

Planning Committee

29 March 2023

Update/Amendment/Correction/List

Election of Vice-Chairman

The Committee will be asked to elect a Vice-Chairman.

Planning Committee Minutes – 1 March 2023

The minutes of the above meeting are attached for the Committee's approval.

21/P/02333 – (Page 21) – Land south and east of the Cathedral Church of the Holy Spirit, Stag Hill, The Chase, Guildford, GU2 7UP

Reason for referral

This application has been referred to the Planning Committee by the *Joint Strategic Director, Place* because the development would affect a sensitive, prominent site in Guildford and is for a site allocation in the Guildford Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2019-2034.

3. Formal Recommendation)

3.1 Reasons for refusal (page 28-29)

1.	The proposed development would harm the setting of heritage assets due to the resulting harm to the significance of the: a) close setting - from the intrusion and loss of separation by the built development into the eastern meadow, the visual prominence of the apartment blocks and roofscapes, the intensification of development on undeveloped parkland and encroachment of dwellings into the western processional route; and b) wider setting - encroachment of the built form into the 'green collar', that forms the foreground to the landmark silhouette in the townscape
----	--

	<p>The proposal would result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) less than substantial harm (middle of the spectrum) to the Cathedral Church of the Holy Spirit to appreciate the open spaces, monumental scale, topography, visibility, contrast with loss of the green foreground and loss of sky gap; ii) less than substantial harm (at the lowest end of that spectrum) to the two lodges to the south to appreciate the symmetrical arrangement in views from the south; iii) less than substantial harm (at the lowest end of that spectrum) to the Guildford Castle from the visual distraction and loss of the expansive town vista when looking towards Guildford Castle from the eastern meadows. <p>Special regard is given to the need to preserve heritage assets as required by Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990. Whilst public benefit would result from the development, including the provision of new housing and affordable housing, the endowment to the Cathedral resulting from the sale proceeds of the site and wider tree planting, this does not outweigh the harm to the significance of the heritage assets. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies D3 and A15(3) of the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (2019), <i>Policy D18</i> of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2022) as well as Chapter 16 of the NPPF (2021).</p>
2.	<p>The proposed development due to the design approach, layout and appearance fails to take the opportunities available to respect the context and identity of the surrounding areas and the very special quality of the parkland around the Cathedral and the way it functions, shaped by the quality of the landscape and views in and out of the site. The proposals do not achieve the exceptional and innovative design quality required to respond to the sensitive setting of the Grade II* Cathedral nor reinforces locally distinctive patterns of development, which would raise the standard of design more generally in the area. The scale and site layout has been predominantly dictated by the quantum of development,</p>

resulting in the introduction of a visually prominent development from the surrounding roads, townscape and Cathedral parkland with little relatable expression of locally reflective character or a positive identity through the interpretation of local vernacular patterns of development, or sympathetic contemporary design. By virtue of this and the:

- a) isolated location, style and appearance of the clergy housing, given their functional relationship;
- b) contrasting typologies of housing at the top of the Eastern Slopes, would not integrate well, thereby affected the hierarchy of streets;
- c) lack of a sense of arrival from the top of the central steps between the apartment blocks into the grounds around the Cathedral;
- d) the form, profile and rigid large block based apartment buildings;
- e) projecting balconies facing Ridgemount;
- f) single level gardens on the Western Parcel creates the need for larger retaining wall features;
- g) form, profile, setting, sectional relationship would not relate to Alresford Road;
- h) wayfinding and understanding of the parkland setting would be limited from Alresford Road;
- i) visibility of the westernmost houses on the Western Parcel from the western processional route;
- j) conflict between private and public thresholds where gardens and terraces have an aspect onto public open space;
- k) broad palette of four bricks; and
- l) Opportunities for informal car parking on the wide roads and verges;

This development would not establish an attractive, locally resonant sense of place within its own right or as a community on the slopes of the Cathedral.

