

PLANNING COMMITTEE

- * Councillor Vanessa King (Chairperson)
- * Councillor Dominique Williams (Vice-Chairperson)

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| * Councillor Bilal Akhtar | * Councillor Richard Mills OBE |
| Councillor Joss Bigmore | * Councillor Patrick Oven |
| * Councillor David Bilbe | * Councillor Maddy Redpath |
| * Councillor Yves de Contades | * Councillor Joanne Shaw |
| Councillor Lizzie Griffiths | * The Deputy Mayor, Councillor |
| * Councillor Stephen Hives | Howard Smith |
| Councillor James Jones | * Councillor Cait Taylor |

*Present

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillors Joss Bigmore, Lizzie Griffiths and James Jones with no substitutes in attendance.

PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest declared.

PL3 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 22 May 2024 were agreed and signed by the Chairperson as a true and accurate record.

PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the Chairperson's announcements.

**PL5 23/P/02127 - LAND TO THE NORTH OF MEADOW BARN COTTAGE,
EASHING LANE, MILFORD, GODALMING, GU8 5EP**

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

- Councillor Bridget Carter-Manning (Shackleford Parish Council) (to object);
- Mr John Miles (to object);
- Mr Tim Dawes (Agent) (in support) and;
- Mr Wade Disley (Applicant) (in support)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of four uncovered padel courts, reception building, two portacabins for toilet/shower facilities, septic tank, re-instatement of vehicle access and car parking. Associated landscaping works and external lighting scheme. (Description amended 26/01/24).

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Justin Williams. The Committee noted that there was another application, to be considered as part of the agenda, for two uncovered padel courts and would have a separate presentation. This application had been referred to the Committee for determination because of the number of letters of representation received contrary to the officer's recommendation.

The application site was located within the Green Belt and was within the Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). The site was currently in use as a playing field. Hurst Farm had recently received approval for 216 houses to the south (Waverley Borough Council application). The proposed four padel courts were located along the western boundary, with a reception building, toilets and changing area. Fencing was proposed around the padel courts with lighting columns on top. The proposed access was through existing mature hedgerow. There was a large amenity area that was to be retained by the applicant.

No objections had been received from Surrey County Highways, Sports England, National Highways, the Arboricultural Officer or Environmental Health. However, concerns had been raised the National Landscape Officer on the impact on the character and appearance of the AGLV. The Surrey Wildlife Trust had also raised concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on protected species, notably bats and dormice. A significant number of letters of representation had also been received in support and in objection to the application.

The proposal was for sporting facilities in the Green Belt. The NPPF stated that the provision of appropriate facilities in the Green Belt in connection with the use of land for outdoor sport or recreation is an appropriate form of development provided they preserved the openness of the Green Belt and did not conflict with the purposes of land within the Green Belt.

For the reasons outlined in the report, it was considered that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt, being contrary to the essential characteristics of keeping land open and at least one of the purposes of the Green Belt and encroachment into the countryside. As outlined in the NPPF, the proposal was therefore considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and therefore very special circumstances would need to exist to outweigh any harm. It was considered that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the AGLV. The proposal would include external lighting in an area which was currently unlit, although it was noted that there are streetlights along Guildford Road to the west of the site. Concerns had been raised by the Surrey Wildlife Trust regarding the potential impact on the protected species from the proposed lighting. The proposal would also result in the reinstatement of an existing access which was significantly overgrown as well as works required to improve visibility in the area. This would significantly change the appearance of the area. It was considered that the applicant had put forward some very special circumstances to overcome the harm in principle. However, these did not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm identified. The application was therefore recommended for refusal.

In response to comments made by public speakers, the Joint Assistant Director for Planning, Claire Upton-Brown wished to clarify that Hurst Farm sat within Waverley Borough Council, rather than Guildford, and was an allocated site within the Local Plan. Therefore the issue of Hurst Farm being on Green Belt land was examined as part of the Local Plan process and was allocated as part of that plan making process.

