

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 Tim Anderson, George Potter, John Redpath, John Rigg and Catherine Young, were also in attendance.

PL49 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Jan Harwood for whom Councillor Pauline Searle attended as a substitute and Councillor Maddy Redpath for whom Councillor Tony Rooth attended as a substitute.

PL50 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

20/P/01163 – Holy Trinity Parish Church, 5 Trinity Churchyard, Guildford, GU1 3RR

All councillors that sat on the planning committee, who were in attendance at this meeting, declared a non-pecuniary interest in the above application by virtue of the fact that they had attended civic occasions at the Holy Trinity Parish Church, Guildford and knew the applicant. It was confirmed that the disclosure would not affect the planning committee member's objectivity in the consideration of this application.

Those planning committee members in attendance included: Councillors Jon Askew, Christopher Barrass, David Bilbé, Chris Blow, Ruth Brothwell, Colin Cross, Angela Gunning, Liz Hogger, Marsha Moseley, Susan Parker, Caroline Reeves, Tony Rooth, Pauline Searle, Paul Spooner and Fiona White.

PL51 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 7 October 2020 were approved and signed by the Chairman as a true record.

PL52 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the procedures for determining planning applications.

PL53 19/P/02237 - LAND ADJACENT TO, PEMBROKE HOUSE, 54 POTTERS LANE, SEND, WOKING, GU23 7AL

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

- Cllr Pat Oven (Send Parish Council) and;
- Mr Mark Hendy (Shanly Homes Ltd)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of 10 houses (2 x 2 bed dwellings, 7 x 3 bed dwellings and 1 x 4 bed dwellings) with associated landscaping, parking and vehicular access. (Amended description and amended plans received 9 July 2020).

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application site was located within the settlement of Send, it was inset from the Green Belt and was also within the 400m to 5km buffer zone of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA) and River Wey corridor. The site currently consisted of paddock land with mature trees to the west, north and frontage. A public footpath was located along the northern edge of the site. The area was characterised by a mix of residential properties which were comprised of semi-detached and detached two- bedroom properties.

The proposal was for ten new two-storey dwellings with two new access points being created onto Potters Lane. The existing access point which served 54 Potters Lane was to be retained. Several trees were to be removed to make room for the new access road, but the majority of trees would be retained and enhanced with new tree and hedgerow planting. The parking provision accorded with the Council's adopted parking standards. Concerns had been raised by residents regarding visibility along Potters Lane being restricted by parked cars. However, the County Highway Authority had assessed the proposed visibility splays, taking into account the possibility of the parked cars along the road, and concluded that the space provided at the new access points was satisfactory. The properties along the frontage would also be set back sufficiently, along with some tree screening, and long separation distances, to ensure no adverse impacts to adjacent properties.

In conclusion, it was the planning officer's view that the proposal would result in a well - designed development that would be sympathetic to the semi-rural character of the surroundings. The principle of the development was acceptable and would not harmfully affect the character or appearance of the surrounding area or neighbouring amenities. The County Highway Authority had advised that there would be no adverse impact on highway safety, subject to the recommended conditions for appropriate landscaping, ecology mitigation measures and biodiversity enhancements which would be secured via a S106 Agreement. S106 contributions had also been secured towards highway improvements, to provide a new bus shelter on Send Road and new surfacing of the public footpath. In addition, monies would be allocated towards education, open space and mitigation in relation to the TBHSPA.

The Committee considered the application and concerns raised in relation to the parking provision which equated effectively to one long drive for several houses. The Committee questioned how cars would safely navigate by each other. Clarification was also sought as to whether the bin storage would be located down the main street or outside each house.

The Committee noted concerns about the demonstrable need for the development, whilst it was accepted the site had been removed from the Green Belt it was still located in close proximity to the River Wey Navigation which was protected by policy ID1 for blue and green infrastructure which stated that permission would only be granted to sites in close proximity to Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI's) and Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI's), if it was

found to not be harmful to the functioning of the ecological unit as a whole. The Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) had raised concerns regarding the impact upon protected species and it was therefore queried why the development had been recommended for approval with these points in mind.

