

PLANNING COMMITTEE

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

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

*Present

Councillors Chris Barrass and Catherine Young were also in attendance.

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Chris Barrass, Chris Blow and Angela Gunning. Councillor Bob McShee attended as a substitute for Councillor Chris Blow with no substitutes for Councillors Chris Barrass or Angela Gunning.

PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

21/P/00817 – Royal Surrey County Hospital, Egerton Road, Guildford, GU2 7XX

Councillor Fiona White declared a non-pecuniary interest in the above application as she was a member of the governing Board of the Hospital. She would call the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Colin Cross to chair the meeting for the consideration of this application and would leave the Council Chamber after she had spoken for three minutes in her capacity as councillor for the adjoining ward and Surrey County Councillor.

Councillor David Bilbé declared a non-pecuniary interest in the above application due to his wife being an employee at the Royal Surrey County Hospital.

PL3 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 1 December 2021 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the procedures for determining planning applications.

PL5 21/P/01683 - HIGH BRAMBLES, PARK CORNER DRIVE, EAST HORSLEY, LEATHERHEAD, KT24 6SE

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for variation of condition 2 of planning application 20/P/01954 approved 06/01/21 to replace approved drawings with those submitted to create a part two storey part single storey rear extension.

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

- Mr Terence Waters (Chairman of Park Corner Drive Residents' Association (to object);
- Ms Jackie Bunyan (to object) and;
- Mr Andrew Badosz (Agent) (In Support)

The Committee received a presentation from James Overall, Senior Planning Officer. The Committee noted that the site was located in an area inset from the Green Belt and was within the identified settlement boundary. It was also within the 400 metre to 500 km buffer zone of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). The site consisted of a two-storey detached replacement dwelling which was granted permission under 20/P/01954 and is currently under construction. The dwelling was situated on a large plot, located away from the residential cul-de-sac which was characterised by dwellings of various styles. The houses at High Brambles were at a higher ground level than neighbouring properties. The road was characterised by mature hedging and trees to the side and rear boundaries with soft landscaping in front gardens. The plan was to seek to extend the depth across the rear elevation by a third, up to 9.9 metres compared to the approved plan. There would be no change to the width or front elevation of the dwelling. The revised proposal would have the same first floor rear windows, but as a result of the extension these rear elevation windows would be set back. The separation distance to the properties at the rear would be retained at 2.99 metres. The extension would not reduce this distance and as a result of the proposed extension the angle of view would be set back further into the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties either side. When assessing overlooking, 5 metres was considered to be detrimental from the rear elevation with regard to vision splays. The areas affected by overlooking were considered to be small compared to the expanse of amenity space in relation to neighbouring amenities.

There will be an increase in the depth of the flank elevations and insertion of one additional roof light on the eastern flank elevation. There will be a high level rooflight serving a kitchen at ground floor on the proposed alterations. Sufficient spacing would be maintained to the side boundaries to ensure that there would be no detrimental impact on neighbouring plots on either side or any detrimental loss of light or overbearing impact. This Section 73 application proposes an alteration which did not change the front elevation nor the design of the dwelling house. With regard to elevations, the dwelling would continue to follow the line of existing development either side of the host property. The host dwelling extending past the rear building line protrusion was relatively minor and would not harm the character of the area. The boundary with neighbouring properties would be retained at 3.5metres with no increase in height proposed. This resulted in a dwelling which was in keeping with the character of the area and had an acceptable relationship with its immediate surroundings.

In summary the proposed alterations all occur at the end at the rear of the property, and it was considered that there would be no detrimental impact on the character of the area. In terms of the impact upon neighbouring amenity, the alterations would not cause detrimental harm, with regards overlooking, overshadowing or outlook. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions of which one is for the removal of permitted development rights for extensions and roof extensions to ensure dwelling house to not add additional bulk without first applying for planning permission.

