

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

\* Councillor Fiona White (Chairman)

* Councillor Jon Askew	* Councillor Jan Harwood
* Councillor Christopher Barrass	* Councillor Liz Hogger
* Councillor David Bilbé	* Councillor Marsha Moseley
* Councillor Chris Blow	* Councillor Susan Parker
* Councillor Ruth Brothwell	* Councillor Maddy Redpath
* Councillor Colin Cross	* Councillor Caroline Reeves
* Councillor Angela Gunning	* Councillor Paul Spooner

\*Present

Councillors Tim Anderson, Dennis Booth, Ramsey Nagaty, Tony Rooth and Catherine Young, were also in attendance.

### **PL13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

No apologies for absence were received.

### **PL14 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

No disclosures of interest were declared.

### **PL15 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 May 2020 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

### **PL16 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Committee noted the procedures for determining planning applications.

### **PL17 19/P/01734 - TORMEAD SCHOOL, CRANLEY ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 2JD**

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

- Mrs Nicola Amiss and;
- Mr Andrew Amiss

The Chairman permitted Councillor Dennis Booth to speak in his capacity as ward councillor in relation to this application.

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for provision of a multi-use games area, 50m running track and shot-put area, extension to existing netball/tennis courts, relocation of long jump pit and the provision of associated fencing, hardstanding, landscaping and lighting.

The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which detailed some minor alterations to the proposed conditions as well as noting the receipt of six additional letters of objection. The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the site was located in the urban area, characterised by residential properties to the north and south and a railway bounding the site to the west. The development would provide improved sporting facilities at the school therefore providing more onsite recreational activities rather than having to travel off site. Planning conditions were proposed to ensure that the new development would not result in any adverse impact on protected species, trees or highways and parking. The proposed conditions would also mitigate any potential noise impact from the development. However, the floodlights would result in some light spillage with adjoining properties. It was the planning officer's view that this impact was considered to be modest due to the proposed hours and was not materially harmful to the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupants of the neighbouring properties.

The Committee considered concerns raised that the proposed additional sporting facilities represented an over-development of the site as the school already had generously sized sports pitches. That the development would result in an excessive cumulative impact on the street scene and upon residential amenities. The area was prone to flooding along the boundary of the site adjacent to the railway and between the existing sports hall and proposed MUGA and would result in these areas becoming unusable during periods of intense rainfall. Concern was also noted regarding the proximity of the MUGA and additional sporting provisions to residential properties who would be subjected to excessive noise pollution.

In response to comments made by public speakers, the Planning Development Manager referred the Committee to the supplementary late sheets, particularly the amendments made to conditions 3, 6 and 13 and that the hours of operation for the additional sporting facilities was only permitted during term time. In terms of comments made that the application should be considered without the requirement for floodlighting, it was re-iterated that the Committee had to determine the application as laid out. Lastly, in relation to concerns raised regarding noise pollution, it was noted that Environmental Health had looked at this issue in some detail and made no objection.

The Committee considered the application and noted that the existing courts already had floodlighting and wanted to confirm how many more additional floodlights would be installed as part of this application. The planning officer confirmed that the proposal was for more floodlights than currently in situ. The floodlights proposed were of modern design and had been assessed in terms of their overall light output and therefore would be more energy efficient. Concerns were also noted regarding the proximity of the residential properties to the MUGA and associated noise generated by the tennis court. The Committee requested confirmation that the floodlights would not be used on a Saturday and that the condition attached to this could not be varied in the future by the applicant. Additionally, whether a higher acoustic fence could be conditioned and if when the floodlights were replaced the lighting was directional with limited light over spill. Lastly, whether the acoustic fence's effectiveness could be monitored and heightened if necessary.