The Committee also considered whether the application met sustainability criteria in terms of climate change and how the development sought to protect the landscape. In addition, concerns were raised regarding the poor internet connection experienced locally. The provision of an additional bus stop was also noted to be sited a significant distance from Pembroke House which would result in residents being more likely to use their cars, contributing negatively towards the climate emergency which the Council had declared.

The Committee noted that the site was located off a very busy road, the additional traffic would make the road busier and more dangerous. Concerns were raised regarding the SHMA mix which should be 50% on the homes allocated as 1-2 bed homes when it was only 20%.

The Committee considered that the proposal was spacious for the ten houses proposed and had been significantly modified over time, in response to concerns raised by the planning department. The Committee noted raised that it would be difficult to refuse the application, given to the north of the site, a denser form of development already existed at Worsfold Close. Whilst the housing mix was not in accordance with the SHMA, with 70% of the homes being 3-bed and only one 4-bed dwelling, it would be difficult to include 1-bed units on this site. Concerns were raised again regarding the potential for tandem parking.

In response to queries raised by Planning Committee members, the Planning Development Manager confirmed that there was no direct policy requirement to demonstrate the need for the development when it was no longer part of the Green Belt, In terms of the SHMA housing mix, this had been looked at in some detail which took into account two recent appeals, one at 19 Potters Lane which had been allowed at appeal when originally refused owing to the SHMA mix proposed and poor layout. The parking arrangement outlined was not unusual and there was plenty of turning space available to allow for cars to pull in and out of their respective driveways. In terms of waste collection, analysis had been undertaken to demonstrate that there was sufficient space for a refuse vehicle to turn around. In addition, each property would put their waste out on the kerb side. Lastly, in relation to concerns raised regarding ecology, planning officers had consulted on a number of occasions with Surrey Wildlife Trust and the applicant had also carried out additional surveys resulting in appropriate mitigation measures being put in place.

The Committee considered that the principle of the development was acceptable and had been sympathetically designed to fit in with the character of the local area which was semi-rural in nature. The Committee was satisfied that subject to the S106 contributions which had been secured to mitigate against any harm caused to the TBHSPA, as well as improvements to the highway and public footpath, the application should be approved.

A motion was moved and seconded to approve the application subject to a S106 and amended conditions 4 and 16, which was carried.

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Susan Parker		X	
2.	Christopher Barrass		X	
3.	Liz Hogger	X		
4.	Tony Rooth			X
5.	Caroline Reeves	X		

6.	Fiona White	X		
7.	David Bilbé	X		
8.	Marsha Moseley	X		
9.	Pauline Searle	X		
10.	Colin Cross		X	
11.	Chris Blow			X
12.	Jon Askew	X		
13.	Angela Gunning	X		
14.	Ruth Brothwell		X	
15.	Paul Spooner			X
	TOTAL	8	4	2

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

RESOLVED to approve application 19/P/02237 subject:

- (i) That a S106 Agreement be entered into to secure the provision of: SANG and SAMM Contributions and Open Space contributions in accordance with the formula of the updated tariff; £20,000 to go towards a new wooden Littlethorpe bus shelter and a contribution of £24,000 towards Rights of Way improvements within the vicinity on the site, including surfacing Public Footpath 52.; Education contributions as specified by Surrey County Council.

If the terms of the S106 or wording of the planning condition are significantly amended as part of ongoing S106 or planning condition(s) negotiations and 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.

