

PLANNING COMMITTEE

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

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

*Present

Councillors Jo Randall and Catherine Young were also in attendance.

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jon Askew, Chris Blow and Colin Cross. Councillor John Redpath attended as a substitute for Councillor Colin Cross.

PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

22/P/00990 - 13 Oxford Road, Guildford, GU1 3RP

Councillor John Redpath declared a prejudicial interest in the application and would therefore only speak in his capacity as Ward Councillor and withdraw from the room when the application was considered.

22/P/01083 - Orchard Farm, Harpers Road, Ash, Guildford, GU12 6DE

Councillor Fiona White declared a personal interest in the application. Owing to that interest, Councillor White would withdraw from the meeting when that application was considered.

PL3 ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Owing to the personal interest declared by the Chairman, Councillor Fiona White in application 22/P/01083 – Orchard Farm, Harpers Road, Ash, Guildford, GU12

6DE, the Committee nominated and seconded Councillor Liz Hogger to act as Chairman for the consideration of that application.

PL4 MINUTES

The minutes of the planning committee meetings held on 11 January and 29 March 2023 were confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

PL5 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the Chairman's announcements.

PL6 22/P/00990 - 13 OXFORD ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 3RP

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for part two storey / part single storey rear extension and demolition of existing shed.

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

- Ms Helen Marshall (to object) via MSTeams; and
- Mr James Deverill, MCA Architects (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Planning Officer, Katie Williams. The Committee noted that the site was located within the urban area of Guildford and within the town centre Conservation Area. The boundary of the Conservation Area followed the rear boundary line of the dwellings on the northern side of Oxford Road which was a cul-de-sac consisting of detached and semi-detached two storey Victorian dwellings. The site was bordered by 15 Oxford Road to the south and 11 Oxford Road to the north. The road sloped upwards from north to south. The ground level of 11 Oxford Road was set lower than that of the application site and the ground level of 15 Oxford Road was higher.

Permitted development rights would allow for a single storey, rear extension measuring to an eaves height of 3 metres and a maximum height of 4 metres and extending to a depth of 4 metres. The single storey extension would project by 4 metres beyond the rear wall of the existing dwelling and the two storey element would project by 1.6 metres beyond the existing rear elevation.

Due to concerns raised by residents regarding the impact of the proposal on neighbouring amenities, officers requested that a daylight and sunlight assessment was carried out. The report was undertaken and the findings of the

assessment were taken into account. It was acknowledged that there would be some impact on the windows and garden area immediately to the rear of 11 Oxford Road. However, officers considered that there would not be an unacceptable adverse impact in terms of loss of light or overbearing impact to the neighbouring property.

In conclusion, it was considered that the proposed extension would result in sympathetic additions to the host dwelling that would not have an adverse impact on its scale and character and would not detract from the character of the Conservation Area. The concerns raised by neighbouring residents regarding the impact on neighbouring amenity had been considered, however officers felt that there would not be an unacceptable impact and the application was recommended for approval.

The Chairman permitted the Ward Councillor John Redpath to speak for three minutes. The Committee noted concerns raised that Oxford Road was steep with houses built sideways up the hill. There was therefore a height difference between each property of 1.5 metres. The proposed extension at no.13, a detached building was part ground floor and part first floor and built right up to the boundary walls of the properties on either side. This created an overbearing effect to number 11 especially, which was lower down the hill. Even the single storey part of the proposed extension would be some 4.5 metres above the ground level of number 11 with the first floor much higher than this. The daylight and sunlight report was not sufficient and did not allow for the height difference between the properties. The report appeared to incorrectly calculate the loss of daylight. Policy H5(1) stated that extensions should not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities enjoyed by occupants of adjacent buildings. A 30% loss of daylight to one of the living rooms at number 11 was unacceptable. The 45 degree rule should be applied to the ground floor extension. Councillor John Redpath then left the room for consideration of this application.

