PLANNING COMMITTEE

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

* Councillor Jon Askew
Councillor Christopher Barrass
Councillor David Bilbé
* Councillor Chris Blow
* Councillor Ruth Brothwell
* Councillor Angela Goodwin
* Councillor Angela Gunning
* Councillor Liz Hogger
* Councillor Marsha Moseley
* Councillor Ramsey Nagaty
* Councillor Maddy Redpath
* Councillor Pauline Searle
* Councillor Paul Spooner

*Present

Councillors Susan Parker, John Redpath and Tony Rooth were also in attendance.

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors David Bilbé and Christopher Barrass. Councillors Graham Eyre and Deborah Seabrook attended respectively for the above as substitutes.

PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Councillors Chris Blow and Ramsey Nagaty declared a non-pecuniary interest in application 20/P/01291 – Ashley House, Christmas Hill, Shalford, Guildford, GU4 8HN owing to the fact that they were both ward councillors. They both confirmed that they had come to the meeting with an open mind and would consider the application accordingly.

PL3 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 28 April 2021 were approved and signed by the Chairman as a true record.

PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the procedures for determining planning applications.

PL5 APPLICATION DEFERRED: 18/P/02456 - LAND AT ASH MANOR, ASH GREEN ROAD, ASH GREEN, GUILDFORD, GU12 6HH

The above application 18/P/02456 was deferred following the very late receipt of three weighty documents received at different times (20/5) from Ash Green Residents Association (AGRA) without any prior warning. Officers feel given the circumstances, the information needed to be reviewed and could only be done through deferral. Officers would seek to take the item back to the earliest available Planning Committee to consider the item.

PL6 APPLICATION DEFERRED: 20/P/00737 - ORCHARD WALLS, BEECH AVENUE, EFFINGHAM, LEATHERHEAD, KT24 5PG

This application was deferred owing to outstanding issues regarding viability and unit size.

PL7 20/P/01291 - ASHLEY HOUSE, CHRISTMAS HILL, SHALFORD, GUILDFORD, GU4 8HN

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

- Councillor David Semple (Shalford Parish Council) (to object)
- Ms Sarah Singleton (to object)
- Mr Dominic Kay (Barchester Healthcare) (in support)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of a care home (use Class C2) with parking, access, landscaping and other associated works following demolition of the existing structure. (Amended plans received 01.02.21 revised footprint, landscaping, refuse strategy, external materials and appearance).

The Committee was informed by the planning officer that the proposed erection of a care home would provide 60 ensuite bedrooms as well as a residents café, hair and beauty salon, library, cinema and communal activities space. The site was in a sustainable location with good access to services and public transport. The buildings to be removed had some historic and architectural interest but were not considered of sufficient quality to warrant statutory protection or inclusion on a local list of significant buildings. There were therefore no reasonable grounds to resist the demolition of the existing building and there was no objection to its replacement with a new building. Access to the development would remain via the existing access track which led to a new car park area and included 24 car parking spaces, 12 bicycle spaces, an ambulance bay and a turning area for refuse vehicles. The proposed building would be predominantly two and a half storeys with a third storey floor of accommodation contained within the roofspace. Officers considered that the building was of a good quality design and that the articulation and carefully considered use of materials would ensure that the building would not cause any harm to the character or appearance of the building. Concern had been raised in relation to the impact upon an elm tree on adjoining land, however, following submission of amended plans, the Council's Arboricultural Officer had assessed the tree and concluded that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact upon it. A landscaping strategy also demonstrated how the removal of some low-quality trees would be replaced and how the remaining garden would be used for the benefit of future residents.

In conclusion, the proposed development was considered to be of good quality and design which included materials using architectural details that were sympathetic to the character of the local area. Whilst the building would be of a greater scale than the existing, the design could nevertheless be accommodated without causing harm to its surroundings. It would not harm the special landscape or character of the wider area nor result in any material impact on local amenities and would not prejudice highway or pedestrian safety. The level of parking proposed was considered to be appropriate for the scale of the development and supported the principle of sustainable travel. The development accorded with the provisions of the Development Plan and the relevant national planning policy guidance.

The Committee discussed the application and noted concerns raised that the proposed development would impact the character of the village and the views into and out of it. The character of the existing building was valued by local residents whilst the proposed building was perceived as too large for the one-acre plot and would be detrimental to the neighbouring

properties enjoyment of their amenities. The access road was narrow and would restrict access to ambulances and fire services vehicles.

In response to comments made, the planning officer confirmed that the report did assess the impact of the proposed development upon neighbouring amenity which was found to be acceptable. In addition, Surrey County Council's Highway Authority was satisfied with the access arrangements and contributions had been sought as part of the S106 agreement secured as part of a Travel Plan.

