

PLANNING COMMITTEE

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

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

*Present

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillors Chris Barrass, Chris Blow and Paul Spooner. Councillors Tony Rooth, Deborah Seabrook and Jan Harwood attended as substitutes respectively. Councillor Fiona White sent her apologies and Councillor Colin Cross acted as Chairman in her absence.

PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

21/P/00428 – Howard of Effingham School

Councillor Liz Hogger declared a non-pecuniary interest in the above application and stated that although she is a member of Effingham Parish Council, she did not comment or vote on any planning applications which come before the parish council. She did not therefore participate in the parish council's decision to object to this application.

Secondly, her husband is a trustee for Effingham Village Recreation Trust, which owns the KGV Fields to the south of the application site. He has submitted an objection on behalf of the Trust and not in a personal capacity.

Councillor Hogger confirmed that neither of these issues would affect her judgement on this application, and she would approach the discussion on the application tonight with an open mind to all the arguments made.

PL3 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 2 February 2022 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the procedures for determining planning applications.

PL5 APPLICATION DEFERRED - 20/P/01057 - WHITE HORSE YARD, HIGH STREET, RIPLEY, GU23 6BB

The Committee noted that the above application had been deferred. Due to the scale of the application and proximity to a Grade II* listed building there was a requirement to consult Historic England. This had not taken place. In the absence of a statutory consultation a decision could not be made on the applications. Officers had now initiated the consultation and would bring the items to the next available planning committee updating Members on the response from Historic England.

PL6 APPLICATION DEFERRED - 20/P/01058 - WHITE HORSE YARD, HIGH STREET, RIPLEY, GU23 6BB

The Committee noted that the above application had been deferred. Due to the scale of the application and proximity to a Grade II* listed building there was a requirement to consult Historic England. This had not taken place. In the absence of a statutory consultation a decision could not be made on the applications. Officers had now initiated the consultation and would bring the items to the next available planning committee updating Members on the response from Historic England.

PL7 21/P/00428 - HOWARD OF EFFINGHAM SCHOOL, LOWER ROAD, EFFINGHAM, LEATHERHEAD, KT24 5JR

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

- Mr Ian Symes (Chairman of Effingham Parish Council) (to object)
- Ms Vivien White (Chairman of Effingham Residents Association) (to object)
- Mr David Gilchrist (Agent) (In Support)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned Reserved Matters application pursuant to outline permission 14/P/02109 approved on 21/03/2018, to consider appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of 99 dwellings.

The Committee received a presentation from Specialist Development Management Majors Officer, John Busher. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets as some changes had been made to the southern and eastern boundaries of the application site, an amendment to condition 14 and a new condition. This was a reserved matters application for the construction of 99 dwellings following approval of outline planning permission by the Secretary of State in 2018 as part of the Effingham School development. The main phase of the development was planned on the Lodge Farm site. The site was located outside of but adjoining to Effingham Conservation Area and Little Bookham Conservation Area which was in Mole Valley. The site was previously Green Belt land. Residential properties were located mainly to the west, King George Recreation Ground to the south and to the east a school and a church. The planning officer referred to the Masterplan which had been approved by the Secretary of State. The largest part of the application site was set on the northern side of the road which included houses and the replacement secondary school and a smaller residential development accessed off Brown's lane. The Inspector considered the Masterplan as part of the appeal. The access from Lower Road led to a central open space in the middle of the site leading to cul-de-sacs with a variety of dwellings and apartment units. The approved parameter plans were also referred to by the Planning Officer, also considered by the Planning Inspector, which showed the approved building height parameters at two and a half storeys in height which was considered acceptable in those areas. A potential pedestrian/cycle link was

proposed along the eastern boundary which would link Lower Road into King George the Fifth Recreation grounds.

The Committee noted that the appeal layout plan had been amended on a number of occasions to deal with issues raised by planning officers and residents. The main changes were focused on the eastern portion of the site where a much improved arrangement of buildings fronting onto the spine road had been achieved. Previously, the dwellings were located side onto the access road and the applicant had changed it so all the dwellings fronted onto the streetscene. The applicant had also swapped the terrace of four dwellings with an apartment block on the eastern boundary. The apartment block now had an active frontage onto Lower Road therefore improving the streetscene. The larger blocks were also located further away from the listed buildings and the conservation areas. The terrace of 4 dwellings had moved to the south-eastern corner with a greater gap to the southern and eastern boundaries. The building would also be slightly smaller in height. The taller buildings were located around the central open space and the existing lodge was still being retained and incorporated into the scheme.