The planning officer confirmed that whilst there was some encroachment on the 45-degree angle, the Committee had to be mindful that the single storey extension could still be built out under permitted development.

The Committee questioned whether the consultant employed to write the sunlight and daylight report had actually visited the site, given the overbearing nature of the extension proposed and how number 11 would be significantly affected.

The Committee noted that the height of the single storey extension proposed was 3.2 metres and under permitted development could be built to 3 metres to eaves height and was therefore a 200mm difference. The Committee noted comments that this was relevant and such a minor differential would indicate that the Council would most likely lose at appeal if the application was refused. It was also further confirmed that the 45-degree angle did not affect the permitted development that could be carried out. Planning officers clarified that whilst they could not verify if the consultants who submitted the sunlight and daylight report actually visited the site or not, it was undertaken by a Chartered Surveyor that was registered as a professional body.

A motion was moved by Councillor Chris Barrass and seconded by Councillor Ruth Brothwell to refuse the application owing to contravening Policy H4 and the Residential Extensions SPD. The vote was lost.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
2	Fiona White		X	
3	Angela Goodwin		X	
4	Chris Barrass	X		
5	Pauline Searle		X	
6	Paul Spooner		X	
7	Liz Hogger		X	
8	Maddy Redpath	X		
9	Marsha Moseley		X	
10	Ruth Brothwell	X		
11	Angela Gunning		X	
12	Graham Eyre		X	
	TOTALS	4	8	0

A subsequent motion was moved by the Chairman, Councillor Fiona White and Councillor Marsha Moseley to approve the application which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Chris Barrass		X	
2	Fiona White	X		
3	Maddy Redpath		X	
4	Liz Hogger	X		
5	Ramsey Nagaty		X	
6	Pauline Searle	X		
7	Angela Gunning	X		
8	Angela Goodwin	X		
9	Marsha Moseley	X		
10	Ruth Brothwell		X	
11	Graham Eyre	X		
12	Paul Spooner	X		
	TOTALS	8	4	0

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

RESOLVED to approve application 22/P/00900 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

**PL7 22/P/01083 - ORCHARD FARM, HARPERS ROAD, ASH, GUILDFORD, GU12
6DE**

Councillor Liz Hogger acted as Chairman for this item owing to the personal interest which the Chairman, Councillor White had declared in relation to this application and left the room for its consideration.

The Committee noted that the application was the subject of a non-determination appeal and as such, the decision on this proposal would be taken by the Secretary of State through the Planning Inspectorate. The appeal would be heard by way of a Hearing that was scheduled to take place on 20 and 21 June 2023. The Committee was therefore asked to make a decision on the application had they of been able to determine it for the Planning Inspectorate's consideration.

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of 51 dwellings with associated open space, landscaping and parking.

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

- Mr Phil Buckley (to object);
- Ms Sue Wyeth-Price (to object);
- Mr James McConnell (McConnell Planning on behalf of Bellway Homes) (in support); and
- Mr Jon Williams (I-Transport) (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the planning officer, Peter Dijkhuis. The Committee noted that their decision was to either approve or refuse the application, deferral was not an option. The Council had broad agreement with the applicant and statutory authorities in terms of the conditions, informatives and a draft SANGs agreement which had not been engrossed. There was also broad agreement in terms of the financial contribution and the draft Heads of Terms. The applicant had confirmed a delivery programme of a condition set at 3 years. There was also a duplicate application 22/P/02121 for the site and in some cases, residents had commented on this too, which had similarly been considered against this application by planning officers.

The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which detailed the financial contributions updated for 2023 and agreed by the applicant. The NHS had been approached in terms of healthcare contributions and that information had been chased up but was not forthcoming as yet for the previous four weeks. Planning officers had also received reissues of the representations made by Ash Parish Council and were referred to in the report. The date of the hearing had also been mistakenly detailed as 26 April and should read 28 April.

