

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

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

- |                               |                                |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| * Councillor Bilal Akhtar     | * Councillor Richard Mills OBE |
| * Councillor Joss Bigmore     | * Councillor Patrick Oven      |
| * Councillor David Bilbe      | * Councillor Maddy Redpath     |
| Councillor Yves de Contades   | * Councillor Joanne Shaw       |
| * Councillor Lizzie Griffiths | * The Deputy Mayor, Councillor |
| * Councillor Stephen Hives    | Howard Smith                   |
| Councillor James Jones        | * Councillor Cait Taylor       |

\*Present

Councillors Fiona White and Catherine Young were also in attendance online.

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Yves de Contades and James Jones. Councillors Gillian Harwood and Steven Lee attended as substitutes respectively.

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

There were no disclosures of interest.

### **PL3 MINUTES**

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 9 October 2024 were agreed and signed by the Chairperson as an accurate record.

### **PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Committee noted the Chairperson's announcements.

### **PL5 24/P/00441 - LAND WEST OF BLACKWELL FARM, HOGS BACK, GUILDFORD, GU3**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for the installation of a 12.21 MWp solar facility comprising ground mounted infrastructure including inverters, transformers, a GRP switchgear enclosure,

fencing, infrared cameras, motion detection system, underground cable connections, export cable, access works, including new tracks, landscape planting and other ancillary development.

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

- Mr Ramsey Nagaty (to object) read out by: Mr Stephen Mallet (Chairman of Compton Parish Council);
- Ms Karen Stevens (to object) read out by: Mr John Goodridge (Chairman of Surrey CPRE);
- Mr Paul Rogers (Planning Agent Tor&Co) (in support) and;
- Mr Will Davies (Chief Operating Officer, University of Surrey) (in support)

The Chairperson, Councillor King asked the Interim Team Leader, Kelly Jethwa to re-start her presentation owing to the fact that Councillors Steven Lee and Maddy Redpath had joined the meeting late. This would enable them to hear the presentation from the start.

The Committee received a presentation from the Interim Team Leader, Kelly Jethwa. The application was for a solar facility to be located in three fields, including an access track from Egerton Road and an underground cable route from the Stag Hill Campus. The application site was located to the west of the urban area of Guildford and north of the Surrey Hills National Landscape Area. There was a railway line to the north, and beyond which was Wood Street Village. To the west, was the complex of buildings associated with Manor Farm and the University.

The site allocation for Blackwell Park was partly located in the candidate area for the Surrey Hills National Landscape Area and partly located in an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). There was also areas of ancient woodland along the edges of the ancient woodland copses close to the proposed solar fields. Part of the site was located in an area of Green Belt whilst the other part was located in the east in the urban area of Guildford.

The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which detailed the fact that there was a public consultation on amendments to changes to the Surrey Hills National Landscape Area. The entire solar array sat within the Green Belt. The Surrey Hills National Landscape Area extended north of the Hogs Back. The application site fell within the area that was subject of review by Natural England as part of a boundary review and was therefore known as a candidate area. The Committee was reminded that there was no directive which prevented the local

planning authority determining this planning application in a candidate area while the review was in progress. In recognition of this, the application would provide measures which comprised of an interpretative information strategy, including information boards, signposts, sculptures and other features for those visiting the area so that they would have a better understanding of the landscape environment and its history.

The Committee noted plans which showed a number of public rights of way which crossed the site. There were also permissive paths that traversed the site. These allowed access for pedestrians and for bridleways from the north of Wood Street Village, from the south and from the urban area of Guildford. The three fields proposed to house the solar facility were called Wildfields, Big Misley and Little Misley. The Committee noted that part of the development proposed would include a 2.4-metre-high deer proof fence which would enclose each of the three fields. The solar array would be placed east to west on an angled frame facing southwards with a maximum height of 3 metres. The applicant had submitted a glint and glare survey and no harm had been identified. In addition, following advice from the Council's landscape specialist, non-reflective finishes were recommended under condition 19.

The solar panels were inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources was a material consideration as per paragraph 156 of the NPPF. This had been given substantial weight and boosted by the Ministerial Statement issued in July 2024 by the Deputy Prime Minister.

The Committee noted photos of the three fields taken at different times of the year where the seasonal changes could be observed. Little Misley was the smallest field in the AGLV as well as the Green Belt and could be observed northwards towards the boundary with the Surrey Hills National Landscape Area and the Hogs Back in the distance. The Big Misley field was located in the Green Belt and adjoined an ancient woodland. The final field was Wildfields and was furthest to the north nearest the railway line.

The Committee noted further details regarding the access track and cabling. A spoil heap needed to be removed for the access track. The access track and cabling route had been designed to reduce the impact on habitats and species, trees, ancient woodlands, hedgerows and heritage features. The track would have no engineering aprons, curbs or lighting. The track would be laid with recycled or secondary aggregate. The cabling route would run from the solar field to the Stag Hill Campus where it would be connected to a substation. The

cables would be laid underground, however, there was a small section that would require open excavation under the A3 along Egerton Road. An engineering technique called horizontal directional drilling would be used to manage the effects on woodlands and habitats. No objections had been raised to this on arboricultural grounds. As these works were construed as an engineering operation where the site was in the Green Belt, it was considered to be appropriate development owing to there being limited impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

The applicant had carried out a landscape and visual assessment and the viewpoints were agreed with planning officers and a specialist consultant. As a result of this work, additional planting was recommended along the southern boundary of Little Misley field and would be comprised of a 10-metre-deep woodland planting belt with other hedgerows along the field boundaries. The Committee noted the verified views which had been taken by the applicant in accordance with the methodology agreed. It was demonstrated that over time the 3-metre-high solar panels would be screened by the additional planting. It was acknowledged that harm to this viewpoint from the Surrey Hills National Landscape Area would be caused to its setting and potential harm to the candidate area.

The applicant had carried out an alternative sites assessment which had been reviewed by officers and was considered acceptable. Officers were satisfied that all other options to deliver renewable energy had been investigated. Further information had also been requested and provided regarding the use of previously developed land, including car parks and the roofs of buildings. The solar arrays would be used as part of a wider strategy by the University to achieve net zero by 2030 which included roof mounted PV panels, reducing energy consumption, replacing boilers with more efficient electric boilers and better arrangements for heat storage and future battery storage.