The Committee also queried the number of staff who would be working at the care home which was confirmed could not be found in the Design Access Statement. A total of twenty-four parking spaces were to be provided and the Committee asked how many would be accessible. The planning officer confirmed that the Design and Access Statement provided for accessible communal spaces and accessible paths however it did not confirm how many accessible parking spaces would be provided but would very probably be covered. The Committee noted that approx. 20 staff would be working on three separate shifts so the number of people onsite at any one time would be manageable. However, the number of electric vehicle charging points was less than a quarter of that required to meet our sustainability targets. The planning officer confirmed that the number of electric vehicle charging points was managed by Surrey Highways Authority and not Guildford Borough Council and was therefore difficult to secure additional charging points. The Committee also discussed whether it was possible to include a landscape boundary treatment condition so that additional planting could be secured at the back of the car parking spaces to provide relief from the traffic. The planning officer confirmed that an additional landscaping condition could be sought.

The Committee agreed on balance that the proposed development represented a modern building that was fit for purpose. The County Highways Authority had raised no objections to the parking arrangements.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jon Askew	X		
2	Deborah Seabrook	X		
3	Graham Eyre	X		
4	Chris Blow		X	
5	Ruth Brothwell	X		
6	Colin Cross			X
7	Angela Gunning	X		
8	Pauline Searle	X		
9	Liz Hogger	X		
10	Marsha Moseley	X		
11	Ramsey Nagaty		X	
12	Maddy Redpath	X		
13	Angela Goodwin	X		
14	Paul Spooner	X		
15	Fiona White	X		
	TOTALS	**12**	**2**	**1**

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

RESOLVED to approve application 20/P/0129, subject to the additional landscaping boundary treatment condition:

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

- A contribution of £7000 towards the cost of works to reduce the width of the access track
- A contribution of £45,000 toward road safety improvements to include the creation of a pedestrian refuge and highway widening on Kings Road/Christmas Hill.
- A contribution of £4,600 towards the cost of Surrey County Council auditing the Travel Plan

If the terms of the S.106 or wording or the planning conditions are significantly amended as part of ongoing s.106 or planning contribution(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.

PL8 20/P/01708 - LAND AT WISLEY AIRFIELD, HATCH LANE, OCKHAM, GU23 6NU

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

- Mr David Alexander (on behalf of the Royal Horticultural Society) (to object);
- Ms Imogen Jamieson (Ockham Parish Council) (to object) and;
- Mr Antonis Pazourou (Taylor Wimpey) (in support)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full detailed application for engineering operations to form a new roundabout and stub road.

The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which contained an update in relation to the Highways England Investment Strategy relating to the M25 junction 10 and the A3 Wisley interchange development consent order which was due to be decided by the 12 May 2021. A ministerial statement was laid in Parliament on that day which stated that the deadline would be further extended to 12 November 2021. The additional 6 months would allow for further consideration of environmental matters. Planning officers considered that the delayed Highways England Development Consent Order (DCO) did not affect the ability to determine the application on the basis of the Grampian condition 4. An objection had also been received on behalf of RHS Wisley and some very minor amendments had been made to a number of the conditions proposed which also detailed the reasons for those changes.

The Committee noted that the new access proposed was to serve the former Wisley Airfield strategic site and would be taken from the Wisley Lane Diversion, which formed part of the DCO and for this reason the application was only acceptable if the DCO was approved and built out, secured by a Grampian condition. The DCO would therefore form the appropriate baseline to assess the impacts of the proposal. The new access would serve the former Wisley Airfield site allocated in the Local Plan. The vast majority of the SNCI overlapped the boundary of the DCO. To the north of the site was Elm Corner Woods which were designated as ancient woodlands SNCI, was Green Belt and close to the TBHSPA. The roundabout incorporated a cycle and pedestrian facilities along the southern side of the wisley lane diversion and a crossing. Surrey Highway Authority had assessed the scheme and were satisfied that the interchange would accommodate traffic flows and was safe.

Grampian Condition 4 was a key aspect of the proposal and had been agreed by both Highways England and Surrey Highway Authority as an appropriate way to control the development. The condition stated that: *'No development shall take place until (a) the Highways England Investment Strategy (RIS) improvement to M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley Interchange Development Consent Order (DCO) has been granted and (b) written confirmation has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Highways England and Surrey County Council) that the relevant part of the DCO, being the Wisley Lane Diversion, has been implemented/commenced on site. Reason: The proposed development is only acceptable as part of the diverted Wisley Lane.'* The Council had sought legal advice and it was confirmed that the application could be considered now, with the use of Grampian condition 4 despite the 6-month delay to the decision of the DCO. There were two key issues in considering the application now. The first was that the construction of the roundabout and stub road simultaneously with the Wisley Lane diversion would limit construction impacts upon the local community and RHS Wisley and would ensure that they were built at the same time providing both economic and environmental benefits. If the decision was delayed until after the DCO was made it would potentially put time constraints on the developer and the Council in discharging conditions prior to works commencing on the DCO. The material planning issues were the same now as they will be after any grant of the DCO. In conclusion, it was the planning officers view that the proposal was in accordance with the specific access requirements of Policy A35 as well as the Strategic Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document which recognised that the access for the airfield would be from the realigned Wisley Lane. The benefits of the proposal outweighed the identified harm and the application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Committee considered the application and noted that the DCO scheme proposed was for the building of a large bridge over the A3 and going into Wisley which would be four lanes wide. The construction of a stub road at this stage, when the above had not yet been implemented was therefore considered as premature. The Committee also agreed that this should be considered at the same time as the full planning application for the Wisley Airfield site when the stub road and roundabout could be fully assessed to ascertain whether it would meet the needs of the development.

