

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Councillor Fiona White (Chairperson)
* Councillor Vanessa King (Vice-Chairperson)

Councillor Bilal Akhtar	* Councillor Patrick Oven
* Councillor David Bilbe	* Councillor Maddy Redpath
* Councillor Yves de Contades	* Councillor Joanne Shaw
Councillor Lizzie Griffiths	* Councillor Howard Smith
* Councillor Stephen Hives	* Councillor Cait Taylor
* Councillor James Jones	* Councillor Sue Wyeth-Price
Councillor Richard Mills OBE	

*Present

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from the following; Councillors Bilal Akhtar, Lizzie Griffiths, Richard Mills and Fiona White. Councillor Jane Tyson attended as a substitute for Councillor Fiona White.

PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest.

PL3 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 6 December 2023 were agreed and signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record.

PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the Chairman's announcements.

PL5 22/P/01966 - 94 POTTERS LANE, SEND, WOKING, GU23 7AL

The Committee considered the above full application for construction of 5 dwellings, including access and landscaping.

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

- Mr Bruce Gomme (to object);
- Ms Julia Osborn (Chair of Send Parish Council) (to object);
- Ms Charlotte McSharry (Agent) (in support) and;
- Mr Wayne Beglan (Cornerstone Barristers) (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Justin Williams. The Committee noted that the existing bungalow, agricultural barn and access would be retained and included a heritage orchard and pond located centrally on the site. The proposed dwellings were individually designed and added to the character of the development. The Committee noted views along the Conservation Area and from footpath 55 leading up to Potters Lane. The site was inset from the Green Belt and was outside of the Wey Navigation Conservation Area which was located approximately 133 metres away. There were mature and deciduous and evergreen trees onsite as well as trees ready to be planted onsite.

The proposal was a revision from a previously refused scheme which was for 29 units. This application would provide 5 dwellings that were a mix of 2-4 bedroom units constructed of brick, timber and render having a rural appearance overall. Each unit would have off-street parking and set into spacious plots.

Letters of both concern and support had been received in response to the proposed scheme. No objections however had been received from statutory consultees. Concerns had been raised from the Conservation Area Officer and the National Trust regarding the impact of the proposal on the Conservation Area which had been fully considered and summarised in the report.

Planning officers were satisfied that the proposal would be in keeping with the spacious character of the area and would not materially impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties nor cause a loss of privacy or materially harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The application was therefore recommended for approval which was subject to a legal agreement to mitigate the impact upon the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA).

The Committee discussed the application and noted that the site was inset from the Green Belt and that no statutory consultees had objected. The Committee noted that the developer had reduced the ridge height significantly and queried whether this was in response to the National Trust's concerns. In addition, whether there were any bats or badgers near the site.

The Senior Planning Officer, Justin Williams confirmed that the application had been assessed by the Surrey Wildlife Trust who had raised no objection to the proposal and confirmed that there were no bats roosting onsite. Whilst some badger runs did exist outside of the site there were none on the site itself.

The Committee noted concerns raised that whilst it stated in the officer's report that the houses would be set further away from the boundaries than the dismissed scheme, plots 4 and 5 were actually closer to footpath 55 than any of the houses on the previous scheme comprised of 29 dwellings. The proposal was also completely visible from the footpath and along the navigation. The upper storey of plot 1 was completely visible when currently all you can see from the towpath was the agricultural barn. Although the site was outside of the Conservation Area, the site itself remained within the setting of the Conservation Area as found by the planning appeal Inspector of the previously refused scheme. This site was distinguished from other sites further into Send by the Inspector who noted that to the south and west the site was surrounded by open countryside which sloped towards the River Wey navigation and became significantly more rural and tranquil. This contributed to the rural setting of both the village and river. The appeal scheme as well as this proposal would extend the built form beyond the established line of development along Potters Lane and would appear as a discordant element and completely out of character with the village and the open rural character beyond the built form.

The Senior Planning Officer, Justin Williams confirmed that with regard to plots 4 and 5, there was a separation distance of approx. between 25 and 18 metres from the edge of the southern boundary of the site. There were also some large mature oak trees which lay outside of the application site when viewed from footpath 55 with an open bund and planting along the southern boundary.

