

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

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillors Yves de Contades, Pat Oven and Sue Wyeth-Price with no substitutes.

PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest.

PL3 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 27 March 2024 were agreed and signed by the Chairperson as a true and accurate record.

PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the Chairperson's announcements.

PL5 23/P/01965 - STREAMSIDE, HARPERS ROAD, ASH, GUILDFORD, GU12 6DB

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

- Mr Andrew Kamm (Bourne Homes) (in support)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed erection of 24 two-storey dwellings with associated parking and landscaping; creation of new vehicular access from Harpers Road.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, John Busher. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets where some changes to conditions as well as additional conditions were detailed to highlight the fact that there are two distinct parts to the site with their own separate access points. The site was located on the western side of Harpers Road and since the adoption of the Local Plan, was now within the urban area of Ash. The site forms part of the larger and A31 strategic allocation for Ash and Tongham and the land to the east of Harpers Road was still located within the Green Belt. There were a number of listed buildings in the surrounding area including the closest one which is the Grade II listed York House. Both the northern and southern halves of the site were separated by an area of woodland and stream. The northern half had a number of mature trees around its perimeter as well as within the site. The southern half contained the existing streamside dwelling, its ancillary buildings and garden area. The site had a long planning history and the Committee had refused a similar scheme for 22 dwellings back in June 2023. The subsequent appeal was allowed in February 2024.

This application sought permission for 24 dwellings. Because of this, the layout to the development was slightly different. The Committee noted the other development sites nearby which included Orchard Farm, which was allowed on appeal last year and May and Juniper Cottages. The area was therefore experiencing significant change and was in a period of transition.

The Committee noted the block plan which demonstrated that the scheme would be split into distinct sections. The northern half would consist of eight semi-detached properties all of which would be two-storeys in height. The existing woodland and stream would be retained as part of the development and improved and integrated into the scheme. The southern half of the site would contain 14 houses and 2 apartments utilising the existing access into the Streamside property. Overall, the proposed layout was deemed to be acceptable and would be in keeping with the evolving character and appearance of the area. In terms of the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, it was noted that one of the concerns raised by members when considering the last application was the impact upon Oakside cottage. The appeal allowed in February this year concluded that the appeal scheme would have resulted in some loss of privacy to this property but that the degree of harm caused to the overall living conditions would be very limited. Given the appeal decision and the

views made by the Inspector, although the scheme was slightly different, officers felt that the same harm would result from this proposal. That harm had been factored into the final balance of the report. Some harm would be caused by overlooking from the properties, from the windows in the side elevations, which have now been built out as part of the Wildflower Meadow scheme. However, condition 23 stipulated that no additional windows were permitted to be put in the side elevation and the windows were to be frosted or obscurely glazed. That mitigation would therefore be enough to avoid any adverse impact on these neighbouring properties.

The Committee also viewed comparisons between the consented appeal scheme and the proposed block plan. No change was proposed to the northern half however the layout to the southern half had been tweaked slightly to accommodate two additional dwellings.

It was also noted that the Council's Conservation Officer had raised concerns about a proposed grey tile roof finish which had been recommended to be changed to a more traditional red roof tile. The properties were fairly traditional in their appearance in what was a fairly spacious and open development.

In summary, the proposal was found to be an acceptable addition to this part of allocation 31, being of a layout, design and scale which was in keeping with the other developments already approved in the area.

Although a number of objections had been received regarding highway safety along Harper's Road and the capacity of the local highway network, no objections had been raised by the County Highway Authority. In addition, the highway reason for refusal for the last application was not supported by the Planning Inspector. It was acknowledged that the proposal would result in modest harm to the privacy of the occupants of the cottage and that there would be less than substantial harm at the lower end of the scale caused to the surrounding heritage assets. The public benefits associated with the proposal was considered on this occasion to outweigh the harm caused to the setting of the listed buildings. The proposal would also result in an affordable housing provision of 39.1% which was less than the 40% required by the Council's policy. There was therefore a technical breach of policy H2 of the Local Plan. However, it was also very close to being compliant overall. The benefits of the scheme were therefore considered sufficient to outweigh the identified harm on this occasion and as such it was recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions in the report and the supplementary late sheets as well as the completion of a S106 agreement.

The Committee discussed the application and questioned what the education contribution was detailed on page 69 of the report. The senior planning officer confirmed that as part of the planning application, the Council consulted with the education authority at Surrey County Council, and they requested contributions towards early years primary and secondary school education. As the proposed development would increase pressure on the schooling system within the area, the contributions were designed to help offset that in terms of new projects to existing skills in that area.

The Committee also noted comments that the new proposal was welcomed and provided two additional homes as well as one more affordable home. The £900,000 contribution secured through the S106 would benefit the infrastructure needed to support the development going forward. The current proposal also preserved the trees and stream. Previous concerns raised about highway safety on Harpers Road remained however it was accepted that the County Highway Authority had made no objection.