The Chairman permitted, Councillor Catherine Young to speak in her capacity as ward councillor for three minutes.

The Committee noted concerns raised that by allowing this variation would cause significant planning harm to the character of the immediate local area. It would also have a significant impact on the private amenity on both sets of neighbours. If the variation were granted it would result in a building virtually the same size as that refused. The Planning Inspector described this as a bulky and dominant scheme and undermining of the existing character, stating that it would result in a proposal that was discordant, harmful and completely out of place. The proposal contravened the Local Plan and East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan as the proposal did

not respect the distinct local character of the area and was in conflict with policy D1 with regard to place shaping, G1 regarding general standards of development and G1(3) regarding protection of amenity and that residents expect to be protected from unneighbourly development in terms of privacy and access to sunlight and daylight. This development would result in a significant loss of day and sunlight which was a material planning consideration. This was exacerbated by the fact that the road sloped upwards and the new extension would sit higher in comparison to the neighbouring property, notably the orientation on the map provided in the officer's report on page 84 was inaccurate where it pointed which was critical in tracking the movement of the sun and the impact of shadowing on both neighbour's gardens, in particular the patio and seating area of the garden of Two Steps. As a result of its scale and bulk the proposed development was also contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan policy EH47 which required that designs were in keeping with the established character. There was also a lack of significant screening following the felling of trees given the right to daylight and sunlight.

The Committee discussed the application and was concerned regarding the increased volume proposed of the property of which there was not a clear breakdown in the report. It was critical to see the breakdown of volume owing to the loss of amenity to the neighbours.

The Committee also noted their concerns regarding the size of the extension which was significant and bulky and would be out of character. In addition, the effect of the light on the patio and the effect upon neighbouring amenities.

The Committee queried if permitted development rights were allowed would the proposal therefore be a single storey structure as opposed to two storeys in height.

The Committee also considered points raised that the proposal did not look out of character despite it being a larger house.

The Head of Place, Dan Ledger clarified comments made by the Committee. With regard to permitted development, there were different permitted development criteria for single storey and two storey extensions. More than one storey could be carried out under permitted development subject to a number of criteria, one of which was that it didn't exceed 3 metres in depth. So a two-storey extension could conceivably be done under permitted development. Single storey extensions for detached properties could also go deeper. With regard to volume calculations, these were not included in the report as the site in question was inset from the Green Belt. With regard to character, the changes proposed were predominantly to the rear of the property and how that affected the wider character not just visibility. Whilst the proposal projected further backwards it was not any closer to the boundary.

The Committee agreed that the proposal represented a building that was excessive in scale in comparison to the neighbouring properties. It was overbearing and would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area. Of particular concern, was the patio at the property Two Steps which would be overshadowed and have their amenity space reduced.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jon Askew		X	
2	David Bilbé	X		
3	Bob McShee		X	
4	Ruth Brothwell		X	
5	Colin Cross		X	
6	Angela Goodwin		X	
7	Liz Hogger		X	
8	Marsha Moseley	X		
9	Ramsey Nagaty		X	
10	Maddy Redpath		X	
11	Pauline Searle		X	
12	Paul Spooner	X		
13	Fiona White			X
	TOTALS	3	9	1

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Angela Goodwin	X		
2	Pauline Searle	X		
3	Maddy Redpath	X		
4	Fiona White			X
5	Ruth Brothwell	X		
6	Paul Spooner		X	
7	Bob McShee	X		
8	David Bilbe		X	
9	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
10	Jon Askew	X		
11	Marsha Moseley		X	
12	Colin Cross	X		
13	Liz Hogger	X		
	TOTALS	9	3	1

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 21/P/01683 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed dwelling would by virtue of the additional depth at two storey height result in a building which is excessive in scale compared to nearby properties, resulting in overbearingness and having a detrimental impact upon the character of the prevailing area. As such the proposal does not comply with the Local Plan (2015-2034) Policy D1(4) - 'Place Shaping: Distinct Local Character', which seeks for all new development to be designed and reflect the distinct local character of the area and reinforce locally distinct patterns of development. Furthermore, the proposal does not comply with the Neighbourhood Plan (2017-2033) Policy EH-H7 (a) - 'East Horsley Design Code: Houses & Bungalows', which

seeks for designs to be in keeping with the established character of Easy Horsley and the style of properties surrounding the development.

