

**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 Ramsey Nagaty  |
| * Councillor Chris Blow        | Councillor Maddy Redpath    |
| * Councillor Ruth Brothwell    | * Councillor Pauline Searle |
| * Councillor Angela Goodwin    | Councillor Paul Spooner     |
| * Councillor Angela Gunning    |                             |

\*Present

**PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies were received from Councillors Chris Barrass, David Bilbé, Paul Spooner and Maddy Redpath. Councillors Graham Eyre and Deborah Seabrook attended as substitutes for Councillors Paul Spooner and Maddy Redpath respectively.

**PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

No disclosable pecuniary interests were declared.

**21/P/01496 – 86 The Mount, Guildford, GU2 4JB**

Councillor Deborah Seabrook declared a non-pecuniary interest in the above application given that she knew some of the people who had submitted objections. Councillor Seabrook confirmed that the objectors had not contacted her about the application and it would not affect her own judgement, approaching the discussion on the application with an open mind to all the arguments made.

**PL3 MINUTES**

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 15 June 2022 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

**PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Committee noted the procedure for determining planning applications.

**PL5 21/P/02403 - TRANQUILITY, 12 CONFORD DRIVE, SHALFORD, GUILDFORD, GU4 8DX**

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

- Mr Ian Camfield (to object) and;
- Mr Christopher Bailey-Gates (to object)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for a side infill extension, side extension, and first floor extension, following removal and replacement of existing pitched roof.

The Committee received a presentation from the planning officer, John Busher. The Committee noted that the application was located on Conford Drive which was off the Horsham Road in Shalford. The site was suburban and residential in character, with dwellings to the north. To the south and east, the site was covered by a TPO which protected the existing trees in the western and northern boundaries. The proposal was for modifications and extensions to an existing bungalow, including the provision of some first-floor accommodation. The existing bungalow was a modest sized property which included an internal garage and was set on a large corner plot. The surrounding area was comprised of mainly bungalows of a similar design and scale with some two-storey dwellings located opposite.

A small extension was proposed to the western elevation and a very small extension on the eastern elevation. The dwelling would fit comfortably within the plot. The common boundary with the neighbouring property would be set a significant distance away, the rear element of the first floor set 5 metres off the boundary and 8 metres between the two side elevations of the host property. The new rear elevation would be 17 metres to the boundary to the south. Planning officers had visited both neighbouring sites which would be most impacted by the proposal and whilst it was accepted that there would be some loss of light to number 11 Conford Drive, it would not be to an extent which would materially harm the occupiers of the dwelling. The proposal included numerous areas of flat roof which had been raised by the objectors to the application. However, the applicant had confirmed that there was no intention to use those areas of flat roof as amenity space and was also controlled by condition 6.

The remodelled dwelling would be of a modern contemporary design with a flat roof featuring glazing that would be finished with timber cladding. The new dwelling would not be significantly taller than the existing house. It was acknowledged that the design would be different to the existing properties on Conford Drive, however, it was Officer's view that the proposal would not result in any harm to the character or appearance of the surroundings.

Planning officers were comfortable with the design, size and scale of the property and had concluded that the proposal was compliant with the Local Plan. Officers had also carefully assessed the impact on the neighbouring properties and whilst there would be some limited impact on the amenity of number 11 Conford Drive, it would not be of a level which would warrant the refusal of the application.

The planning officer, John Busher confirmed in response to comments made by the public speakers that the plans that had been submitted by the applicant were sufficient enough to be able to assess the impact upon neighbouring properties. In terms of the increase in floor area of 88%, that figure could not be verified, however, the site was not located in the Green Belt and the Council did not have any policies to restrict the size of houses in the settlement areas. In terms of policies, G1 and G5 were mentioned. G1 was the policy used to assess the impact upon neighbouring amenity which was relevant and policy D1 in the new Local Plan.

The Head of Place, Dan Ledger confirmed that government regulations determined what was required for the validation of an application, the application in this instance met those requirements and therefore there was more than sufficient information to make a recommendation. In terms of the comments made regarding whether it should have been a householder or full application, the planners were bound to consider the application as submitted. There was also an information on the recommendation which set out that if during the course of development they were required to remove the whole building and it became a replacement rather than an extension, an appropriate application would then need to be submitted. The Committee therefore had to determine what was before it on the basis of it submitted as an extension.

The Committee discussed the application and noted the increase in height of the new dwelling from 4.7 metres to 6.1 metres, which was considered would not have a significant impact on the neighbouring kitchen window. However, whilst it was an extension and not a re-development, it still represented a significant extension and therefore asked if a condition could be applied to regulate the hours of work. The Committee was also concerned regarding the level of works that would take place in a small quiet cul-de-sac. The Committee noted concerns raised that the size of the proposed property was out of character with the existing area and represented an overdevelopment.

The Head of Place, Dan Ledger clarified that in terms of the proposed condition regarding regulating the hours of work it was not normally the type of condition applied to works that involved extensions. However, it was something that could be added into the recommendation if the Committee agreed it was reasonable to do so. In addition, in response to comments regarding the architectural design and impact on character, just because something introduces a different style did not mean that it was out of character. The main consideration was to establish what harm would be caused by the development. The officers report did allude to the fact that the site was located in an area which was characterised by dwellings of mixed character. The proposed dwelling was also respectful of the scale and height and proportions of the existing dwelling on Conford Drive. With regard to the first-floor accommodation the applicant could have taken a different route which would have resulted in a much bigger and taller building. However, the flat roof reduced the height, bulk and massing of the dwelling so overall planning officers had concluded that it did respect the scale and character of the existing dwelling on Conford Drive.