The submitted Design and Access Statement and Addendum does not provide a sufficient explanation of principles that could inform the design and layout including the work undertaken in the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) (December 2022). This absence of an appreciation of the

	<p>analysis or interpretation of local architectural style, character, landscape, views or context setting fails to produce a design response adequate for this nationally important setting and parkland, that would provide a strong and positive response given what is so special and unique about this site and its hilltop location. The applicant has failed to take the opportunities identified during the Design Review process to improve the design quality of this proposal. This would be contrary to policies D1 and A15 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: strategy and sites (2019), Policy D4 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan (2022), Landscape Character Assessment (2007) the NPPF (2021) and the National Design Guide (2019).</p>
3.	<p>The built form on the southern side of the Eastern Meadows would have a residual, adverse effects on the outward, south eastern view from viewpoint 15 in the Guildford Town Centre Views SPD and a Major adverse effect for visual receptor V11 (Stag Hill), as identified in the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) (December 2022). Furthermore, the proposed housing would compromise this unique and secluded area of open space as their courtyard gardens would open out onto the meadow. The proposals would have a harmful impact on the ability to enjoy and appreciate the landscape character and visual amenity from this elevated location which provides a vantage point over the town centre and would be compromised by the domestication and privatisation, further reducing its accessible as an area of public open space. This would fail to comply with the objectives of policies S3 and D1(4) of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: strategy and sites (2019), policy D4(3) of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2022), Guildford Town Centre Views SPD (2019), Landscape Character Assessment (2007) the NPPF (2021) and the National Design Guide (2019).</p>
4.	<p>The site lies within the 400m to 5km zone of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). In the absence of a completed planning obligation, the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that there will be no likely significant effect on the Special Protection Area and is unable to</p>

	<p>satisfy itself that this proposal, either alone or in combination with other development, would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area and the relevant Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). As such, the development would be contrary to the objectives of saved Policy NE4 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (as saved by CLG Direction on 24/09/07), Policy P5 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites, 2019 and with saved Policy NRM6 of the South-East Plan 2009. For the same reasons, the development would fail to meet the requirements of Regulation 63 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 as amended, and as the development does not meet the requirements of Regulation 64 the Local Planning Authority must refuse to grant planning permission.</p>
5.	<p>In the absence of a completed planning obligation the development fails to mitigate its impact on infrastructure provision. This includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• provision of 31 affordable homes in accordance with Council's approved tenure split;• provision of 13 homes for occupation as staff accommodation by the Cathedral;• A contribution towards SANG mitigation in accordance with the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance Strategy 2017;• A contribution towards SAMM in accordance with the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance Strategy 2017;• A contribution of £70,000 towards an improved pedestrian crossing at The Chase/St Johns;• A contribution of £40,000 towards mitigating traffic on local residential roads;• A contribution of £35,000 towards the improvement of two bus stops within the vicinity of the site;• A contribution of £7,000 towards speed survey studies within the vicinity of the site;• £14,000 towards the upgrading, improvement and/or potential re-routing of Footpath 6 from Scholars Walk to the University site;

- £6,150 for the monitoring of the Travel Plan;
- Implementation of two Electric Vehicle Car Club spaces;
- To offer to each household of each residential unit free membership of the Car Club for two years;
- A contribution of £130,632 to support sustainable travel choices, to the Yorkie's Bridge section of the Sustainable Movement Corridor (SMC);
- A contribution to early years, primary and secondary education;
- A contribution for additional floor space at primary care facilities;
- A contribution to policing infrastructure;
- Provision and maintenance of public open spaces for the lifetime of the development;
- A contribution to off-site playing fields/sport provision;
- A contribution to off-site play space provision; and
- Implementation of new tree planting along the western approach to the Cathedral.

Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policies P5, H2, ID1 and ID3 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (2019), ~~saved Policy NE4 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (as saved by CLG Direction on 24/09/07)~~, saved Policy NRM6 of the South-East Plan (2009), Policy ID6 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2022); the Council's Planning Contributions SPD (2017) and the NPPF (2021).

11. Planning policies.

11.4 Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (LPSS) 2019 (page 47)

The Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites was adopted by Council on 25 April 2019. The Plan carries full weight as part of the Council's Development Plan. ~~The Local Plan 2003 policies that are not superseded are retained and continue to form part of the Development Plan (see Appendix 8 of the Local Plan: strategy and sites for superseded Local Plan 2003 policies).~~

11.5 Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP) 2023 (page 48)

The LPDMP was adopted by the Council on 22.03.2023. This now forms part of the statutory development plan and the policies are given full weight.