2. As a result of the increased rear projection and proximity to the boundary protruding past the rear building line of the neighbouring property Two Steps, the development will have an overbearing and overshadowing impact upon the patio area of Two Steps thereby having a detrimental impact upon their amenity space. As such the proposal does not comply with the Saved Local Plan (2003) Policy G1(3) – ‘Protection of Amenities Enjoyed by Occupants of Buildings’, which seeks to ensure that amenities enjoyed by occupants of buildings are protected from unneighbourly development with regard to privacy and access to sunlight/daylight.

Informatives:

1. 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 on the original scheme (20/P/01954) prior to submission and minor alterations were required to overcome concerns, these were sought and the applicant agreed to the changes.

For the Section 73 application (21/P/01683) pre-application advice was not sought prior to submission and there are significant objections to the application that minor alterations would not overcome, it was not considered appropriate to seek amendments through the course of this application.

PL6 21/P/00630 - MERROW LAWN TENNIS CLUB, EPSOM ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU4 7AA

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for the conversion of one outdoor natural grass tennis court to one outdoor porous asphalt tennis courts with the installation of LED floodlighting and associated works.

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

- Mr Julian Tedder (to object);
- Mr Andrew Strawson (to object);
- Mr Adrian Rees (in support) (Chairman of Merrow Lawn Tennis Club) and;
- Mr David Clegg (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from Sakina Khanbhai, Specialist Development Management (Applications). The Committee noted that the application site comprised a parcel of land within the tennis club grounds. The site was located within the Green Belt and within an

Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). The site was located to residential development, recreational fields and a golf club.

The site was proposed to have chain link fencing measuring 3.6 metres in height connected by rectangular posts which would surround the tennis court and included the installation of 6 x 6-metre-high lighting columns. There was also 3.5-metre-high hedging on the side boundary which provided screening however the 6-metre-high floodlights would be visible above the hedge line. The technical drawings demonstrated the lighting overspill beyond the site boundaries. Of particular concern was the 14.6 lux level overspill of light to the rear garden of number 3 Abbot's Way which would cause material harm to residential amenities. The Council's Environmental Health Officer had also raised concerns to the proposed lighting scheme on this basis.

In summary, the additional lighting in the proposal location would result in adverse harm to the visual amenities of the rural character of the wider landscape. The proposed lighting scheme would result in overspill in number 3 Abbot's Way's Garden. Furthermore, the creation of an additional tennis court in close proximity to the residential properties would result in noise activity at an intensity that would be harmful to neighbouring amenity which the Council's Environmental Health Officer had objected to.

The Committee discussed the application and noted concerns raised that whilst they were supportive of refusing the application on the basis of the intrusive lighting, the potential noise impact was questionable given another court could be put there now.

The Committee also noted comments regarding the importance of physical exercise and yet there was already a redundant outdoor tennis court.

With regard to noise, the Committee also appreciated that the use of asphalt would make it noisier overall.

The Head of Place, Dan Ledger also confirmed that it was not just about the use of the tennis courts but the increased intensity of the site as a whole alongside the additional lighting, which would increase the noise throughout the day and was supported by the Council's Environmental Health Officer.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jon Askew	X		
2	Marsha Moseley			X
3	Pauline Searle	X		
4	Angela Goodwin	X		
5	Maddy Redpath	X		
6	Ruth Brothwell	X		
7	David Bilbe	X		
8	Colin Cross	X		
9	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
10	Paul Spooner			X
11	Liz Hogger	X		
12	Bob McShee	X		
13	Fiona White	X		
	TOTALS	11	0	2

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 21/P/00630 for the reasons as outlined in the report.