Subject to the following amended conditions:

Condition 4 amended to the following:

No work shall take place until detailed drawings and/or samples of all new external joinery details including windows (depth of reveal, method of opening, details of heads, cills and lintels) and doors. The submitted details be at a scale of not less than 1:20 sample elevations, horizontal/vertical frame sections (including sections through glazing bars) at not less than 1:2. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

Condition 16 amended to the following:

Prior to the commencement of development, an energy statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include details of how energy efficiency is being addressed, including benchmark data and identifying the Target carbon Emissions Rate TER for the site or the development as per Building Regulation requirements (for types of development where there is no TER in Building Regulations, predicted energy usage for that type of development should be used) and how a minimum of 20 per cent reduction in carbon emissions against the TER or predicted energy usage through the use of onsite low and zero carbon technology and improvements to the energy performance of the

building shall be achieved. The approved details shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development and retained as operational thereafter.

Reason: To reduce carbon emissions and incorporate sustainable energy in accordance with the Council's Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction & Energy SPD 2020

PL54 20/P/01066 - 14 DEVON BANK, GUILDFORD, GU2 4DQ

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

- Mr P Green (Applicant) (in support)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for side extension, rear porch and garden steps.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application site was located within the Guildford urban area, the River Wey corridor and Portsmouth Road Conservation Area. Some Grade II listed buildings were also located nearby. The application property was a three-storey end of terrace dwelling located within the cul-de-sac of similar flat roofed properties. The proposal would require the removal of part of the bank which was located to the front of the house. It was initially proposed to remove 25% of the bank which had been significantly reduced by officers in negotiation with the applicant to 10%. A TPO tree was located in the rear garden. A number of other trees would be removed for which consent had already been granted. Given the proposed three-storey side extension would match the scale of the existing dwelling it would not appear subservient to the host dwelling but blended in with the existing property and the overall existing design concepts displayed at Devon Bank.

In conclusion, it was the planning officer's view that the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact upon the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. Given the proposed extension would be fully concealed by the existing built form on the site, the extension would respect the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the listed buildings.

The Committee considered the application and noted the diverse architectural style of the area which was characterised by both modern houses of which this application was a part and the nearby Grade II listed properties. The Committee considered that the proposed extension was conveniently tucked away off the Portsmouth Road and because of the design it blended in very well. The Committee welcomed the fact that the amount of bank reduction proposed had been significantly reduced by the applicant. The Committee was also satisfied that the removal of the rear garden land to enable access to the site to do the works must also be reinstated as well as retaining the TPO tree as controlled by conditions.

The Committee expressed concerns that the reinstatement of the garden was not guaranteed and might not be adequately enforced. The Committee was advised by the Chairman that they had to consider the application before it and not what might happen.

The Committee also raised concerns that it appeared to look like a fourth house in a terrace of three and that it may appear out of scale with the neighbouring properties.

The planning officer confirmed that the extension would match the existing property by blending in with it by virtue of the design proposed.

The Committee agreed that subject to the controls in place to ensure the replacement of the garden and a reduction in the amount of bank to be removed, the proposal represented a suitable form of development that would fit in with the character of the area and would not be harmful to neighbouring amenities.

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

	RECORDED VOTES LIST			
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Colin Cross	X		
2.	Chris Blow		X	
3.	Angela Gunning	X		
4.	David Bilbe	X		
5.	Fiona White	X		
6.	Paul Spooner	X		
7.	Pauline Searle	X		
8.	Susan Parker			X
9.	Liz Hogger	X		
10.	Tony Rooth	X		
11.	Caroline Reeves	X		
12.	Jon Askew	X		
13.	Marsha Moseley	X		
14.	Christopher Barrass	X		
15.	Ruth Brothwell	X		
	TOTAL	13	1	1

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/01066 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL55 20/P/01163 - HOLY TRINITY PARISH OFFICE, 5 TRINITY CHURCHYARD, GUILDFORD, GU1 3RR

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

- Mr Stephen Marriott (in support) and;
- Rev. Canon. Robert Cotton (Applicant)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for replacement of 8 windows to the front elevation.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application site was the Holy Trinity Parish office which was located in a passageway that ran off the High Street. The building was locally listed and formed part of the town centre conservation area and was subject to an Article 4 Direction. The building was sited within a row of locally listed buildings. Three of the windows had already been replaced retrospectively for which planning permission was granted under planning application 19/P/00362 in May 2019. This application had been recommended for refusal by officers and was overturned by the Planning Committee on the basis of special circumstances. In permitting the application, the decision was caveated with an

informative which stated that the applicant was advised that in approving this decision, the Council had regard to the special circumstances of the nature of the development. However, given the harm identified, it was unlikely that any future applications for similar developments would be considered acceptable.