The officer report refers to the policy titles in the submission version dated June 2022, this needs to be cross-referenced with the adopted version:

Submission version	Adopted version	
H8	H7	First Homes
P8/P9	P6	Protecting Important Habitats and Species
P6/P7	P7	Biodiversity in New Developments
P10	P8	Land Affected by Contamination
P11	P9	Air Quality and Air Quality Management Areas
P12	P10	Water Quality, Waterbodies and Riparian Corridors
P13	P11	Sustainable Surface Water Management
D4	D4	Achieving High Quality Design and Respecting Local Distinctiveness
D5	D5	Protection of Amenity and Provision of Amenity Space
D5a	D6	External Servicing Features and Stores
D8	D7	Public Realm
D9	D8	Residential infill development
D10	D10	Noise Impacts
D10a	D12	Light Impacts and Dark Skies
D12	D14	Sustainable and Low Impact Development
D13	D15	Climate Change Adaptation
D14	D16	Carbon Emissions from Buildings
D16	D18	Designated Heritage Assets
D17	D19	Listed Buildings

D18	D20	Conservation Areas
D19	D21	Scheduled Monuments
D19a	D22	Registered Parks and Gardens
D20	D23	Non-designated Heritage Assets
D21	D24	Enabling Development and Heritage Assets
ID5	ID5	Protecting Open Space
ID6	ID6	Open Space in New Developments
ID10	ID9	Achieving a Comprehensive Guildford Borough Cycle Network
ID11	ID10	Parking Standards

11.9 Guildford Borough Local Plan (GBLP) 2003 (as saved by CLG Direction 24 September 2007)

~~Policy G1: General Standards of Development~~

~~Policy G5: Design Code~~

~~Policy H4: Housing in Urban Areas~~

~~Policy HE4: Development which affects the setting of a Listed Building~~

~~Policy HE10: Development which affects the setting of a Conservation Area~~

~~Policy NE4: Species Protection~~

~~Policy NE5: Development Affecting Trees, Hedges and Woodland~~

~~Policy R2: Recreational Open Space in relation to Large New Residential~~

The officer report refers to policies within the saved Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003. These are now superseded by specific policies in the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP) 2023.

12. Planning considerations.

Amendments and corrections.

22/P/00738 – (Page 163) – Ipsley Lodge Stables, Hogs Back, Seale, Guildford, Surrey, GU10 1LA

Planning policies.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2021:

2. Achieving sustainable development.
4. Decision-making.
5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes.
8. Promoting healthy and safe communities.
9. Promoting sustainable transport.
11. Making effective use of land.
12. Achieving well-designed places.
14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change.
15. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS), 2015:

The Government also published Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) in August 2015. The overarching aim of the PPTS is to ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates the traditional and nomadic way of life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community.

For decision taking, the PPTS states that Local Planning Authorities should consider the following issues amongst other relevant matters when considering planning applications for traveller sites:

- a) the existing level of local provision and need for sites;
- b) the availability (or lack) of alternative accommodation for the applicants;
- c) other personal circumstances of the applicant;
- d) that the locally specific criteria used to guide the allocation of sites in plans or which form the policy where there is no identified need for pitches/plots should be used to assess applications that may come forward on unallocated site and
- e) that they should determine applications for sites from any travellers and not just those with local connections.

South East Plan (SEP), 2009:

NRM6: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.

Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (LPSS), 2015-2034:

The Council is able to demonstrate a five year housing land supply with an appropriate buffer. This supply is assessed as being 6.46 years based on most recent evidence as reflected in the GBC LAA (2002). In addition to this, the Government's recently published Housing Delivery Test indicates that Guildford's 2021 measurement is 144%. For the purposes of NPPF footnote 8, this is therefore greater than the threshold set out in paragraph 222 (75%). Therefore, the Plan and its policies are regarded as up-to-date in terms of paragraph 11 of the NPPF.