PL7 21/P/00817 - ROYAL SURREY COUNTY HOSPITAL, EGERTON ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU2 7XX

The Deputy Chairman, Councillor Colin Cross chaired this application owing to the Chairman's declared non-disclosable pecuniary interest.

The Committee considered the above-mentioned hybrid application for the development of land known as Plot 23 (and south of Rosalind Frank Close) comprising: A. Full planning permission for six level multi storey car park to accommodate 598 staff parking spaces and a security office on land at the south of plot 23 and the creation of 15 disabled parking spaces on main hospital site with associated landscaping. B. Outline planning permission with, matters of landscaping reserved, for new cancer centre and associated car parking on land at the north of Plot 23.

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

- Ms Flora Curtis (on behalf of the Students of the University of Surrey) (to object);
- Mr Ray Rogers (Governor) (in support) and;
- Ms Vicky Mumford (Assistant Director of Nursing, Cancer) (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Head of Place, Dan Ledger. The Committee noted that the proposal related to the reorganisation of some of the accessible car parking spaces from the main hospital. Plot 23 would also be developed for a 6-level multi-storey car park and a new clinical facility to be used as a cancer centre. The application was hybrid when meant full planning permission was sought for the multi-storey car park and for the accessible parking spaces and outline permission for the cancer centre. The outline part of the application dealt with matters of access, layout, scale and appearance together with

landscaping and formed part of the Site Allocation A17 within the adopted Local Plan. The proposal would use the existing vehicular and pedestrian access points into the site. The multi-storey car park would be located to the west. The cancer centre would be comprised of a two-storey building which would include a surface car park with 32 spaces to specifically serve this building. The multi-storey car park would have 6 split level decks between 15-18 metres in height. It would provide 598 car parking spaces for hospital staff and was a large structure approx. 80 metres in length and 35 metres deep. The car park would include two lifts and staircases located at either end of the buildings for access and a security office.

The design of the building was utilitarian with metal mesh screening on the walls and indicated the functionality of the building being proposed. It would be seen within the context of the other larger buildings on the university site and from wider angles you would see it behind other existing structures. There were a number of trees around the site boundary, nearly all of which would be retained apart from a group around the site access. The retained trees would be protected during construction to ensure they continue to screen the site and was required by condition. Additional planting would also enhance screening and soften the appearance of the building. A reasonable gap was maintained between nearby properties and those adjoining student accommodation buildings. The gap was sufficient to screen any light spillage and reduce the impact of noise which would be limited to the vehicles entering and leaving the site. Planning officers considered this was acceptable in the context of the development. A new footpath would be established from the northern access to the existing pedestrian link and Rosalind Franklin Close. You would use the same walking route through to the hospital. The clinical building would be predominantly 2-storeys in height with a maximum height of 8.6 metres increasing to a maximum of 11.1 metres which included rooftop plant machinery. It would have a contemporary appearance with elevations of a dark brick at ground floor level with lighter coloured aluminium cladding used on the upper levels. At the front of the building there would be an overhang. Given the proximity to the A3, the impact of the strategic highway network had been assessed and subject to highway improvement works on the junction to increase capacity to manage queuing onto the slip road there was no objection. Planning officers considered that the proposal offered solutions to the complex parking demands of the hospital which needed to be in line with the sustainable transport choices. Surrey County Council were satisfied that there would not be an adverse impact on highway capacity from the increase in vehicle movements. The development would also safeguard land to provide infrastructure for the Sustainable Movement Corridor. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to a Section 106 Agreement.

Councillor Fiona White spoke in her capacity as Councillor for the adjoining ward for three minutes and then left the room for the duration of the consideration of the application.

