

Planning Committee

6 November 2024

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

23/P/00139 (Page 21) – 176 Epsom Road, Guildford, GU1 2RR

One additional letter of representation has been received raising the following concerns

The proposal would result in increased traffic into an area which is already busy with roads in close proximity to application site

The proposal would result in an increase in noise and disturbance to the occupiers of the adjacent neighbouring properties from the additional residential units.

Trees need to be protected and not felled.

Officer comment – The concerns have been addressed in the report.

24/P/00563 (Page 41) - Land west of Blackwell Farm, Hogs Back, Guildford, GU3

7.0 Consultations:

External consultees

(page 71)

7.6 Surrey Hills AONB Planning Adviser (on behalf of the Surrey Hills National Landscape Board): additional comments and have raised the following new matters:

- LPA should be satisfied the development would seek to further the statutory purposes of the SHNL, under Section 245 (Protected Landscapes) of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act (LURA) 2023

[Officer comment: none of the application is in the SHNL however is in a candidate area see para. 11.3.30-37]

- Weight to the Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan and its policies
[Officer comment: this is a material consideration, see para. 8.11 and policy P6 is referenced in these late sheets]
- Weight to 'public disbenefits'
[Officer comment: see para. 11.2.40-41, 11.3.28, 11.4.29, 11.5.15-17, 11.14.1-2 and Appendix 1]

Parish councils

(page 75)

7.26 Worplesdon Parish Council: additional objection and have raised the following matters:

- defer a decision until Surrey Hills National Landscape boundary review has "reached its natural conclusion".

[Officer comment: The second round of consultation expires on 10.12.2024 this is limited to additions and deletions to the proposed extension areas for the SHNL. There are a number of statutory steps for NE to carry out before the amendment Order is confirmed by the Secretary of State (SoS), who has discretion to call a Public Inquiry, before deciding whether or not to confirm the Order. There is no published timescale for this process and neither Natural England or the SoS have requested planning applications are deferred until confirmation occurs. The most relevant material consideration is in the Written Ministerial Statement of 30.07.2024 from the Deputy Prime Minister which increases the weight that planning policy gives to benefits associated with renewable energy generation see para 11.1.7]

Amenity groups

(page 75-78)

7.28 Save Surrey Countryside: additional objection and have raised the following new matters:

- Limited BNG benefits

[Officer comment: see para 11.6.48-54, in excess of the policy requirement for 20% would be delivered and Surrey Wildlife Trust are satisfied]

- Retained agricultural use

[Officer comment: the grazing of sheep would constitute 'agriculture' as defined by Section 336 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990]

- Change to previously developed land

[Officer comment: see conditions 2 – temporary development, 32 (now 33) – decommissioning scheme and 33 (now 34) – soil management plan. The three fields do not meet the current definition of 'previously developed land' in Annex 2: Glossary of the NPPF and this is for a temporary use followed by decommissioning, any other development would require planning permission in its own right]

7.40 Surrey Chambers of Commerce: in support and have raised the following matters:

- Energy security
- Financial security
- Importance to Guildford's economy
- Supports internationally renowned research
- Very special circumstances demonstrated
- Facilities decarbonisation and net zero strategy

Third party comments

(page 78-80)

One additional objection and have raised the following new matters:

- Alternative proposal preferred – remove Little Misley from proposals, PV panels at Onslow park and ride, route of access track
[Officer comment: all the alternatives have been assessed at section 11.10, the identified planning harms have been identified and an overall balancing exercise has been carried out at section 11.14; this park and ride is owned by Surrey County Council; see para. 11.5.43-46 and the applicant's Transport Statement for justification for the route proposed]

**24/P/00563 (Page 145) – Surrey County Constabulary Police Headquarters
Mount Browne, Sandy Lane, Guildford, GU3 1HG**

2.0. *Additional letters of representation*

2.1. 27 additional letters of representation have been received since the agenda was published raising the following objections and concerns:

- Highway safety concerns.
- Response times will be higher which makes it more dangerous to people within the community [*Officer note: a key purpose of the proposed access road would be to improve response times by up to two minutes*].
- Consultation on applications not adequate [*Officer note: The Local Planning Authority consider that consultation on both 24/P/00563 and 24/P/00564 has been undertaken in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement*].
- Holding objection as insufficient time to consider

2.2. The Officer considers that these concerns have been addressed within the report.

**24/P/00564 (Page 199) – Surrey County Constabulary Police Headquarters
Mount Browne, Sandy Lane, Guildford, GU3 1HG**

24/P/00564:

1.0. *Additional letters of representation*

1.1. 31 additional letters of representation have been received since the agenda was published raising the following objections and concerns:

- Highway safety concerns
- Proposed flats at the Old Law College will add significant road usage.
- Time taken around Guildford one way will increase.
- Health and wellbeing impact from 24/7 sirens.
- Damage to Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- Noise pollution.
- Speed of Portsmouth Road cannot be greater than 30mph due to blind junctions.

- Response times will be higher which makes it more dangerous to people within the community [*Officer note: a key purpose of the proposed access road would be to improve response times by up to two minutes*].
- Consultation on applications not adequate [*Officer note: The Local Planning Authority consider that consultation on both 24/P/00563 and 24/P/00564 has been undertaken in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement*].
- Holding objection as insufficient time to consider
- Relocation of emergency response to Mount Browne has not been included within the description of development [*Officer note: the Police Station within Guildford Town Centre could be closed anytime and relocated to Mount Browne without planning permission*].
- Emergency Response base is inappropriate adjacent to Conservation Area and within Surrey Hills National Landscape and Green Belt.
- Not appropriate in St Catherine's Village heritage of ancient Pilgrims Way at its crossing point of River Wey and St Catherine's Chapel, ancient monument.

1.2. The Officer considers that these concerns have been addressed within the report.

1.3. It should be noted that an objection was received from the Artington Parish Council, which was only recorded on application 24/P/00563. It has been brought to the LPA's attention that this letter and the contents should apply to application 24/P/00564 also. Accordingly, paragraph 6.4 of 24/P/00563 shall also apply to 24/P/00564.

24/P/00855 (Page 323) – 88 Linden Way, Ripley, Woking, GU23 6LP

A representation has been received setting out the following concerns:

- neighbour's were not informed of the changes to the plans (Officer note: Amended plans were submitted showing a reduction to the proposed works. Therefore, it was not considered necessary to re-consult)

- the neighbour's front porch and rear extension have not been accurately represented on the submitted plans. (Officer note: A site visit to both the application property and neighbouring property has been carried out – an accurate assessment of the proposal has been made on this basis).
- additional water run-off should be dealt with within the application site (Officer note: Any downpipes/guttering should be contained wholly within the application site)
- application description is misleading (Officer note: Following the receipt of amended plans, the application description has been changed to accurately reflect the alterations)
- comment regarding ownership of the application property (Officer note: Officers are satisfied that the correct Certificate of ownership has been completed)
- concerns regarding parking (Officer note: This has been addressed in the officer's report)