

PLANNING COMMITTEE

- * Councillor Fiona White (Chairman)
- * Councillor Colin Cross (Vice-Chairman)

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

*Present

Councillors Ramsey Nagaty, John Redpath, John Rigg and Catherine Young, were also in attendance.

PL27 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Ruth Brothwell for whom Councillor Tony Rooth attended as a substitute.

PL28 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

No disclosures of interest were declared.

PL29 MINUTES

The minutes of the Special Planning Committee meeting held on 8 July 2020 were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

PL30 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the procedures for determining planning applications.

PL31 20/P/00676 - 1 LITTLE WARREN CLOSE, GUILDFORD, GU4 8PW

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

- Mr Gary Shilston (to object);
- Mr Stephen Hofmeyr (to object) and;
- Mr I Blake (Applicant) (in support)

The Chairman also permitted Councillors John Rigg and John Redpath to speak in their capacity as ward councillors in relation to the above application.

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of replacement dwelling.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer to note the supplementary late sheets which detailed updated conditions. The application site was located within the urban area of Guildford within a residential area and within the 400m to 5km buffer zone of the TBHSPA. The area was characterised by two storey residential dwellings and the site itself was located on a corner plot, comprised of a single residential dwelling with vehicle access. The application sought to make changes to the approved scheme. It would be no wider or taller but would have a reduction across the width of the two-storey dwelling by 0.4 metres. An additional single storey projection was also proposed and would extend 3.6 metres beyond the rear wall of the approved scheme with a width of 9.5 metres wrapping around the rear of the garage. Further changes proposed included the addition of two dormer windows on the rear elevation, the addition of a dormer window on the south-west elevation and replacement of the two storey bay window elements on the south-west elevation with two single storey pitched bay windows at ground floor and the introduction of two windows at first floor level. Minor fenestration alterations on the north-east elevation at ground floor level were also proposed to correct an architectural error made on the drawings of the previously approved scheme. This was where the south-east elevation did not correspond with the side south-west and north-east elevations which resulted in an increase in the ridge heights on the hipped front projections. The maximum height of the proposed scheme remained unchanged. The two-storey bay elements on the side elevation had been removed and replaced by a single bay window feature. The hipped elevations had increased in height, with the two-storey element set back along with a reduction in the depth of the dwelling.

It was the planning officer's view that the proposed development was acceptable in principle and would not result in any adverse impact upon the character of the area, the AONB, neighbouring amenities or highways. The proposal would also meet the national space standards requirements and was therefore recommended for approval.

The Committee considered concerns raised that the site had been subjected a number of applications since 2014 which had resulted in planning creep. A previous application for the site with a footprint of 316smq had been previously refused by the Council for being excessively bulky. The proposal would now result in a footprint of 355sqm which was far bigger and therefore contradicted the previous refusal when it would result in a materially larger property. The Committee also noted comments that the site was located in the Green Belt and that extensions such as this should be restricted.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the site was not in the Green Belt, it was located in the urban area and therefore restrictions on extensions in the Green Belt did not apply in this case. It was also confirmed that the scheme was not simply assessed according to footprint and floor area space calculations. Reductions had been achieved across the two-storey elements and the proposal was looked at as a whole in its three-dimensional form. A condition had also been imposed removing Permitted Development Rights as the property had now reached a level in planning policy terms that required any future amendments to be assessed via application. In response to comments made regarding planning creep it was also important to note that the planning system allowed people to make as many applications as they liked. Each application had to be considered on its own merits. In this instance, it was not sufficient to find fault in a proposal simply because the site had been subject to a number of applications in quick succession.

The Committee queried the architectural error regarding the height of the roof and whether the originally approved application was based on an inaccurate perception of the roof height being lower than it was. The planning officer confirmed that the maximum ridge height of both the previously approved and proposed schemes was exactly the same. The architectural error had occurred as the frontage and side elevations of the hipped front projections did not match up but the dormers were no higher.

The Committee also queried whether the applicant had Permitted Development Rights to build out the wrap around the garage proposed for the previously approved scheme and whether the additional dormer windows proposed were relevant to the footprint given the overall bulk and mass of the property was not increased by the use of the roof space. The planning officer confirmed that Permitted Development Rights had not been removed from the previously approved scheme and whilst elements of the current proposal could be implemented it could not be built out as a whole as restrictions were in place including not permitting the addition of dormer windows.

The Committee also considered that it could not refuse the scheme, simply based upon bulk when the previously approved application had found it to be acceptable in this regard. The efficient use of roof space even with the additional dormers would not be detrimental to neighbouring amenities.

A motion was moved and seconded to approve the application.

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Marsha Moseley	X		
2.	Christopher Barrass		X	
3.	Chris Blow		X	
4.	Fiona White	X		
5.	Paul Spooner	X		
6.	Colin Cross		X	
7.	Tony Rooth			X
8.	Susan Parker		X	
9.	Jon Askew	X		
10.	Angela Gunning		X	
11.	Caroline Reeves	X		
12.	Jan Harwood	X		
13.	Liz Hogger	X		
14.	Maddy Redpath		X	
	TOTALS:	7	6	1

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/00676 subject to the reasons and conditions as detailed in the report and updated conditions as detailed on the supplementary late sheets:

Condition 6 shall be replaced by the following condition:

The dwelling hereby approved shall be constructed using the following materials:

Facing Brick – Maplehurst Red Multi
Hanging Tile - HF - Orange Sand faced
Roof Tile – Buckingham Brown Sandfaced
Driveway – natural gravel

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory.

