

PLANNING COMMITTEE

- * Councillor Vanessa King (Chairperson)
- * Councillor Dominique Williams (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

Councillor Catherine Young was also in attendance.

PL1 ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2023-24

The Committee elected Councillor Vanessa King as Chairperson of the Planning Committee for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2023-24.

PL2 ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRPERSON FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2023-24

The Committee elected Councillor Dominique Williams as the Vice-Chairperson of the Planning Committee for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2023-24.

PL3 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Bilal Akhtar for whom Councillor Bob Hughes attended as a substitute.

PL4 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

23/P/01085 – 80 The Mount, Guildford, GU2 4JB

Councillor Howard Smith declared a non-pecuniary interest in the above application. Councillor Smith stated that he would leave the meeting when the above application was considered.

23/P/01567 – Cherry Tree Cottage, Pine Walk, East Horsley, Leatherhead, KT24
5AG

Councillor Jo Shaw declared a non-pecuniary interest in the above application owing to the fact that her father lived in East Horsley, however this would not affect her objectivity in the consideration of this application.

PL5 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 3 January 2024 were agreed and signed by the Chairperson as a true and accurate record.

PL6 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the Chairperson's announcements.

PL7 23/P/01085 - 80 THE MOUNT, GUILDFORD, GU2 4JB

Councillor Howard Smith left the meeting for the duration of the consideration of this application owing to the non-pecuniary interest he declared.

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of a detached two-storey dwelling following demolition of the existing dwelling and widening of the existing access.

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

- Reverend Peter Levell (to object);
- Mr Paul Banwell (to object) and;
- Mr Philip Andrews (Agent) (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Sakina Khanbhai. The Committee noted that the application site was located in the urban area and situated towards the upper end of The Mount. The existing dwelling was located on the northern side of the road which was set back and positioned on elevated land from the street level. The plot was much wider than the neighbouring residential plot. The surrounding area was comprised of a mix of dwelling styles. The proposal was 14.8 metres wide and 10 metres deep with a height of 7.32 metres.

The design proposed had been revised from an earlier withdrawn scheme with a first-floor layout so that the bathrooms were located to the rear of the dwelling

with obscure glazing. The dwelling would also be narrower than the existing dwelling with generous separation distances to neighbouring side boundaries.

The proposed dwelling would be slightly deeper than the existing by 2.3 metres and narrower. The existing access would also be widened, and sufficient parking spaces provided for two vehicles within the existing parking area to the front of the dwelling.

The proposal was for a contemporary design with a simplified gable front which previously included a large amount of glazing to the rear of the property that was now obscure glazed. The height of the proposed dwelling was also broadly in line with the existing.

The application was therefore recommended for approval with the proposed conditions as outlined in the report and updated conditions in the supplementary late sheets.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that the proposed huf house was not out of character with the existing neighbouring properties given there was no uniformity in the overall design employed in the neighbourhood. In addition, there was already a huf house located further up the road which fitted in well. Concerns raised regarding overlooking at the back of the property would be successfully overcome via the proposed obscured glass. In relation to concerns regarding an increase in on-road parking, the property did have a forecourt and so provision was made already. If the residents did wish to park their cars on-road they would have to apply to the Surrey Highway Authority. With regard to concerns raised regarding the development representing a form of over-development, the Committee noted that the footprint of the proposal was largely similar to the existing property. Whilst it was deeper, it would not be seen from the road or from the rear. The proposed roof line would be higher than the existing property but was largely the same as the property to the left. The Committee also commended the eco-design methods incorporated which included triple glazing, water efficiency measures and solar panels.

The Committee noted further comments in support of the application that Guildford did not have a predominant architectural style. The fact that the huf design was different to conventional houses did not mean that it was harmful.

The Committee noted comments that the proposal did not comply with Policy D1 of the Local Plan Strategy and Sites, as far as there was a distinctive local character. The design also failed to comply with policies D4 and D5 of the Local Plan, development management policies which required any building to enhance

its surroundings, which it was felt this proposal did not. The development was also overbearing and dominant in the street scene.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
		FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
2	Richard Mills	X		
3	Dominique Williams	X		
4	Maddy Redpath	X		
5	Joanne Shaw	X		
6	Patrick Oven		X	
7	Vanessa King	X		
8	Sue Wyeth-Price	X		
9	Cait Taylor	X		
10	Yves de Contades	X		
11	James Jones	X		
12	Stephen Hives	X		
13	David Bilbé	X		
14	Bob Hughes	X		
	TOTALS	13	1	0

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

RESOLVED to approve application 23/P/01085 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report and additional conditions as detailed below:

1) The development should be carried out in accordance with the submitted Preliminary Ecological Assessment and Biodiversity Net Gain report prepared by Ecology & Habitat Management Ltd and the recommendations set out within Table 6 and Section 6.3 of this document.