Following the site visit held with members and concerns raised, three additional conditions and two informatives had been discussed with the applicant that related to the provision and technical specification of the path network, the condition requiring that the overhead cables were put underground, the implementation of a Grampian condition regarding start of work and in terms of access, that alternative preliminary construction activity was looked at. Officers had also had discussions with South East Water regarding fresh water supplies.

The site fell under the A31 policy land to the south and east of Ash and Tongham. The site was 3.34 hectares in size. Ash town centre was located to the south-west and north of the site. The Green Belt was located to the east of Harper's Road. Ash Station was 500 metres walking distance away. Ash Manor which was

a Grade II listed building had been taken into consideration in terms of the harm to a listed heritage asset. To the north of the site was a wildflower meadow, 154 dwellings to the immediate north and cut through that site was a public right of way that was built out.

In terms of urban and landscape context, there was land at Grange Road which had x60 units consented in 2019, Wildflower Meadows which was currently under construction, streamside there was a current application for x22 units and May and Juniper Cottages for approx. 100 units which was under reserved matters.

Ash Road Bridge was also proposed and would have a significant impact upon the landscape. It required an embankment of 6.5 metres either side. Overall, the character of each of the developments was individual residential clusters set within a blue/green network that would mature over time to create the policy aspiration of a garden settlement.

Ash Road Bridge was elevated 6 metres across the railway line with green areas either side of it and was above the Orchard Farm site which had been used for storm water capacity, landscape and habitat creation. In terms of the elevation, it was a material consideration for the views and setting of the manor.

One of the policy requirements is to ensure that there was a network of pedestrian and cycling routes that ensured that each of the sites as they come forward were not fragmented but tied together.

Access to the site was off Harper's Road with the junction from Guildford Road. The cumulative additional vehicle movements had been considered by the County Highway Authority who had recommended various mitigation measures.

A central objection was regarding policy A31 which talks about the interconnection between individual development sites within the site allocation. Planning officers recognised that A31 was a fragmentation of different sites across a rather broad area. Further discussions with the Ash Road Bridge team and the consented scheme were explored and discounted. The first consideration was the requirement for an embankment from the elevated Ash road bridge onto the site. The embankment would have been over 120 metres in length and resulted in a considerable land take which would occupy flood land capacity. The landscape was open, flat meadow grassland framed by trees, hedgerows and mature trees with isolated woodlands close to Harper's Road. The stream drained along Harper's Road in several directions through the

recreation grounds and towards the roundabout which minimised the amount of development that could come forward on Orchard Farm. The visual intrusion of the spur leading towards Orchard Farm was also a concern.

In terms of technical issues, when reviewing the two junctions and forward visibility and capacity at the junction the option of an independent spur going towards Orchard Farm was discounted.

In order to address remedial actions and mitigation, planning officers had been speaking with both the applicant and the county regarding measures that could be undertaken with Harper's Road, these were set out in the report and a condition setting out a reference to those conditions against a plan. They required that signage and various rondels were put in situ to slow traffic down and ensure that the public rights of way crossing Harper's road were protected. County Highways was satisfied that these measures would address the safety concerns raised.

The Church of St. Peter could be seen from the site as well as the Ash Manor complex. The existing trees were to be retained in perpetuity via a management strategy. The landscape masterplan consisted of a simple loop system with no back gardens or fences, the unit sizes and tenure varied and were peppered across the site. Acoustic fencing would be installed along the railway line so to ensure that noise levels were acceptable.

A total of 51 dwellings were proposed with 40% affordable of which 15% units were affordable rent with one shared ownership property, varying in size of 1-5 units. The buildings would be of contemporary architecture with clay roof tiles. The same materials were used to create continuity and urban coherence across the scheme. EV charging points would be installed on each house and the scheme would be read as a single settlement.