The Committee discussed the application and noted the benefits afforded by the application by encouraging health and recreation through sport. Concern was however expressed about the planning history of the site which related to a number of refused applications. The Committee also noted that an extraordinary number of letters of support, totalling 223 had been submitted which was questioned as to whether these actually came from local residents. A bat survey had also not been carried out. Most importantly the substantial harm caused to the Green Belt by this proposal was perceived as not being outweighed by very special circumstances.

The Committee asked for clarification as to the proximity of the site to the Surrey Hills National Landscape boundary, and if that boundary were to be extended, would it include this site. The Senior Planning Officer, Justin Williams confirmed that if the boundary were to be extended it would still not include this site.

The Committee noted that aside from the immediate three cottages that would be affected by the proposal, there was also the wider and much larger village which owing to the wider proximity of the site would not be affected. The Senior Officer for Planning, Justin Williams confirmed that the village fell within the boundary of Waverley. The impact therefore applied to the immediate properties that were in the Guildford boundary.

The Committee agreed that there were no exceptional circumstances that warranted the development of four padel courts in the Green Belt. It was also noted that padel courts were noisy spaces which was not an appropriate sport for the space proposed in this case.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
		FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Pat Oven	X		
2	David Bilbé	X		
3	Howard Smith	X		
4	Stephen Hives	X		
5	Cait Taylor			X
6	Bilal Akhtar	X		
7	Richard Mills	X		
8	Yves de Contades	X		
9	Maddy Redpath	X		
10	Dominique Williams	X		
11	Joanna Shaw	X		
12	Vanessa King	X		
	TOTALS	11	0	1

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 23/P/02127 for the reasons as detailed in the report and amended reasons for refusal, 2, 3 and 4 as detailed on the supplementary late sheets.

**PL6 23/P/02128 - LAND TO THE NORTH OF MEADOW BARN COTTAGE,
EASHING LANE, MILFORD, GODALMING GU8 5EP**

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

- Councillor Philip Randall (Shackleford Parish Council) (to object) and;
- Mr John Miles (to object)
- (The applicant, Mr Wade Disley declined to speak in support)

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of four padel courts (two covered, two uncovered), reception building, two porta cabins for toilet/shower facilities, septic tank, re-instatement of vehicle access and car parking. Associated landscaping works and external lighting scheme. (Description amended 26/01/24).

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Justin Williams. The application had been referred to the Committee because of the number of letters of representation contrary to the officer's recommendation.

The site was located in the same area as per application 23/P/02127 and the layout was the same. The difference was that the middle two padel courts would have a covering over them so that it could be played in all weathers. The remainder of the application was identical to 23/P/02127.

No objections had been received from Surrey County Highways, Sport England, National Highways, the Arboricultural Officer or Environmental Health. Concerns had however been raised by the National Landscape Officer regarding the impact on the character of the AGLV and the Surrey Wildlife Trust regarding the impact upon protected species.

Again, a significant number of letter of representation had been received for this application both in support and in objection. Officers considered that the proposal would still constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt and that there were no very special circumstances to outweigh that harm. The application was therefore recommended for refusal.

The Committee requested clarification on the size of the reception building, which in this application was 12.8 metres (w) x 7 metres (l) and in the previous application was 6 metres in length. The Senior Officer for Planning, Justin Williams confirmed that the buildings were the same size and it was a typo.

The Committee again commended the proposal to provide sporting facilities. However, they did not support the location of the padel courts and its effect upon the community in terms of noise and light pollution as well as on the adjacent woodland. No exceptional circumstances were identified that would support this development taking place in the Green Belt.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Richard Mills	X		
2	Howard Smith	X		
3	Stephen Hives	X		
4	Maddy Redpath	X		
5	Bilal Akhtar	X		
6	David Bilbé	X		
7	Joanna Shaw	X		
8	Yves de Contades	X		
9	Vanessa King	X		
10	Dominique Williams	X		
11	Cait Taylor			X
12	Pat Oven	X		
	TOTALS	11	0	1

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 23/P/02128 for the reasons as detailed in the report and subject to the amendments made to conditions, 2,3 and 4 as detailed in the supplementary late sheets.