The Planning Officer confirmed that a condition could be applied to request a higher acoustic fence if the Committee felt it was essential to do so however this was caveated with the warning that the Committee would therefore be changing what had been applied for. The Committee was advised that they should defer the item if they wished to pursue that route so that a new consultation could be carried out with the applicant and interested parties. In terms of changing the lights, condition 12 required the scheme to be carried out in accordance with the lighting details provided. The Committee could not stop the applicant from applying to vary a planning condition in the future, such as to permit use of the floodlights on a Saturday or Sunday. An application to vary this condition would be subject to consultation and determination in the usual manner. Monitoring of the acoustic fence's effectiveness was not something that could be pursued either as the Committee had to deal with the application before it and Environmental Health had raised no concerns in this regard.

The Committee raised concerns regarding the potential use of the sporting facilities by outside bodies. The Planning Officer confirmed that the conditions limited the use of the MUGA Between the 31st October and 1st of March between the hours of 07:30-17:45 Monday to Friday and at all other times of the year between 07:30 and 18:30 Monday to Friday. There was therefore very limited scope to anybody other than the school to be able to use the sporting facilities.

The Committee agreed that the advantages of the provision of the additional sporting facilities were that the school children would no longer have to be bussed to external sporting sites which would have a positive impact upon reducing traffic in the local area. The Committee also acknowledged that a lot of the objections raised were in relation to concerns that the additional sporting facilities would be used on a Saturday which was now prohibited by condition. The floodlights would only be in use for two hours after sunset in wintertime and therefore represented a minimal effect upon neighbouring amenities. The Committee agreed overall that the scheme provided an improved offer in terms of sporting facilities to its pupils as well as being balanced by a number of conditions which safeguarded residential amenities in the main.

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

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

RESOLVED to approve application 19/P/01734 for the reasons as detailed in the report subject to the following amended conditions as detailed in the supplementary late sheets:

Amended condition 3:

The use of the MUGA hereby permitted shall not operate other than between the hours of 07:30 to 18:30 Mondays to Friday during term time and shall not operate at all on Saturday, Sundays, Bank or National Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

Amended condition 6:

The use of the floodlights serving the MUGA hereby permitted shall not be operated other than when the MUGA is in use and only:

- Between the 31st October and 1st of March between the hours of 07:30-17:45 Monday to Friday
- At all other times of the year between 07:30 and 18:30 Monday to Friday

All year the floodlights shall not be operated at all on Saturdays, Sundays or Bank or National Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of neighbouring properties and to prevent disturbance to nearby roosting bats.

Amended condition 13:

The floodlights serving the tennis/netball court shall only operate when the courts are in use and between the hours of 07:30 to 18:30 Mondays to Fridays (inclusive) during term time and shall not operate at all on Saturdays, Sundays, Bank or National Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jon Askew	X		
2	Christopher Barrass		X	
3	David Bilbé			X
4	Chris Blow		X	
5	Ruth Brothwell		X	
6	Colin Cross		X	
7	Angela Gunning	X		
8	Jan Harwood	X		
9	Liz Hogger	X		
10	Marsha Moseley	X		
11	Cllr Susan Parker		X	
12	Maddy Redpath		X	
13	Caroline Reeves	X		
14	Paul Spooner	X		
15	Fiona White			X
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>

**PL18 20/P/00409 - 20 THE STREET, WEST HORSLEY, LEATHERHEAD, KT24 6AX**

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

- Parish Councillor Catherine Young (to object) (on behalf of West Horsley Parish Council);
- Mr James Gow (to object);
- Mr Hartley Beames (in support) (Black Onyx Group) and;
- Ms Lucy Elliott (in support) (The DSO read out Ms Elliott's speech on her behalf)

The Chairman permitted Councillor Tim Anderson to speak in his capacity as ward councillor in relation to this application.