The NPPF and policy E5 of the Local Plan safeguarded against the loss of agricultural land. The applicant had carried out a soil and agricultural quality assessment of the fields. Planning Officers were satisfied that the majority of the land was not best and most versatile which fell within grades 3A and 2. The proposed development would result in the temporary loss of 13.4 hectares of best and most versatile land which was approximately 36% of the study area. As the development would prevent arable farming for the term of the use, this would therefore be contrary to the NPPF policy E5 (3).

Some of the public rights of way would go across the access track. Therefore, working with Surrey County Council, the applicant had provided details which would ensure that these rights of way would remain unobstructed. This would consist of a system of gates across the access track which would only be open for maintenance vehicles once the solar farm was operational. Otherwise, the public rights of way would be unfettered, including during construction with further details required by condition 16.

The Committee noted that the proposal would achieve in excess of 20% biodiversity net gain as required by policy P7. New grassland would be laid in the fields with new hedging and a new woodland. In the Wildfields site there would also be some woodland planting and a pond. The supplementary late sheet included a summary of the harms identified and the public benefits. It was the planning officer's opinion that there were very special circumstances that weighed in favour of the development. Those public benefits outweighed the less than substantial harm identified to the Grade II listed Wildfields Farmhouse and other harms identified to the landscape quality, the Green Belt and the best and most versatile land. Those harms had been balanced against the benefits, and in this case, the benefits would outweigh the harm. The applicant had sought to minimise the effect where possible and where that harm could not be minimised, there would be appropriate mitigation such as the additional screen planting to Little Misley. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions and a S106 agreement to secure the biodiversity net gain as well as the amendments and corrections as detailed in the supplementary late sheets.

Prior to the Committee discussing the application, Councillor Howard Smith noted that given Councillors Steven Lee and Maddy Redpath arrived late to the meeting, they had missed the opportunity to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests or non-disclosable pecuniary interests. For the record, both Councillors Steven Lee and Maddy Redpath confirmed that they had no interests to declare.

The Committee discussed the application and noted concerns raised that there were insufficient very special circumstances to offset the harm caused to ecology, conservation and wildlife. The site would be losing high quality agricultural land through the use of the fields being turned over to a solar facility. The number of objections received was also a material planning consideration. A similar energy capacity of 9.4 megawatts could be generated by placing solar panels on roof tops rather than fields which generated approx. 12 megawatts. Lastly, it was noted that the solar fields would be in place temporarily for a period of 35 years.

The Committee noted further concerns raised that the inclusion of Little Misley field for use as a solar facility was problematic owing to the harm caused to this piece of land which was a candidate for the Surrey Hills National Landscape Area. No problems were identified with the other two fields proposed to be used for solar panels; Big Misley and Wildfields. If the application were to be approved, it was queried whether it would be possible to secure a mature planting scheme to act as a screen to Little Misley rather than approve planting that could take up to 35 years to fully establish. It was also queried whether the track would be made up of recycled aggregates as referred to in the officers presentation or of unbound materials as detailed in condition 24. This was owing to concerns about carbon emissions associated with concrete production if it was a material to be used in the track.

The Interim Team Leader, Kelly Jethwa confirmed that in condition 15 (8), officers had made a request for advanced planting of trees and hedgerows. If members were minded, then it could be conditioned that Little Misley was planted earlier so to assist the quicker development of screening. It was also confirmed that unbound materials included aggregates and condition 19 required details to be submitted including embodied carbon.

The Committee noted that the second round of consultation for the Surrey Hills National Landscape Area was finishing on 10 December 2024. Was it therefore possible to defer this application until this was decided so that the Committee could make a well-informed decision, should Little Misley become part of the Surrey Hills National Landscape Area.

The Joint Assistant Director for Planning, Claire Upton-Brown advised the Committee that the end of the consultation period for the Surrey Hills National Landscape Area was not a decision date. The Committee therefore needed to be mindful that should they want to align a decision with this application with the decision on designation that there was no timescale for, and that the application could therefore be undetermined potentially for an indefinite period of time.

The Committee noted a query raised regarding the financial savings that would likely be achieved via the scheme. The Joint Assistant Director for Planning confirmed that she was not in a position to discuss the finances of the applicant. Energy bills had obviously increased globally, and the University's budget had not increased in turn. The creation of solar energy onsite would therefore help the University bridge that financial gap. The commercial arrangement between SSE and the University was unknown however the energy generated by the solar farm would be used by the University. A query was also raised about whether the

planting would sufficiently screen Little Misley. The Interim Team Leader, Kelly Jethwa confirmed that the applicant provided a landscape and visual assessment which identified harm to the landscape. The additional planting would go some way to mitigate that harm, but it would not completely obscure it.

The Committee noted a comment that the Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan which was part of the Local Plan, and it did not permit solar facilities on such land. The Senior Planning Officer, Kelly Jethwa confirmed that the application site was not within the Surrey Hills National Landscape, part of the site was rather located in a candidate area. The relevant policy in the AONB Management Plan was P6 which related to the setting of the AONB and views to and from the Surrey Hills National Landscape.

The Committee noted comments that some members had attended a site visit earlier that week which had helped place the application in context, particularly when considering the views of Little Misley. The additional planting, at an earlier stage was fully endorsed so to ensure that the solar panels were screened more quickly. It was also queried and confirmed that the solar panels would be fixed in place and would not move.

The Committee noted concerns raised that there were no very special circumstances to enable this development on a significant green asset. Rather, a combination of utilising urban options would have been preferred. It was also observed that the likelihood of Guildford achieving net zero by 2030 was very slim.

The Committee noted comments that the cables being run through the solar facility was close to ancient woodland. It was queried whether further information could therefore be provided on the specific type of drill being used, how far down the drilling would go and what the buffer distance was around the trees to protect them. In addition, was the cable shortened within the options of what they assessed and how many routes did they look at? What was the timeframe to deliver renewable energy back to the University? Was it four years? Lastly, how many options were looked at with the access track which was a form of hardstanding?

The Interim Team Leader confirmed that in relation to the drilling, a drill would go down at a given entry point on one side and to a greater depth of three metres owing to the woodland areas and would then emerge at an exit pit on the other side. There was one very large ancient woodland next to the site allocation and another one next to Little Misley. In those locations there was a requirement

by Natural England and the Forestry Commission for a 15-metre buffer. The drilling entry and exit points would also be outside of those buffer areas. In terms of the cable route, it needed to be long because it had to get from the solar fields, which were effectively in the countryside to a substation. The substation which had the best capacity to serve the needs of the University was at the Stag Hill campus. It was acknowledged that the route followed a zig zag path however if it followed a straight line, it would be much more harmful to the designation in that area. It was also estimated that there was a 20-month lead in period from starting work to potentially first exporting electricity from the site.

