

## 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 for absence were received from Councillors Chris Barrass, Chris Blow and The Mayor, Councillor Marsha Moseley. Councillors Deborah Seabrook, Bob McShee and Graham Eyre attended as substitutes respectively. Councillor Bilbé was also absent from the meeting.

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

No disclosable pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests were declared.

### **PL3 MINUTES**

The minutes of the previous meetings held on 21 and 30 March 2022 will be approved by the Committee at its meeting on 27 April 2022.

### **PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Committee noted the procedures for determining planning applications.

### **PL5 21/P/02296 - 1 AND 2 ASH GROVE, GUILDFORD, GU2 8UT**

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

- Mr Neil Thompson (to object) (in person)
- Dr R Hazelwood (to object) (in person) and;
- Mr Robert Shaw (in support) (in person)

The Committee considered the full application for variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of planning permission 18/P/02391, approved on 17/02/2020, to allow changes to the approved scheme to increase bedspaces from 79 to 99 with use of 'twodios', external substation and bike store, removal of first floor podium, additional dormer windows and removal of connection between Blocks B and C. (Amended plans received 02.02.22 routes, 'twodio' arrangement, removal of roof terrace, addition of rooflights, landscaping, brick detailing, window design and dormer window dimensions).

The Committee received a presentation from the planning officer, Kelly Jethwa. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets and was asked to ignore the second blue page as well as the late representations listed as neither were relevant to the application and had been included in error. The only relevant information was included on the first blue page detailing the amendments and corrections. The site had previous approval for 79 bed spaces for student housing with the extant planning permission implemented. The site was surrounded by mixed uses with a no through road abutting the A3 and the railway separating the site from the University Campus. This was a minor material amendment to make alterations to the external layout and internal arrangements to accommodate 24 bed spaces which would increase the total number of available bed spaces to 99 as opposed to 79 as previously approved. In relation to Block C, new windows would be installed within the stairwells as well as dormer windows to prevent overlooking to number 3 Ash Grove and had been stipulated in condition 32. The link previously proposed between blocks B and C had been removed. Some ancillary buildings for bike storage and a home delivery locker had also been included as well as a podium off the pedestrian footbridge. A reduction in parking from 11 to 7 spaces was also proposed. No changes were proposed to the elevation, height or size of the building. The main changes related to the detailing such as the windows and dormers and window designs. The internal arrangement of the buildings would be altered to create the additional bed spaces in what had been described as 'Twodios'. These would have two bedrooms, shared kitchen, dining areas and changed the requirement for internal spaces to external spaces outside of the building.

The Committee noted that planning officers had worked with the applicant to improve the development with a number of changes secured via condition. The proposed scheme would cause no material harm to the character of the area or neighbouring amenities. The site was found to be suitable for the additional 24 bedspaces and the application was therefore recommended for approval subject to the amendments as detailed in the supplementary late sheets and a Deed of Variation to the S106.

The Committee discussed the application and expressed their concerns regarding the effects of air pollution caused by the siting of the accommodation next to the A3 and the effects of air quality during the construction phase. The Environmental Control Officer, Gary Durrant confirmed that all applications of this size had to undertake an air quality assessment. Some air quality monitoring had already taken place and the objective levels were not any where near to the definition of 'developed'. The site was also located some distance away from the road and given the levels were not high, Environmental Health were satisfied that the monitoring levels were safe. The expectation was that the development would provide EV charging points. The number of car parking spaces was also low considering the number of people who would live onsite therefore reducing the number of car users. Lastly, in terms of the effect on the air quality during the construction phase, this would be managed via Environmental Health legislation. Condition 24 was also in place to encourage residents not to use their own personal cars as a means of transport.

The Committee noted their concern that only 56 bike places had been provided for a total of 99 residents as well as accessing bike storage which looked like quite a convoluted journey and how it would work practically.

The Committee noted that no significant changes had been made to the footprint or built form of the proposed development. The Committee also noted queries raised in relation to the evidential need for more student accommodation in Guildford given the existing the plethora of existing student residences. In addition, how did the room sizes of the 'twodios' compare to a single unit.

