

## **Planning Committee**

**29 March 2023**

### **Late Representations**

Since the last date for the submission of views on applications/matters before the Committee this evening, representations in respect of the under mentioned applications/ matters have been received. The letters, copies of which will be available for inspection by councillors at the meeting, are summarised below.

#### **Item 5 – Planning Applications**

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

The applicant and third parties have submitted the speeches they would have given if the item was eligible for public speaking. These have been treated as comments on the application and any new matters have been summarised below and should be read in conjunction with the summary in the officer's report.

#### **5. Proposal. (page 33)**

5.9 Further to the assessment from Amanda Reynolds, AR Urbanism published on 06.03.2023, the applicant has made a response dated 24.03.2023; comments on the officer report dated 24.03.2023 and further comments dated 28.03.2023, in summary:

- Has not reviewed the supporting landscape documents
- Makes efficient use of land to reduce pressure on the Green Belt
- Houses require more land than flats
- Subjective opinion on quantum on housing
- Site allocation not a cap
- Hillside not easily accessible
- Site accessible by various modes of travel and wheelchair/less able bodied

- incorrect in their interpretation as to the extent of the land being described as “not to be built upon”, on the 1954 Maufe plan
- Wider landscape benefits
- All application documents and Design and Access statement should be read as a whole and not in isolation
- Rationale for clergy housing to the north of the Eastern Meadow
- Highway design on Eastern Slopes achieve technical requirements and design matters
- Link to Old Court Road discounted
- New trees and orchard to mitigate loss of green space
- Tree removal justified
- Sufficient car parking to avoid overspill parking
- Design approach and accommodation provision of clergy housing response to needs and feedback
- Reduction in mass would reduce visibility to apartment blocks
- Roof forms varied and to allow space for solar panels and green roofs
- The palette of materials has tone variation to not compete with the Cathedral
- Buildings on the Western Parcel reflect housing on Alresford Road
- Principle of development acceptable
- Weight to endowment as a planning benefit should be significant
- Sensitive designed
- Cathedral would continue to be dominant on the hilltop
- Design is subjective
- Impact on viewpoint in SPD not a previous reason for refusal  
[officer comment: the SPD was adopted in 2019 after the decision on the previous scheme]
- View can still be seen from other parts of the meadow
- Meet under delivery of affordable homes
- Deliver much needed affordable housing
- Substantial public benefits from response to climate change
- Substantial financial contributions secured by S106
- Substantial public benefits from surface water management
- Contribute to housing land supply in next five years

- Developer would retain stewardship of the land
- Responded to extensive engagement process

A letter was received from the Dean of Guildford dated 16.03.2023. Requesting a deferment until June 2023 to respond to consultees comments and officer recommendation for refusal.

[officer comment: there are fundamental concerns that cannot be overcome through amendments to the current scheme, therefore there is no reason to delay the decision on the proposed development]

## 9. Consultations.

### 9.1 Historic England: (page 36) additional comments

- no Conservation Plan submitted
- funding details for repairs achieved and delivered in a transparent way

### 9.31 Friends of Stag Hill (FOSH): (page 42) additional comments:

- Cathedral did not provide all information available when promoting the site allocation regarding the history of the site
  - Relying on superseded comments from Historic England
  - ‘privatisation’ of open amenity green space
  - drainage improvement would not justify development
  - unsubstantiated risk to the Green Belt
  - historic significance of land surrounding the Cathedral
  - homes for Cathedral staff not a type of affordable housing
- [officer comment: the Housing Development Lead has assessed the proposal and is satisfied these constitute affordable housing]

### 9.40 SAVE Britain’s Heritage: (page 46) object and have raised the following matters:

- harm to setting of a heritage asset
- some benefit from restoration of treeline to processional routes
- public benefits do not outweigh the harm
- Out of character – density scale, massing and materials
- Clergy housing does not relate to the Cathedral
- Harm to views
- Lack of financial justification including the endowment

## **10. Third party comments.**

10.1 288 letters of representation have been received relating to the proposal. Following the publication of the report these additional objections and repeat those reported. (page 46)

10.2 24 letters of representation have been received which raise the following additional matters in support of the application (page 46):

- Endowment for the Cathedral
- Sustainable location
- Good design
- Improvement to surface water flooding risk
- Improved public realm
- Housing choice
- Improved connectivity
- Houses not all flats

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

Two further letters of objection have been received raising the following objections / concerns:

- It is not an allocated site (Officer note: this would not prevent the submission of a planning application the site)
- Impact on the character of the area sited directly adjacent to a number of properties and very close to town
- The site is equestrian and adjacent to SANG and opposite AONB
- There have been a number of other applications on the site for the same change of use of the land
- It would set a precedent for the site to be redeveloped (Officer note: the use of the land would revert back to agricultural use after 5 years should permission be granted for the temporary use of the land as recommended)
- The development is retrospective

- Work has been carried out on site after the injunction was placed on the site (Officer note: this is a matter for enforcement officers)
- Objections for the previously submitted applications should be taken into account (Officer note: objections received on other application can not be considered against the current proposal)
- The S106 payment is hugely outweighed by the damage and precedent that would be set (Officer note: the requirement to pay a legal agreement to mitigate against the impact of the proposed development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area does not add weight in favour of the proposal, but would be necessary for an approval to be granted)
- Caravans should be taken off the land for 6-8 weeks each year
- The site address has changed from Ipsley Lodge (Officer note: the site has been sold off and separated from Ipsley Lodge and no longer forms part of it)
- The Council has a housing land supply for traveller sites so there is no justification (Officer note: there are currently no pitches available)
- There is an injunction on the land, and this has been breached by works carried out to the wall and gate pillar (Officer note: these works were carried out outside of the applicant's ownership)
- Highway safety concerns, increased traffic and fuel emissions (Officer note: no objection has been raised by the County Highway Authority)
- Incongruous and detract from the countryside and the setting of the Surrey Hills AONB and AGLV (Officer note: no objection has raised by the AONB officer)
- Increased surface water run-off
- Insufficient infrastructure to support the proposal
- Unsustainable location (Officer note: the site is located a 15-minute walk from the urban area)
- Light pollution (Officer note: a condition is recommended to secure details of any external lighting)
- Litter and burning on site (Officer note: this would fall under the remit of Environmental Health)
- Businesses are run from the site (Officer note: this application does not seek any commercial use of the site; a separate planning permission would be required should any use of the land constitute a material change in the use of the land)
- Noise (Officer note: should there be a statutory nuisance, this would be dealt with by Environmental Health officers)

- Loss of an equestrian facility (Officer note: there are no policies to retain such facilities)
- Bins left by the roadside (Officer note: it is understood that the site has arranged private refuse collection)
- Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (Officer note: a legal agreement will secure the necessary mitigation to mitigate against the impact of the development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area)