A number of options were looked at for the access road. The previous application included an access from Chalk Pit Lane. After a road safety audit it was felt to not be a viable option and alternatives had to be sought. Another option included accessing the site from the north but the railway line impeded access. Land ownership issues affected routes from the north and the west. Access to the east of the site by the Surrey Research Park was also dismissed because of ownership issues as well as the impact on trees and ancient woodland. The access track proposed therefore allowed access using Egerton Road onto University Road including Francis Crick Road.

It was confirmed by the Interim Team Leader that there would be a requirement for a tree protection monitoring report to be provided on a monthly basis by a suitably qualified arboriculturalist as per condition 21.

On the site visit, it was noted that there was a property behind the hedgerows closest to Little Misley. It was queried whether that property would be affected by glare and glint from the solar panels. It was confirmed by the Interim Team Leader that the frames would mainly have a southernly aspect, and the house was located towards the west. Condition 19 also required the panels to have an anti-reflective finish applied to the panel frame to help mitigate those concerns.

The Committee noted comments that this was a much welcomed solar farm and a first for Guildford and considered that the panels would not be visible. Concerns about loss of farmland were not accepted given this was only three fields out of thousands of fields in Guildford overall. The Council should still strive to meet the zero-carbon emissions target despite views that we might not reach it. If the University could supply itself with over a third of the power it required then that was a very good thing, not just for the cost reduction for them but for Guildford as well.



The Committee noted comments made that three issues needed to be considered, the need for sustainable energy, the protection of an area of AGLV land and a candidate as a Surrey Hills National Landscape Area and the need to ensure national food security. It was acknowledged that solar farms could be built in the Green Belt and on agricultural land and on best and most versatile agricultural land. Paragraph 156 of the NPPF states that in very special circumstances, this included renewable energy projects. However, the inclusion of Little Misley in this application was of concern, as it was visible from the Hogs Back and would take a long time for them to be screened by the additional planting proposed. The land was also comprised of best and most versatile agricultural land and equated to a lot of land being taken out of agricultural production. Land of this quality was not a common feature in Surrey and food security needed to be elevated in the UK. The application should be refused on that basis. Councillor Owen who raised these concerns stated that he was minded to refuse the application and had reasons to support a refusal should other members wish to support him. No other member stated they would do so.

The Committee noted comments that the University had explored other brownfield sites and commended the application for approval.

The Chairperson, Councillor King asked the Committee if any other member had further comments to make on the application. No further comments were made.

The Chairperson, Councillor King moved the motion to approve application 24/P/00441 subject to a S106 and Councillor Jo Shaw seconded that motion which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
		FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Cllr Bilal Akhtar			X
2	Cllr Stephen Hives	X		
3	Cllr David Bilbé		X	
4	Cllr Vanessa King	X		
5	Cllr Cait Taylor	X		
6	Cllr Dominique Williams	X		
7	The Deputy Mayor, Cllr Howard Smith	X		
8	Cllr Lizzie Griffiths			X
9	Cllr Steven Lee	X		
10	Cllr Joss Bigmore	X		
11	Cllr Pat Oven		X	
12	Cllr Maddy Redpath		X	
13	Cllr Richard Mills		X	
14	Cllr Joanne Shaw	X		
15	Cllr Gillian Harwood	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 24/P/00441 subject to the updated and additional conditions as detailed in the supplementary late sheets and:

- (i) That delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director of Planning to grant permission and make minor amendments to the wording of conditions subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to secure:

- Monitoring of onsite Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

(ii) That upon completion of the above, the application be determined by the Joint Assistant Director of Planning. The recommendation is to approve planning permission subject to conditions.

**PL6      24/P/00563 - SURREY COUNTY CONSTABULARY POLICE HEADQUARTERS  
MOUNT BROWNE, SANDY LANE, GUILDFORD, GU3 1HG**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed new access road associated with police operations at the existing Mount Browne headquarters with associated landscaping, drainage, including attenuation pond, lighting and supporting engineering works.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Morgan Laird. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which detailed 27 further emails of objection to the application as well as two further objections received after the late sheets had been published. The issues raised did not identify any new matters which officers were not already aware of and were largely restricted to highway safety concerns. Concerns were raised as to whether the Police response times would improve as a result of the new access road as well as a question on whether adequate public consultation on the plans had taken place. A memo was circulated to councillors the day before from a resident on behalf of other residents. The late sheets had rebutted the comments made in that. Artington Parish Council did also object to this application, as well as the wider site, which was acknowledged in the late sheets. An amendment to condition 8 had also been made to make it clearer regarding the access road as well as further clarification with respect to the additional duty introduced by the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act.

The Committee noted that the access road would extend from the Artington Road roundabout westwards. The existing access was from Sandy Lane and The Ridges. The site was restricted as far as potential alternatives for where the access road could go and was surrounded by Green Belt. The site was entirely within the Green Belt as well as the Surrey Hills National Landscape Area and an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). There was also a public right of way that ran along the southern side of the site, north of the access road. The topography of the site rose to the northwest and the access road would make use of that topography.

The new proposed access road would have a carriage width of 6 metres, increasing to 7 metres towards the roundabout. Column lighting would run along its length, ranging from 5 to 8 metres in height with an attenuation basin at the base. It would include landscaping strips either side as well as pedestrian and cycle facilities along the northern side of the road.

Access to the field to the eastern side would be maintained through the road which was 269 metres in length. Only a section of it would be through the field and the rest through woodland extending towards the ridges. The landscaping would include an area of woodland planting to the northeast of it, hedgerow planting along its length as well as trees and a hedgerow along the Old Portsmouth Road.

Officers fully acknowledged that there would be harm associated with the implementation of the access road which was afforded significant weight. The column lighting would be visible in the trees and a portion of the road would be visible from Pewley Down. The road would not be visible from the southern side of the site where the public right of way was located because it sat below the topography of the land at this point.

The proposal would result in significant harm to the Surrey Hills National Landscape and result in a loss of agricultural land. However, the significant benefits afforded by this scheme were that it would improve response times for the Police by up to two minutes. It would also take vehicle traffic off the existing access points on Sandy Lane and The Ridges, which would in turn improve traffic safety. It would also improve the residents enjoyment of their amenities along Sandy Lane. A significant biodiversity net gain would also be achieved above the national requirements set. A new signboard would be erected to educate the public on the benefits and values of the Surrey Hills National Landscape.

