

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 | 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

Councillor Catherine Young was also in attendance.

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillors Chris Barrass, Liz Hogger and Pauline Searle. Councillors Tony Rooth, Wil Salmon and Cait Taylor attended as substitutes for the above councillors respectively. Councillor Marsha Moseley also sent her apologies and no substitute was in attendance.

PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

No disclosures of interest were declared.

PL3 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 13 April 2022 were approved and signed by the Chairman. The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 27 April 2022 were to follow.

PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the procedures for determining planning applications.

PL5 21/P/01537 - FOREST FARM, FOREST ROAD, EAST HORSLEY, LEATHERHEAD, KT24 5ER

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

- Ms Louisa Richter von Morgenstern acting on behalf of Mr Ian Dixon (to object);
- Mrs Denise Etwell (In support) and;
- Ms Susan Hoysted (In support).

The Committee considered the full application for construction of a single storey, two-bedroom dwelling.

The Committee received a presentation from planning officer, Katie Williams. The site was located within the identified settlement of East Horsley which was inset from the Green Belt and was also within the 400 metre to 5km buffer zone of the Thames Basin Heath SPA. The site consisted of a detached dwelling which was a Grade II Listed Building and fronted onto Forest Road. It had a long rear garden which extended to the railway line which ran to the north-east of the site. The trees along the frontage of the site were covered by a Tree Preservation Order. The character of the surrounding area was residential, consisting of detached dwellings fronting Forest Road, with spacious plots.

The proposal was for the construction of a single storey L-shaped 2-bedroom dwelling in the rear garden of the existing house on the site. The proposed development would be accessed via the existing vehicular access which ran along the side of the dwelling. The existing dwelling parking was proposed for at least three cars on an existing graveled area. To the front of the proposed plot, sufficient parking would also be retained for the host dwelling on the existing driveway. The Conservation Officer had no objection in terms of the impact of the proposal on the setting of the Listed Building and was concluded that there would be no material harm to the significance of the heritage asset. However, officers consider that the proposal to position the new dwelling set back behind a prevailing pattern of development along Forest Road would not respect the wider established character of the area.

The proposed development was to incorporate several sustainability measures and would look to achieve a 94% reduction in carbon emissions from the standard target. Emissions rate ecological enhancement measures were also proposed including planting and enhancement to the existing hedgerows. Due to the single-storey height and separation distance to neighbouring properties it was considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity.

The elevations of the proposed dwelling were of a contemporary design, incorporating block element components. There was a slight difference in height between the two block sections with the living block having a maximum of 4 metres and bedroom block set down slightly with a maximum of 3.3 metres. The roof would incorporate photovoltaic panels and a biodiverse green roof.

In conclusion, whilst there were no objections to the proposed development in principle. It was considered that the proposal would result in an inappropriate form of backland development that would fail to respect the wider established character of the area and would not be substantially surrounded by development contrary to the requirements of Policy IH8 of the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan. It was considered that the proposal would result in significant harm to the established character and appearance of the area which was also contrary to the design aims of Policy D1 of the Local Plan and G5 of the saved Local Plan. The application was therefore recommended for refusal due to concerns regarding the application. The applicant had not been invited to enter into a S106 Agreement to secure the required SANG and SAMM contributions to mitigate the impact on the Thames Basin Heath SPA and was therefore included as a reason for refusal.

The Chairman permitted Councillor Catherine Young to speak for three minutes in her capacity as ward councillor. The Committee noted points raised that there were many public benefits of the development which were exceptional and clearly outweighed the planning harm of backland development. This application took a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change as required by the NPPF through a host of reduction methods such as the green roof and many other features listed in the Design and Access Statement. The scheme was designed as net zero home which more than exceeded our own requirement for reductions in carbon emissions. The design was also innovative and minimized its impact upon the environment. The principle of development was also found to be acceptable by planning officers. There was no adverse impact on neighbouring amenity and the site was well screened therefore limiting the impact upon the character of the area. A wealth of biodiversity and ecological enhancements were also provided, and no harm would be caused to existing heritage assets.

The Committee discussed the application and noted concerns raised that the proposal did not represent a limited infill backland development. Whilst the design of the dwelling incorporated good energy efficiency design features, it still constituted an inappropriate form of backland development. The Committee discussed the pros and cons of the proposed development and agreed overall that owing to the development representing an inappropriate form of backland development, it would therefore fail to respect the wider established character of the area and would not be substantially surrounded by existing development. It would also be harmful to the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA).

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

| RECORDED VOTE LIST | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | COUNCILLOR | FOR | AGAINST | ABSTAIN |
| 1 | Ramsey Nagaty | | X | |
| 2 | Jon Askew | X | | |
| 3 | Cait Taylor | | X | |
| 4 | Ruth Brothwell | X | | |
| 5 | Paul Spooner | X | | |
| 6 | Chris Blow | | X | |
| 7 | Tony Rooth | | | X |
| 8 | Will Salmon | X | | |
| 9 | David Bilbe | X | | |
| 10 | Fiona White | X | | |
| 11 | Maddy Redpath | | X | |
| 12 | Angela Goodwin | X | | |
| 13 | Colin Cross | | X | |
| 14 | Angela Gunning | | X | |
| | TOTALS | 7 | 6 | 1 |

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 21/P/01537 subject to the reasons given in the report.