Reason: To mitigate against the loss of existing biodiversity and nature habitats.

2) No development shall take place until a Biodiversity Enhancement Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The approved details should include measures to enhance the nature conservation interest of the site.

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

3) Before any other works in association with restoration of the land are commenced, the Cotoneaster present on the site as stated in the Preliminary Ecological Assessment and Biodiversity Net Gain report which is listed as an invasive species under Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside act 1991, shall be eradicated using qualified and experienced contractors and disposed of in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act (Duty of Care regulations 1991 and a verification report shall be submitted to and approved in writing prior to the commencement of the above ground works.

Reason: To ensure the cotoneaster is eradicated in the interests of the natural habitat of the area, to prevent the spread of cotoneaster in the wider area and in the interests of residential amenities, in compliance with good practice.

Informatives:

1. The applicant should take action to ensure that development activities such as demolition and vegetation or site clearance are timed to avoid the bird nesting season of early March to August inclusive.

2. The applicant is advised that the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal also notes that there are Cheryl Laurel and Buddleia are present on site and although not listed as an invasive species in Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 these are non-native invasive plants and should be eradicated from the site by a suitable qualified professional.

**PL8 23/P/01567 - CHERRY TREE COTTAGE, PINE WALK, EAST HORSLEY,
LEATHERHEAD, KT24 5AG**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension, front porch together with roof extension to include first floor addition following demolition of rear extension, front porch and bay.

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

- Dr Roger Main (to object);
- Mrs Charlotte Eagle-Hodgson (Applicant) (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Katie Williams. The Committee noted that the site was located within the identified settlement boundary of East Horsley and was currently comprised of a detached bungalow with accommodation within the roof space. The property was located between Links Hill to the west and Pine Walk to the east which was accessible from both roads. The surrounding area was residential in character, made up of detached dwellings of varying traditional styles and of varying scale and height.

The application had been amended from the original submission, with the proposed rear extension reduced from a two-storey extension to a single storey rear extension with a simplified roof design. There was existing mature hedging and trees to the plot boundaries.

The existing property was a modest dormer bungalow designed and built by Frank Chown. The building was not identified as a statutory or locally listed building and it had been previously extended. The northern flank of the proposal would have a cat slide roof whilst the southern flank would have gabled projections to the front and rear elevations.

Due to the local historic interest in the existing building, the Council's Conservation Officer had been consulted on the application. The proposal was subsequently amended to include the retention of some traditional townhouse features, including the brick plinth. The proposed porch would also replicate the existing. Following the amendments made, the Conservation Officer had confirmed that the proposals were considered to be acceptable in design terms. The proposed ridge height of the dwelling as extended, would measure approximately 9 metres from the finished floor level which was an increase of 3 metres.

In summary, the proposed extensions, whilst changing the single storey character of the dwelling, were considered to reflect the original Chown character and detail of the building and therefore was not considered to result in harm to the character of the dwelling, street scene and surrounding area. The impact of the proposals on neighbouring properties had been carefully assessed and was not considered that the amenities of neighbouring properties would be significantly harmed. Therefore, subject to the conditions proposed the application was recommended for approval.

The Chairperson permitted Councillor Catherine Young to speak in her capacity as Ward Councillor for three minutes. The Committee noted concerns raised that the Parish Council had also objected to this application. In addition, there were

also letters of support and the cottage was clearly in need of attention. The cottage was an original Frank Chown dating back to the 1920's. The architect Frank Chown had had a huge influence upon the development and character of East Horsley which was replicated across the village today.

The Committee noted praise to planning officers for working with the applicant to amend the original proposals so that some of the unique and special features of the original building would be retained. However, not enough of the original features would be preserved and result in an unsympathetic development of a significant local heritage asset.

Whilst the porch and one window would remain, the proposed frontage would contain eight windows in total and the changes would amount to very limited design revision. The rear glazing had also been amended, but to a more modern design and included 10 windows and floor to ceiling glazing thereby removing any semblance of the original town style. Therefore, this development did not meet the tests of policies D1, place shaping, it did not respond to the distinct local character, policy D4 and it did not demonstrate a clear understanding of place. It did not respond positively to the history and significant views to and from immediate surroundings. The building was highly visible from both Links Hill and Pine Walk and the existing hedge at the front maybe removed to open up the plot to enable the development. It was also in contravention of policy D3 in that it failed to conserve this non-designated heritage asset including its features of historic interest and the setting which makes this cottage so unique.