The Committee noted that given the site was located in the Green Belt there were limited alternatives available. The applicant had therefore sought to minimise the harm through sympathetic planting and design. The applicant had explored the option of buying further land from the owner of the site but was deemed not possible in this case. Whilst significant harms were associated with the scheme, planning officers considered that the benefits would clearly outweigh the harms associated with the development and were therefore recommending approval subject to the conditions set out in the report and a S106 agreement.

The Committee discussed the application and noted comments that the access road off the Artington roundabout seemed to be the ideal place to provide access

to the wider Police site. However, whilst it would reduce the amount of time accessing and leaving the site would it increase the number of vehicle movements using this road or would there be the same number of vehicles as onsite at the moment?

The Senior Planning Officer, Morgan Laird confirmed that the road would not see an increase in road traffic but the trip generation increase would be associated with the main site.

The Committee noted a further query regarding the reduction in response time by two minutes, would that be achieved from Mount Browne or from somewhere else? The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the existing access and exit from Sandy Lane onto Portsmouth Road was quite dangerous with cars travelling at high speeds. The two minutes saved would therefore be achieved by not using that access anymore and by using the new access proposed.

The Committee noted comments that it was a shame the access road had not been cut into the landscape as it would have been a lot less noticeable than being routed with the topography of the land. However, if the topography of the land was cut into further, it would also increase the length of road overall which would require more engineering works within the site and field.

The Senior Planning Officer, Morgan Laird confirmed that this had been explored by the applicant as it was a point raised by the AONB Advisor and discussed as part of the pre-application process. Given it was a design question it would be something explored prior to going to Committee and not at this stage.

The Chairperson, Councillor Vanessa King moved the officer's recommendation to approve application 24/P/00563 subject to a S106 and updated condition 8 as detailed on the supplementary late sheets, and Councillor Steven Lee seconded that motion which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Cllr Richard Mills	X		
2	Cllr Dominique Williams	X		
3	Cllr Joss Bigmore	X		
4	Cllr Lizzie Griffiths	X		
5	Cllr Bilal Akhtar	X		
6	Cllr David Bilbé	X		
7	Cllr Steven Lee	X		
8	Cllr Cait Taylor	X		
9	Cllr Joanne Shaw	X		
10	Cllr Maddy Redpath	X		
11	The Deputy Mayor, Cllr Howard Smith	X		
12	Cllr Pat Oven	X		
13	Cllr Stephen Hives	X		
14	Cllr Vanessa King	X		
15	Cllr Gillian Harwood	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 24/P/00563 subject to a S106 and the amendments to condition 8 as detailed on the supplementary late sheet and:

- (i) That delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director of Planning to grant permission and make minor amendments to the wording of conditions subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to secure:

- Monitoring of onsite Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
- Implementation of the proposed landscaping

(ii) That upon completion of the above, the application be determined by the Joint Assistant Director of Planning. The recommendation is to approve planning permission subject to conditions.

**PL7      24/P/00564 - SURREY COUNTY CONSTABULARY POLICE HEADQUARTERS  
MOUNT BROWNE, SANDY LANE, GUILDFORD, GU3 1HG**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for redevelopment of Mount Browne headquarters including demolition of existing dog school and operational policing buildings and development of replacement dog school with associated staff accommodation, replacement core operational police buildings, ground maintenance compound and refurbishment of core operational building including courtyard wing, old building and sports building. Construction and refurbishment of associated parking including new decked car park. Associated landscaping, engineering operations and ancillary works.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Morgan Laird. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which detailed the 31 emails of objection which had been received since the agenda was published and two further objections received since the late sheets were published. It was also pointed out by a resident in a memo to members that Artington Parish Council's objection was not logged on the Guildford Borough Council planning portal. The comments were reviewed by planning officers, with the exception of one comment with respect to drone use, which was not part of this application, the remaining comments had already been considered in the officer's report. The late sheets also summarise a few changes, particularly with further assessment of air quality. The officer's report, as published, did not come to a conclusion on the impact of air quality because further clarification was being sought from the applicant. In this case, it had been provided with respect to the impact on the Town Centre Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and the Council's Environmental Health Officer raised no further concerns. Condition 7 had also been amended, for clarity, to make it clear that it related to biodiversity net gain. A further condition, no.32, was also being recommended which would require the access road to come forward before first use of any of the buildings on the main site. This was to address the highway impact associated with the increased trip generation. The County Highway Authority considered that the access road would mitigate that harm because it would take vehicle movements from Sandy

Lane and The Ridges. The access road was fundamental to that which was why this condition was recommended.

The Committee noted that the site was located to the south of Guildford's urban area. The College of Law was located to the northeast with Old Portsmouth Road running along the eastern boundary. The site was located on a steep topography with dense vegetation and ancient woodland to the east with a woodland belt running centrally through the site.

The main site was comprised of previously developed land and was inset from the Green Belt. Part of the site was also allocated for housing with ancient woodland to the east. St Catherine's Conservation Area was situated to the north of the site and the development was outside of the Conservation Area. A public right of way ran along the western side of the site and the southern boundary. The lower half of the site was known as the valley bottom and was located in the Green Belt, the Surrey Hills National Landscape Area and an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV).

The site also contained a non-designated heritage asset known as the Old House. The development would not include any alterations to this building. The Old House would be renovated internally and have a minor alteration to the roof made to provide a connecting corridor between the wings. The Conservation Officer had reviewed the proposal and considered that no harm was associated with the works proposed to the Old House. The Courtyard Wing would have an additional staircase to the side and be retained in its current footprint. The main building would be demolished, and the multi-storey car park set down below the existing tree line. Owing to their poor condition, the existing dog school and kennels would be demolished as part of the application. The kennels were also currently set-up so that the dogs could see each other and set each other off barking. There was no acoustic insulation or a way to reduce the noise from the dogs. Therefore, there was a need to provide and improve facilities for the dog school. The applicant had undertaken an assessment of alternative sites for the dog school, but the site proposed was intrinsically linked with other operational requirements, including firearms training and drug relocation.