The Committee noted comments that Royal Surrey Hospital had taken steps to solve the problem of staff parking even to the extent of leasing land to run a park and ride on land that's no longer available owing to being earmarked for housing. There had been a clear need for additional parking for a long time and this application would go a long way to meet that need. Surrey Highways had also withdrawn their objection subject to condition 11. Additional accessible parking spaces would also be created as well as providing more spaces for patients and visitors at the hospital. Whilst the application for the cancer centre was in outline form only, it would contribute towards improved healthcare facilities which was much needed in Guildford. The additional parking provision would also provide relief to staff and patients who were very often parking offsite owing to lack of spaces onsite.

The Committee considered the application and noted comments that the proposed car park was a practical necessity which would assist staff and patients with parking which was woefully inadequate currently. It was also telling that 154 people had written letters of support with only 34 people against the proposed scheme. The tarmacking of the ground was also seen as a necessity given the muddy state of the ground which was difficult to navigate.

The Committee noted concerns raised regarding the local residents view of the monolithic structure and whether a green wall could be installed or green roof. The total number of electric vehicle charging points which equated to 5% of the total parking spaces was also perceived to be very low. The number of accessible spaces was welcome but was likely not to meet the demand and therefore was it possible to ask for additional accessible spaces? In addition, in relation to sustainable movement and travel, there was no mention of safe and secure bike lockers which would encourage more people to leave their bikes whilst at work and to use them as an alternative mode of transport.

The Committee noted concerns that the scheme should be postponed until the issues are resolved between the Hospital, the University and Surrey Research Park regarding traffic volumes. Air quality concerns remained an issue owing to the fact that the A3 was twice over the legal limit of what it should be. A development such as this would create additional vehicle movements.

The Committee agreed that the building was practically designed and would improve the patient and staff experience overall.

The Head of Place, Dan Ledger confirmed in relation to queries raised by the Committee that they had to assess the application before it. The number of additional accessible car parking spaces was an improvement upon the existing situation. Under the Heads of Terms, as per the S106 Agreement, the hospital was required to submit a new Master Travel Plan which would cover some of the points raised regarding alternative travel options for staff. The number of electric vehicle charging points was in line with the standards currently in place and could be increased according to need generated in the future. National Highways and County Highways had required as part of the S106 and conditions to require that works needed to be carried out prior to the development becoming operational.

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	David Bilbe	X		
6	Angela Goodwin	X		
7	Marsha Moseley	X		
8	Pauline Searle	X		
9	Bob McShee	X		
10	Ramsey Nagaty			X
11	Paul Spooner	X		
12	Liz Hogger	X		
	TOTALS	11	0	1

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

RESOLVED to approve application 21/P/00817:

- (i) Subject to a Section 106 Agreement securing:
 - Submission of an updated Master Travel Plan.
 - Contribution towards the auditing of Master Travel Plan.
 - Contributions towards relevant junction improvement works with the A3
 - Requirement to undertake a travel study and implement the findings
 - Contributions to local highway improvements
 - Safeguarding land for Sustainable Movement Corridor

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 Members for Onslow.

- (ii) That upon completion of the above, the application be determined by the Head of Place.
- (iii) In the event that a satisfactory legal agreement is not completed the Head of Place be allowed to refuse the application.

PL8 21/P/01858 - LAKESIDE CLOSE, LAKESIDE CLOSE, ASH VALE GU12

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for variation of condition 14 (flood and surface water drainage) relating to Planning Application 12/P/01005 approved 10/04/2013.