S2: Planning for the borough - our spatial development strategy

H1: Homes for all

P1: Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Area of Great Landscape Value

P3: Countryside

P5: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

D1: Place shaping

D2: Climate change, sustainable design, construction and energy.

ID3: Sustainable transport for new developments

ID4: Green and blue infrastructure

Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2023

Guildford's Local Plan Development Management Policies (LPDMP) was adopted by the Council on 22 March 2023. This now forms part of the statutory development plan and the policies are given full weight.

P7: Biodiversity in New Developments

P6: Protecting Important Habitats and Species

P11: Sustainable Surface Water Management

D4: Achieving High Quality Design and Respecting Local Distinctiveness

D5: Protection of Amenity and Provision of Amenity Space

D14: Sustainable and Low Impact Development

ID10: Parking Standards for new development

Supplementary Planning Documents

Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy SPD 2020
Guildford Landscape Character Assessment 2007
Parking Standards for New Development 2023

With regard to informative 1:

Omit the word '(either)'

With regard to condition 4:

Within the reason section at the end of the sentence add: and in order to minimise the impact on bats.

Add an additional informative:

With reference to condition 4 and external lighting, it is recommended that the applicant refers to: <https://www.bats.org.uk/our-work/buildings-planning-and-development/lighting>

Summary of The Pines, Green Lane East, Normandy, GU23 2JL Appeal Decision

Appeal A (APP/Y3615/W/21/3287182) Appeal B (APP/Y3615/W/21/3287186)

Two applications were made on 4 March 2021 in respect of both sites (A and B), seeking the permanent occupation of both sites for the stationing of caravans for residential purposes for gypsy pitches. These were both refused and are the subject of these appeals.

Appeal A - 21/P/00454, dated 4 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2021. The application sought planning permission for variation of condition 3 of planning consent 10/P/00507 (approved on appeal on 14/06/2011) for the use of land for stationing of caravans for residential purposes for 1 gypsy pitch, with ancillary utility/day room, to allow permanent occupation of the pitch on the site without complying with conditions attached to planning permission Ref 15/P/02363, dated 5 March 2018.

The conditions in dispute are Nos 1 and 2 which state that:

- (1) *The use hereby permitted shall be carried on only by the following individuals: John Searle (senior) and John Searle (junior) and their dependants and shall be for a limited period being the period of three (3) years from the date of this decision, or the period during which the premises are occupied by them, whichever is the shorter.*
- (2) *When the premises cease to be occupied by those named in condition 1) above, or at the end of three (3) years, whichever shall first occur, the use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, buildings, structures, materials and equipment brought on to the land, or works undertaken to it in connection with the use, shall be removed and the land restored to its condition before the development took place.*

Appeal B - Ref 21/P/00456, dated 4 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2021.

The application for planning permission for the use of land for the stationing of caravans for residential purposes for 1 No. gypsy pitch together with a utility/dayroom ancillary to that use without complying with conditions attached to planning permission Ref 15/P/02364, dated 5 March 2018.

The conditions in dispute are Nos 1 and 2 which state that:

- (1) *The use hereby permitted shall be carried on only by the following individuals: Jade Searle and her dependants and shall be for a limited period being the period of three (3) years from the date of this decision, or the period during which the premises are occupied by them, whichever is the shorter.*
- (2) *When the premises cease to be occupied by those named in condition 1) above, or at the end of three (3) years, whichever shall first occur, the use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, buildings, structures, materials and equipment brought on to the land, or works undertaken to it in connection with the use, shall be removed and the land restored to its condition before the development took place.*

The Inspector found that the openness of the Green Belt had been reduced as a result of the development and would continue be reduced through the ongoing use of the sites, and the development and caravans associated with

this. In the context of the rural edge, but in close proximity to existing development the Inspector concluded that the development would result in moderate harm to the openness and the purpose of including land within the Green Belt.

The Inspector accepted that Guildford Borough Council can demonstrate a supply of deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites against its locally set target and that this target includes those persons who would fall outside of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) Annex 1 definition of a traveller.⁽¹⁾

However, the Inspector went on to point out, that whether or not there were alternative sites available is a relevant matter and that alternative accommodation would need to be suitable, affordable, available and acceptable. The Inspector noted that the Council is seeking to deliver a number public pitches during the plan period, however, it was confirmed that there are currently no alternative pitches available that the sites' occupants could move to in the short-term.