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for the erection of 8 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) to include internal roads and footways, together with car parking, areas of hardstanding and associated landscaping. Any existing structures on site to be demolished.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application site was located within West Horsley Conservation Area. A number of listed buildings were located in the vicinity, the closest of which was known as Sumners some 73 metres away from the proposed development. The application site formed part of an allocated site in the Local Plan for approximately 40 dwellings. To the west and north of the site was a previously approved scheme for 23 dwellings as well as to the south-east for 10 dwellings. Therefore, the three sites combined, if this application was approved, would deliver a total of 41 dwellings. The proposed development would effectively be an extension to the approved scheme for 23 houses. The access which had already been approved onto The Street would serve the additional dwellings and lead to a cul de sac for the new 8 dwellings.

Planning Officers believed that the layout and design of the proposal was acceptable and reflective of the approved 2019 scheme following the submission of some minor

improvements. The Council's Conservation Area Officer raised no objections to the design and layout of the proposal. It was acknowledged that the development would result in less than substantial harm to West Horsley Conservation Area. The harm also needed to be balanced against the public benefits of the scheme. In terms of impact upon the listed building and or buildings in the surrounding area it had been concluded that over and above the already approved scheme the proposal would not result in any further harm in this regard. Although the scheme was technically below the threshold for providing affordable housing the applicant had agreed to provide a policy compliant 40% of the dwellings as affordable which equated to three units and was being secured as part of the legal agreement.

The Committee noted that the design of the dwellings would be in keeping with those already approved as part of the 2019 scheme and would be constructed using materials that were common to the area including red bricks and clay tiles. It was also acknowledged that the vast majority of trees currently onsite would need to be felled in order to deliver the scheme. The Council's Tree Officer had concluded that the trees were of a low ecological value and were mainly young to semi-mature specimens and therefore raised no objection to their removal. Following further discussions with the applicant, additional tree planting was agreed to include a new tree planting scheme along the eastern boundary of the site.

The planning officer concluded that the proposed development would effectively form an extension of the approved 2019 scheme for 23 houses with a similar layout and style. It would utilise the existing access already approved, and Surrey County Council had confirmed that the additional movements would not result in any highway safety or capacity concerns. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to West Horsley Conservation Area and this needed to be given weight in the committee's assessment of the scheme. The NPPF also stated that the harm needed to be balanced against the public benefits of the proposal which was the delivery of additional housing and the provision of affordable housing. This was also an allocated site where 33 dwellings had already been approved and the scheme was therefore considered acceptable.

The Committee considered the application and noted concerns raised that the proposed development was out of character with the surrounding area that was defined by a loose knit and rural environment, with listed buildings set in large individual plots. Boundaries were formed by dense tall evergreen hedging which created a sense of privacy which the proposed development failed to create. Concerns were also raised regarding the cumulative impact of the development in combination with the already approved schemes which undermined the Conservation Area and would impact upon the setting of the Grade II listed buildings.

Despite the County Highway Authority confirming that the additional 8 dwellings would not pose a safety risk in terms of accessing the site, the Committee remained concerned regarding the proposed access road, in terms of safe egress from the site, but had already been approved as part of the scheme for 23 dwellings in 2019.

The Committee also recognised that it may not always be possible to reflect locally distinct patterns of development and that new development sites such as this must create their own identity to ensure cohesive and vibrant neighbourhoods. This development would therefore fit in with the existing already approved schemes. The Committee noted that the proposed development site was not clearly visible from the listed buildings.

The Committee considered on balance that the site was allocated in the Local Plan and the scheme combined with the two already approved developments would help to provide more dwellings for Guildford. The proposed development was very similar in design and density to the two previously approved schemes and was therefore not out of character. The access road to this scheme had already been approved and County Highways had not objected.

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

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/00409 subject:

- (i) That a S106 agreement be entered into to secure:
- The delivery of three affordable housing units (a minimum of 70% to be affordable rent with mix as agreed); and
  - Contribution towards early years and secondary education projects.

If the terms of the s.106 or wording or the planning conditions are significantly amended as part of ongoing s.106 or planning condition(s) negotiations any changes shall be agreed in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee and lead Ward Member.