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

- Mr Grant Archard (to object) and;
- Mr Ian Thomas (to object)

The Committee received a presentation from James Overall, Senior Planning Officer. The Committee noted that it was a Section 73 application for the variation of condition 14 of the original permission which related to drainage. The site was located in the urban area of Ash, within an area of flood plain. A railway ran along the northern boundary of the site behind tree screening. Access to the site was gained via the south of Lakeside Close. There was a residential estate located to the south and east and the site was also located with the Special Protection Area. The first option, which was part of the original application, was for a 1-metre-deep swale, 64 metres long and 6.5 metres wide. The second option, which was part of the original application was for a 6-metre-deep swale and 4.1 metres wide. A swale was a linear depression which led surface water to a drainage system. The valve south of Lakeside Road in 2019 was silted and not working. A sequential test was carried out by the Council which concluded that there were no suitable available alternative sites at less risk of flooding. In addition to this, an exception test was undertaken which was completed to demonstrate that the development provided wider sustainable benefits to the community that outweighed flood risk. A site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrated that the development would be safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere and where possible reduce flood risk. As such, the application was permitted subject to conditions to ensure a flood risk assessment strategy was carried out appropriately. However, the drainage system was not installed correctly which had subsequently resulted in flooding in the surrounding area. The variation of condition 14 proposed was therefore recommended for refusal given it was imposed to ensure that the development was built in accordance with the flood mitigation controls.

The Committee discussed the application and noted comments that the Council should be aiming for exemplary development and drainage and supported the refusal of the application. The Committee also noted that the site was not located in Ash, South and Tongham as per the agenda. The flood prevention scheme was clearly not adequate and had resulted in unacceptable flooding to residential properties which must be rectified via the refusal of this proposed amendment to condition 14.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Colin Cross	X		
2	Pauline Searle	X		
3	Paul Spooner	X		
4	Bob McShee	X		
5	Maddy Redpath	X		
6	Fiona White	X		
7	Angela Goodwin	X		
8	Ruth Brothwell	X		
9	Jon Askew	X		
10	Liz Hogger	X		
11	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
12	Marsha Moseley	X		
	TOTALS	12	0	0

(Councillor David Bilbè had left the meeting)

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 21/P/01858 subject to the reasons as detailed in the report.

PL9 21/P/00646 - WOODLANDS, THE WARREN, EAST HORSLEY, LEATHERHEAD, KT24 5RH

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of a replacement dwelling together with alterations to parking and vehicular access arrangements (revision of 20/P/00952).

The Committee received a presentation from Kieran Cuthbert, Specialist Development Management (Applications). 20/P/00952 was an application which was also refused and a revision of application 18/P/01718 also refused and dismissed at appeal. The site was located on a private residential road in East Horsley located in the Green Belt and outside of an identified settlement boundary. The changes were less noticeable on the front elevation drawings and showed the overall bulk increase caused by the gable roof alterations. The height increase from the existing to the proposed was 1.18 metres. In summary, taking into account that prior approval extensions, the volumetric increase would still create a 46% volume increase which was significant and would result in the construction of a much larger building with a substantial increase and was therefore recommended for refusal.

The Committee discussed the application and agreed that given it was a site located in the Green Belt, the Committee had to be consistent with its policies. The test was whether it was

materially larger than the existing house which it clearly was resulting in an increase of volume of 46% which was excessive.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Fiona White	X		
2	Colin Cross			X
3	Angela Goodwin	X		
4	Ramsey Nagaty			X
5	Pauline Searle	X		
6	Liz Hogger	X		
7	Marsha Moseley	X		
8	Maddy Redpath	X		
9	Jon Askew	X		
10	Ruth Brothwell	X		
11	Bob McShee	X		
12	Paul Spooner	X		
	TOTALS	10	0	2

(Councillor David Bilbè had left the meeting)

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 21/P/00646 for the reasons as detailed in the report.

PL10 NORTH MOORS ALLOTMENT FOOTPATH DIVERSION

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for change of use of amenity land to deliver 76 allotment plots, bee keeping facilities, composting areas, community buildings, landscaping and associated cycle storage and car parking.

The application had been referred to the Planning Committee because the council is the owner of the land and it is also the applicant.

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

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

RESOLVED to approve the North Moors Allotment Footpath Diversion.

PL11 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The meeting finished at 9.31 pm

Signed

Chairman

Date