The existing sports field remained, and its use would not change. The proposal included a new maintenance compound as well. The multi-storey car park to the north-east of the site had a split-level design, three to four storeys in height, to work with the levels of the site. An ancillary building was proposed to provide amenities to staff onsite, including showers and lockers storage. The Munstead



building would replace the existing dog school and was situated in an enclosed woodland setting.

Throughout the pre-application and application process, planning officers had raised concerns regarding the extent of development within the Green Belt. As a result, the development had been made smaller and more compact. The extent of the footprint was also largely contained to the area of previously developed land. Planning Officers acknowledge that harm would be caused to the Green Belt by virtue of this development. It was an open site that was visible from the public footpath. However, in this case, an assessment of alternative sites had been undertaken and were not found to be appropriate. The site already had a dog school and would not result in an increase in the number of kennels which amounted to 50 in total. Owing to the open landscape, noise would travel differently. However, the noise assessment submitted demonstrated that there would not be an unacceptable impact on surrounding sensitive areas. The dog kennels would also be located some distance from Sandy Lane and The Ridges, as well as the properties located there. The new kennels would have acoustic controls in place to help mitigate concerns regarding noise which included insulation by acoustic fencing surrounding it and between the kennels. In addition, the dogs would no longer have sight of each other.

In conclusion, it was the planning officer's view that the application did result in harm and represented an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt. There would be harm to the Surrey Hills National Landscape although this was only identified as moderately adverse by the landscape and visual impact assessment. This still represented harm and was afforded significant weight.

Planning Officers nevertheless considered that there were exceptional circumstances for a public need for the proposed development. Planning Officers had made that assessment and concluded that the benefits, which included the need for the new dog kennels, ensured the secure ongoing operation of the Police Headquarters and provided improved welfare and facilities for staff retention and its associated economic and employment benefits.

The scheme had also been designed to be BREEAM excellent with the associated sustainability benefits. The scheme proposed enhancements to the Surrey Hill National Landscape Area which included sign boards to be erected near the public right of way. It also included additional planting above and beyond what was originally proposed with the scheme. It would consolidate car parking and remove car parking from ancient woodland. In this case, planning officers were satisfied that the benefits of the scheme would clearly outweigh the harms, and

subject to the conditions and Section 106 as detailed in the report and late sheets, was recommended for approval.

The Committee considered the application and noted comments that the redevelopment proposed appeared to fit in better with the overall environment and appeared less intrusive. There was no overall increase in height or visibility of the buildings from any significant vantage point. The development was therefore commended.

The Committee noted a query raised in relation to the fact that the site had been allocated in the Local Plan. What was the potential reduction in housing that would result from the sites continued use by the Police and what weight should be applied to that?

Planning Officers confirmed that the site had been allocated for 116 houses in the Local Plan and the development proposed by the Police would impact the Borough's overall housing supply given they were not moving from that site. It was for the Committee to decide what weight they wished to apply to that. The Police would also be moving from the existing town centre site which would therefore be available for redevelopment.

The Committee noted comments of support for the proposed redevelopment of the site which would bring cohesion to what was currently a piecemeal and aged set of buildings. The Committee recognised the concerns that had been raised by residents but overall commended the scheme for approval.

The Chairperson, Councillor King therefore moved the officer's recommendation to approve application 24/P/00564, subject to a S106, and updated conditions 7 and 32, as detailed on the supplementary late sheets, and Councillor Steven Lee seconded the motion which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
		FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Cllr Bilal Akhtar	X		
2	Cllr Stephen Hives	X		
3	Cllr David Bilbé	X		
4	Cllr Vanessa King	X		
5	Cllr Cait Taylor	X		
6	Cllr Dominique Williams	X		
7	The Deputy Mayor, Cllr Howard Smith	X		
8	Cllr Lizzie Griffiths	X		
9	Cllr Steven Lee	X		
10	Cllr Joss Bigmore	X		
11	Cllr Pat Oven	X		
12	Cllr Maddy Redpath	X		
13	Cllr Richard Mills	X		
14	Cllr Joanne Shaw	X		
15	Cllr Gillian Harwood	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 24/P/00564 subject to the S106 and to the updated conditions 7 and 32 as detailed in the supplementary late sheets and to the following:

- (i) That delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director of Planning to grant permission and make minor amendments to the wording of

conditions subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to secure:

- Monitoring of onsite Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
- Implementation of the proposed landscaping

(ii) That upon completion of the above, the application be determined by the Joint Assistant Director of Planning. The recommendation is to approve planning permission subject to conditions.

**PL8 24/P/00779 - WEYSIDE URBAN VILLAGE (SLYFIELD REGENERATION PROGRAMME), SLYFIELD GREEN, GUILDFORD, GU1**

(Councillor Steven Lee left the meeting and was not present for the discussion or vote taken in relation to this application).

The Committee considered the above-mentioned reserved matters application pursuant to outline consent 20/P/02155 (siting, design and external appearance, access and landscaping) for the erection of 187 dwellings and associated infrastructure, parking and landscaping on the southern part (Phase 3) of Weyside Urban Village (Slyfield regeneration Programme), Slyfield Green, Guildford, GU1 with access from Woking Road.

The Committee received a presentation from the Principal Planning Officer, Jo Chambers. The phase three site occupied a prominent gateway location on the southern part of the wider Weyside Urban Village on the area of the existing Council depot. The site was bounded to the west by the existing residential area of Parsons Green, Bellfield Road, Mangles Road, Swan Court and Stoke Mill Close which were also accessed from Woking Road. The site contained a number of single-storey buildings of varying condition which were currently being utilised as part of the existing depot. The only building of significance was the Victorian Pump House which was recognised as a non-designated heritage asset and was to be retained for future community use. The site and existing building was visible from the public towpath on the eastern side of the riverway. There were also some very large buildings on the depot site which were also visible through the existing vegetation from the towpaths. The link to Mangles Road which was currently a vehicular link would be a pedestrian link under the new proposals.

Reserved matters approval had previously been granted for phase one of the Weyside Urban Village Development and also for phase 6 of the depot. The relocation of the depot would enable the redevelopment of the phase three land

for residential development. The part of the site in the sewage treatment works use including the pump would only come forward following the relocation of the sewage treatment works to the new site, the north of Slyfield Industrial Estate. The site boundary had been amended to exclude the former pump house which remained in operational use and was not programmed to be decommissioned by Thames Water until 2027. Details of the pump house, including future community uses in the adjoining public square to the south would be submitted for approval by the Council under condition 20 of parent consent. The proposed development complied with the principle set out in the design code and made good use of the previously developed site in accordance with policy objectives. The development comprised the erection of 187 new homes, of which 75, 40% would be affordable together with associated infrastructure, including a section of the strategic movement corridor which ran the full length of the Weyside Urban Village development and the landscaping, including a section of the Riverside Walk and Wey Riverside Park which ran along the length of the development.