The Committee queried if a barrier would be created between the urban area and Greenbelt so to cut down on the visibility of the built-up area. The senior planning officer clarified that there was no physical barrier proposed between the urban area and Green Belt. Rather a softening of the boundaries had been incorporated by introducing additional planting as screening. This would act as a green buffer and transition point. The Committee also noted comments that the conditions relating to the preservation of wildlife were adhered to.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
		FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Maddy Redpath	X		
2	Cait Taylor	X		
3	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
4	David Bilbé	X		
5	Dominique Williams	X		
6	James Jones	X		
7	Howard Smith	X		
8	Vanessa King	X		
9	Stephen Hives	X		
10	Joanne Shaw	X		
11	Richard Mills	X		
12	Bilal Akhtar	X		
	TOTALS	12	0	0

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

RESOLVED to approve application 23/P/01965 subject to the amended and new conditions as detailed on the supplementary late sheets and subject:

(i) That a s.106 agreement be entered into to secure:

- education contribution;
- securing private SANG which would be suitable to mitigate the development;
- SAMM (Strategic Access Management and Monitoring) contribution;
- free and unfettered access to the development to all;
- provision and subsequent retention of the pedestrian and cycle access points before first occupation of the units;
- highways contribution;
- Ash Road Bridge contribution; and

- The provision of nine affordable dwellings (two First Homes, five affordable rent and two intermediate units).

If the terms of the s.106 or wording of the planning conditions are materially amended as part of ongoing s.106 or planning condition(s) negotiations, any material changes shall be agreed in consultation with the Chairperson of the Planning Committee and Ward Members.

- (ii) That upon completion of the above, the application be determined by the Joint Executive Head of Planning Development. The recommendation is to approve planning permission, subject to conditions.
- (iii) If, after 12 months has elapsed since the resolution of the Planning Committee to grant planning permission, the s.106 agreement is not completed then the application may be refused on the basis that the necessary mitigations to offset the impact of the development cannot be secured.

PL6 23/P/02045 - MANDOLAY HOTEL, 36-40 LONDON ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 2AF

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

- Dr Kate Relph (to object) (read out by the Democratic Services Officer)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for two storey rear extension to coach house and two storey rear extension to hotel, with rooms in the roof.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, John Busher. The hotel was located on the eastern side of London Road, close to the junction with Warren Road and within the Warren Road Conservation Area, opposite the town centre. The hotel was comprised of a number of connected and detached buildings which extended approximately 35 metres into the site. There was limited car parking to the front and rear of the site, with both parking areas accessed through the front from London Road. The surrounding area was mixed use in character with both residential and commercial properties on Warren Road. G-Live was also located close-by.

The Committee noted that planning permission was sought for a two-storey extension to the rear of the hotel, to provide 25 additional bedrooms. The site

benefitted from extant planning permission for a similar extension granted in 2015 which has been partially implemented.

In conclusion, it was the planning officers view that this proposal was an acceptable extension to the existing hotel premises. No harm had been found to neighbouring properties and the impact on the Conservation Area was considered to be acceptable. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Committee considered that the overall size of the extension proposed represented a modest increase and that the number of bedrooms had only increased by five. The Committee also noted comments that the concerns raised in the 2014 application were satisfactorily addressed by the 2015 permission which had to be given significant weight. The Committee noted remaining concerns regarding an imbalance in the amount of development on this site and the remaining open area given there was very little space at the rear of the hotel. The Director for Planning confirmed that the Committee should consider the impact the development would have on the conservation area. The test was whether it would preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. The Committee was cautioned on applying too much weight to what happened in 2014 as in 2015 permission was granted. As part of that permission, the Council would have considered the same test and concluded that it did preserve and enhance the conservation area as well as meeting the test in Section 72 of the Planning Act. The 2015 permission had therefore been technically implemented and could be built out within 3 months and as such significant weight was attached to that fact.

The Committee noted concerns raised regarding the tight parking situation onsite for both the hotel and other businesses located there. It was confirmed by the Director for Planning that the construction management plan was in place in order to mitigate the impact of development in that regard. It was also confirmed that none of the windows in the extension would overlook properties such as Lincoln House or Red House and was noted that the hotel was mainly surrounded by businesses overall.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Vanessa King	X		
2	Bilal Akhtar	X		
3	Maddy Redpath	X		
4	Richard Mills		X	
5	James Jones	X		
6	David Bilbé	X		
7	Dominique Williams	X		
8	Howard Smith	X		
9	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
10	Cait Taylor	X		
11	Joanne Shaw	X		
12	Stephen Hives	X		
	TOTALS	12	0	0

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

RESOLVED to approve application 23/P/02045 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL7 21/P/01882 - NORTH MOORS ALLOTMENT SITE, NORTH MOORS, WORPLESDON, GUILDFORD, GU1 1SE

The Committee considered the above mentioned full application for change of use of amenity land to deliver 78 allotment plots, bee keeping facilities, composting areas, community buildings, landscaping and associated cycle storage and car parking (Revision of Location Plan to Application 20/P/00197).