- (ii) That upon completion of the above, the application be determined by the Planning Development Manager. The preliminary view is that the application should be granted subject to conditions.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jon Askew	X		
2	Christopher Barrass		X	
3	David Bilbé	X		
4	Chris Blow		X	
5	Ruth Brothwell		X	
6	Colin Cross		X	
7	Angela Gunning	X		
8	Jan Harwood	X		
9	Liz Hogger	X		
10	Marsha Moseley	X		
11	Cllr Susan Parker		X	
12	Maddy Redpath		X	
13	Caroline Reeves	X		
14	Paul Spooner	X		
15	Fiona White			X
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>

**PL19 19/P/01980 - LAND OFF, WESTWOOD LANE, WANBOROUGH, GUILDFORD**

The Chairman permitted Councillors Tony Rooth and Ramsey Nagaty to speak as non-ward councillors in relation to the above application.

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of agricultural (horticultural) barn and shade tunnel (on land referred to as Berry Farm by the applicant) (Additional and amended plans received on 06/02/2020 and 07/02/2020).

The Planning Committee deferred the application at its meeting on 26 February 2020 so that a site visit could be held and to seek further information on highways issues, biodiversity and the proximity of the site to ancient woodland. Due to the current Covid-19 crisis the March and April planning committee meetings were cancelled. The application was referred back to the

virtual planning committee meeting held on 20 May but could not be considered due to running out of time owing to the fact the meeting had reached 10:30pm and members voted to end the meeting in accordance with the committee rules.

The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which summarised the additional representations received in objection to the scheme. The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application site was located in the Green Belt and an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) and was approximately 400 metres away from the boundary with the Surrey Hills AONB. The two main structures proposed was a shade tunnel and barn. A pump house was also proposed in the northern end of the site as well as the installation of water tanks. Dark green cladding was required for the barn and its corrugated roof would be approximately 4.3 metres high. The shade tunnel would be covered in green mesh material, was 3.5 metres in height and the pump house 2 metres in height. It was the officer's view that the scheme represented appropriate development within the Green Belt and would not result in an adverse impact on the character of the AGLV or material impact to the setting of the AONB.

The Committee considered concerns raised that the proposed buildings were substantial in size with the Barn being 18 metres long and the shade tunnels some 23 metres long with a lot of trip lines required for the water tanks. Views from the Hogs Back as well as into and out of the AONB would be interrupted by the proposed scheme with modest tree cover for the site from Westwood Lane. The Committee noted that the Surrey Hills AONB officer had objected to the scheme owing to its scale, nature and form which would be incongruous with its surroundings and impact upon views in and out of the AONB and distinctive character of the AGLV. The Committee was also concerned about the cumulative impact of the development and of adjacent plots nearby and above the Hogs Back. The access to the site was on a 90-degree bend and the Committee was concerned regarding safe egress from the site.

The Committee noted that horticulture was a discretionary activity and the site had been allocated in the Local Plan to be protected as Green Belt. The views into and out of the AONB and AGLV would be significantly impacted by the proposed erection of an agricultural barn and shade tunnel. In addition, an Article 4 Direction had been put in place to protect the openness of this piece of land which the proposed scheme would interrupt. The Committee was concerned that the current trees in situ were oak and prone to die back and therefore could not be relied upon to act as a necessary screen to the site. The proposed development would also result in irreplaceable habitat loss. The distinctive character of the AGLV would be compromised and whilst the proposal was small in scale it nevertheless would introduce some very large buildings that would significantly effect the character of the landscape.

A motion was moved but not seconded to approve the application. The motion to approve therefore failed.

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

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 19/P/01980 for the following reasons:

1. The development proposed, by virtue of the scale of the buildings required and the likely intensity of the proposed use, would result in a development which would detract from the distinctive landscape character of the Area of Great Landscape Value and would be harmful to the setting of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Accordingly, the development is contrary to Policy P1 of the Guildford Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034 and would conflict with the objectives of the paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal would also be contrary to the objectives of the

Guildford Landscape Character Appraisal.