The County Highway Authority were satisfied that the scheme delivered 92 residential parking bays, 10 visitor bays and 22 garages. It also delivered smart EV electric charging points for each development. The impact of the development was also considered acceptable by the Surrey Highway Authority. The impact on the character of the area would over time be read as a single settlement with wildflower meadows and green landscape. The impact upon the setting of the listed buildings was considered by the Council's Conservation Officer as less than substantial harm at the lowest end of the impact. The site also delivered a flood capacity on the site and a landscape area generated by the Ash Road Bridge scheme. The scheme was compliant with the 20% carbon

reduction requirement in relation to sustainable energy and a SANGS and SAMM contribution agreed. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Chairman permitted the Ward Councillor Jo Randall to speak for three minutes. The Committee noted concerns raised about the proposed site access for the development from Harper's Road. Whilst improvements to the nearby public right of way were proposed to enable pedestrian and cycle users to get to and from Guildford Road and the railway station, there would only be one vehicle access onto the development and this would be from Harper's Road. This was in contravention of the Local Plan 2019 which required the provision of road connections between individual development sites within the overall site allocation for the area. The road was considered narrow and unsustainable for a development of 51 homes.

In relation to comments made by public speakers, the planning officer, Peter Dijkhuis confirmed the following. That the Council had been email dialogue with the NHS in terms of healthcare contributions for over a month but owing to resourcing an answer has not been given yet. A financial contribution by the applicant towards healthcare facilities was not in dispute, the amount just needed to be clarified.

In terms of concerns raised regarding the impact upon the culverts of the stream along Harper's Road, it was important to clarify that at present there was a built over area to access the two cottages in this development. The flood capacity at that point would not be impacted in any way. The pedestrian and cycle link across the stream towards Wildflower Meadows was envisaged as a bridge and would not impact the culvert. There were no culverts proposed in terms of the two watercourses.

It was also clarified that there was a plan within the documentation pack that indicated the minimum works to be undertaken both in terms of Harper's road, extensions and remedial works, possibly to the public rights of way that the money would be spent.

It was further clarified that policy A31 was a critical consideration particularly clause 10 which needed to be read in its totality. It stated that the proposed road layout to provide connection between both the individual development sites within the site allocation between Ash Lodge Drive and Foreman Road, providing a through connection in order to maximise accessibility and to help alleviate congestion on the A323 corridor. If you looked at the policy against the reality, recognising these are 5-6 sites grouped together, the intent of being able to

create road connectivity between each one of the parcels was a physical impossibility. Planning officers did recognise that the sites to the north of the railway line were backed against each other and had therefore ensured that the pedestrian and cycling network linked the site together.

In terms of sustainable development as required by the NPPF and sustainable transport modes, officers had worked hard to ensure that the network of routes was attractive and safe.

The Committee discussed the application and noted concerns raised regarding the road access and turning what was effectively footpath into a road. The members at the site visit had requested that a Grampian clause was added to ensure that the scheme would not go ahead until the Ash Road Bridge scheme was started. A31 (10) was noted as a policy devised by the Council to ensure that road connectivity was enabled on this large parcel of land which this scheme did not deliver. The road would become dangerous with the increased use anticipated by the development and its residents to both cyclists, pedestrians and motorists.

The planning officer, Peter Dijkhuis confirmed that the applicant had agreed to put the Grampian condition on that ensured that they would only start the development when the road bridge commenced. The relationship between displacing traffic off local roads onto Ash Road bridge was part of the release of these sites for development.

The planning officer confirmed that Wildflower Meadows was a scheme that had already been consented and built out. It was essentially a third party and not linked to the application. It therefore made it difficult legally to request linked access to the site.

The safety along Harper's Road has been considered by officers and they had done everything required by policy to ensure that the needs of pedestrians and cyclist's safety was addressed through the strategic allocation of the sites both individually and cumulatively. The County Highway Authority had not objected to the scheme either given that the applicant had addressed those policy requirements.