The Inspector referred to caselaw which established that there was no burden on the appellant to prove that there are no alternative pitches or sites available and whilst in this case the appellants were not on the waiting list for a Council site, 17 people were already on the waiting list, (although it was accepted that this could not be relied upon to provide an accurate assessment of need as it may include those currently residing on private sites but looking to move to a public site for example). However, due to the absence of alternative sites in the short term, this could lead to the occupants of the site having to resort to an unauthorised roadside encampment or doubling up on pitches occupied by extended family, neither of which the Inspector considered to be satisfactory.

The Inspector referred to Article 3 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child which requires a child's best interests to be a primary consideration, and no other consideration must be regarded as more important or given greater weight than the best interests of any child. In this case, whilst the Inspector acknowledged that it would certainly be in the best interests of the children on the site to continue to have access to education and health care from a settled base, she also acknowledged that it was also not uncommon for children to move schools or change GPs when their families move home.

The Inspector concluded that in the absence of suitable, acceptable, and affordable alternative locations to which the occupants could move to in the short-term, (should the appeals be rejected), the families would be either forced into a roadside existence or into doubling up with other family members, with likely issues around overcrowding arising. The Inspector considered that this would have a negative impact upon the child on that site attending school. In addition, having no settled base would not give the pre-school aged children currently residing on the sites an optimal start in life. The Inspector also found that it would cause some inconvenience in terms of medical care. This result, she considered would not be in the best interest of the children.

The Inspector also found that that despite the sites being located outside the defined settlement boundary, they are not detached from the settlement, given their proximity to development both within and adjacent to the boundary. Whilst concerns were raised that this may set a precedent for similar forms of development, she concluded that any such proposal would have to be assessed on its own individual planning merits.

In this appeal, the sites were located within the Green Belt and the applicant sought unrestricted occupation of the site; as such the Inspector rightly stated that the personal circumstances of the occupants of the site would not be a factor to weigh against the harm to the Green Belt and that the other considerations put forward in favour of the proposals did not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt sufficiently to amount to the very special circumstances to allow the permanent occupation of the sites on an unrestricted basis.

However, taking into account the Public Sector Equality Duty and the best interest of the children residing on the site which is a primary consideration, as well as the right to respect private and family life enriched under Article 8 of the Human Rights Act, the Inspector considered whether a personal permission would be appropriate and able to amount to very special circumstances to justify the proposal. It was considered that should a personal permission be granted it is likely that the sites would remain occupied in the long-term with the harm to the Green Belt arising from this to be similarly long-term, and in the Inspectors view, not dissimilar to the permanent occupation of the site; and as such the personal circumstances were not considered to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.

In this instance it was considered that a temporary permission would reduce the period in which the actual harm to the openness of the Green Belt would

occur. Given the sites occupants had changed in the case of appeal site A and that there were children residing on both sites, whose best interests would not be served should the appeal be dismissed, the Inspector concluded that this would be sufficient to amount to the very special circumstances to outweigh the Green Belt harm and that a further temporary permission should be granted for both sites. This would enable the occupants of the sites time to find suitable alternative accommodation whilst allowing for more delivery of sites through the Local Plan and that three years should be a sufficient time period within which this could take place.

⁽¹⁾ Court of Appeal in *Smith v SSLUCH & Ors* found the definition in Annex 1 of the PPTS to be unlawful on the basis that it discriminates against those gypsies and travellers who have permanently ceased to travel due to age and / or disability

22/P/01770 – (Page 209) – Chalk Barton, Shere Road, West Horsley, Leatherhead, KT24 6EW

Guildford Borough Council v (1) Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities

and (2) Christopher Weeks.

On 17 March 2023, the High Court handed down judgement in the matter of a statutory review by Guildford Borough Council against a Planning Inspector's grant of planning permission at Foxwell Cottage, Hunts Hill Road, Normandy. The review proceeded on a single ground, namely that the Planning Inspector had misinterpreted Policy P2(2) of the Guildford Borough Plan 2015-2034 ("GBP").