The Committee noted that to address issues raised by residents, the applicant had reintroduced the cycle and pedestrian route that was shown on the parameter plan along the eastern boundary of the site. There would be a pedestrian and cycle link from Lower Road to the recreation area with the road flanked by a 1.5 metre high metal fence. The additional condition would secure the design and layout. To the southern boundary of the site there was the potential to have an access point between the two sites but was dependent upon an agreement being reached between the two private landowners.

The planning officer concluded that this was a reserved matters application, and as such the principle of development was deemed acceptable, including the access and the number of units which had already been agreed and established by the Secretary of State. The design and layout of the proposal was considered by planning officers to be an overall improvement compared to the indicative details submitted as part of the appeal proposal. The application did not result in any harm to heritage assets, neighbouring amenities, flooding or highways issues. No objections had been raised by statutory consultees other than the Parish Council. Planning officers were therefore of the opinion that the proposal was acceptable and recommended approval.

Planning officers were invited to comment on anything that the public speakers had referred to and confirmed that the fact Effingham Residents Association had objected to the application had been clarified on the supplementary late sheets.

The Chairman permitted Councillor Liz Hogger five minutes to speak in her capacity as ward councillor. The two amendments as laid out in the supplementary late sheets were welcomed and was hopeful that the precise design of the fence could be resolved shortly along the southern boundary. However, the provision of the cycle and pedestrian route along the eastern boundary was a concern. The southern part of the boundary in the vicinity of the row of terraced cottages and the land to the east of that land all belonged to All Saints Church which was a Grade II listed building and adjoined the existing graveyard of the church. The Mole Valley Historic Environment Officer had expressed strong concerns about the impact of the design and layout on Little Bookham's Conservation Area as well as on the setting of All Saints Church, and its graveyard, which was more harmful than the indicative layout presented at appeal. At the rear elevation of the terrace of cottages was a 9-metre high brick elevation, which was similar in height to the apartment building, whilst it was further away, it was still a very obvious structure when viewed from the graveyard of All Saints Church. The Inspector said at the appeal that there would be an opportunity at reserved matters stage for additional planting to screen this development from the Conservation Area, and from Little Bookham Church, to avoid material harm to the heritage assets as well as along the rear of the terraced cottages. However, there was no planting or green screening proposed, only a boarded wooden fence at the back of the gardens and then an open metal fence along the cycle path

with no trees or hedges along that particular boundary. The Rector of All Saints Church was also very concerned about the effect upon the tranquility of the graveyard. With regard to over-development, reference had been made to 12 bonus rooms which were to be treated as bedrooms and therefore the housing mix would be contradictory to the SHMAA and indicative plans at appeal. The proposal would also result in a scale of built form which was actually greater than the indicative scheme.

The Committee discussed the application and remained concerned about the lack of screening proposed between the graveyard and pedestrian and cyclist route. The bonus rooms proposed were noted as beneficial for people wanting to work from home which had become more prevalent since the pandemic.

The Committee discussed the design of the houses as being very block like and unattractive. The bonus rooms were also questioned as to their necessity as well as garages which people tended to convert into additional rooms. In addition, the number of affordable homes had been reduced by 20% as well as the number of affordable rented properties. The Committee also expressed concerns regarding the housing mix which had resulted in fewer smaller properties that were in demand and general affordability. Two cycling spaces per apartment would have also been good.

The Committee considered that the development proposed was out of character and an over-development of the site with insufficient affordable properties with bonus rooms potentially skewing the housing mix.

The Committee also noted comments that planning policy did not dictate how people should use the rooms in their homes. The SHMAA mix was agreed by the Planning Inspector at the appeal. The energy sustainability of the scheme was also very impressive.

The Committee queried why the rooms were called 'bonus rooms' and why it was described as having approximately 12 of those rooms. Were bonus rooms smaller than a standard room?