The new windows proposed would have a thicker and heavier frame and thicker glazing bars which contrasted with the original wooden frames that were thinner. A glazing bar was also missing from one of the windows that had been replaced retrospectively and subsequently approved. The argument for this proposal was that the new windows would ensure consistency across the elevation as all the windows were the same as those already replaced. However, planning officers had serious concerns over the consistency in appearance of the replacement windows in regard to the glazing which seemed to project beyond its frame in some instances versus being stuck on and looking like very flat glazing. It was the planning officer's view that the proposal would significantly impact the historic setting of the building and was therefore unacceptable and recommended for refusal.

The Senior Conservation Officer was invited to comment on the application who stated that the benefit of the development as put forward by the applicant was that the replacement windows would create better thermal efficiency and health and safety benefits owing to the existing units rotting and appearing warped. The replacement windows would also ensure the continued use of the parish office for community events which was reasonable and valid in the main. However, it was worth emphasising that these benefits could also be accommodated by other more appropriately designed units that would allow the traditional profile of the existing unit to be replicated throughout via refurbishing, retro-fitting or applying secondary glazing. No evidence had been submitted by the applicant to demonstrate that they had considered such alternative options or that they were following the only reasonable outcome.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that at the time the planning committee approved the previously replaced three windows, the assumption was that the replacement windows would look the same as the existing. Concerns were therefore raised that if all the windows were now replaced would it look consistent given that there was evidently a difference in the depth of the glazing bars currently. Concern was also raised regarding the how the windows with the arch above them would be retained with a new window below and how that would look.

The Committee also noted that the new canopy proposed was extremely elegant and demonstrated that the façade was not frozen in time. There was also a similarity observed between the new modified style of window proposed with the cottages at numbers 6-10 which provided a continuation of the façade as you progressed along the churchyard. The performance of the windows was also acknowledged by the Committee to be important given that it operated as a public building and should be fit for purpose. The Guildford Vision Group along with a significant number of people had also written into the Council to support the application on this basis.

The planning officer responded to queries raised by the committee and confirmed that they were concerned that the replacement windows would not be consistent in the overall look of the building. The Committee noted that the replacement windows had been bought in 2018, with three of the windows being replaced to date. The planning department had not been provided with the details of the windows that would be replaced. With regard to the arched windows, planning officers had not been provided with any detail as to how they would be supported. The existing window frames were thinner than the ones that were proposed to replace them. Whilst planning officers appreciated the public benefit afforded by the windows being replaced, the level of harm to the heritage asset of the building had to also be taken into consideration. There were more sensitive ways to replace the windows and the applicant had not engaged with the Council on that basis. No evidence had been submitted by the applicant that the

building would fall into a state of disrepair to the point where the building could no longer be used.

The Committee sympathised overall with the fact that the church were trying to maintain a community building that remained fit for purpose and was hospitable. However, given the inconsistencies identified between the three windows already replaced and the existing windows, there was therefore no certainty that the remaining windows proposed for replacement would also be installed consistently. The new windows would introduce a powder coated aluminium and a design and profile that was not in keeping with the character and significance of the locally listed building, the Town Centre Conservation Area and setting of the Grade I Listed Building.

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Caroline Reeves		X	
2.	Tony Rooth			X
3.	Fiona White	X		
4.	Christopher Barrass		X	
5.	Angela Gunning	X		
6.	David Bilbe	X		
7.	Liz Hogger	X		
8.	Marsha Moseley	X		
9.	Pauline Searle		X	
10.	Colin Cross	X		
11.	Ruth Brothwell		X	
12.	Paul Spooner	X		
13.	Chris Blow		X	
14.	Susan Parker	X		
15.	Jon Askew		X	
	TOTAL	8	6	1

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 20/P/01163 for the reasons as detailed in the report.