PL7 23/P/01088 - HOWARD OF EFFINGHAM SCHOOL, LOWER ROAD, EFFINGHAM, LEATHERHEAD, KT24 5 JR

The Committee considered the above-mentioned reserved matters application pursuant to outline permission 21/P/01283, approved on 15/09/2022, to

consider appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of the erection of 99 dwellings on the existing Howard of Effingham School site, Lower Road, Effingham, Leatherhead, KT24 5JR.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer Becky Souter. The Committee noted that the application had been referred to Committee by the Joint Assistant Director for Planning owing to it being a strategic matter.

The Committee noted that it was a reserved matters application for 99 dwellings which followed a consented outline permission, determined by the Secretary of State in 2018. The principle of development had therefore already been agreed and this application was to provide the details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the 99 dwellings on the parcel of land known as the existing school site. The quantum for up to 99 dwellings had been agreed through the outline and reserved matters, consent had already been granted for the replacement school and the dwellings on the parcel of land opposite. This application was the final reserved matters submission, as the principle had already been agreed.

The matters that could be considered at reserved matters stage were more limited in scope than a full application. The outline permission also provided the overarching legal agreement and conditions to cover all parcels of development. Therefore, the conditions recommended for this application were only concerned with matters which were a direct consideration of the reserved matters. A number of highway conditions were covered in the outline consent as well as conditions relating to tree matters and biodiversity enhancements.

The Committee noted the approved outline master plan for the existing school site would have one access onto Lower Road leading to a central open space area and cul-de-sac of residential development comprised of dwellings and apartments. The approved parameter plans from the outline application showed that the taller buildings were located around the central open space area. The site layout plan to be considered was reflective of the outline Master Plan layout. There was a single vehicular access point onto Lower Road adjacent to the retained Lodge building. The scheme had a central green for open space, a playground and a further pocket of open space with wildflower grassland. A pedestrian and cycle link was to be provided along the eastern boundary, which would connect Lower Road to a public footpath.

The development would deliver a mix of 1- and 2-bedroom flat, 2, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom houses with a strong frontage of buildings along Lower Road. The original Master Plan envisaged an apartment block in the eastern corner with a

small row of terraced properties above that. That development had been removed from the eastern corner owing to the sensitivity of neighbouring heritage assets.

The eastern boundary was in close proximity to All Saints Church, a Grade II star listed church and its graveyard as well as Little Bookham Conservation Area and a Grade II Manor House School. A green buffer was provided at the edge of the residential development and a pedestrian cycle link ran the full length of that boundary. The details of boundary treatments had not been provided as the applicant was still finalising the details and intended to consult further with relevant local groups. However, condition 8 was in place to secure details of boundary treatments. The fencing though was likely to comprise of metal railing which was 1.5 metres high with rounded tops.

The southern boundary adjoins the Effingham Conservation Area and had previously attracted concerns from local groups, including the King George the fifth residents. Again, the details of the boundary treatment was secured under condition 8.

In conclusion, it was a reserved matter application and as such the principle of development had already been established. It was considered that the design and layout of the proposal was an overall improvement compared to the indicative master plan and details submitted as part of the appeal for the outline consent. The proposal did not result in any harm to heritage assets, neighbouring amenity or highways. No objections had been raised by statutory consultees apart from the parish council. The application was therefore considered acceptable and was recommended for approval subject to conditions as detailed in the agenda.

The Committee discussed the application and asked for clarification regarding the eastern boundary and the removal of four of the dwellings and whether these had been absorbed elsewhere in the development and increased its density overall. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the four dwellings had been absorbed elsewhere in the development. Densities had increased in the central area, but this was where the greater densities were expected to be and had not led to a significant increase overall.

The Committee noted disappointment at the lack of affordable housing provided which equated to 20% as opposed to 40%. In addition, the only 4 affordable homes had no garden. The Senior Planning Officer, Becky Souter confirmed that affordable housing could not be re-visited at this stage and that suitable shared outside spaces had been provided.

The Committee discussed the concerns raised by both the Parish Council and Effingham Residents' Association regarding the cycleway. It was recommended that the cycleway was built prior to the houses being built. This was in the interest of children safety travelling to school who would use the cycleway extensively. The Committee agreed to amend the current condition to ensure that the cycleway was prioritised prior to the construction of the houses.