In response to points raised by the Committee, the planning officer, John Busher confirmed that the additional screening on the western boundary was negated by the change of layout, swapping the apartment building with the terraced block which therefore created a buffer. The pedestrian/cycle route was already a public right of way by the graveyard so there was movement in that area currently and was accepted by planning officers that it would likely increase as a result of this proposal. The extension of the graveyard was also something that the Committee should bear in mind. In terms of questions about the number of affordable units, the tenure and mix were all issues already dealt with by the Secretary of State and unfortunately there was no opportunity to re-open those aspects as part of the reserved matters application. In addition, whilst the Council was consulting on new parking standards, the proposal met the current standards. Lastly, the term 'bonus rooms' had been coined by the planning officer and just referred to rooms that you would not ordinarily expect to see as these were ancillary additional rooms which did provide flexibility in terms of how they were used. There was nothing to stop residents in planning terms from splitting up the room configurations.

The Committee considered the proposed built form along the eastern boundary as out of scale by way of its location and arrangement. The lack of green screening and planting along the southern section would harm the tranquility of the Little Bookham Conservation Area as well as its setting and significance as well as the Grade II Listed building, All Saints Church. The harm identified to these heritage assets was greater than that harm identified by the Planning Inspector at appeal.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Angela Gunning		X	
2	Tony Rooth			X
3	David Bilbé	X		
4	Liz Hogger		X	
5	Pauline Searle		X	
6	Colin Cross		X	
7	Ruth Brothwell		X	
8	Deborah Seabrook	X		
9	Jan Harwood	X		
10	Ramsey Nagaty		X	
11	Angela Goodwin		X	
12	Jon Askew		X	
13	Maddy Redpath	X		
14	Marsha Moseley	X		
	TOTALS	5	8	1

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Angela Goodwin	X		
2	Liz Hogger	X		
3	David Bilbé (left the meeting)			
4	Colin Cross	X		
5	Angela Gunning	X		
6	Jon Askew	X		
7	Tony Rooth			X
8	Pauline Searle	X		
9	Deborah Seabrook		X	
10	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
11	Marsha Moseley		X	
12	Jan Harwood		X	
13	Maddy Redpath			X
14	Ruth Brothwell	X		
	TOTALS	8	3	2

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 21/P/00428 for the following reasons:

1. By virtue of the location and arrangement of built form along the eastern boundary of the site, the scale of the built form in this area of the site, and the lack of planting to screen the built form along the southern section of this boundary, the proposal would harm the tranquillity, setting and significance of the Little Bookham Conservation Area, and the listed building (and its curtilage) known as All Saints Church. Their setting is an important contributor to the heritage significance of these designated heritage assets and the tranquillity of the Church yard and the rural character of its setting adds specifically to the significance of All Saints Church. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm (toward the higher end of this scale) to their significance. This harm is considered to be greater than the harm identified by the Inspector in the appeal decision giving outline consent. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy D3 of the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites, saved policies HE4 and HE10 of the Local Plan 2003, and policy ENP-G3 of the Effingham Neighbourhood Plan, as well as Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