Policy P2 closely mirrors the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") in seeking to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development and states that development will not be permitted unless it falls within one of the exemptions listed in the NPPF. Of relevance to this case are the exemptions applicable to extensions, alterations and replacement buildings.

The appealed application sought permission for the conversion of a garage to habitable accommodation (involving two-storey side and rear extensions, raised ridge height and three dormer windows) as well as a single-storey side

extension to the main house. Foxwell Cottage and its garage were built in 2003/04 under planning permission for the demolition of an existing bungalow and the erection of a detached chalet bungalow.

As part of its evidence to the Court, the Council produced a plan from 1975 showing the dwelling that existed before demolition (known only as 'Foxwell'). When overlapped with a map showing the current Foxwell Cottage, it was apparent that 'Foxwell' was slightly smaller than Foxwell Cottage and that no garage existed in 1975 or, if it did, it was not in the same location or of the same size as the current garage.

The Court's considerations centred on: (1) what was the correct starting point for assessing whether the proposed works were disproportionate, (2) the meaning of "original building" in Policy P2 and the NPPF, and (3) whether the Inspector had applied the correct limb of Policy P2.

The Council submitted that Policy P2(2)(a) was the relevant policy and it prohibits disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The starting point for assessing disproportionality should have been the square meterage of the demolished 'Foxwell' (and no garage) as the "original building" and, had the Inspector taken that as the starting point, the degree of total uplift in floor space as a result of the proposals would have been significant.

The Secretary of State argued that the starting point was the total square meterage of the current cottage and its garage, and therefore the degree of uplift was less significant. It was also argued that the situation of a previously demolished building was not precisely covered by Policy P2 and as such it was a matter of planning judgement for the Inspector to decide what should be the starting point for his assessment.

Judge Jarman K.C. found that:

- the Inspector had not dealt with limbs (a) and (b) of Policy P2(2) as distinct policies and had impermissibly factored into his assessment notions relating to replacement buildings under limb (b);
- the Inspector did not make clear that he adopted the approach he did because of a gap in Policy P2 or that he was using his planning judgment to fill that gap;

- Policy P2(2)(a) was clear that what must be considered in the evaluation of proportionality is the original building as existed on 1 July 1948 or the first building as originally built after that date;
- the “original dwelling” was the now demolished ‘Foxwell’ not the current cottage and its garage; and
- had the Inspector followed the correct approach, a materially larger percentage in the total uplift would have been arrived at.

The Court held that the Inspector’s decision must therefore be quashed and the appeal submitted for redetermination by the Planning Inspectorate. The judgement provides a helpful endorsement as to the Council’s approach to extensions, alterations and replacement dwellings under GBP policy P2.

Legal Services

27th March 2023

Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP) 2023

The LPDMP was adopted by the Council on 22.03.2023. This now forms part of the statutory development plan and the policies are given full weight.

The officer report refers to the policy titles in the submission version dated June 2022, this needs to be cross-referenced with the adopted version:

Submission version	Adopted version	
H5	H4	Housing Extensions and Alterations including Annexes
D4	D4	Achieving High Quality Design and Respecting Local Distinctiveness
D5	D5	Protection of Amenity and Provision of Amenity Space

The officer report refers to policies within the saved Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003. These are now superseded by specific policies in the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP) 2023.

23/P/00003 & 23/P/00007 – (Pages 217 and 227) 6 Orchard Gardens, Effingham, Leatherhead, KT24 5NR

Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP) 2023

The LPDMP was adopted by the Council on 22.03.2023. This now forms part of the statutory development plan and the policies are given full weight.

The officer report refers to the policy titles in the submission version dated June 2022, this needs to be cross-referenced with the adopted version:

Submission version	Adopted version	
H5	H4	Housing Extensions and Alterations including Annexes
D4	D4	Achieving High Quality Design and Respecting Local Distinctiveness
D5	D5	Protection of Amenity and Provision of Amenity Space
ID11	ID10	Parking Standards for New Development

The officer report refers to policies within the saved Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003. These are now superseded by specific policies in the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP) 2023.