

PLANNING COMMITTEE

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

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| * Councillor Jon Askew | * Councillor Angela Gunning |
| * Councillor Christopher Barrass | * 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 Paul Spooner |

*Present

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillors Chris Blow, Ruth Brothwell and Colin Cross. Councillors Tony Rooth, Bob McShee and Dennis Booth attended as substitutes respectively. In addition, Councillor David Bilbé sent his apologies with no substitute.

PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

21/P/01811 – Guildford Plaza (former Buryfield House), Portsmouth Road, Guildford, GU2 4DH

Councillor Angela Goodwin declared a non-pecuniary interest in the above application by virtue of the fact that she was a Trustee of the Caleb Lovejoy Alms Houses but confirmed that this would not affect her objectivity in considering the application.

PL3 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 12 January 2022 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the procedures for determining planning applications.

PL5 21/P/01811 - GUILDFORD PLAZA (FORMER BURYMEAD HOUSE), PORTSMOUTH ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU2 4DH

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for the erection of four buildings of between 4 and 6 storeys to provide up to 301 units of Co-Living accommodation (Sui Generis) together with associated communal facilities, basement level to provide access, vehicle and cycle parking, plant and refuse enclosure, with associated groundworks and landscaping.

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

- Ms Marie Hanlan (to object)

- Mr Duncan Tindale (Tiger Developments Ltd) (In Support) and;
- Mr Paul Landsberg (Barton Wilmore) (In Support)

The Committee received a presentation from Specialist Development Management Majors, John Busher. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which included some typo corrections and one additional late representation from a resident. The application was for the construction of a co-living scheme on the site of the former Burymead House, Portsmouth Road. The development would consist of 301 residential units with an array of internal and external communal areas. The site was located within the town centre and urban area. Burymead House had been demolished in the early 2000's in anticipation of re-development and was an office building up to 10 storeys in height. The site already had two extant planning permissions in place, one for an office development and the second in 2018 for an assisted living scheme which in terms of design was virtually identical to that proposed in this application, except for a different pattern of fenestration and external materials as well as a slight reduction in some building heights. The 2018 scheme was therefore a significant material planning consideration. The site was located within the Millmead and Portsmouth Road Conservation Area as well as a number of listed buildings close to the site including those on Berry Street.

The proposal was split into four individual blocks with each block split into two sections of different heights and roof forms. The height and massing of the buildings were virtually the same as the extant scheme with slight reductions in height compared to the approved scheme. Residents would have their own private studios and living space but was shared with a large area of communal space for residents which included a coffee bar and gym that would be maintained by the owner in perpetuity. Fifty-two of the apartments would have a private communal meal space provided. The outdoor space would be split into an upper courtyard with lower-level seating areas and landscaping.

The Committee noted that despite some minor reductions in height made to the buildings proposed and changes to materials and fenestration, the current proposal was virtually identical to the assisted living scheme which was approved by the Committee in 2018. In terms of design and appearance, officers were still of the view that the proposal was acceptable, subject to conditions to control materials, landscaping and window details. It was also acknowledged that the site was within the Millmead and Portsmouth Road Conservation Area, in close proximity to a number of Grade II listed buildings and the Grade II star listed St Nicolas' Church. Planning officers had concluded that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the surrounding heritage assets and that the harm would be at the lower end of that scale and was in accordance with the NPPF. Great weight and considerable importance was afforded to such harm; however, the public benefits of the scheme were considered to outweigh the harm on this occasion. In addition, officers had attributed a moderate level of harm to the lack of any wheelchair accessible dwellings within the scheme. However, the benefits of the proposal were considered to be wide ranging, providing a significant quantum of housing which would meet a demand for smaller accommodation in the town as well as the provision of 67 affordable units. The proposal would also bring a long-term derelict site in a prominent location into reuse and would help to repair the street scene in the area. There would also be economic benefits and improvements to local infrastructure. When taking into account the harm resulting from the scheme and the great weight and importance which must be afforded to the impact on the heritage assets, the planning balance weighed in favour of the application and was therefore recommended for approval subject to a Section 106 Agreement.

The Committee discussed the application and considered that given the extant planning permissions that already existed for this site, the scheme proposed was compliant with planning policy. The Committee recognised the demand for co-living opportunities. The Committee noted that the site had remained a vacant brownfield site for many years and welcomed the development of it. Concern was raised that the accommodation appeared to be geared towards young professionals and there was no mention of couples, single parents or people in

professions such as lorry drivers, shop assistants or people with families who may also have a desire for this sort of accommodation. Clarification was sought from planning officers regarding the allocation of affordable homes and how this allocation would be maintained in perpetuity. The Committee also considered that the open space on Portsmouth Road had a very steep slope and asked planning officers whether it would be levelled out. The Committee was also concerned that all tenants should have adequate access to daylight not just satisfactory access, as alluded to in the planning officers report.