1. This decision relates expressly to the following drawings:

	Drawing number
Site Layout	S857/HE/01 Rev O
Plots 1-5 Elevations 1	S857/HoE/P1-5/04 REV A
Plot 1-5 Elevations 2	S857/HoE/P1-5/05 REV A
Plot 1-5 Elevations 3	S857/HoE/P1-5/06
Plot 1-5 FF Plans	S857/HoE/P1-5/02 REV A
Plot 1-5 GF Plans	S857/HoE/P1-5/01 REV A
Plot 1-5 SF Plans	S857/HoE/P1-5/03 REV A
Plots 6-8 Elevations	S857/HoE/P6-8/02 REV B
Plot 6-8 Plans	S857/HoE/P6-8/01 REV B
Plot 9-10 Elevations	S857/HoE/P9-10/02 REV B
Plot 9-10 Plans	S857/HoE/P9-10/01 REV A
Plot 11-12 Elevations	S857/HoE/P11-12/02 REV B
Plot 11-12 Plans	S857/HoE/P11-12/01 REV B
Plot 13-14 Elevations	S857/HoE/P13-14/02 REV B
Plot 13-14 Plans	S857/HoE/P13-14/01 REV B
Plot 15 Elevations	S857/HoE/P15/02 REV B
Plot 15 Plans	S857/HoE/P15/01 REV A
Plot 16 Plans	S857/HoE/P16/01 REV A
Plot 16 Elevations	S857/HoE/P16/02 REV A
Plot 17-18 Elevations	S857/HoE/P17-18/02 REV B
Plot 17-18 Plans	S857/HoE/P17-18/01 REV B
Plot 19-20 Elevations	S857/HoE/P19-20/02 REV A
Plot 19-20 Plans	S857/HoE/P19-20/01 REV A
Plot 21-22 Elevations	S857/HoE/P21-22/02 REV A
Plot 21-22 Plans	S857/HoE/P21-22/01 REV A
Plot 23-24 GF&FF Plans	S857/HoE/P23-24/01 REV A
Plot 23-24 SF Plans	S857/HoE/P23-24/02 REV A
Plot 23-24 Elevations	S857/HoE/P23-24/03
Plot 25 Plans	S857/HoE/P25/01 Rev A
Plot 25 Elevations	S857/HoE/P25/02 REV B

Plot 26-27 Elevations 1	S857/HoE/P26-27/03 REV C
Plot 26-27 Elevations 2	S857/HoE/P26-27/04 REV C
Plot 26-27 GF&FF Plans	S857/HoE/P26-27/01 REV C
Plot 26-27 SF Plans	S857/HoE/P26-27/02 REV C
Plot 28 Elevations	S857/HoE/P28/02 REV B
Plot 28 Plans	S857/HoE/P28/01 REV A
Plot 29 Plans	S857/HoE/P29/01
Plot 29 Elevations	S857/HoE/P29/02 REV B
Plot 30 Elevations 1	S857/HoE/P30/03 REV B
Plot 30 Elevations 2	S857/HoE/P30/04 REV A
Plot 30 FF Plans	S857/HoE/P30/02 REV A
Plot 30 GF Plans	S857/HoE/P30/01 REV A

Plot 31 Elevations	S857/HoE/P31/02 REV B
Plot 31 Plans	S857/HoE/P31/01 REV A
Plot 32 Elevations	S857/HoE/P32/02 REV A
Plot 32 Plans	S857/HoE/P32/01 REV A
Plot 33 Elevations	S857/HoE/P33/02 REV A
Plot 33 Plans	S857/HoE/P33/01
Plot 34 Elevations	S857/HoE/P34/02 REV A
Plot 34 Plans	S857/HoE/P34/01
Plot 35 Elevations	S857/HoE/P35/02 REV A
Plot 35 Plans	S857/HoE/P35/01
Plot 36 Elevations	S857/HoE/P36/02 REV A
Plot 36 Plans	S857/HoE/P36/01
Plot 37 Elevations	S857/HoE/P37/02 REV B
Plot 37 Plans	S857/HoE/P37/01 REV A
Plot 38-41 FF Plans	S857/HoE/P38-41/02 REV C
Plot 38-41 GF Plans	S857/HoE/P38-41/01 REV C
Plot 38-41 Elevations 1	S857/HoE/P38-41/03 REV D
Plot 38-41 Elevations 2	S857/HoE/P38-41/04 REV D
Plot 42-43 GF Plans	S857/HoE/P42-43/02 REV A
Plot 42-43 FF Plans	S857/HoE/P38-41/04 REV D
plot 42-43 Elevations	S857/HoE/P42-43/03 REV B
Plot 44-45 Elevations 1	S857/HoE/P44-45/04 REV A
Plot 44-45 Elevations 2	S857/HoE/P44-45/05 REV A
Plot 44-45 FF Plans	S857/HoE/P44-45/02 REV A
Plot 44-45 GF Plans	S857/HoE/P44-45/01 REV A
Plot 44-45 SF Plans	S857/HoE/P44-45/03 REV A
Plot 46 Plans	S857/HoE/P46/01 REV B
Plot 46 Elevations	S857/HoE/P46/02 REV C
Plot 47-50 Elevations 1	S857/HoE/P47-50/04 REV A
Plot 47-50 Elevations 2	S857/HoE/P47-50/05 REV A
Plot 47-50 Elevations 3	S857/HoE/P47-50/06 REV A
Plot 47-50 FF Plans	S857/HoE/P47-50/02 REV A
Plot 47-50 GF Plans	S857/HoE/P47-50/01 REV A
Plot 47-50 SF Plans	S857/HoE/P47-50/03 REV A