**Informatives:**

. This statement is provided in accordance with Article 35(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Guildford Borough Council seek to take a positive and proactive approach to development proposals. We work with applicants in a positive and proactive manner by:

- Offering a pre application advice service
- Where pre-application advice has been sought and that advice has been followed we will advise applicants/agents of any further issues arising during the course of the application
- Where possible officers will seek minor amendments to overcome issues identified at an early stage in the application process

Guildford Borough Council will generally not engage in unnecessary negotiation for fundamentally unacceptable proposals or where significant changes to an application is required. There are significant objections to the application that minor alterations would not overcome, it was not considered appropriate to seek amendments through the course of this application.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jon Askew	X		
2	Christopher Barrass	X		
3	David Bilbé	X		
4	Chris Blow	X		
5	Ruth Brothwell	X		
6	Colin Cross	X		
7	Angela Gunning	X		
8	Jan Harwood			X
9	Liz Hogger	X		
10	Marsha Moseley			X
11	Cllr Susan Parker	X		
12	Maddy Redpath	X		
13	Caroline Reeves	X		
14	Paul Spooner	X		
15	Fiona White			X
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>

**PL20 20/P/00446 - MEADOW COTTAGE, SCHOOL LANE, EAST CLANDON, GUILDFORD, GU4 7RS**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed extension to existing single storey rear extension.

The Chairman permitted Councillor Catherine Young to speak in her capacity as ward councillor in relation to the above application.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application site was located in the Green Belt facing onto School Lane and New Road. The proposal would allow for a new kitchen and utility area which would result in a 71% increase in floor area. Whilst the extension would create a small increase in footprint compared to the current proposal it would result in a



greater built form in terms of bulk and footprint and was therefore considered a disproportionate addition. The property had already benefitted from a two-storey extension which had been taken into account when calculating the overall uplift in increase in floor area. No very special circumstances had been put forward by the applicant. East Clandon Parish Council had written in support of the application as the proposal would improve the amount of space available to the residents as well as improving the energy efficiency of the dwelling. The building had already been extended to include an additional bedroom and reception room and already had an existing kitchen utility area. It was the planning officer's view that improving the dwelling's energy efficiency could be achieved without having to increase the dwellings size further.

The Committee considered the application and concerns raised that very special circumstances had been demonstrated by the applicant to justify the proposed extension. The 7m<sup>2</sup> extension would permit the replacement of an old oil-fired boiler which had reached the end of its serviceable life and could not be replaced in its current location. The proposed extension would therefore permit the installation of a new boiler as well as incorporating significant improvements in energy efficiency such as introducing insulation materials to the existing walls. The sustainable design and small home improvement would deliver significant benefits to the property and provide very special circumstances that outweighed the harm to the Green Belt. The Committee noted that the proposed extension would have no detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity or the character of the Conservation Area.

The planning officer confirmed that uplift was calculated from when the dwelling was originally built and no very special circumstances had been submitted by the applicant to justify the proposed extension. The Committee considered on balance that the extension represented a very small uplift, whilst it was higher than what was normally accepted, it had originally been a very small dwelling. In addition, the heritage statement submitted outlined that the proposal would create a more sustainable dwelling which was in line with the Council's commitment to pursuing climate change initiatives. The Council's Conservation Officer was also in support of the scheme as its design was in keeping with the established character of the dwelling and the materials to be used were complimentary to its overall appearance.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jon Askew			X
2	Christopher Barrass		X	
3	David Bilbé		X	
4	Chris Blow		X	
5	Ruth Brothwell		X	
6	Colin Cross		X	
7	Angela Gunning		X	
8	Jan Harwood	X		
9	Liz Hogger		X	
10	Marsha Moseley	X		
11	Cllr Susan Parker		X	
12	Maddy Redpath		X	
13	Caroline Reeves	X		
14	Paul Spooner	X		
15	Fiona White			X
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jon Askew			X
2	Christopher Barrass	X		
3	David Bilbé	X		
4	Chris Blow	X		
5	Ruth Brothwell	X		
6	Colin Cross	X		
7	Angela Gunning			X
8	Jan Harwood		X	
9	Liz Hogger	X		
10	Marsha Moseley		X	
11	Cllr Susan Parker	X		
12	Maddy Redpath	X		
13	Caroline Reeves		X	
14	Paul Spooner		X	
15	Fiona White			X
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/00446 for the following reasons:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Date received Drawing No. Plan