John Busher, planning officer, confirmed that in terms of daylight, it would have been the same situation for the extant scheme. Planning officers had therefore taken a pragmatic approach towards the scheme as a whole in terms of access to daylight for the dwellings, in the rooms and in the communal spaces. The affordable apartments would be let to people on a median wage level of £25,000 per annum or less. The open space provided between Blocks A and C would also be on level land. If tenants were to start a family, then they would need to assess their situation accordingly and move to a larger dwelling as appropriate.

The Committee considered the increase in the number of units to be considerable however also acknowledged that the scheme was located in a sustainable area close to bus, train and cycle networks and would make an ideal purchase for younger people seeking affordable accommodation.

In conclusion, the Committee agreed that on balance the scheme represented a positive contribution towards the housing needs of Guildford. The extant permissions previously secured for the site was a significant material consideration whereby the site had already been considered acceptable for this type of development. The size and massing of the scheme was virtually identical to the extant scheme approved in 2018. The harm caused to the local heritage assets was also outweighed by the benefits of the scheme in helping to plug the gap in the provision of affordable dwellings and overall housing shortage.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Tony Rooth			X
2	Jon Askew	X		
3	Fiona White	X		
4	Dennis Booth	X		
5	Maddy Redpath	X		
6	Bob McShee	X		
7	Pauline Searle	X		
8	Liz Hogger	X		
9	Paul Spooner	X		
10	Marsha Moseley	X		
11	Angela Goodwin	X		
12	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
13	Angela Gunning			X
14	Chris Barrass	X		
	TOTALS	12	0	2

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

RESOLVED to approve application 21/P/01811 subject:

(i) That a s.106 agreement be entered into to secure:

- provision of not less than 67 units to be provided at a Discounted Market Rent;
- arrangements to secure the letting of the 67 affordable units, and in a situation where they are not, a mechanism for the Council to be compensated for any under provision of affordable units;
- 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;
- contribution towards NHS Primary Care;
- contribution towards policing infrastructure;
- on-site car club provision (provision of two cars);
- car-club membership for all new residents;
- on-site cycle hire scheme;
- bus shelters with Real Time Passenger Information;
- variation to TRO to preclude future occupiers from obtaining a parking permit;
- upgrade the existing pelican crossing on Portsmouth Road;
- contribution towards wayfinding signage;
- a 6-metre area of land (4 metre wide by 1 metre deep) fronting Portsmouth Road to be dedicated to Surrey County Council in order to provide land for a bus shelter;
- contribution towards the implementation of the Council's Sustainable Movement Corridor; and
- management plan to be agreed (including pulling the bins out to the designated areas, engaging with Designing Out Crime Officer) If the terms of the s.106 or wording or the planning conditions are significantly amended as part of ongoing s.106 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 Head of Place / Director of Service Delivery. The recommendation is to approve planning permission, subject to conditions.

PL6 21/P/02257 - WATERSIDE FARM COTTAGE, WHARF LANE, SEND, WOKING, GU23 7EJ

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

- Mr Dave Burnett (to object);
- Cllr Pat Oven (on behalf of Send Parish Council) (to object) and;
- Mr Thomas Rumble (Agent) (In Support)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed erection of 8 dwellings (C3 use class) with associated access, landscaping and parking, following demolition of Waterside Farm Cottage, outbuildings and Wharf Lane garages.

The Committee received a presentation from Specialist, Development Management Applications Officer, Katie Williams. The proposed development was identical to that proposed under a previous application, 21/P/01581 which was the subject of a non-determination appeal. This application was considered by the Planning Committee on 1 December 2021 and the Council's decision was that it would have approved the application had an appeal against non-determination not been lodged. The Committee also noted the supplementary late sheets which detailed a correction to the tree report reference.

The application was located within the settlement of Send which had been inset from the Green Belt following the adoption of the 2019 Local Plan. The site was within the corridor of the River Wey, adjacent to the Wey Navigation Conservation Area and also within the 400 metre to 5-kilometre buffer zone of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. The site lay outside of flood zones 2 and 3. The site was currently comprised of a detached bungalow and its outbuildings, together with a small area of parking which was currently owned by the Council. The surrounding area included residential properties along Wharf Lane and an area of open space called Heathfield Nature Reserve. A public footpath also ran through to the Wey Navigation.

A new vehicular access was proposed where the existing access to the garages was located and followed the existing hedge line through to a new residential cul-de-sac consisting of semi-detached and detached dwellings. The housing mix was for 2x2 beds, 4x3 beds and 2x4 beds. There was a total of 21 parking spaces, three of which would be allocated for visitors. A parking court was proposed to replace the current garaging replacing the eight garages with eight parking spaces. The existing pedestrian access through to the nature reserve would be retained as well as several mature trees on the site boundaries along with new tree planting. The development offered opportunities to restore and enhance biodiversity and the applicant had submitted an Ecological Management Plan as part of the application which would aim to offset the proposed loss of trees and hedging. With enhanced planting and ecological mitigation measures and also a pre-commencement condition recommended the proposed development was considered by planning officers to not result in harm to the nearby Site of Nature Conservation importance which incorporated the Wey Navigation.