Plot 51 Elevations	S857/HoE/P51/02
Plot 51 Plans	S857/HoE/P51/01
Plot 52-55 Elevations 1	S857/HoE/P52-55/03 REV A
Plot 52-55 Elevations 2	S857/HoE/P52-55/04 REV A
Plot 52-55 FF Plans	S857/HoE/P52-55/02 REV A
Plot 52-55 GF Plans	S857/HoE/P52-55/01 REV A
Plot 56-57 Elevations 1	S857/HoE/P56-57/03
Plot 56-57 Elevations 2	S857/HoE/P56-57/04
Plot 56-57 FF Plans	S857/HoE/P56-57/02
Plot 56-57 GF Plans	S857/HoE/P56-57/01
Plot 58-59 Elevations	S857/HoE/P58-59/02
Plot 58-59 Plans	S857/HoE/P58-59/01
Plot 60-62 Elevations	S857/HoE/P60-62/03
Plot 60-62 FF Plans	S857/HoE/P60-62/02
Plot 60-62 GF Plans	S857/HoE/P60-62/01
Plot 63-66 Elevations 1	S857/HoE/P63-66/03
Plot 63-66 Elevations 2	S857/HoE/P63-66/04
Plot 63-66 FF Plans	S857/HoE/P63-66/02
Plot 63-66 GF Plans	S857/HoE/P63-66/01
Plot 67-78 Elevations 1	S857/HoE/P67-78/04 REV C
Plot 67-78 Elevations 2	S857/HoE/P67-78/05 REV C
Plot 67-78 FF Plans	S857/HoE/P67-78/02 REV B
Plot 67-78 GF Plans	S857/HoE/P67-78/01 REV B
Plot 79 Plans	S857/HoE/P79/01 REV C
Plot 79 Elevations	S857/HoE/P79/02 REV C
Plot 80 Plans	S857/HoE/P80/01 REV A
Plot 80 Elevations	S857/HoE/P80/02 REV C
Pot 81-82 Elevations	S857/HoE/P81-82/02 REV C
Plot 81-82 Plans	S857/HoE/P81-82/01 REV C
Plot 83-84 Elevations	S857/HoE/P83-84/02 REV C
Plot 83-84 Plans	S857/HoE/P83-84/01 REV C
Plot 85-86 Plans	S857/HoE/P85-86/01 REV B
Plot 85-86 Elevations	S857/HoE/P85-86/02 REV C
Plot 87 Elevations	S857/HoE/P87/02 REV B
Plot 87 Plans	S857/HoE/P87/01 REV A
Plot 88-89 Plans	S857/HoE/P88-89/01 REV B
Plot 88-89 Elevations	S857/HoE/P88-89/02 REV C
Plot 90-91 Elevations	S857/HoE/P90-91/02 REV B
Plot 90-91 Plans	S857/HoE/P90-91/01 REV B
Plot 92-93 FF Plans	S857/HoE/P92-93/02 REV B
Pot 92-93 GF Plans	S857/HoE/P92-93/01 Rev B
Plot 92-93 Elevations 1	S857/HoE/P92-93/03 REV C
Plot 92-93 Elevations 2	S857/HoE/P92-93/04 REV C
Plot 94-95 Elevations 1	S857/HoE/P94-95/03 REV C
Plot 94-95 FF Plans	S857/HoE/P94-95/02 REV B
Plot 94-95 GF Plans	S857/HoE/P94-95/01 REV B
Plot 96-99 Elevations 1	S857/HoE/P96-99/04 REV D