A range of building types were provided from 1-, 2- and 4-bedroom apartments to 4 bed houses. The density of development was around 90 dwellings per hectare which complied with the illustrative density plan which showed the site to have an indicative density of between 65 and 100 dwellings per hectare. There had been two principle changes made to the approved design code. The first was the approved design code and delegated master plan which showed 3-bedroom, 3 storey townhouses and 4 storey marker buildings along the strategic movement corridor facing onto the riverway. This had been changed to 4 storey apartment buildings along the length of that frontage. The increased height remained in accordance with the building heights parameter plan which showed a continuous frontage of three to four storey buildings along that route. The impact of the increased height had also been assessed on the heritage assets such as the pump house and the setting of the conservation area. The NPPF required a balanced judgement of the scale of harm and significance of the non-designated heritage assets. It had been concluded, following an assessment, that the development would have a less than substantial impact on the heritage assets and any impact would be outweighed by the public benefits delivered by the scheme, such as a range of housing, including 40% affordable, the redevelopment of an under-utilised brownfield site, the delivery of a major regeneration project and of new public spaces and infrastructure. The second principle change would be a reduction in the width of the western edge corridor to accommodate the proposed development. This was considered acceptable in the context of the wider open space provision. A shared pedestrian cycle route would be provided in accordance with the regulatory plan along that boundary.

The development would also deliver a network of green spaces, access to the river from the existing community via Mangles Road via a central living street which would provide a pedestrian and child friendly environment with limited vehicular traffic. The development would deliver the first part of the Weyside Walk Riverside Park which would include viewing areas and seating areas for the public. Phase 3 comprised the heritage quarter in the southern part of the Riverside Wharf character areas which were important features of the overall Weyside development.

The architecture and materials of Phase 3 had been inspired by several buildings in Guildford that either resulted from or was inspired by Guildford's waterfront industrial past. Planning Officers had worked closely with the applicant on the design of the development. Block A adjacent to the pump house had been identified as a special building. In accordance with the design code it had been designed with particular reference to industrial architecture and formed of the retained pump house. Buildings along the frontage had been designed in detail to respond to the architecture of the retained pump house and the waterfront heritage using red and multi red bricks as the primary facing material and gable ended building forms. Dual aspect homes had been created by the introduction of deck accesses to the rear of the apartment buildings. Regular Mews Streets ran through the development formed by terraced housing taking inspiration from the existing Victorian Pump House and Industrial Worker's House.

The proposed development would deliver a high level of sustainability benefits. The energy statement indicated that all proposed developments of dwellings in phase 3 could target passive house classic standards to provide an exemplar development. These were future proofed homes that incorporated health and wellbeing, minimised their impact on the climate and set a precedent for future phases of the development. With the incorporation of air source heat pumps and solar panels the proposed energy strategy for the site would result in carbon savings above policy requirements.

Parking provision was below the maximum standards as set out in Policy ID10 but was considered acceptable in the wider context of the development and the objective of promoting sustainable transport modes. No parking overspill was anticipated for the proposed development; however a parking review was required by the S106 agreement once the threshold of 300 dwellings was reached. This would assess whether there was any occurrence of overspill parking on nearby residential streets. If parking overspill had occurred potential future measures could include the introduction of a controlled parking zone and the provision of additional parking in future phases of the development.

The proposal complied with the principle set out in the design code and made good use of a previously developed site in accordance with policy objectives. It would deliver a range of housing, including a high proportion of affordable housing and a range of infrastructure and new public open spaces that would serve the whole of the Weyside development and adjoining residential areas. It's been designed to reflect the industrial waterfront character of the area, including the retained pump house and would create a distinctive new neighbourhood, high quality housing and was a prominent gateway to the Weyside Urban Village development. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Committee discussed the application and noted a query raised in relation to whether there would be electric car charging points incorporated into the scheme. It was confirmed that there was a condition on the application which required a strategy to be submitted and that Surrey Highways had recommended a higher proportion electric charging point provision than was required.

The Committee also noted comments of support for the proposal which was considered to be a well-designed development which incorporated a number of particular well-defined styles.

The Committee noted comments made that this part of the Weyside development represented 187 homes out of a total of 1500 which accounted for approximately 10% of the overall scheme. The scheme proposed did look dense and it was queried whether it was possible to look at the amount of public realm onsite to counterbalance the density such as the incorporation of large play areas.

The Principal Planning Officer, Jo Chambers confirmed that they had to look at every phase of development in the context of the overall masterplan. There were strong green linkages through the site. In phase one, there was a large neighbourhood play area approved which was within 400 metres of every dwelling. This part of the scheme included doorstep play and local play for smaller children. An assessment had been undertaken of the open space provision which was slightly under the required amount. The living street would therefore provide some amenity space as well as it being used for some vehicular access which was limited and at low speeds. The park would also extend along the river. The entire site therefore needed to be looked at in context. With regard to density overall, it was noted that this was a regeneration project on largely previously developed land. Its emphasis was on providing a sustainable

development making the best use of brownfield sites. Building at density also meant that walking and cycling could be encouraged as well as providing services that were easily accessible. Phase 4 was noted to be a critical phase and would include a local health centre.

The Committee also noted that there would be a blending of existing buildings with the new development. Connections were proposed to be made through the existing community, with residents of Mangles Road having direct access to the river for the first time. This integration of the wider town was a key element to the scheme.

The Committee noted that phase 3 seemed to be coming forward ahead of phase 2. It was explained that phase 2 was at the northern end of the site and phase 2 infrastructure had already started to be delivered and could be undertaken fairly quickly. A revised phasing plan was submitted as part of every reserved matters application. The works to Woking Road junction had commenced with the demolition of the existing property at no.30 Woking Road. These works could commence without the relocation of the sewage treatment works which was the biggest move to facilitate the development.

It was confirmed to the Committee with regard to play space provision for the development that phase one included the construction of a neighbourhood play area connected by cycle and pedestrian routes. The riverside park would include seating and ecological areas.

The Chairperson, Councillor Vanessa King moved the officer's recommendation to approve application 24/P/00779 and Councillor Howard Smith seconded that motion which was carried.



RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	The Deputy Mayor, Cllr Howard Smith	X		
2	Cllr Richard Mills	X		
3	Cllr Joanne Shaw	X		
4	Cllr Lizzie Griffiths	X		
5	Cllr Vanessa King	X		
6	Cllr Cait Taylor	X		
7	Cllr Pat Oven	X		
8	Cllr David Bilbé	X		
9	Cllr Maddy Redpath	X		
10	Cllr Joss Bigmore	X		
11	Cllr Stephen Hives	X		
12	Cllr Bilal Akhtar	X		
13	Cllr Dominique Williams	X		
14	Cllr Gillian Harwood	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 24/P/00779 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

**PL9 24/P/00855 - 88 LINDEN WAY, RIPLEY, WOKING, GU23 6LP**

(Councillor Steven Lee had left the meeting and was not present for the discussion or vote taken in relation to this application).

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, first floor rear Juliet balcony and front porch following demolition of existing garage.

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

- Mr Renaud (to object) (read out by the Democratic Services Officer)

The Committee received a presentation from the Team Leader, Justin Williams and noted that the application had been referred to Committee owing to the number of letters of representation received in objection to the application. The site was located within the urban area and also within the residential area which was comprised of other similarly styled properties which were semi-detached with good sized gardens. The two-storey side extension to the side of the property and the single storey side extension was to the front. There was a small front porch proposed as well. The side extension had been set down from the height of the existing dwelling house and was also set back from the front elevation. There was an attached garage which was proposed to be demolished and replaced with a two-storey extension.

The Committee noted that the application had received 16 letters of objection which had been summarised in the report. A further letter of representation was received following the publication of the agenda and was detailed on the supplementary late sheets.

The proposed side extension and front porch would be visible in the street but by the nature of the design it was considered by planning officers to be a subservient addition to the dwelling and would not materially harm the visual amenities of the street scene. It was considered that the proposal would not materially harm the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent properties. Officers were satisfied that the proposal would comply with policies within the Local Plan and the application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Committee discussed the application and were sympathetic to the concerns raised by the neighbour. Planning officers advised that the construction process would always inevitably have some impact on neighbours owing to noise and dust created, even for very small-scale developments. That in itself was not a reason to refuse planning permission. The report did address the equality issues around making planning decisions and that members needed to be mindful that

whilst they had heard one objection tonight, they could not make an assessment about the impact of this on just one adjoining resident but all residents within the immediate area.

The Committee noted a query raised in relation to the proposed rear extension, that the hatched area shown on the plan did not appear to show the rear extension. Was the irregularly shaped area above the house the entire rear extension? It was confirmed that the plan included the rear and side extension and that the plan needed to be viewed from the other way around. It was also queried whether the number of bedrooms had increased from 3 to 5? Planning officers confirmed that there had been an approved certificate for lawful development for the creation of a rear dormer window to include habitable accommodation in the roof area and the works had been approved under a certificate. The rear door had also been removed from the plan, the front roof lights and the 1-metre-high close boarded fence and gate. It was also confirmed that the works could be completed via permitted development. Lastly, it was queried what the percentage increase in floor area was? Planning officers confirmed that given the site was located in the urban area, floor percentage increases were not assessed as was required in Green Belt areas.

The Committee noted comments that whilst access to the rear of the property would be limited the removal of the garage was perceived as a positive. Great empathy was noted for the neighbours negatively impacted by the proposed development. In such cases, whilst it was not within the Committee's remit to mandate referrals, the ward councillor was encouraged to make contact with the affected resident so that the relevant Council support service could engage with them.

The Committee wished to receive further information on the equality and diversity issue that was raised. Planning officers confirmed that there was a requirement under International Human Rights Law that they took into account equality and diversity and those issues had been taken into account as detailed in the report.

The Committee noting the neighbours concerns over the potential disruption caused by the proposed development agreed to add an informative to advise on the Control of Pollution Act, and to specify the time period for noisy building works on the boundary of the application site. It was also noted that there was already legislation in place that restricted when people were permitted to build.

The Chairperson, Councillor Vanessa King moved the officer's recommendation to approve application 24/P/00855, subject to the additional informative as detailed above, and Councillor Joss Bigmore seconded that motion which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Cllr Joss Bigmore	X		
2	The Deputy Mayor, Cllr Howard Smith		X	
3	Cllr Maddy Redpath	X		
4	Cllr Dominique Williams	X		
5	Cllr Joanne Shaw	X		
6	Cllr David Bilbé	X		
7	Cllr Lizzie Griffiths	X		
8	Cllr Cait Taylor			X
9	Cllr Stephen Hives			X
10	Cllr Richard Mills			X
11	Cllr Bilal Akhtar	X		
12	Cllr Pat Oven		X	
13	Cllr Vanessa King	X		
14	Cllr Gillian Harwood	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 24/P/00855, subject to the additional informative and conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

**PL10 23/P/00139 - 176 EPSOM ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 2RR**

(Councillors David Bilbé and Steven Lee had left the meeting and were not present for the discussion or vote taken in relation to this application).

The Committee considered the above-mentioned outline application with all matters reserved except for access for the demolition of the existing residential dwelling and outbuildings and erection of 4 dwellings (C3) with associated infrastructure (amended plans and amended description 11 September 2024).

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

- Mrs Julie Williams (to object);
- Mrs Anna Gould-Mets (to object);
- Mrs Carol Benson (in support) (online) and;
- Mr Ross Mayger (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Team Leader, Justin Williams. The application site was located within the urban area and a residential area of Guildford which was comprised of a mixed style of properties with a proposal resulting in a net increase of three residential units. The plans have been revised during the course of the application with a number of units reduced from six to four. There was an existing access road which served both 176 and 178 Epsom Road who had access towards the front. There was also a traffic light pedestrian crossing outside of the site.

The Committee noted the proposed indicative site layout plan with access as the only matter to be considered. The site was already planted densely with trees and the existing boundary would be planted as much as possible.

The Committee noted that 28 emails of objection had been received and a letter of support. A further letter of representation had been received following the publication of the agenda and was detailed on the late sheets, along with an additional condition recommended by the Council's Tree Officer. Planning officers were satisfied that the proposal would comply with policies in the Local Plan and was recommended for approval subject to conditions as detailed in the report and on the supplementary late sheets.