The planning officer, Kelly Jethwa confirmed in relation to the councillors queries that the cycle storage was a 52 two-tiered structure and therefore it would provide at least 104 spaces for bicycles. Regarding accessibility, a couple of spaces were being provided near to the podium

but most of the students would have to navigate through the podium to the cycle storage. Twodios were more commonly seen in London and developers were responding to a market demand for the scenario whereby two friends get to live together. The applicant was not required to comply with the nationally described space standards that were set by central government. Single occupancy studios were generally smaller. The Committee also noted that the road was a classified adopted road by Surrey County Council. Under the original planning application considered in June 2019, part of the proposal included a controlled parking zone along Ash Grove so obstructive parking would not affect bin lorries or deliveries to local residents.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Cllr Bob McShee	X		
2	Cllr Jon Askew	X		
3	Cllr Deborah Seabrook	X		
4	Cllr Angela Goodwin			X
5	Cllr Ramsey Nagaty			X
6	Cllr Pauline Searle	X		
7	Cllr Liz Hogger	X		
8	Cllr Angela Gunning	X		
9	Cllr Ruth Brothwell	X		
10	Cllr Maddy Redpath	X		
11	Cllr Paul Spooner	X		
12	Cllr Colin Cross	X		
13	Cllr Fiona White	X		
14.	Cllr Graham Eyre	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 21/P/02296 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 in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee and lead Ward Member.

- (i) 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.
- (ii) Amended condition 6:

The development must accord with the Arboricultural Report prepared by Dryad (amended version dated 24.02.2022, reference D2549.REV4.0.AIA.AM) *and addendum showing removal*

of tree G2 (reference D2549 - Additional tree removal twodio V1.2). No development shall commence on site until the protective fencing and any other protection measures shown on the Tree Protection Plan (amended version dated 24.01.2022, reference D2549.REV4.0.A1.TCPWR Rev 4.0) in the Arboricultural Report have been installed. At all times, until the completion of the development, such fencing and protection measures shall be retained as approved. Within all fenced areas, soil levels shall remain unaltered, and the land kept free of vehicles, plant, materials and debris. No development shall commence until a site meeting has taken place with the site manager, the retained consulting arboriculturalist and the Local Planning Authority Tree Officer.

Reason: To protect the trees on site which are to be retained in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

**PL6      21/P/02643 - TRETOWER HOUSE, MERROW STREET, GUILDFORD, GU4 7AT**

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

- Ms Regena Coult (to object) (in person) and;
- Mr Joe Jelley (in support) (MD of Aspen Homes) (in person)

The Committee considered the erection of a single dwelling and attached garage on land between Smugglers End and Merlins, Smugglers Way.

The Committee received a presentation from the planning officer, Kelly Jethwa. The Committee noted that the application involved six new homes on the garden of Tretower with a pair of semi-detached dwellings facing the road and four detached homes in the existing rear garden. The southernmost access would be moved slightly north and widened to provide access for the six new houses with the retained access for Tretower. There would be two visitor bays provided onsite and further space in the front garden where most of the properties would benefit from side-by-side parking for the detached houses and tandem parking for the semi-detached houses. The elevations of the semi-detached dwellings would be mainly comprised of brick and tiling. The detached houses at the rear would have a fully hipped roof with an attractive chimney on the side protruding from the roof. On page 61 of the agenda details the planning history of the site and a previously withdrawn scheme where larger buildings were proposed, and less space provided between the boundaries. Some tree clearance was required at the side, but additional tree planting would be introduced along the front to mitigate from that loss. Looking towards Colliers Way there was an adequate separation distance between the proposed building as well as tree screening. There would not be a loss of amenity to these neighbours. The applicant had provided an energy strategy and they had provided measures which would be secured by condition. The strategy included consideration of sustainable lifestyles, water efficiency, cycle parking and a lot of electrical vehicle charging points.

The site had been identified as a toad habitat but had less legal protection than that for bats of a great crested newt. However, mitigation to reduce impact on their habitat had been proposed and assessed by the Surrey Wildlife Trust. The Council's Consultee on Biodiversity and Ecology matters had found the scheme to be acceptable. In addition, whilst the site was not a major application because it was below 10 new dwellings, a Flood Risk Assessment had been submitted following concerns from third parties and had been reviewed by Surrey County Council as a Lead Local Flood Authority. They had recommended conditions regarding the detail design for the scheme as well as a financial contribution from the development to improve the drains along Barrow Street. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions, changes in the late sheets and a S106 Agreement.