Plot 96-99 Elevations 2	S857/HoE/P96-99/05 REV D
Plot 96-99 FF Plans	S857/HoE/P96-99/02 REV C
Plot 96-99 GF Plans	S857/HoE/P96-99/01 REV C
Plot 96-99 SF Plans	S857/HoE/P96-99/03 REV C
Bin and cycle store plots 67-78	S857/HoE/P67-78/BCS
Car barn plots 1-3	S857/HoE/P1-3/GD
Car barn plots 4-7	S857/HoE/P4-7/GD REV A
Car barn plots 48&54	S857/HoE/P48-54/GD
Garage plots 32-37	S857/HoE/P32+37/GD REV B
Garage plots 8-11	S857/HoE/P8+11/GD REV B
Garage plots 15-79-81	S857/HoE/P15-79&81/GD REV B
Garage plots 16-99 20-21	S857/HoE/P16-99 +20-21/GD REV A
Garage plots 79-81	S857/HoE/P79&81/GD REV A
Garage plots 82-87	S857/HoE/P82-87/GD REV A

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.

In this case pre-application advice was not sought before submission. Officers secured amendments to the scheme during the formal assessment. However, the Local Planning Authority found that the amended scheme was still not acceptable and permission was therefore refused.

PL8 21/P/00976 - LOT 5, LAND TO THE WEST OF MANOR FARM COTTAGES, WESTWOOD LANE, WANBOROUGH, GUILDFORD, GU3 2JF

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

- Mr Oscar de Chazal (to object) and;
- Ms Mary Adkins (to object)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for provision of a water tap and a manhole to facilitate the provision of a mains water supply for the purposes of agriculture.

The Committee received a presentation from the planning officer, John Busher. The Committee noted that the application was for planning permission for a tap and manhole cover on land off Westwood Lane in Wanborough. The site was comprised of part of an agricultural field, in the Green Belt and an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) and located outside of the AONB boundary. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets where it had been incorrectly stated in the report that the site was within the AONB but the site actually sits outside of it. An additional comment had also been received from the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty officer.

The site was largely open and undeveloped and the proposed tap was very similar to an application the Committee had approved back in May 2021. The application sought permission for a water tap and no other development was proposed. The land remained in agricultural use. The application did not seek material change to the use of the land. Given the development was for an engineering operation in the Green Belt, the only consideration was the impact on the surrounding openness. As the proposed was for a tap and manhole cover, officers did not believe that there would be any loss of openness or discernable harm to the Green Belt nor impact on its character or appearance and had therefore recommended the application for approval.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that a significant piece of beautiful and open landscape had been sold off in various lots, in some cases to plant trees which would need water as well as possibly to graze livestock on. The Committee noted concerns therefore that this would not be the last tap application and the recommendation that the Article 4 Direction that covered this land was placed as an informative if it was approved.

The Committee noted that enforcement action was a regular activity on the adjacent site. Concern was noted that a tap or a proposal for tree planting would impact on the views in and out of the AGLV and views of the AONB as well as an impact on the openness. The planting of trees or use of livestock on the land would also require the erection of fences which was contrary to the Article 4 Direction as it would break up the openness of the land. The fields also flooded regularly and therefore the need for a tap was questioned.

The Head of Place, Dan Ledger confirmed that the Committee had to consider the application before it for a tap. The proposal was not for a change of use of the land. As the application was for an engineering operation and not a new agricultural building there was no requirement to establish whether the proposed works were 'reasonably necessary' for the purposes of agriculture.

The Committee noted the concerns raised however accepted that there was no relevant planning policies on which to refuse the application. The Committee agreed that the Article 4 Direction was attached as an informative.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Ruth Brothwell	X		
2	Pauline Searle	X		
3	Jan Harwood	X		
4	Deborah Seabrook	X		
5	Colin Cross	X		
6	Ramsey Nagaty			X
7	Angela Goodwin	X		
8	Marsha Moseley	X		
9	Angela Gunning			X
10	Tony Rooth			X
11	Liz Hogger	X		
12	Jon Askew	X		
13	Maddy Redpath	X		
14	David Bilbé (was not present for this application)			
	TOTALS	10	0	3

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

RESOLVED to approve application 21/P/00976 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report and the additional informative referring to the Article 4 Direction as detailed below:

2. The applicant's attention is drawn to the Article 4 Direction which is currently in place on this land. The applicant is advised to carefully consider the Article 4 Direction before commencing any work at this site.