The Committee noted further concerns raised regarding the sites position on a corner plot as well as the narrowness of the drive and how to control construction vehicles. The Head of Place confirmed that conditions such as Construction Transport Management Plans tended to be restricted for large developments and therefore the reasonableness of applying such a condition had to be considered.

Concerns were also raised regarding a landing window and the potential for overlooking to number 11. The Committee noted that it would not be obscure glazed given the large separation distance between both properties and the fact that it was a narrow window it was not necessary.

The Committee voted on a motion to include an hours of work condition which was approved as per condition 8. (9:2:2 – not a recorded vote).

The Committee also voted on a motion regarding controlling traffic and parking onsite which was lost. (10:1:2 – not a recorded vote).

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Angela Gunning	X		
2	Pauline Searle	X		
3	Liz Hogger	X		
4	Deborah Seabrook	X		
5	Colin Cross	X		
6	Fiona White	X		
7	Ruth Brothwell		X	
8	Angela Goodwin	X		
9	Chris Blow		X	
10	Marsha Moseley	X		
11	Ramsey Nagaty		X	
12	Jon Askew	X		
13	Graham Eyre		X	
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 21/P/02403 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report and additional condition 8:

8. Works related to the construction of the development hereby permitted, including works of demolition or preparation prior to building operations, shall not take place other than between the hours of 0800 and 1800 Mondays to Fridays and between 0800 and 1300 Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Bank or National Holidays.

Reason: To protect the neighbours from disturbance outside the permitted hours during the construction period.

**PL6 21/P/01496 - 86 THE MOUNT, GUILDFORD, GU2 4JB**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for construction of a new two storey dwelling (with room in the roof) with basement level and associated external works following demolition of existing bungalow and garage. (Amended plans received 05.11.21 to reduce height and remove roof terrace).

The Committee received a presentation from the planning officer, John Busher. The Committee noted that the site was located at the upper end of the Mount in the urban area of Guildford. The proposal was for the replacement of the existing bungalow which occupied the site with a new dwelling which would be set over four floors. The existing bungalow was a

modest sized property with two bedrooms. The property benefitted from a detached garage which was located to the front of the site level with the Mount. The proposed dwelling stretched boundary to boundary across the width of the site as well as garage accommodation to the front. The existing bungalow was modest in size and sat comfortably within the streetscene however the proposed dwelling was built with a minimal gap to the western boundary and closer proximity to number 84. The proposed new dwelling would be a poor and bland design. The large dormer on the side elevation gives the dwelling an unbalanced appearance which was further exacerbated by the proposed roofscape. The different eaves heights resulted in a property which was cramped on a narrow site compared to other properties within the surrounding area. The lack of space to the side boundaries would also cause harm to the amenities of number 84a The Mount located to the east of the application site. The maximum ridge height of the proposed dwelling would be 3.8 metres higher than the neighbouring property, and the considerable difference in height of the two dwellings combined with a replacement dwelling being spread across the full width of the site and its overall scale and mass would result in an overbearing impact on number 84. The application was therefore recommended for refusal as it was deemed contrary to policies D1 of the 2019 Local Plan and G1 of the 2003 Local Plan.

The Chairman permitted Councillor Cait Taylor to speak in her capacity as ward councillor on the application for three minutes.

The Committee noted comments made that the main volume of the proposed home was accepted in the officer's report. A garage would be provided with no car space to the front which was a more sensible use of the plot space. The area was characterised by a mix of property styles with many having rooms in the roof. Out of 45 homes only 4 were chalet bungalows. The rest were at least all two storey homes. The proposed scheme at no.86 only marginally increased the footprint of the existing bungalow and did not project any further to the rear than the existing bungalow and did not represent a form of over-development. The neighbouring property at no.88 was significantly larger and was in full view when travelling along the Mount. It was therefore difficult to understand how a two-storey home with a roof pitch less than the plot above was an issue. The architect had created a contemporary design, using natural materials, minimising the carbon footprint of the home. The design attempted to create a balanced composition of the volumes using the changes in materials to emphasise the key activity areas. The dwelling did not extend the full width of the site and was only 58cm wider to the street frontage than the existing bungalow and 38cm to the side to the east of the site.

The Committee discussed the application and was interested to know if the size of the rooms were equivalent to the National Space Standards as they appeared much bigger and whether that had influenced the width of the property. The Committee also noted comments that the applicant was trying to achieve a lifetime home standard which was a positive in creating enhanced disabled access if needed in the future, a disabled bathroom if needed, electric vehicle charging points and bicycle storage. Concerns were also raised regarding the overall volume of the proposed property.

The Committee noted a query regarding the location of the site boundary and whether access was provided via the Mount as it would be narrower than it was originally. Further comments were noted that the property appeared top heavy and cramped on a narrow site. House

numbers 88 and 90 were also located on significantly larger site. The wall facing no 84A would also be a blank brick wall and was therefore an overbearing form of development.

The Head of Place, Dan Ledger confirmed that the room sizes proposed would have been compliant with the national space standards. With regard to the site plan it related to the parking for the neighbouring property where the existing parking situation was to be retained. A car port was proposed for the new dwelling which gives a raised garden above the car port which would provide the parking for the new dwelling.

A motion was moved and seconded to refuse application 21/P/01496 which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Chris Blow	X		
2	Angela Goodwin	X		
3	Fiona White	X		
4	Jon Askew	X		
5	Pauline Searle	X		
6	Liz Hogger	X		
7	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
8	Colin Cross	X		
9	Angela Gunning	X		
10	Deborah Seabrook	X		
11	Ruth Brothwell	X		
12	Marsha Moseley	X		
13	Graham Eyre	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 21/P/01496 for the reasons as outlined in the report.

#### **PL7 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS**

The Committee noted and discussed the planning appeals.

The meeting finished at 8.10 pm

Signed .....

Date .....

Chairman