PL56 20/P/01287 - 9 DENHOLM GARDENS, GUILDFORD, GU4 7YU

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

- Ms Nancy Kozak – (to object) and;
- Ms Karen Darby - (in support).

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed loft conversion to habitable accommodation with increased ridge height and insertion of two dormer windows on the front roof slope, one dormer window and rooflights on the rear roof slope; single storey rear extension.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application site was located in the urban area of Guildford. The surrounding area was residential in nature and characterised by properties of various scale and design. The application property was a dilapidated detached bungalow set within a small plot. The roof of the property would be raised by approximately half a metre so to provide the first-floor accommodation. The proposed front dormer windows would be minor in scale and would match the front roof slope. The dwelling would retain the same roof shape as the proposed single storey rear-extension and would appear subservient to the host dwelling. In terms of parking, the Burpham Neighbourhood Plan required the same level of off-street parking for 2-3-bedroom properties. This application did not propose any changes to the current access and parking arrangements and also benefited from an existing garage onsite. The single storey extension would result in no loss of light or have an overbearing impact upon neighbouring amenities of the closest properties at No.8 Denholm Gardens, No.29 Weylea Avenue and No.1 Dovedale Close.

The Chairman permitted the Ward Councillor George Potter to speak for three minutes in relation to the above application. (Post-meeting note: The Ward Councillor, George Potter would like to correct his verbal statement where he said that the adjacent neighbours to the proposed scheme were supportive. This was not the case and rather it was the two nearest neighbours that the application site shared a boundary with were supportive of the proposal).

The Committee discussed the application and noted points raised that the scheme would rejuvenate what was currently a dilapidated bungalow. The Committee agreed that the proposal was in scale and character with the surrounding area and was re-assured by the planning officer that the parking provision did meet the Council's parking standards. The property would have grey slate roof tiles which was also confirmed would be acceptable in the urban area and the development proposed was in keeping with the scale and character of surrounding properties.

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Tony Rooth	X		
2.	Paul Spooner	X		
3.	Fiona White	X		
4.	Ruth Brothwell		X	
5.	Angela Gunning			X
6.	Jon Askew	X		
7.	Colin Cross	X		
8.	Pauline Searle	X		
9.	Chris Blow	X		
10.	Caroline Reeves	X		
11.	Christopher Barrass	X		
12.	David Bilbe	X		
13.	Susan Parker	X		
14.	Liz Hogger	X		
15.	Marsha Moseley	X		
	TOTAL	13	1	1

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/01287 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL57 20/P/01462 - 9 WHITEMORE ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 1QT

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

- Mr John Walmsley (to object);
- Ms Charlotte Ryan-Elliott (to object);
- Ms Elena Charles (Applicant) (in support) and;
- Mr Mark Harris (Agent) (in support)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for a two-storey rear extension and the replacement and removal of the existing detached garage to be replaced with a new detached garage.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the site was located in the urban area of Guildford and consisted of a two-storey detached dwelling. The surrounding area was residential in character consisting of a mix of detached and semi-detached properties which were of similar scale and size. The proposal was for a two-storey rear extension 4 metres in depth and a new detached garage following demolition of the existing garage. The proposed garage would be repositioned slightly further back on the plot to allow for space for the rear extension. From the northern side elevation, the extension would extend out continuing from the existing ridge and extend out to the gable end at the rear. The bricks and tiles to be used would match the existing with the design of the extension incorporating some contemporary features and detailing on the rear elevation with an element of composite cladding at first floor. The rear of the elevation would be modern in appearance and blended in sympathetically with the existing building.