Planning officers had no objection to the principle of development on this site. The proposal would deliver a net increase of seven new homes in a sustainable location. The development would not harmfully affect the character or appearance of the surrounding area including the setting of the adjacent Wey Navigation Conservation Area and would not materially impact on the residential amenities enjoyed by the occupants of the surrounding properties subject to recommended conditions. There would be no adverse impact on the ecology of the site or surroundings, the development would not give rise to conditions prejudicial to highway safety and wouldn't impact on the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA) subject to the conditions and the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure the necessary SANG and SAMM contributions, the application was deemed to be acceptable.

The Committee discussed the application and whilst sympathetic to the concerns raised by residents, this scheme was identical to the application which the Committee would have approved when considering it at its meeting on 1 December 2021, had it not been submitted for non-determination. In addition, it was confirmed by the planning officer that any concerns regarding SUDs had been dealt with by condition 20, as implemented by Surrey County Council who were the Local Lead Flood Authority. The Committee therefore agreed that the principle of development for this site was acceptable. The S106 Agreement ensured that the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA) was protected by virtue of the SANG and SAMM contributions secured.

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	Angela Goodwin	X		
3	Jon Askew	X		
4	Paul Spooner	X		
5	Maddy Redpath	X		
6	Fiona White	X		
7	Angela Gunning	X		
8	Liz Hogger	X		
9	Bob McShee	X		
10	Tony Rooth	X		
11	Marsha Moseley	X		
12	Pauline Searle	X		
13	Ramsey Nagaty		X	
14	Dennis Booth			X
	TOTALS	11	1	2

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

RESOLVED to approve application 21/P/02257 subject:

- (i) That a S106 Agreement be entered into to secure the provision of:
- SANG and SAMM Contributions in accordance with the formula of the updated tariff.

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 with the Chairman of the Planning Committee and lead Ward Member.

- (ii) That upon completion of the above, the application be determined by the Head of Place. The preliminary view is that the application should be granted subject to conditions.

PL7 20/P/01058 - WHITE HORSE YARD, HIGH STREET, RIPLEY, GU23 6BB

The Committee considered the above-mentioned Listed Building Consent application for the partial demolition of the existing wall to enable the erection of 26 houses and flats, associated landscaping, open space, access and parking following demolition of buildings.

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

Mr John Burns (to object) (read by Sophie Butcher, Democratic Services Officer)

The Committee received a presentation from the Specialist Development Management Applications Officer, Katie Williams. The Committee noted that the application site was allocated under Policy 44 of the Local Plan for residential development and retail or service users. The majority of the site had been inset from the Green Belt with just the southern and eastern edges remaining within the Green Belt. The site fronted onto Ripley High Street and the application sought listed Building Consent for the partial demolition of the curtilage listed. A

previous application for residential development on the site was granted at appeal in 2016 and included the demolition of the same section of listed wall as proposed under this current application. The listed wall was associated with the Talbot Hotel which was a Grade II star listed building.

The listed building application sought listed Building consent for the partial demolition of the curtilage listed wall. The same partial demolition was considered under the earlier appeal application where the Inspector allowed the appeal granting the acceptability of creating an opening through the existing wall. The harm caused was considered to be less than substantial and was outweighed by the benefits of enabling the redevelopment of the site, subject to conditions to ensure details were secured for the demolition and repair schedule. The Listed Building Consent could not be implemented until planning permission was secured for residential redevelopment of the site and was therefore recommended for approval.

The Committee queried why it was being asked to decide the Listed Building Consent application before a decision had been made on the actual planning application which was for 26 units. This report referred to the main planning application, stating that a terrace of three dwellings fronting the High Street would enhance the setting of the Conservation Area. If this therefore was part of the consideration of the recommendation to approve, the Committee therefore agreed that it was not in a position to make that decision until it had seen the details of the main planning application. The site was also allocated in the Local Plan A44 for approximately 26 homes and 90 square metres of retail or service units. The Committee agreed to defer this application until both applications could be considered together.

A motion was moved and seconded to defer application 20/P/01058 until it could be considered along with the main application for this site 20/P/01057. (Post meeting note: both applications are now scheduled to be considered by the Planning Committee at its meeting on 2 March 2022).

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Angela Gunning	X		
2	Maddy Redpath	X		
3	Fiona White	X		
4	Jon Askew	X		
5	Chris Barrass	X		
6	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
7	Bob McShee	X		
8	Paul Spooner	X		
9	Angela Goodwin	X		
10	Tony Rooth	X		
11	Pauline Searle	X		
12	Marsha Moseley			X
13	Dennis Booth	X		
14	Liz Hogger	X		
	TOTALS	13	0	1

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

RESOLVED to defer application 20/P/01058 until it can be considered with application 20/P/01057.

PL8 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted and discussed the planning appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 9.00 pm

Signed

Chairman

Date