Condition 7 shall be replaced by the following condition:

The development hereby approved shall be implemented in accordance with the Premier Assessors report dated 22/04/20, received 23/04/20 detailing a 20% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions through the use of renewable energy. The renewable energy measures shall be retained as operational thereafter.

Reason: To secure a reduction in carbon emissions and incorporate sustainable energy in accordance with the Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2011.

PL32 20/T/00155 - 106 STOKE ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 1HB

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

- Ms Donna Collinson (to object)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned Tree Preservation Order Yew (T1) – crown lift to a height of no more than 3 metres above ground level to provide better ground level clearance and light penetration beneath the crown for improved enjoyment of the garden area. The crown lift will be achieved by removing or cutting back small lower branches no bigger than 25mm in diameter at branch attachment (TPO P1/201/504).

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the tree was situated in the urban area of Guildford, in the northern boundary of the garden of 106 Stoke Road adjacent to St. John's Church and was protected by a Tree Preservation Order in 2004. The proposed crown lifting would be achieved by removing or cutting back smaller branches no bigger than 25mm or 0.98 inches in diameter at branch attachment. The Council's Arboricultural Officer had visited the site and confirmed that the works to the tree would be minor in nature and had no negative arboricultural implications and would not affect the amenity value of the tree. The tree works were therefore recommended for approval to be carried out in accordance with British Standards within two years from the date of the decision.

The Committee considered concerns raised that owing to the visually prominent nature of the Yew Tree the works proposed would significantly affect the amenity value for neighbouring residents, creating an incongruous flat bottom of truncated branches.

In response to comments made by the public speaker, the Arboriculturalist Officer confirmed that the works proposed were minimal and no lateral branches would be removed resulting in no harm to the tree.

The Committee were concerned that any cuts or works done to the tree might compromise its overall health by making it more vulnerable to disease. The Committee queried whether any treatment could be applied to the cuts to prevent this from happening. The Arboricultural Officer confirmed that the cut sizes were very small, and any works undertaken had to adhere to British Standards. Trees when cut created natural pathogens and chemical barriers to prevent disease and was not standard practice to apply a treatment given that the works proposed were very minor and would be undertaken using pruning sheers and not with a chainsaw.

The Committee agreed overall that the works proposed were acceptable.

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Maddy Redpath	X		
2.	Christopher Barrass	X		
3.	Chris Blow	X		
4.	Liz Hogger	X		
5.	Tony Rooth	X		
6.	Fiona White	X		
7.	Marsha Moseley	X		
8.	Paul Spooner	X		
9.	Caroline Reeves	X		
10.	Angela Gunning	X		
11.	Susan Parker			X
12.	Jon Askew		X	
13.	Colin Cross			X
14.	Jan Harwood		X	
	TOTALS:	10	2	2

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

RESOLVED to approve the tree works application 20/T/00155 subject to the reasons and conditions as detailed in the report.

PL33 20/P/00511 - 1 ASH LODGE CLOSE, ASH, GUILDFORD. GU12 6JU

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of an attached two storey, three-bedroom house with associated parking.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the site was located in the urban area of Ash in the eastern part of the garden area of 1 Ash Lodge Close which was a semi-detached house. A single parking space would be provided to the front of the dwelling together with a second parking space to the rear. The existing parking spaces for numbers 1 and 3 Ash Lodge Close would be retained. A 1.8 metre fence would be erected to provide a boundary treatment as well as the retention of a small area of amenity. Opposite the proposed site, an additional dwelling had been permitted creating a row of four terraced properties. It was the planning officer's view that the proposal was considered acceptable in principle and would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the site and surrounding area, neighbouring amenities, parking or highway safety. The proposal was therefore recommended for approval subject to a S.106 Agreement.

The Committee considered concerns raised that the proposal represented an over-development of the plot. The comparison between the proposal and the development permitted opposite the plot was misleading given this would encroach beyond the fence line to the highway. The development proposed would also result in the loss of a semi-detached property creating a terraced form of development that was incongruous with the character of the surrounding area. Whilst parking provision was acceptable this would also encroach upon the remaining part of the garden.

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Christopher Barrass			X
2.	Paul Spooner		X	
3.	Maddy Redpath	X		
4.	Angela Gunning		X	
5.	Jon Askew		X	
6.	Susan Parker		X	
7.	Chris Blow		X	
8.	Fiona White			X
9.	Jan Harwood			X
10.	Caroline Reeves		X	
11.	Colin Cross		X	
12.	Marsha Moseley	X		
13.	Tony Rooth			X
14.	Liz Hogger		X	
	TOTALS:	2	8	4

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Jon Askew	X		
2.	Angela Gunning	X		
3.	Chris Blow	X		
4.	Caroline Reeves	X		
5.	Jan Harwood	X		
6.	Marsha Moseley		X	
7.	Fiona White			X
8.	Liz Hogger	X		
9.	Maddy Redpath			X
10.	Christopher Barrass	X		
11.	Colin Cross	X		
12.	Tony Rooth			X
13.	Susan Parker	X		
14.	Paul Spooner	X		
	TOTALS:	10	1	3

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 20/P/00511 for the following reasons:

PL34 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted a request that a twelve-month analysis of the latest appeal decisions was circulated to committee members by email to provide a comparison to the previous 2-3 years prior to the introduction of the Local Plan which planning officers agreed to undertake.

The meeting finished at 8.44 pm

Signed

Chairman

Date

This page is intentionally left blank