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Jo Chambers. The application had been submitted on behalf of Guildford Borough Council in its capacity as landowner, in support of the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project. This development was required to facilitate the Weyside Urban Village development which required the re-provision of allotments from the existing Bellfield site. The Council purchased the application site to relocate up to 724 rods with the remaining provision to be located at the existing Aldershot Road allotment site.

The application site was located in the Green Belt to the north of the Slyfield Industrial Estate immediately adjacent to the Royal Mail site adjoining to the east and the new waste treatment plant which was within the industrial estate. A public footpath ran across the site at the present time and through the woodland to the east which links Slyfield to Jacobs Well. A public footpath diversion had been granted to accommodate the proposed development.

The application sought the change of use of the land to allotments and would provide 78 new allotment plots and two beekeeping plots. The application also included the provision of a small building containing WC facilities and office and storage areas. Access to the site would be from North Moors which would lead to a small car park for 9 vehicles and approximately 6 bicycles. Planning permission was granted for the same development in June 2020. The current application sought to formalise changes to the site boundary and the layout of the allotments and associated facilities to enable the allotments to be completed and made available for use.

The main changes proposed comprised a realignment of the southern boundary to exclude the Post Office land, associated redesign of the car park at the southern edge of the development and the allotment facilities, vehicle access and a reduction in the EV charger capacity from 7 kilowatts to 3.6 kilowatts due to a lack of electrical capacity at the local grid. It was important to note that development had commenced under the extant consent and a significant amount of work had already been undertaken. The principle of development had therefore been established under the extant consent.

The proposal constituted appropriate development in the Green Belt and would be a significant benefit to the local community supporting local and national objectives for healthy and active lifestyles. The development of allotments in this location would not prejudice the delivery of the adjoining waste treatment plant and would facilitate the wider Slyfield Area Regeneration Project.

The development had necessitated the loss of semi-improved grassland scrub, scattered trees and young plantation woodland and rural habitats. However, the proposed design provided for mitigation in avoiding effects on features of ecological value, with further measures to deliver compensation and biodiversity enhancements, as set out in the previously approved landscaping ecology management plan which also formed part of the current application. The development would not materially impact on the character of the area, residential amenity or highway safety. The revised application also allowed for some retention of additional woodland around the boundary.

Some concerns had been raised by the Guildford Allotment Society about the revised layout and location of the allotment facilities owing to the risk of crime and anti-social behaviour. The buildings have been moved from the southern boundary due to the realignment of the boundary to the northern most part. The allotment society believes that the revised building location materially obstructs the line of vision between plots and the entrance, which was a security feature of the original plan. The applicant has therefore looked at options and advised that the proposed layout is the configuration that best delivered on the site requirements including turning space for site access for emergency vehicles and car parking. Whilst working within the confines of the site in respect to levels, trees and landscaping which constrained the access track to the east, whilst the proposed buildings would sit between the allotments and the entrance, this would be the case for only a small number of the plots immediately adjacent and there would be surveillance of the entrance and car park from all other plots and views through the buildings.

The technical team had subsequently met with the allotment society to discuss the project in further details, and this resulted in amendments to the internal layout of the allotment facilities. A designated liaison officer had been appointed to manage the transition from Bellfields into the new allotment sites and would remain in position until North Moors was fully handed over. The design and layout of the proposed allotment facilities, storage space and toilets had all been updated in consultation with the allotment society since the submission of their comments in November 2023. Furthermore, a condition was proposed to address concerns about security which required the implementation of a written scheme for the reduction of opportunities for crime, details of locks, lighting and CCTV.

Planning officers were satisfied that the changes to the planning application did not deviate from the scheme previously approved by the Planning Committee in June 2020. It was an important development and recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out in the report and revised conditions in the supplementary late sheets.

The Committee discussed the application and were content that the allotment society was working closely with the liaison officer who was present at the meeting. The Liaison Officer confirmed that a lot of the original concerns had been addressed and was looking into providing solar powered wi-fi for the security cameras.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Richard Mills	X		
2	David Bilbé	X		
3	Cait Taylor	X		
4	Bilal Akhtar	X		
5	Dominique Williams	X		
6	Stephen Hives	X		
7	Howard Smith	X		
8	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
9	Maddy Redpath	X		
10	Vanessa King	X		
11	James Jones	X		
12	Joanne Shaw	X		
	TOTALS	12	0	0

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

RESOLVED to approve application 21/P/01882 subject to the conditions and reasons as laid out in the report and amended conditions in the supplementary late sheets.

PL8 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee discussed and noted the appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 8.30 pm

Signed

Date

Chairman