10 Mar 2020 20022/01 Existing plans

10 Mar 2020 20022/02 Existing elevations

10 Mar 2020 20022/03 Proposed plans

10 Mar 2020 20022/04 Proposed elevations

10 Mar 2020 20022/05 Block plan and site location plan

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in the interests of proper planning.

3. The external finishes of the development hereby permitted, including making good to the retained fabric, shall match in material, colour, size, style, bonding, texture and profile those of the existing building.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory and preserve the non-designated heritage asset.

**Informatives:**

1. This statement is provided in accordance with Article 35(2) of the Town and

Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. Guildford Borough Council seek to take a positive and proactive approach to development proposals. We work with applicants in a positive and proactive manner by:

- Offering a pre application advice service
- Where pre-application advice has been sought and that advice has been followed we will advise applicants/agents of any further issues arising during the course of the application
- Where possible officers will seek minor amendments to overcome issues identified at an early stage in the application process

However, Guildford Borough Council will generally not engage in unnecessary negotiation for fundamentally unacceptable proposals or where significant changes to an application is required.

In this case pre-application advice was sought and provided which addressed potential issues, the application has been submitted and the Council accepted that there were Very Special Circumstances that outweigh the harm of inappropriateness to the Green Belt as the proposal would be a disproportionate addition.

**PL21 19/P/02102 - LAND AT MANOR FARM, THE STREET, TONGHAM, GU10 1DG**

The Committee received a presentation from the planning officer in relation to a reserved matters application pursuant to outline permission 16/P/00222 permitted on 26/01/2018, to consider appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of the erection of 254 dwellings and including the creation of open spaces, drainage systems and associated infrastructure.

The Committee debated the merits of undertaking a site visit which was voted against with the Chairman using her casting vote against the proposal.

RECORDED VOTE LIST			
COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
Jon Askew			X
Christopher Barrass	X		
David Bilbé	X		
Chris Blow		X	
Ruth Brothwell	X		
Colin Cross			X
Angela Gunning		X	
Jan Harwood		X	
Liz Hogger		X	
Marsha Moseley		X	
Cllr Susan Parker	X		
Maddy Redpath	X		
Caroline Reeves		X	
Paul Spooner	X		
Fiona White		X	X
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>

The Committee agreed to defer the above application due to not having enough time to consider it fully. In addition, the Committee had been sent by email a virtual video of the site and the deferral would ensure that all members had watched the footage prior to the committee

considering the application. [The application was deferred to a Special Meeting of the Planning Committee scheduled on 8 July 2020].

The Committee unanimously,

RESOLVED to defer application 19/P/02102 to a Special Meeting of the Planning Committee (held on 8 July 2020).