The Committee noted concerns raised regarding difficulties obtaining a GP appointment and wanted assurance that a GP surgery would be built as part of the development. It was confirmed that a new surgery was proposed already as part of the outline application.

The Committee wanted to clarify how the revised scheme preserved the integrity of conservation and enhance heritage assets. It was confirmed that the enhancements to the scheme made overall represented an improvement upon the scheme overall.

The Committee wanted to know if the houses would operate air source heat pumps. It was confirmed that it was likely that the houses would have air source heat pumps fitted owing to the sustainability statement submitted.

The Committee noted that the scheme also included a Local Area of Play (LEAP) for younger children which was also close to King George the fifth recreation ground and the pedestrian link.

The Committee supported the design and layout proposed. A motion was moved and seconded to approve the application which was carried.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Bilal Akhtar	X		
2	David Bilbé	X		
3	Cait Taylor	X		
4	Pat Oven	X		
5	Maddy Redpath	X		
6	Dominique Williams	X		
7	Stephen Hives	X		
8	Richard Mills	X		
9	Yves de Contades	X		
10	Joanna Shaw	X		
11	Vanessa King	X		
12	Howard Smith	X		
	TOTALS	12	0	0

RESOLVED to approve application 23/P/01088 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report, amended conditions 1 and 7 as detailed on the supplementary late sheets and amended condition 12 to require that the construction of the cycleway took place prior to the development of any houses.

PL8 24/P/00331 - WEYSIDE URBAN VILLAGE, (SLYFIELD REGENERATION PROGRAMME), GUILDFORD, GU1

The Committee considered the above-mentioned reserved matters application pursuant to outline permission 20/P/02155 permitted on 30/03/2022, to consider appearance, means of access, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of the erection of a new GBC Depot, Multi Storey Car Park, MOT Test Centre, storage buildings and workshops with associated external areas of hard and soft landscaping, parking and storage. (EIA Development).

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer John Busher. The application had been submitted on behalf of Guildford Borough Council, acting in its capacity as landowner, in support of the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project. A hybrid application was granted in March 2022 for the sustainable mixed-use development, now referred to as Weyside Urban Village. The Master Plan incorporated new homes, integrated alongside landscaped open spaces, community and retail facilities with associated infrastructure, including highways and green spaces. It also made provision for the relocation of the

Council's existing Woking Road Depot and the sewage treatment works from the southern part of the site.

The site was located in an area of existing scrubland and to the east of Slyfield Industrial Estate there was an area of green space and beyond that the River Wey. The surrounding area was formerly used as a Council waste landfill site but had since been covered up and left as unmanaged scrubland. The site adjoined the new sewage treatment plant which was currently under construction. Slyfield Industrial Estate was accessed via Moorfield Road from the junction with Woking Road. Moorfield Road ran through the centre of the industrial estate and linked to a newly constructed road which provided access into the new Council depot.

A revised reserved matters application was previously approved in March 2023, but has since been amended to reflect changes in the operational requirements. The revised scheme was very similar to the previously approved reserved matters application. The new depot brought together a range of Council departments and services onto one site, including waste services, street scene parks, housing repairs and supporting urban teams. The principle changes included the reduction in the scale and massing of the multi-storey car park which was associated with the development. The car park was now much smaller and had moved back into the site. This had also improved views from the River Wey. There was also a reduction in the number of parking spaces, due to the exclusion of public parking and vehicle storage from the multi-storey car park and the restriction of staff and operational vehicles. There were also minor changes to the internal layout of the depot building itself where the second floor was now to be used as a bulk store and the previous conference and rentable office spaces removed. A simplification of the structure improved the buildability of the proposal. A revised colour palette for the materials softened the appearance of the built form in the landscape as well as increased soft landscaping in areas which provided the maximum benefit in terms of ecology and visual appearance.