The proposal was also in conflict with Policy EH9 of the heritage assets of the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan and finally it did not meet any of the guidance of the residential extensions and alterations SPD. The proposal did not reflect the existing character of the original Chown house. On balance, the harm to this non-designated heritage asset would be significant and the Committee was urged to refuse the application.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that it was unfortunate that a Frank Chown house such as this was not locally listed. The Committee noted comments that the proposal represented a complete rebuild of the house which was not in keeping with its original character. The house sat on a very small plot in comparison to its neighbours and was visually prominent.

The Committee noted comments of support for the proposed alterations given that the existing property was clearly dilapidated and needed renovation. The house needed to be made fit for purpose to suit modern day living standards.

The increase in the size of the footprint was perceived as modest considering the overall size of the plot. The Committee agreed that on balance the proposal would not represent a harmful addition to the character of the area. Whilst it was acknowledged that the hedge could be removed it was not the applicant's intention to do so.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Sue Wyeth-Price	X		
2	Bob Hughes	X		
3	David Bilbé	X		
4	James Jones	X		
5	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
6	Dominique Williams	X		
7	Richard Mills	X		
8	Howard Smith	X		
9	Maddy Redpath	X		
10	Vanessa King	X		
11	Stephen Hives	X		
12	Joanne Shaw	X		
13	Cait Taylor	X		
14	Yves de Contades	X		
15	Patrick Oven		X	
	TOTALS	14	1	0

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

RESOLVED to approve application 23/P/01567 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report and subject to the re-wording of condition 5 as detailed below:

Condition 5 has been reworded at the request of the Council's Conservation and Design Officer to clarify the requirements relating to the rebuilding of the porch.

5. Prior to the commencement of development on site a detailed methodology of the taking down and rebuilding of the existing porch shall be submitted to and

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The porch's design and configuration shall replicate the existing porch, reusing the existing material where viable. To ensure that this can happen the structure's dismantlement shall only be carried out by hand or by tools held in the hand other than power driven tools and securely stored for later reuse.

Reason: In the interests of the external appearance of the proposal.

PL9 23/P/01827 - 114 TILLINGBOURNE ROAD, SHALFORD, GUILDFORD, GU4 8EU

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for part single, part two storey rear extension with rooflights including removal of existing chimney stack.

The Committee noted that the application had been referred to the Planning Committee because the applicant was an employee of Guildford Borough Council.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Katie Williams. The Committee noted that the application site was located within the inset boundary of Shalford. It was also within the Surrey Hills, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and in an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). The site was comprised of an end of terrace, two storey dwelling in a residential cul-de-sac. There was an existing single storey rear extension across the rear of the dwelling and the proposed extensions would partially replace the existing rear extension and then extend to a further depth of 1.1 metres. No changes were proposed to the front elevation, apart from the removal of one of the chimney stacks. The proposed two storey rear extension would extend out slightly further than the existing single storey rear extension. The two storey extension incorporated a rear facing gable end with the rear ridge set down from the main ridge line of the existing dwelling. On the proposed rear elevation the two storey element would be set away from the boundaries and also set down from the main ridge. The proposed single storey element would extend out beyond the existing single storey extension incorporating a small area of flat roof. A rooflight was proposed on the western roof slope set at a high level above the finished floor level and therefore would not result in any adverse loss of privacy to the neighbouring property.

In conclusion, the site was inset within the boundary of Shalford and therefore the principle of development was acceptable. The proposal would result in subordinate additions which would not have an adverse impact on the scale and

character of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area. There would also be no adverse impact on neighbouring amenity or highways and parking considerations. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The Committee discussed the application and agreed that the proposal represented an improvement upon the existing property.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Joanne Shaw	X		
2	Sue Wyeth-Price	X		
3	Stephen Hives	X		
4	Bob Hughes	X		
5	Cait Taylor	X		
6	Yves de Contades	X		
7	Maddy Redpath	X		
8	Patrick Oven	X		
9	David Bilbé	X		
10	Vanessa King	X		
11	Dominique Williams	X		
12	Howard Smith	X		
13	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
14	Richard Mills	X		
15	James Jones	X		
	TOTALS	15	0	0

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

RESOLVED to approve application 23/P/01827 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL10 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee considered and noted the appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 8.15 pm

Signed

Date

Chairman