PL9 21/P/01456 - LAND AT POYLE ROAD, TONGHAM

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

- Mr David Neame (Agent) (in support)

The Committee considered the full application for the erection of 38 no. dwellings, vehicular and pedestrian access, car parking and cycle storage together with associated landscaping and servicing (description amended 02/11/2021).

The Committee received a presentation from Jo Trask, Planning Officer. The Committee noted that there was a typo in condition 7 where reference to sooner should be replaced with 'season'. The application site was allocated for housing under policy A31 and fell within the urban area of Ash and Tongham. The site was also located within 400 metres to 5 kilometres of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). The site was also adjoined to a nature conservation area and a footpath ran along the western boundary. A total of 36 dwellings were proposed, comprising of a mix of detached and semi-detached flat and terrace style properties. Allocated and visitor parking would also be provided within the site. The site approved in 2020 was granted planning permission for 35 units and had been implemented. The proposed scheme sought an additional three units on a large site area and were

accommodated on plot A. The majority of the built form would be located in the middle of the plot therefore retaining the existing rural character as per the already approved scheme.

Planning officers accepted that there would be an inevitable change in the character and appearance of the land. The principle of development had already been found to be acceptable in the granting of the 35 units in 2020. The scheme currently proposed a net increase of 3 units on a slightly enlarged area. The proposal complied with the development plan and would not result in any material harm to the character of the area. The landscape buffer around the site would also be retained and would help the development integrate into its site. The proposed dwellings were considered to provide a good level of internal and external amenity for future residents. There would be no unacceptable harm to neighbouring residents and subject to conditions, the scheme would also be acceptable in terms of highway safety, trees, ecology, archaeology and sustainable construction. The planning officers recommendation was therefore to approve the application subject to a S106 agreement which would secure 40% affordable housing on site, contributions towards Thames Basin Heath mitigation, education, Ash Road Bridge Highways and NHS healthcare.

The Committee discussed the application and concerns raised that Tongham Parish Council had in fact been consulted given it referred to Ash Parish Council in the report. The Committee welcomed the good proportion of affordable housing offered as part of the development proposal. The Committee also sought clarification on the number of visitor parking spaces to be provided.

The Head of Place, Dan Ledger, confirmed that Tongham Parish Council had been consulted with and the reference to Ash Parish Council was a typo. It was also confirmed that a total of 7 visitor parking spaces would be provided.

The Committee agreed that the proposal for a net increase of 3 dwellings was acceptable and that no material harm would be caused to the character of the area. The landscape buffer around the site provided the opportunity for the scheme to be integrated into the wider area. The dwellings provided a good level of amenity and caused no unacceptable harm to neighbouring residents.

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	Colin Cross	X		
3	Pauline Searle	X		
4	Ruth Brothwell	X		
5	Jan Harwood	X		
6	David Bilbé (not present for this application)			
7	Angela Gunning	X		
8	Liz Hogger	X		
9	Marsha Moseley	X		
10	Tony Rooth	X		
11	Angela Goodwin	X		
12	Maddy Redpath	X		
13	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
14	Deborah Seabrook	X		
	TOTALS	13		

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

RESOLVED to approve application 21/P/01456 subject to a S106 Agreement securing the following contributions:

Contributions towards education infrastructure:

- Early years £25,576
- Primary years £124,925
- Secondary years £137,348

Total contribution towards education infrastructure: £287,849

SANG to be secured at Ash Green Meadows (privately owned SANG).

SAMM contribution of £26,187.80

40% affordable housing 15 units in perpetuity

Open space:

- A contribution based on 0.14ha provision towards formal playing space;
- Children's play space 0.1ha to be secured on site
- Amenity open space 1.65ha to be secured on site

A contribution of £1824 towards Highway safety improvements for a road safety scheme in the vicinity of the site

A contribution of £78,104.82 towards Heath Care

A contribution of £409,084 towards Ash Road Bridge

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 Head of Place/Director of Service Delivery. The recommendation is to approve planning permission, subject to conditions.

(iii) In the event that a satisfactory s.106 is not completed, the application be refused by the Head of Place/Director of Service Delivery.

PL10 APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee discussed and noted the appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 9.09 pm

Signed

Chairman

Date

This page is intentionally left blank