The most significant change from the previously approved scheme was the exclusion of the public parking and the loss of 73 spaces from the multi-storey car park which had enabled a reduction in the size of the multi-storey car park. It was recognised that this was an additional benefit of the previously consented scheme that was considered by members. The County Highway Authority had expressed a preference for some public parking provision to be made, but as officers had concluded, this was not a requirement of the hybrid consent and the original outline application. The development had made sufficient provision to meet its own needs and the design of the depot and security requirements did not allow for public access to the site compounds. There was therefore very little

needs for that level of public parking anymore. It had been agreed with the County Highway Authority that an informative would be added to the permission to ensure that the impact of the development on parking provision more generally on surrounding roads would be carefully monitored.

The additional facilities would result in an increase in vehicular movements, but this would be lower than the previously approved scheme due to the changes in the multi-storey car park and also the changes to the floorspace and removal of the conference facilities and office space. The complex had been designed to meet current operational requirements but had also been designed to accommodate potential changing accommodation needs in the future.

The Committee noted the eastern elevation of the building which had been reduced in size. The Guildford Society had previously raised concerns about the scale of the original building proposed which was now much smaller and as a result had disappeared in view from the banks of the River Wey. Officers were of the view that this scheme represented an improvement upon the previously approved application and recommended it for approval.

The Committee discussed the application and was concerns regarding the potential for parking overspill in neighbouring roads. It was confirmed by the Senior Planning Officer, John Busher that the parking provision had previously been made for the conference facilities as well as potential visitors to the private office space, both elements had now been removed. The parking provision was not for members of the public more generally and was only for visitors to the site so should not result in an overspill of parking locally.

The Committee received confirmation that additional trees would be planted along the eastern boundary to act as a buffer between the development and the River Wey as well as providing a haven for wildlife.

The Committee received clarification that green spaces for staff could not be created onsite owing to the operational nature of the depot with heavy goods vehicles moving around.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Pat Oven	X		
2	Richard Mills	X		
3	Vanessa King	X		
4	Stephen Hives	X		
5	Bilal Akhtar	X		
6	Howard Smith	X		
7	David Bilbé	X		
8	Dominique Williams	X		
9	Yves de Contades	X		
10	Cait Taylor	X		
11	Joanna Shaw	X		
12	Maddy Redpath	X		
	TOTALS	12	0	0

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

RESOLVED to approve application 24/P/00331 subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the report.

PL9 24/P/00639 - 96 STOKE ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 4JN

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of two canopies one fixed and one retractable over an existing eating area to the rear of the property. (Retrospective application).

The application had been referred to the Planning Committee because the owner of the site is a member of the Council.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Justin Williams. The Committee noted that the canopies were already in situ and the application was retrospective. To the north of the site was an Indian Takeaway and a pub and residential flats towards the rear of the site and a row of three terraced properties. You could still see the flats when the retractable canopy was shut and/or open. A fixed canopy area was located towards the back of the café.

The proposal would provide a covered eating area for the users of the café. No letters of representation had been received and it was not considered that the proposed works materially affected the appearance of the property, nor did they

materially impact upon the amenities of the occupiers or the adjacent neighbouring properties. A condition was recommended to restrict the use of the area underneath the canopies, to ensure the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties above and towards the rear were not affected by noise disturbance. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Committee discussed the application and received clarification that restricted use of the canopies referred to preventing people who sit outside in those external areas outside of those hours. The Committee noted that no objections had been received but wished for condition 2 regarding the restricted use of the canopy to be made clearer as follows:

2. The eating area underneath the canopies hereby approved shall not be open to customers outside the following times: 07:30 - 15:00 Monday to Friday, 08:00 - 15:00 Saturdays and 09:00 - 15:00 Sundays and bank holidays Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent neighbouring properties.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Cait Taylor	X		
2	Joanna Shaw	X		
3	Maddy Redpath	X		
4	Richard Mills	X		
5	David Bilbé	X		
6	Bilal Akhtar	X		
7	Stephen Hives	X		
8	Howard Smith	X		
9	Pat Oven	X		
10	Dominique Williams	X		
11	Vanessa King	X		
12	Yves de Contades	X		
	TOTALS	12	0	0

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

RESOLVED to approve application 24/P/00639 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL10 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee discussed and noted the appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 9.02 pm

Signed

Date

Chairman