The Committee queried whether the Council's own refuse team had been consulted about the waste collection and noted that as a result of that consultation the location of the bin stores was revised. The Committee were reassured that Highways would have looked at access for key service vehicles such as ambulances and fire engines to the site and had raised no objections to the proposed scheme on these grounds.

The Committee noted that there would be sufficient room for the construction traffic and the access road would be the same. There would also be individual bins allocated for each household. The Committee noted that if access was granted this was on the basis of access for up to four properties and no more. Concerns were expressed regarding the level of traffic on Epsom Road and that it would be better through High Path Road, however this was not for consideration as it was not part of the application.

The Committee queried whether the woodland called The Spinney was in public ownership? It was confirmed by the Team Leader that this woodland was outside of the application site and was not owned by the applicant.

The Committee noted that in the officer's report it had been stated that the application did not comprise of backland development but would replace an existing form of backland development. The Team Leader confirmed that this proposal could be described as backland development because it was located behind a couple of properties along Epsom Road, no's 178, 180 and 182.

The Committee also received confirmation that whilst this application only dealt with access and demolition of the existing property, design issues would be dealt with at the reserved matters stage.

The Chairperson, Councillor Vanessa King therefore moved the officer recommendation to approve application 23/P/00139, subject to the additional condition in relation to the requirement for an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan to be submitted and approved in writing by the LPA, as detailed on the supplementary late sheet and Councillor Dominique Williams seconded that motion which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	The Deputy Mayor, Cllr Howard Smith			X
2	Cllr Cait Taylor	X		
3	Cllr Bilal Akhtar	X		
4	Cllr Maddy Redpath	X		
5	Cllr Joss Bigmore	X		
6	Cllr Pat Oven	X		
7	Cllr Richard Mills	X		
8	Cllr Dominique Williams	X		
9	Cllr Joanne Shaw	X		
10	Cllr Vanessa King	X		
11	Cllr Lizzie Griffiths	X		
12	Cllr Stephen Hives	X		
13	Cllr Gillian Harwood	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>12</b>		<b>1</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 23/P/00139 subject to an additional condition subject to the additional condition in relation to the requirement for an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan to be submitted and approved in writing by the LPA as detailed on the supplementary late sheets and:

That delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director of Planning to grant planning permission subject to a Unilateral Undertaking being entered into to secure the provision of SANG and SAMM Contributions in accordance with the adopted tariff of the SPA Avoidance Strategy to mitigate against the impact on the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area.

The Committee agreed at 10:30pm to extend the meeting by a further fifteen minutes so that the next two last applications on the agenda could be considered.

**PL11 24/P/01104 - 15 CHRISTMAS PIE AVENUE, NORMANDY, GUILDFORD, GU3 2EQ**

(Councillors David Bilbé and Steven Lee had left the meeting and were not present for the discussion or vote taken in relation to this application).

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed roof extension, to raise the roof line to allow for the creation of an increased upper floor area to include 2 front facing dormer windows and a dormer window to the rear.

The application had been referred to the Planning Committee because more than 10 letters of objection had been received, contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

The Committee received a presentation from the Planning Officer, James Tang. The proposal involved increasing the existing roof by 20cm in order to utilise the first-floor space. The original scheme proposed increasing the height by 1.8 metres which had received 11 emails of objection. After the amended scheme had been received, 5 emails of objection were received. The 20cm roof height increase would not have a significant impact in terms of the appearance and character of the street scene. The Committee noted that the roof had recently been demolished owing to a structural safety issue. There were similar properties with both a front dormer and similar roof design to this proposal particularly at no.23 Christmas Pie Avenue.

The Committee discussed the application and commended the illustration of the different types of bungalows shown as part of the presentation.

The Chairperson, Councillor Vanessa King moved the officer's recommendation to approve application 24/P/01104 and Councillor Bilal Akhtar seconded the motion which was carried.



(Councillors Steven Lee and David Bilbé had left the meeting at this point)

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Cllr Richard Mills	X		
2	Cllr Joanne Shaw	X		
3	Cllr Lizzie Griffiths	X		
4	Cllr Cait Taylor	X		
5	Cllr Bilal Akhtar	X		
6	Cllr Vanessa King	X		
7	Cllr Maddy Redpath	X		
8	Cllr Pat Oven	X		
9	The Deputy Mayor, Cllr Howard Smith	X		
10	Cllr Dominique Williams	X		
11	Cllr Stephen Hives	X		
12	Cllr Joss Bigmore	X		
13	Cllr Gillian Harwood	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>13</b>		

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

RESOLVED to approve application 24/P/00104 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

**PL12 24/P/01302 - 89 TILLINGBOURNE ROAD, SHALFORD, GUILDFORD, GU4 8ET**

(Councillors David Bilbé and Steven Lee had left the meeting and were not present for the discussion or vote taken in relation to this application).

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of single and two storey rear extensions, new front porch configuration, roof changes, changes to fenestration and erection of new outbuilding following demolition of existing shed/outbuilding.

The application had been referred to the Planning Committee because the applicant's agent is a member of staff of Guildford Borough Council.

The Committee received a presentation from the Planning Officer, James Tang. The proposal sought an extension to the two-storey rear extension element by 45cm and also a front infill extension and front porch, adding a roof light to the single-storey rear extension. The proposed design would be the same as what had been approved in 2023 but the depth of the two-storey element was being extended by 45cm. The existing shed was proposed to be extended in width and depth. It was the planning officer's view that the application was modest in scale and therefore recommended it for approval.

The Chairperson, Councillor Vanessa King moved the officer's recommendation to approve application 24/P/01302 and Councillor Stephen Hives seconded that motion which was carried.

(Councillors Steven Lee and David Bilbé had left the meeting)

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Cllr Richard Mills	X		
2	The Deputy Mayor, Cllr Howard Smith	X		
3	Cllr Stephen Hives	X		
4	Cllr Maddy Redpath	X		
5	Cllr Bilal Akhtar	X		
6	Cllr Dominique Williams	X		
7	Cllr Cait Taylor	X		
8	Cllr Pat Oven	X		
9	Cllr Joanne Shaw	X		
10	Cllr Vanessa King	X		
11	Cllr Joss Bigmore	X		
12	Cllr Lizzie Griffiths	X		
13	Cllr Gillian Harwood	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 24/P/01302 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the agenda.

### **PL13 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS**

There were no planning appeal decisions to consider as part of this agenda.

The meeting finished at 10.45 am

Signed .....

Date .....

Chairman