The Committee received advice from the Head of Place who confirmed that an extension of time for consideration of this application could be sought from the applicant. The Committee wished for the application to be deferred until 12 November 2021 to coincide with the DCO outcome. It was noted that the applicant may not agree and could seek non-determination and launch an appeal. The Committee nevertheless agreed that it made more sense to determine the application once the DCO outcome was known.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Angela Goodwin	X		
2	Pauline Searle	X		
3	Maddy Redpath	X		
4	Fiona White			X
5	Ruth Brothwell	X		
6	Paul Spooner	X		
7	Chris Blow	X		
8	Graham Eyre	X		
9	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
10	Jon Askew	X		
11	Marsha Moseley		X	
12	Deborah Seabrook	X		
13	Angela Gunning	X		
14	Colin Cross	X		
15	Liz Hogger	X		
	TOTALS	**13**	**1**	**1**

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

RESOLVED to defer application 20/P/01708 until 12 November 2021.

PL9 21/P/00293 - LOT 4, WESTWOOD LANE, WANBOROUGH, GUILDFORD, GU3 2JR

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

- Mr Oscar de Chazal (on behalf of Wanborough Parish Council) (to object); and
- Ms Mary Adkins (to object)

The Chairman permitted ward Councillor Tony Rooth to speak for three minutes in his capacity as ward councillor in relation to the above application.

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for provision of a water tap to facilitate water for the purposes of agriculture and a manhole to gain access to the metre and stop tap.

The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which included an updated plan to show the correct location of the plot. The original plan had been produced internally, however the applicant's drawings and references in the report were correct. The site formed part of an agricultural field to the west of Westwood Lane, which was within the Green Belt and part of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). The application sought permission for the installation of a water tap on a standpipe and a single manhole cover to contain the connection to the mains water supply. No other development was proposed, and the land would remain in agricultural use. The application did not seek a change of use of the land, given the development was for agriculture and it was therefore considered to be an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt. Therefore, an assessment on the impact on openness was not required as the proposal would have no

discernible impact on the character or the appearance of the area and would conserve the special character of the AONB and was therefore recommended for approval.

The Committee considered the application and concerns raised regarding the potential impact of a proposed development which should be considered, as stated in the Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan. Furthermore, the Management Plan stated that small developments would reduce the landscape and scenic beauty of the Surrey Hills. The requirement for a water tap to water walnut trees and for grazing sheep was questioned. The walnut trees would also amount to having an adverse impact on the amenities and landscape of the AONB and was contrary to policy G12 of the Local Plan 2003. In addition, no tree report had been provided to ascertain the suitability of growing conditions for walnut trees.

The Head of Place confirmed that planning permission was required for the installation of the water tap as it was an engineering operation and required planning permission in its own right. Whilst it was acknowledged there had been speculation over the future use of the land, the Committee was requested to consider the application before them which was the provision of a water tap for agricultural purposes.

The Committee noted additional concerns raised that the water tap would ruin the AONB and questioned the need for the tap when unauthorised developments had occurred on adjacent plots which necessitated enforcement action at cost to the Council.

The Committee noted that it did not have planning control over the planting of non-native trees and the proposal was just for the installation of a water tap that was considered to be unobtrusive in the wider landscape. It was also noted that if the applicant wished to install water troughs this would not require planning permission however the installation of a tap did. The Committee queried whether NPPF S172 required the applicant to prove exceptional need in order to develop. It was confirmed that this stated that the scale and extent of development within designated areas should be limited and that planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances and where it could be demonstrated that the development was in the public interest. The Committee noted that given it was not a major development it was not applicable in relation to the installation of a water tap.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Graham Eyre	X		
2	Chris Blow	X		
3	Jon Askew	X		
4	Fiona White	X		
5	Colin Cross			X
6	Maddy Redpath			X
7	Ruth Brothwell		X	
8	Pauline Searle	X		
9	Liz Hogger	X		
10	Paul Spooner	X		
11	Marsha Moseley	X		
12	Angela Goodwin	X		
13	Ramsey Nagaty		X	
14	Angela Gunning		X	
15	Deborah Seabrook	X		
	TOTALS	**10**	**3**	**2**

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

RESOLVED to approve application 21/P/00293 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL10 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted the appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 8.55 pm

Signed ..... Date .....

Chairman