The separation distance to no.8 Whitmore Road was 2.5 metres to the boundary with a further 2 metres to the flank elevation of the dwelling. There was also an existing single storey garden room extension at the rear. The separation distance to No.10 Whitmore Road was 2 metres to the flank wall. The side elevation of the extension would face No.10. The rear of the proposed rear extension would not encroach the 45-degree angle taken from the rear window of No.10 Whitmore Road. There was also a kitchen window at No.10 Whitmore Road that would face the proposed extension with a gap of 2 metres. It was the planning officer's view that whilst the extension would result in some loss of light and outlook from the kitchen window, it was considered that due to the orientation of the properties, the separation distance and existing outlook, the proposal was acceptable in this case.

In conclusion, it was the planning officer's view, that the scale and design of the proposed extension was considered to be in keeping with the existing dwelling and would not adversely impact on the neighbouring amenities or character of the surrounding area.

The Committee discussed the application and noted concerns raised that the scheme was not supported locally given ten letters of objection had been received. The roofscape was in contravention of the SPD in relation to extensions given it extended out substantially beyond other rooflines. The Committee noted that in the drawings submitted by the applicant, No.10's kitchen window had not been shown. However, it had been confirmed by planning officer's that there was no requirement for the applicant to show this window as it was not considered to be a habitable room. The Committee considered that it was in fact a habitable room and should be taken into consideration on that basis in relation to the 45-degree rule. The garage that was going to be replaced was 2.7 metres wide and potentially 3 metres wide on the inside which equated more to a building than a garage that would be used for those purposes.

The planning officer confirmed that whilst it was accepted that No.10's kitchen window was only 2 metres to the boundary of the proposed extension and would result in some loss of light and outlook it was not considered to be so great to warrant refusal. It was also confirmed that the gable end was located at the same pitch as the roof and ridge height and would therefore not be prominent in the street scene.

The Committee agreed that the proposed development would in fact significantly harm neighbouring residential amenities, particularly for No.10, in respect of loss of light and outlook from their side kitchen window, and impact upon No.8 Whitemoor Road in respect of loss of light to their garden room and overall represented an overbearing extension that was unneighbourly.

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Pauline Searle			X
2.	Colin Cross		X	
3.	Susan Parker			X
4.	Ruth Brothwell		X	
5.	Liz Hogger		X	
6.	Christopher Barrass		X	
7.	David Bilbe			X
8.	Marsha Moseley			X
9.	Angela Gunning		X	
10.	Jon Askew			X
11.	Fiona White	X		
12.	Tony Rooth			X
13.	Paul Spooner		X	
14.	Caroline Reeves		X	
15.	Chris Blow		X	
	TOTAL	1	8	6

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Caroline Reeves	X		
2.	Susan Parker	X		
3.	Marsha Moseley			X
4.	Christopher Barrass	X		
5.	Liz Hogger	X		
6.	Colin Cross	X		
7.	Paul Spooner	X		
8.	Angela Gunning	X		
9.	Chris Blow	X		
10.	Jon Askew			X
11.	Pauline Searle	X		
12.	Ruth Brothwell	X		
13.	Fiona White			X
14.	David Bilbe			X
15.	Tony Rooth			X
	TOTAL	10	0	5

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 20/P/01462 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed two storey rear extension, by virtue of its scale, height and depth, would have an unacceptable overbearing impact and result in loss of outlook and daylight to the side kitchen window at 10 Whitmore Road and would result in an unacceptable overbearing impact and loss of light to the garden room to the rear of 8 Whitmore Road. The proposal will therefore have a detrimental impact on the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of these neighbouring properties, contrary to Policies G1(3) and H8 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (as saved by CLG Direction on 24/09/07) and the Guildford Borough Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2018.

2. The proposed two storey rear extension, by virtue of its scale, gable ended design and proposed window detailing, will have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling and the context and character of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy H8 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (as saved by CLG Direction on 24/09/07) and the Guildford Borough Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2018.