The Committee noted further concerns raised about the heights of the proposed buildings which whilst they had been lowered were still at a height of between 7.4 and 8 metres. This proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding area. Concern was also raised about the access off the site which was obscured by an oak tree.

The Committee also noted comments in support of the application that the proposal did not cause any significant harm to its surroundings. The proposal was for reasonably sized properties on plots spaced out nicely from the street. The northern most houses were obscured by the barn when viewed from the towpath and were some significant distance from the river.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
		FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Maddy Redpath		X	
2	Patrick Oven		X	
3	Sue Wyeth-Price		X	
4	Stephen Hives	X		
5	Yves de Contades	X		
6	Cait Taylor	X		
7	Howard Smith	X		
8	David Bilbe	X		
9	James Jones	X		
10	Joanne Shaw	X		
11	Vanessa King	X		
12	Jane Tyson	X		
	TOTALS	9	3	0

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

RESOLVED to approve application 22/P/01966 subject to a Section 106 Agreement securing appropriate SANG and SAMM mitigation payments and subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the report.

PL6 22/P/01999 - THE HARROW INN, THE STREET, COMPTON, GUILDFORD, GU3 1EG

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for change of use of public house, together with extensions and alterations following partial demolition to provide 5 dwellings with associated amenity space and car parking.

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

- Mr Stephen Mallett (Chairman of Compton Parish Council) (to object);
- Mr Will Douetil (to object) (read by the Democratic Services Officer) and;
- Mr Andrew Bandosz (Agent) (In Support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Justin Williams. The Committee noted that were residential units towards the south and north west of the site with Compton Village Hall to the south east.

Extensions were proposed to the north west and south east. Tyrone Cottage, a Grade II listed building was also located nearby. To the left handside of the site was a public footpath. The Committee noted that access was to be retained to the public footpath and for the properties towards the rear and lefthandside.

The Committee noted that the pub had been vacant since it had stopped trading in July 2019. The site was located within the village settlement, the Green Belt, the National Surrey Hills Landscape Area and was within a Conservation area. It was also located adjacent to a locally listed building, the village hall and a Grade II listed building at Tyrone Cottage. No objections had been received from statutory consultees.

Planning officers had concluded that the proposal would be an appropriate form of development within the Green Belt and would not materially harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, nor unduly impact upon the setting of the adjacent Grade II listed building. The proposal would reuse an existing locally listed building which had been vacant for some time. The proposal would provide a good standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers. The County Highway Authority was also satisfied that the proposal would not impact upon highway safety. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Chairperson, Councillor King permitted Councillor Dominique Williams to speak in her capacity as ward councillor for three minutes. The Committee noted concerns raised that the trees sited in the Conservation Area were not protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) but should still be given special protection. The current established hedge and trees located in this area contributed to the surrounding greenery that ran along Field Cottage and Howards End. Given the proximity of the development to the cottages it was hoped that the hedge and trees would be retained so to provide privacy and improve environmental benefits regarding the proposed number of 5 dwellings. Concerns were raised that the total width and floorspace of the proposed development would increase by 45% and reduce the access road. Were the proportions of the access road therefore sufficient or would it have an adverse impact upon the setting of the adjacent cottages. The development proposed was also in a Conservation Area within the Green Belt that had no high demand for housing. The proposed development would result in a loss of garden bin storage areas and loss of parking for the village hall which had been permitted by the previous landlord of the pub.

In response to the points raised by public speakers and the Ward Councillor, the Senior Planning Officer, Justin Williams confirmed that the Council's Tree Officer

had raised no objection to the proposal. In addition, the County Highways Authority had raised no objection to the proposed access on and off the site. There was also condition 4 which related to making improvements to the proposed vehicle access. However, if there were land ownership issues, as alluded to by the public speakers, then it may not be possible for the development to be implemented because that condition could not be complied with. However, that would not be a reason for the Committee to refuse the application, because that was a private matter between the different landowners.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that the current building was in a significant state of dilapidation. However, the proposed development represented an overbearing form of development. It was queried whether the plans as presented were correct given the updated ownership certificate submitted by the applicant. Planning officers confirmed that the plan was correct. It was within anyone's gift to submit an application on land outside of their ownership. The only requirement was that the applicant served a certificate B confirming that they were the owners of the land. However, the Committee were not required to consider such matters, only whether the development was considered acceptable or not.

