | |
| 9 | Jon Askew | X | | |
| 10 | Fiona White | X | | |
| 11 | Chris Blow | X | | |
| 12 | The Mayor, Cllr Marsha Moseley | X | | |
| 13 | Colin Cross | X | | |
| 14. | David Bilbé | X | | |
| | TOTALS | 14 | 0 | 0 |

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

RESOLVED to approve application 21/P/00039 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL8 21/P/00470 - 50 CHARLOCK WAY, GUILDFORD, GU1 1XZ

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for single storey side extension, and conversion of existing loft space to habitable accommodation, including roof alterations, changes to fenestration, 2 dormer windows and 1 roof light.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application had been referred to the Planning Committee by Councillor George Potter who considered that the proposal may be out of character with the street scene and surrounding area and may result in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity.

The application site was located in the urban area of Guildford and the existing dwelling was a detached bungalow. The surrounding area was comprised of a mix of dwellings with bungalows and two-storey properties of different designs and sizes. Number 48 Charlock Way had also been subject to a significant extension at first floor level. The proposed development would have a similar appearance from the front elevation and as such would remain in keeping with the character of the area. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Chairman permitted Councillor George Potter to speak for three minutes in his capacity as ward councillor. The Committee noted concerns raised regarding the potential impact upon the streetscene and loss of light caused by the proposed development and whether it had been adequately dealt with in the report. It was also noted that a significant part of the development would already be permissible under permitted development rights.

The Development Management Lead, Dan Ledger confirmed that the report did assess the effect of the proposed extension on the surrounding area, the streetscene and effect upon neighbouring amenities. Additional information in relation to planning harm could have been

provided if requested. The previous application refused on this site owing to its large dormer windows did not include a reason for refusal based on amenity grounds and therefore this new issue would have to be carefully considered if it were to be pursued.

The Committee considered points raised that the scheme proposed was consistent with the existing streetscene but to assist with concerns regarding the effects upon the neighbours enjoyment of their amenities it was recommended to amend condition 4 so that the dormer windows in the south-west elevation of the development were obscure glazed in perpetuity. The Committee noted that neighbouring properties had already been significantly extended and on that basis the extension proposed on this site was appropriate.

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

| RECORDED VOTE LIST | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| | COUNCILLOR | FOR | AGAINST | ABSTAIN |
| 1 | Maddy Redpath | X | | |
| 2 | Ruth Brothwell | X | | |
| 3 | Colin Cross | X | | |
| 4 | Jon Askew | X | | |
| 5 | Angela Gunning | X | | |
| 6 | Fiona White | X | | |
| 7 | Pauline Searle | X | | |
| 8 | The Mayor, Cllr Marsha Moseley | X | | |
| 9 | Angela Goodwin | X | | |
| 10 | Chris Blow | | X | |
| 11 | Ramsey Nagaty | X | | |
| 12 | David Bilbé | X | | |
| 13 | Liz Hogger | X | | |
| 14 | Chris Barrass | X | | |
| | TOTALS | 13 | 1 | 0 |

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

RESOLVED to approve application 21/P/00470 subject to the amendment to condition 4, conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL9 21/P/00819 - 24 THE STREET, SHALFORD, GUILDFORD, GU4 8BT

The Committee considered the above-mentioned Listed Building Consent application for a new external side door, re-lay lean to roof adding three rooflights, and 3 obscured glazed lean-to windows, restore leaded light windows and internal works.

The application had been referred to the Planning Committee because the applicant was a Council employee. There had been no objections to the application. The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the dwelling was Grade II listed located in the Shalford Village area, inset from the Green Belt and was outside of the Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). The works proposed all fall under permitted development but as the building was Grade II listed building consent was required. The Council's Conservation Officer had assessed the scheme of works proposed and concluded that they had been sensitively

considered so not to undermine the historic significance of the building. A pre-commencement condition had been included to ensure that the details of the proposed windows, doors and re-roofing materials were submitted prior to installation. The roof lights were also required to be installed flush with the roof plan and for the boiler flue to be black coloured.

The Committee discussed the application and agreed that the proposed works had been sympathetically designed for the Grade II listed building and were content that the boiler flue which would be seen from the outside would blend in and had been conditioned to be painted black.

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

| RECORDED VOTE LIST | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| | COUNCILLOR | FOR | AGAINST | ABSTAIN |
| 1 | Chris Barrass | X | | |
| 2 | Pauline Searle | X | | |
| 3 | Jon Askew | X | | |
| 4 | David Bilbé | 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 | The Mayor, Cllr Marsha Moseley | X | | |
| 12 | Angela Goodwin | X | | |
| 13 | Ramsey Nagaty | X | | |
| 14 | Colin Cross | X | | |
| | TOTALS | 14 | 0 | 0 |

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

RESOLVED to approve application 21/P/00819 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the agenda.

PL10 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee discussed the appeal decisions and noted comments from the Development Management Lead, Dan Ledger regarding the second appeal listed, Land to the west of the Street, Tongham. Two reasons for refusal were put forward by the Committee regarding the design of the scheme and sustainability measures. It was worth noting the Inspector's comments regarding the scale of the development being able to create its own identity and that the scheme did not therefore need to respond to the local vernacular. The second reason for refusal regarding the SPD and sustainability, the Inspector found that the scheme did in fact meet the requirements of policy DP2 and sustainability requirements. The policies put forward to refuse an application therefore needed to be robust owing to the significant costs involved with an appeal process and officer and councillor time.

The Committee also congratulated officers on the successful appeal win against The Casino regarding costs awarded to Guildford Borough Council.

The meeting finished at 8.03 pm

Signed

Chairman

Date