**PL22      20/P/00197 - 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.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application sought a change of use of land to create allotment sites. The site was located in the Green Belt and adjacent to the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project (SARP) site. The closest part of SARP to the proposed site was also allocated for waste management facilities and sewage treatment works by the Surrey Waste Plan. The site was largely comprised of grass and scrub woodland and a number of trees would need to be removed which were of low quality. A tree protection plan was also in place to preserve other trees on the site. A small ancillary building was also proposed which was modest in scale providing office storage, a small kitchen and toilets. A small car parking area would also be created. Planning officers had no objection to the principle of this development and was considered an appropriate addition within the Green Belt. It would neither prejudice the delivery of the adjoining waste allocation site. Subject to conditions to secure the replacement tree planting and habitat creation the developer would secure net gains in biodiversity. The proposal would not impact upon the character of the area, residential amenities or highway capacity.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that condition 4 stated that the landscaping scheme shall be fully implemented before the allotments were brought into use. The Committee noted that the creation of the plots would coincide with the fallow season and the scheme should therefore not be held up so stringently by the landscaping needing to be in place first. The planning officer confirmed that this condition could be amended. Condition 5 also stated that no buildings, structures, fences or hard surfaces should be erected on the site and the Committee raised concern in this regard given that allotments often had sheds or greenhouses. It was confirmed by the planning officer that the application included the provision of 6x4 sheds on each of the plots. Lastly, concern was raised in relation to condition 6 and that the Ecological Assessment Report detailed must be carried out sensitively and thoroughly. The Committee queried whether allotment holders would be assisted with the safe transfer of their plants to the new allotment site as well as with soil improvement owing to the lands current scrubby nature. The planning officer confirmed that the Planning Authority did not intervene in how plots were relocated. In terms of soil quality, the application did include an assessment which indicated that the soil was broadly suitable for allotments. The developer could undertake remedial work to improve the soil quality but that could not be secured by condition.

The Committee fully supported the provision of the allotment sites subject to the amended condition 4.

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

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/00197 subject to the reasons and conditions as detailed in the report and amended condition 4:

4. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved Landscape Proposals. There shall be no variation from the approved details and the landscaping scheme shall be fully implemented before the allotments hereby approved are first brought in to use (or other timescale as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority). Any of the proposed trees, shrubs or plants that die, become damaged or diseased within 10 years of planting shall be replaced by replacement of a similar size and species to those that are to be removed.

Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of an appropriate landscape scheme in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jon Askew	X		
2	Christopher Barrass	X		
3	David Bilbé	X		
4	Chris Blow	X		
5	Ruth Brothwell	X		
6	Colin Cross	X		
7	Angela Gunning	X		
8	Jan Harwood	X		
9	Liz Hogger	X		
10	Marsha Moseley	X		
11	Cllr Susan Parker	X		
12	Maddy Redpath	X		
13	Caroline Reeves	X		
14	Paul Spooner	X		
15	Fiona White			X
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

**PL23 20/P/00774 - OLD ORLEANS RESTAURANT, BEDFORD ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 4SJ**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for change of use of existing A3 premises to use class D2 (cinema) along with associated alterations to elevations and creation of two emergency exits in south elevation.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application had been referred to it owing to the fact the Council was the freeholder of the site. A small single storey extension was proposed to allow a link between the cinema and the former restaurant. The building would be clad in timber with tile hangings. The Council had previously objected to the original cladding

proposed which was comprised of grey metal and had been removed. It was the planning officer's view that the proposed change of use of premises was acceptable given the existing building had remained vacant for many years and would enable the cinema to expand upon its offer to the public. The remodelling of the building would only result in modest changes to its built form and the change in materials ensured that it would not result in any harm to the character or appearance of the surrounding area.

The Committee discussed the application and welcomed the improvements proposed to a vacant building that would now be used for the benefit of Guildford residents and make it a more pleasing environment overall.

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

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/00774 subject to the reasons and conditions as detailed in the report.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jon Askew	X		
2	Christopher Barrass	X		
3	David Bilbé	X		
4	Chris Blow	X		
5	Ruth Brothwell	X		
6	Colin Cross	X		
7	Angela Gunning	X		
8	Jan Harwood	X		
9	Liz Hogger	X		
10	Marsha Moseley	X		
11	Cllr Susan Parker	X		
12	Maddy Redpath	X		
13	Caroline Reeves	X		
14	Paul Spooner	X		
15	Fiona White			X
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

## PL24 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted the appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 10.45 pm

Signed .....

Chairman

Date .....