A motion was moved by Councillor Paul Spooner and seconded by Councillor Graham Eyre to refuse the application for the following reasons. A recorded vote was taken for reasons 1 and 2 and reasons 3 and 4 were agreed as part of the overall vote taken:

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Maddy Redpath	X		
2	Angela Gunning	X		
3	Graham Eyre	X		
4	Chris Barrass	X		
5	John Redpath	X		
6	Marsha Moseley	X		
7	Ruth Brothwell	X		
8	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
9	Paul Spooner	X		
10	Angela Goodwin	X		
11	Pauline Searle	X		
12	Liz Hogger	X		
	TOTALS	12	0	0

1. Highways: the proposed development would result in additional traffic movements along Harpers Road which is a narrow, rural road. Due to the nature and characteristics of the road, the increased movements would create a dangerous environment for pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders, and motorists and would exacerbate and worsen the existing highway safety concerns. The proposal would therefore result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety, contrary to Policies ID3 and A31(10) of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: strategy and sites 2015 – 2034, the Strategic Development Framework SPD (2020), and NPPF paragraphs 110 and 111.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Paul Spooner	X		
2	Marsha Moseley	X		
3	Chris Barrass	X		
4	John Redpath	X		
5	Angela Gunning	X		
6	Graham Eyre	X		
7	Ruth Brothwell	X		
8	Liz Hogger	X		
11	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
12	Pauline Searle	X		
13	Maddy Redpath	X		
14	Angela Goodwin	X		
	TOTALS	12	0	0

2. Local distinctiveness: the proposed development is located in a transition point between the urban area and a more rural environment, which is designated as Green Belt, to the east. The proposed development does not adequately respond to, or reflect, the surrounding context and character of the area and fails to contribute to local distinctiveness. The proposal is therefore deemed to be contrary to Policy D4 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2023, Policy A31 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: strategy and sites 2015 – 2034, the Strategic Development Framework SPD (2020), and the guidance contained within the NPPF paragraphs 110 and 130.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
2	Ruth Brothwell	X		
3	Paul Spooner	X		
4	Marsha Moseley	X		
5	Chris Barrass	X		
6	Maddy Redpath	X		
7	John Redpath	X		
8	Angela Goodwin	X		
9	Graham Eyre	X		
10	Liz Hogger	X		
11	Pauline Searle	X		
12	Angela Gunning	X		
	TOTALS	12	0	0

3. Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area: 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 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 Policy P5 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: strategy and sites 2015-2034, the Thames Basin Heaths Avoidance Strategy SPD, and saved Policy NRM6 of the South1East 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.

4. Planning obligation: in the absence of a completed planning obligation the development fails to mitigate its impact on infrastructure provision. This includes the following: a) the delivery of 21 affordable housing dwellings; b) provision of SAMM contributions; c) secure SANG capacity to mitigate the impact of the development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area; d) contribution towards primary healthcare; e) contribution towards police infrastructure; f) contribution towards early years, primary and secondary

education projects; g) contribution towards open space provision infrastructure in the area; h) contribution towards highway safety improvements and pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure improvements in the area; i) contribution towards Ash Road Bridge; and, j) provision that the Applicant gives free and unfettered access to the estate roads, pathways, and cycleways. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policies P5, H2, ID1 and ID3 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: strategy and sites 2015-2034, saved Policy NRM6 of the South-East Plan (2009), Policy ID6 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2023, the Council's Planning Contributions SPD (2017), and the guidance contained within the NPPF paragraphs 55-57.

RESOLVED to refuse application 22/P/01083 for the reasons as detailed above.

PL8 22/P/01831 - LAND TO THE REAR OF 164-176 NEW ROAD, CHILWORTH, GU4 8LX

The Committee considered the erection of 3 no. two storey dwellings with associated parking and landscaping together with formation of vehicular access.

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

- Mr Grant Martindale (to object);
- Ms Bridget Hayward (to object); and
- Mr Kevin Scott (Solve Planning) (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the planning officer, Katie Williams. The Committee noted that it was revised application following the refusal of a previous application 21/P/0176 for 5 dwellings onsite which was dismissed at appeal. The appeal decision for the previous application was attached to the supplementary late sheets.