PL6 22/P/00038 - 42 RECREATION ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 1HP

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

- Ms Katie Walker (Agent) (In Support)

The Committee considered the full application to erect 2 dwellings in the land to the rear whilst extending and subdividing 42 Recreation Road to create two separate dwellings.

The Committee received a presentation from the planning officer, Katie Williams. The site was located within the urban area of Guildford and was within the 400 metre to 5km buffer zone of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. It was located on the northern side of Recreation Road and currently consisted of a detached dwelling on a large plot with a long rear garden, incorporating several outbuildings. The surrounding area was characterized by a mixture of dwelling type styles and sizes. Adjacent to the site was a relatively modern development consisting of a small residential cul-de-sac comprised of two rows of terraced properties accessed via an access drive from Recreation Road. The site was also surrounded by adjacent properties 43 Recreation Road and 42A Recreation Road and then properties to the east which front onto Stoke Road and to the north. These consisted predominantly of detached and semi-detached two storey dwellings.

The proposal sought to erect two four-bedroom dwellings on the land to the rear of the site, extending and sub-dividing the existing dwelling, 42 Recreation Road to create two separate dwellings, consisting of one two-bedroom dwelling and one three-bedroom dwelling. A new access drive was proposed from 42 Recreation Road, replacing an existing vehicular access. Eight parking spaces were proposed and incorporated new areas of soft landscaping and a new tree planting scheme to the front of the dwellings. Each dwelling would have a reasonably sized rear garden which was in keeping with the surrounding dwellings such as those in Pound Field to the west. It was considered that there would be sufficient separation distance to the neighbouring dwellings to ensure that there would be no adverse impact on their amenity in terms of loss of light or overbearing impact.

The proposal included a two-storey side extension and part single storey part two storey rear extension and small single storey extension to the front. Also, a dormer window on the rear roof slope. The proposed extensions would be modest in size and subordinate to the host building. In terms of their scale and height, the designer materials would also be sympathetic to the existing building. The proposed dwellings would be of a traditional design with a maximum ridge height of 8.6 metres, incorporating a bedroom within the roof space for each dwelling with two dormer windows to the rear roof slope. The first-floor windows on the flank elevations would serve bathrooms and were shown to be obscurely glazed.

In conclusion, the proposed development was located within the Guildford urban area and would lead to the creation of a net increase of three family sized homes in a sustainable location which reflected the character of the area. It would make effective use of an accessible site. It was considered that the proposed development would respect the amenity of neighbouring properties and would not result in a detrimental impact on trees, highways, or ecology. Subject to the recommended conditions and S106 Agreement to secure a SANG and SAMM contributions in order to mitigate the impact on the TBHSPA, the application was recommended for approval.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that given it was proposed to be located in an urban area that was characterized by a mixture of housing types it represented an appropriate form of development.

The Committee discussed the on-street parking arrangements and whether a condition could be applied to require the residents of the new dwellings proposed to not be able to apply for on-street parking permits. The Head of Place confirmed that on-street parking was controlled by a different part of the Council. The proposed parking and access arrangements onsite however had not drawn objection from the Highway Authority. Planning officers had also taken into consideration what the Inspector had said regarding a previous appeal decision on this site where the mixed urban grain had been considered appropriate for the dwellings as proposed. It was also further clarified by the Legal Advisor, James Tong that planning conditions could not be used to control the parking arrangements. Planning officers were content that sufficient parking had been provided for a development of this scale. Controls on the public highway were dealt with by other legislation. If planning harm was identified, then that could be addressed via a legal agreement, such as by making a contribution to alter a Traffic Regulation Order.

The Committee agreed overall that the principle of development was acceptable and would lead to the creation of four (three net) family sized homes in a sustainable location that reflected the character of the area.

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

| RECORDED VOTE LIST | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| | COUNCILLOR | FOR | AGAINST | ABSTAIN |
| 1 | Ramsey Nagaty | | X | |
| 2 | Cait Taylor | X | | |
| 3 | David Bilbe | X | | |
| 4 | Ruth Brothwell | | X | |
| 5 | Fiona White | X | | |
| 6 | Jon Askew | X | | |
| 7 | Will Salmon | X | | |
| 8 | Angela Goodwin | X | | |
| 9 | Tony Rooth | X | | |
| 10 | Colin Cross | X | | |
| 11 | Angela Gunning | X | | |
| 12 | Paul Spooner | X | | |
| 13 | Maddy Redpath | X | | |
| 14 | Chris Blow | X | | |
| | TOTALS | 12 | 2 | 0 |

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

RESOLVED to approve application 22/P/00038 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 Head of Place.

PL7 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted and discussed the planning appeals.

The meeting finished at 8.19 pm

Signed

Chairman

Date