The Committee noted further concerns raised that the proposal was too large for its location given that it was within the Conservation Area, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) and Green Belt. It was queried whether the overall increase of 85% in building size, as cited by one of the objectors, in comparison to what it was in 1947, when the Town and County Planning legislation came into force, should be taken into consideration? Planning officers confirmed that the application did not concern an extension to a residential dwelling but rather a building in a Conservation Area that was locally listed. The building was no longer viable for use and therefore was being repurposed. Part of that proposal represented a new build but was different to an extension being proposed to a dwelling in the Green Belt where its size would be a material consideration.

The Committee noted further comments that the existing building was very run down and that the proposal to convert the building into housing appeared a sensible option. Concerns were raised regarding the public right of way and whether traffic would be increased by the proposal. Planning officers confirmed that there was a public right of way which ran past Tyrone Cottage and the application site. A condition had been added for adequate boundary and surface treatments so that the footpath remained accessible. Both Surrey County Council's Rights of Way officer and the Highways Authority had raised no

objection to the application. A reduction in the number of trips to the site had actually been calculated by Highways to equate to 136 less trips per day. Concern was raised also about the impact upon the Grade II listed building, Tyrone Cottage and planning officers confirmed that the Council's Conservation Officer was satisfied that the proposal would not cause harm.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	David Bilbe		X	
2	Sue Wyeth-Price		X	
3	Howard Smith	X		
4	Stephen Hives			X
5	Cait Taylor		X	
6	Vanessa King		X	
7	Patrick Oven		X	
8	Jane Tyson		X	
9	Maddy Redpath		X	
10	James Jones		X	
11	Joanne Shaw		X	
12	Yves de Contades		X	
	TOTALS	1	9	2

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jane Tyson	X		
2	Stephen Hives	X		
3	James Jones	X		
4	David Bilbe	X		
5	Vanessa King	X		
6	Sue Wyeth-Price	X		
7	Cait Taylor	X		
8	Joanne Shaw	X		
9	Howard Smith		X	
10	Patrick Oven	X		
11	Maddy Redpath	X		
12	Yves de Contades			X
	TOTALS	10	1	1

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 22/P/01999 for the following reasons:

1. The proposal by reason of the scale of the development would constitute inappropriate development and there are no very special circumstances that have been demonstrated to justify the scale of the development and outweigh the harm to the Green Belt contrary to paragraph 154 of the NPPF.
2. Informatives: 1. The development hereby determined has been based on the following submitted plans: P001, P002, P003, P004, P005, P007, P008 and P011 received 25 August 2022 and P006 Rev D received 16 August 2023.

PL7 23/P/00592 - WESTHORPE, HOLFORD ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 2QE

The Committee considered the above-mentioned outline application for demolition of existing buildings and erection of 7 apartments with associated parking (access, appearance, layout and scale to be considered).

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

- Mr Keith Meldrum (Marrow Resident's Association) (to object);
- Mr John Waters (to object) and;
- Mr Ethan Brighton (Agent) (in support)

The Committee noted that an appeal had been received from the Planning Inspectorate against non-determination for this application and was lodged by the agent on 2 January 2023.

The application was therefore now the subject of a non-determination appeal. The Council was therefore unable to formally determine the application. Instead, the Committee must decide what their decision would have been had they been in a position to determine it.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Katie Williams. The Committee noted that the site was located within the urban area of Guildford and was within the 400m to 5km buffer zone of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). The site was comprised of a corner plot on the corner of Holford and Epsom Road and incorporated an existing two storey detached dwelling fronting onto and accessed via Holford Road. Holford Road was comprised of predominantly 1930's and 1950's style two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings on spacious plots.

The road slopes up and as a result of the sloping topography, the ridge heights of the adjacent dwelling step up following the natural topography of the road. To the east of the site are two Victorian dwellings which fronted onto Epsom Road. On the opposite side of Holford Road were two storey detached dwellings on spacious plots set back from the road and on the opposite side of Epsom Road a mature tree belt.

The proposed apartment building would be wider and deeper than the existing dwelling, extending further back into the plot and closer to the boundaries with 1 Holford Road and Epsom Road. A portion of flat roof was also proposed as part of the design. The proposed access would be in the same position as existing leading down to the proposed basement car park which would extend the entire width and depth of the plot. A bin store was proposed to the front boundary.

The accommodation was to be provided across three floors, the front elevation would face Holford Road and the rear towards Epsom Road. It was proposed that the ground levels be lowered by approximately 500mm from existing, however, the ridge height would still be taller than the neighbouring property in Holford

Road. Eleven car parking spaces would be provided as part of the basement car park.

In conclusion, the site lies within the urban area, where the principle of development was acceptable. The proposal would deliver a net increase of 7 new homes in a sustainable location. However, there were several significant concerns regarding the application, including the impact on the context and character of the area and street scene, resulting from the scale, bulk and design of the proposed building, the impact on neighbouring amenity for the occupants of both 1 Holford Road and 162 Epsom Road, the proposed housing mix impact on trees and vegetation, the standard of amenity for future occupants in terms of lack of private amenity space for the proposed flats, the impact on biodiversity and the impact on the Thames Basin Special Heath Protection Area (TBHSPA) and the necessary SANG and SAMM contributions have not been secured by way of a S106 Agreement. As a result, had an appeal not been lodged against non-determination, the application would have been recommended for refusal as detailed in the report.

The Committee discussed the application and agreed with the officer recommendation to refuse. The proposal represented a bulky and out of character development with the surrounding area. Whilst two bed flats were needed, the design was incongruous with neighbouring properties by virtue of its size. In addition, problems had been identified with the access via the slope into the road and the drainage in the underground car park. The proposal was a form of over-development.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Sue Wyeth-Price (left the meeting prior to the consideration of this application)	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Joanne Shaw	X		
3	David Bilbé	X		
4	Vanessa King	X		
5	Maddy Redpath	X		
6	Yves de Contades	X		
7	Howard Smith	X		
8	Stephen Hives	X		
9	Cait Taylor	X		
10	Patrick Oven	X		
11	James Jones	X		
12	Jane Tyson	X		
	TOTALS	11	0	0

In conclusion, having taken account of the representations received in relation to this application, had an appeal not been lodged against non-determination, the Committee would have

RESOLVED to refuse application 23/P/00592 for the reasons as detailed in the report.

PL8 23/P/01668 - 108 GEORGELANDS, RIPLEY, WOKING, GU23 6DQ

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed erection of one residential dwelling.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Justin Williams. The application had been referred to the Committee as the applicant was Guildford Borough Council. The site was inset from the Green Belt and was located in a residential area which was characterised by properties with spacious gardens. The property proposed was a three-bedroomed detached unit. The existing access and car parking would be retained for 108 Georgelands.

The Committee noted that no letters of objection from any statutory consultees had been received. The site was also located within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). The applicant had therefore agreed for

a unilateral undertaking to mitigate the impact on the special protection area and the application was recommended for approval.

The Committee discussed the application and agreed that the proposal represented a good scheme providing an affordable home of which more were needed in Guildford. The Committee noted that Ripley Parish Council had raised a concern regarding the number of car parking spaces provided for this property, of two spaces, being too low for a three bedroom property. The planning officer confirmed that whilst one less parking space had been provided, the Highways Authority was satisfied with the parking provision.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Howard Smith	X		
2	Sue Wyeth-Price (had left the meeting when this application was considered)	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Patrick Oven	X		
4	David Bilbé	X		
5	Joanne Shaw	X		
6	Cait Taylor	X		
7	Vanessa King	X		
8	Stephen Hives	X		
9	James Jones	X		
10	Maddy Redpath	X		
11	Yves de Contades	X		
12	Jane Tyson	X		
	TOTALS	11	0	0

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

RESOLVED to approve application 23/P/01668 subject to the provision of a Statement of Intent by the Council to make provision for SANG and SAMM contributions and conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL9 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee considered and noted the appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 9.13 pm

Signed

Date

Chairman