The site was located within the identified settlement of Chilworth which was inset from the Green Belt and was within the 5 to 7km buffer of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). The site was formed of the northern part of an L shaped garden to number 176 New Road. The site was mainly laid to grass and was bounded to the north by the railway line and to the south were dwellings which fronted onto New Road. There was a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings with an existing residential development at St Thomas' Close which also extended beyond the rear gardens of the properties in New Road to the west.

The key changes from the refused scheme was a reduction in the number of dwellings from five to three and the reorientation of the dwellings to reflect the alignment and pattern of existing infill development to the west. The reorientation of the dwellings would also provide a more attractive view along the access road. Looking towards the front elevation of the eastern most dwelling on plot 3 there was also a reduction in the extent of hardstanding and increased soft landscaping and replacement planting. The plans had been amended to show the repositioning of the bin collection point which was now closer to the entrance with New Road. The refuse vehicles would no longer need to enter the site and also the County Highway Authority had no objection to the application and were happy with the revised position for the bin collection point. Tracking drawings had been included with the submitted transport statement which were deemed sufficient.

The existing properties at New Road would still retain their access to their driveways and a proposed access would be required to deal with the alterations to the footpath and the highway to allow for access via a S278 agreement with Surrey County Council. Two parking spaces were proposed for each dwelling.

The dwellings would be of traditional design incorporating pitched roofs measuring to a maximum ridge height of approx. 8 metres. Materials would include plain tiles, vertical tile hanging and facing brickwork.

In summary, the proposal for residential development was acceptable in principle and would deliver three new three bedroom dwellings in a sustainable location close to village amenities. It was considered that the revised proposal had addressed the concerns raised under the previous application. With regard to the impact on the character of the area, there would be no adverse impact. Taking into account the appeal decision relating to 21/P/01761 it was concluded that there would not be an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity and the proposed development would comply with nationally described space standards. The application had satisfactorily addressed concerns regarding surface water drainage and impact on ecology would be mitigated with biodiversity enhancement secured by condition. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Committee discussed the application and noted concerns raised regarding the number of dwellings. Despite the fact that this application had reduced the number of houses proposed on the site compared to a previous application, dismissed at appeal for x5 houses, the same issues existed in that the proposal

represented a cramped form of development with narrow access to the site. The Committee agreed that the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the rural character of the surrounding area with very limited soft landscaping.

A motion was moved by Councillor Ramsey Nagaty and seconded by Councillor Angela Gunning to refuse the application for the following reason, which was carried:

1. The proposed development, due to the number of dwellings, proposed layout and small plot sizes, narrow access and expansive areas of hardstanding, with no space available for meaningful soft landscaping, would result in an overly cramped and stark form of development that will be out of keeping with the character of the area and will have a detrimental impact on the rural context and character of the surroundings. Furthermore, significant areas of existing trees, hedging and planting will be lost as a result of the proposed development with very limited soft landscaping proposed to replace it. This will result in harm to the visual amenity these trees and vegetation currently provide. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy D1 of the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034 and Policies D4 and D8 of the Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2023.

Informatives:

1. 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. Pre-application advice was not sought prior to submission and amendments were sought from the applicant to overcome concerns raised, however, these changes did not address all the matters.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Angela Goodwin	X		
2	Graham Eyre	X		
3	Pauline Searle	X		
4	Paul Spooner	X		
5	Ruth Brothwell	X		
6	Angela Gunning	X		
7	Liz Hogger	X		
8	Fiona White	X		
9	John Redpath	X		
10	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
11	Marsha Moseley		X	
12	Chris Barrass	X		
13	Maddy Redpath	X		
	TOTALS	12	1	0

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Liz Hogger	X		
2	Paul Spooner	X		
3	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
4	Pauline Searle	X		
5	Marsha Moseley		X	
6	Maddy Redpath	X		
7	Chris Barrass	X		
8	Graham Eyre	X		
9	Angela Gunning	X		
10	Angela Goodwin	X		
11	Fiona White	X		
12	Ruth Brothwell	X		
13	John Redpath	X		
	TOTALS	12	1	0

RESOLVED to refuse application 22/P/01831 for the reasons as detailed above.