Informatives:

1. This decision relates expressly to drawing(s): 20125-P016 B received on 20/10/2020, 20125-P011, 20125-P012, 20125-P015 received on 08/09/2020 and 2015-P001, 2015-P002, 2015-P003, 2015-P004, 2015-P005, 2015-P006, 2015-P007, 2015-P008, 2015-P009, 2015-P010, 2015-P013, 2015-P014, 2015-P017, 2015-P018, 2015-P019 received on 28/08/2020.

2. 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.

Pre-application advice was not sought prior to submission and the application was considered acceptable by officers. However, the Planning Committee reached a different decision.

PL58 20/P/01377 - HURSTCOTE, HALFPENNY LANE, CHILWORTH, GUILDFORD, GU4 8PY

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for the erection of a glass link from the main dwelling to the existing garage, underground tunnel connecting the main dwelling to the existing outbuilding, construction of swimming pool and a replacement store.

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the application had been referred to the Committee by Councillor John Rigg on the grounds that the development would not result in an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal would link the existing detached outbuildings to the dwelling thereby resulting in the property sprawling across the site. For Green Belt purposes the assessment of enlargements, which in this case would result in a 138% increase in the size of the original dwelling, was not an openness assessment. It was the planning officer's view that the proposal represented a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling which took into account, the provision of basement area and the fact the passageway connected the main dwelling to the existing garage and pool house, the outbuildings and their attachment to the host dwelling.

The Chairman permitted the Ward Councillor John Rigg to speak for three minutes in relation to the above application.

The Committee discussed the application and noted concerns raised that the proposed scheme did in fact represent a sensitive solution within the Green Belt location and Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The NPPF stated that the relationship between building spaces and landscape as well as detailed design and materials were all relevant factors to also consider which had been incorporated into this scheme. The contentious works involved a small glass link corridor between the existing house and garage behind an existing arch wall creating a hidden area enclosed by walls on three sides. The proposed corridor was 14 metres long but only 3.5 metres above ground providing an invisible route to an outbuilding containing a gym as well connecting to a swimming pool which promoted health and wellbeing. The Committee noted points raised that the visible portion of the contentious proposed link was minimal and effectively hidden away from sight.

The Committee noted that whilst the scheme proposed was of a high-quality design, it was still going to extend the house beyond its original size. The Committee also considered that the sensitive nature of the design meant that it was not perceived as disproportionate overall. In addition, the applicant had agreed to remove the construction of porches, which had been

previously approved, as well as forgoing permitted development rights. On balance, the Committee considered that the increase proposed on the existing additions were fairly modest.

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Liz Hogger		X	
2.	Christopher Barrass		X	
3.	Pauline Searle		X	
4.	Caroline Reeves		X	
5.	Jon Askew		X	
6.	Paul Spooner		X	
7.	Marsha Moseley	X		
8.	Fiona White	X		
9.	Angela Gunning		X	
10.	Ruth Brothwell		X	
11.	Tony Rooth		X	
12.	Susan Parker		X	
13.	Chris Blow		X	
14.	David Bilbe		X	
15.	Colin Cross		X	
	TOTAL	2	13	0

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

RECORDED VOTES LIST				
	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1.	Liz Hogger	X		
2.	Fiona White			X
3.	Susan Parker	X		
4.	Caroline Reeves	X		
5.	Colin Cross	X		
6.	Angela Gunning	X		
7.	Christopher Barrass	X		
8.	Chris Blow	X		
9.	David Bilbe	X		
10.	Tony Rooth	X		
11.	Marsha Moseley		X	
12.	Ruth Brothwell	X		
13.	Pauline Searle	X		
14.	Paul Spooner	X		
15.	Jon Askew	X		
	TOTAL	13	1	1

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/01377 subject to a Section 106 legal agreement ensuring that the certificate of lawfulness approval for an outbuilding and three porches (ref 20/P/00252 was not built out; then subject to the following conditions and reasons:

1. Three-year permission
2. Drawing numbers
3. Materials to be submitted for agreement

And also standard informatives

PL59 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted the appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 10.50 pm

Signed

Chairman

Date