The Committee discussed the application and queried how close the houses were to the west of the site as they appeared to be much taller. The Committee also noted that there were chimneys yet there was no gas. There was also mention of an orchard, could planning officers confirm its location and how it would be managed.

The Committee asked what additional measures would be put in place to protect the amphibious population as the development would disturb the local wildlife. The site was small, but its biodiversity also needed to be protected. The modifications made to the proposed development were good. The condition about reducing heating didn't stop gas nor did it specify solar power.

In response to the Committee's queries, the planning officer confirmed that additional rooms had been created in the roof with roof lights and therefore the 45-degree pitch roof had been applied to accommodate the rooms as well as achieving local distinctiveness with the Surrey vernacular.

The chimneys were false and therefore did not have a fireplace for wood burning or coal. The chimneys were included as a decorative addition to respond to the local features of properties and would not be 100% airtight. Regarding mitigation measures there were a series of conditions recommended in the report, 6, 7 and 8 as well as an amended condition 6 that stated that before any development took place on site, they were required to submit a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan. This would ensure that before a spade was put in the ground that there was going to be appropriate measures employed regarding biodiversity net gain.

Regarding the requirement for biodiversity net gain, this had not been included in the law for England but was anticipated because it required a change to the Town and Country Planning Act. Therefore, we were reliant upon the Development Plan which has an aim to increase biodiversity net gain, but it was still coming through the system. The weight that could be applied to that was therefore limited however, the Council's consultee, Surrey Wildlife Trust, had found the proposal to be acceptable and conditions would reflect those provisions were made.

With regard to the garden being colonised, surveys had been carried out in the last two years and found the techniques to be accurate and reliable. The planning authority did not have any authority currently to stipulate that gas could not be used as an energy source in people's homes, however the applicant had submitted an energy strategy and committed to providing 25% of the energy needs from a non-renewable source. In this case they would be using a combination of solar and potentially air source heat pumps and a condition would be applied once they knew when they would be undertaking the final building control design.

A motion was moved and seconded to approve the application subject to a S106 which was carried.

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

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

RESOLVED to approve application 21/P/02643 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
  - £15,000 contribution to Surrey County Council for the full drainage investigation and maintenance on Merrow Street.

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 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.
- (iii) That in the event a satisfactory S106 is not completed the Head of Place be able to refuse the planning application.

And the following updated conditions:

**Condition 6** is amended to ensure the Landscape Ecological Management Plan is submitted to the LPA for approval **prior to the commencement** of development.

**Condition 6** wording amended as follows:

Prior to the **commencement of development**, a detailed landscape and ecological management plan (LEMP) for the site to include detailed landscaping proposals and the enhancement and mitigation measures set out in the 'Addendum to Planning Supporting Letter - Ecology (from Tetra Tech Planning) dated 8 March 2021, must be submitted to and approved

in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP should include adequate details of proposed impact avoidance, mitigation and enhancement and include details of the following:

- a) description and evaluation of features to be managed
- b) ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management
- c) aims and objectives of management
- d) appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives
- e) prescriptions for management actions together with a plan of management compartments
- f) preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period)
- g) details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan
- h) ongoing monitoring and remedial measures
- i) legal and funding mechanisms by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the application with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery
- j) monitoring strategy, including details of how contingencies and / or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme
- k) final biodiversity net gain assessment

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed LEMP.

Reason: To increase the biodiversity of the site and mitigate any impact from the development.

**Condition 20** is updated to include reference to the proposed sustainability measures as set out in the Planning Supporting Letter (Page 11) from Tetra Tech (dated 17 December 2021) . Condition updated as follows:

**Condition 20** wording amended as follows:

*The development shall be carried out in accordance with the sustainability measures set out in the submitted Climate Change and Sustainability Questionnaire (received 20 December 2021) and the sustainability measures set out on Page 11 of the Planning Supporting Letter from Tetra Tech (dated 17 December 2021).*

Reason: *To ensure that measures to make the development sustainable and efficient in the use of energy, water and materials are included in the development.*

The meeting finished at 8.20 pm

Signed .....

Chairman

Date .....