**PL9 22/P/01845 - ABBOTSWOOD, HIGH PARK AVENUE, EAST HORSLEY,
LEATHERHEAD, KT24 5DF**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application to enlarge roof to accommodate an ensuite shower room with rooflight and to reduce partially constructed rear dormer window.

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

- Ms Louise Entwistle (to object); and
- Mr Lorne Vary (in support);

The Committee received a presentation from the planning officer, Katie Williams. The Committee noted that the application site was located within the identified settlement of East Horsley which was inset from the Green Belt. The site was in an area characterised by residential development of varying designs. The proposal would result in revisions to a previously approved scheme which had been partially implemented. The previous application 21/P/01722 granted consent for extensions and alterations to the roof, incorporating two smaller dormer windows to the front and rear elevation.

The single storey rear extension has been built out and larger dormer windows constructed, were not in accordance with the approved plans. The proposal had now been revised which was the current application for a smaller dormer window which was on the approved scheme and then the enlargement of the gable on the side.

In the planning officers view it was considered that the proposed alteration under the application would result in sympathetic additions which would not detract from the character of the existing property or the surrounding area. It would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity and the application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Chairman permitted the Ward Councillor, Catherine Young to speak for three minutes.

The Committee noted concerns raised that the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the character of the area with an unbalanced

appearance to the roofline. The proposed dormer windows were very large and overlooked neighbouring properties and would have an unacceptable impact.

The Committee discussed the application and agreed with the concerns raised. The proposed dormer window was of particular concern owing to the overlooking potential to neighbouring properties. The roof additions were also incongruous with the overall character of the property, out of scale and disproportionate.

A motion was moved by Councillor Liz Hogger and seconded by Councillor Chris Barrass to refuse the application for the following reasons, which was carried:

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Maddy Redpath	X		
2	Marsha Moseley	X		
3	John Redpath	X		
4	Ruth Brothwell	X		
5	Paul Spooner	X		
6	Chris Barrass	X		
7	Graham Eyre	X		
8	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
9	Pauline Searle	X		
10	Fiona White	X		
11	Angela Goodwin	X		
12	Liz Hogger	X		
13	Angela Gunning	X		
	TOTALS	13	0	0

1. The proposed roof additions, due to their scale, bulk and design, would fail to take into account the scale, character and proportions of the existing building and would have an unacceptable impact upon the character of the immediate surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies H4 (1) and D4 of the Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2023 and Policy EH-H7 of the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2033.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
2	Angela Gunning			X
3	Marsha Moseley	X		
4	Graham Eyre	X		
5	Angela Goodwin	X		
6	Liz Hogger	X		
7	Ruth Brothwell	X		
8	John Redpath	X		
9	Maddy Redpath	X		
10	Fiona White	X		
11	Paul Spooner	X		
12	Chris Barrass	X		
13	Maddy Redpath	X		
	TOTALS	13	0	1

2. The proposed dormer window, due to its scale, height and position, would result in an adverse loss of privacy to neighbouring properties to the south and rear of the site. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies H4 (1b) and D5(1) of the Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2023.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Ruth Brothwell	X		
2	Fiona White	X		
3	Pauline Searle	X		
4	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
5	Maddy Redpath	X		
6	Liz Hogger	X		
7	Marsha Moseley	X		
8	Chris Barrass	X		
9	John Redpath	X		
10	Angela Gunning	X		
11	Paul Spooner	X		
12	Ruth Brothwell	X		
13	John Redpath	X		
	TOTALS	13	0	0

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 22/P/01845 for the reasons as detailed above.

PL10 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee considered and noted the appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 11.15 pm

Signed

Date

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank