

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

Councillors Amanda Creese, Tom Hunt and Fiona White were also in attendance online.

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillors Lizzie Griffiths, Maddy Redpath, Cait Taylor and Dominique Williams. Councillor Masuk Miah attended as a substitute for Dominique Williams and Councillor Jane Tyson attended as a substitute for Councillor Cait Taylor.

PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest declared.

PL3 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the Chairperson's announcements.

**PL4 23/P/01850 - THE UNIVERSITY OF LAW, BRABOEUF MANOR,
PORTSMOUTH ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU3 1HA**

The Committee considered the above mentioned full application for the demolition and retention of existing buildings and erection of new buildings to provide extra care housing (Use Class C2) and associated ancillary accommodation and amenity space, public realm works, at-grade car parking (existing), plus restoration and upgrade works to Braboeuf Manor (ancillary accommodation and amenity space) and the refurbishment of Pound Cottage for use as a single dwelling (Use Class C3) (amended plans received and description changed on 31.07.24, additional plans updated 10th September 2024).

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

- Mr John Harrison (on behalf of St Catherine's Village Association) (to object);
- Mr Alistair Smith (The Guildford Society) (to object);
- Mr Mark Curry (Applicant) and;
- Mr James Ewen (Project Architect)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Kate Little. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheet, in which it was detailed that the revised NPPF had now been published and was a material consideration for all planning decisions. It was also noted that since the agenda had been published, one objection had been withdrawn as it was considered that the amendments made since the initial submission of the application was sufficient to address the concerns raised. A further consultation response from St Catherine's Village Association had also been received.

The application was for the comprehensive redevelopment of the site to provide 131 use class C2 apartments for people aged over 65 years. The proposal would also involve the restoration of a grade II listed Manor House. To the north of the site was the town centre and to the east was Portsmouth Road. Ancient woodlands extended to the south within the site and was also close to Mount Browne Police HQ.

In terms of site constraints, the developed area of the site was inset from the Green Belt and the surrounding area was within the Green Belt. The site was also within the Surrey Hills National Landscape, an Area of Great Landscape Value and St Catherine's Conservation Area. A public right of way passed through the site.

Until recently, the site was home to the University of Law and was therefore a brownfield site. There were a large number of existing buildings onsite which were proposed to be demolished and replaced. The proposed built form was located in similar positions to the existing buildings. Blocks A and J were to be built on undeveloped land. The applicant had worked collaboratively with the Council and therefore the original proposals had changed significantly since the application was first submitted. A multi-storey car park was initially proposed but this has been removed in favour of the existing surface level car park. As per the proposed landscape masterplan, changes to the landscape were quite minimal but improvements would be made. The site was very green to the boundaries and the developed area was located in the centre of the site. Access through the site would be as per the existing arrangements. It was proposed that park land to the front of the site and adjacent to Portsmouth Road would be publicly accessible which was not the case currently. There was also an existing dwelling on the corner of the junction of Portsmouth Road and Sandy Lane and was proposed to be retained. Across from the Manor House a restaurant and wellness centre were proposed. It was a two-storey building built into the gradient of the landscape and read from both elevations as single storey. There was no public access on the ground floor as these were the facilities for staff and kitchens. The first floor was publicly accessible with a restaurant for residents, a gym and a pool. At the northern boundary, the proposal was to remove a squash court and replace it with Block P which would house an air source heat pump and refuse for the whole site.

The Grade II listed Manor House was adjoined to an administration block currently, that wrapped around the building and was out of character. The administration block would be demolished and replaced with Block B, which would improve the overall appearance. The Manor House was ancillary C2 use so to provide communal space for residents, a wellness centre and treatment rooms. These were multi-purpose rooms that would also be available to the public and could be booked by local community groups. The second floor would house staff and administration facilities.

Block D was proposed to be moved forward slightly providing more of a buffer between the ancient woodland. This block would provide 23 apartments that were dual aspect. There were 3-storeys proposed to the north and 2-storeys to the south. The materials selected had been chosen to compliment the bar gate stone and slate used in the Manor House. The site levels rose up in Zone 2 of the development. Fountain Court was close to an existing walled garden that was curtilage listed. Proposals for the walled garden were limited to retention and improvement with landscaping and materials proposed to be conditioned. Block H would provide 44 apartments with a green roof. Block J would provide 35

apartments with its roof line stepped. Blocks G, H and J were taller and bulkier than existing, but it was also considered by planning officers that they were located in a less sensitive part of the site and further away from heritage listed buildings. Some harm had been attributed to the landscape and heritage views but in the balance, it was considered that the planning benefit would outweigh the harm caused and was an effective use of a brownfield site. The surface level car parking would remain. The proposals also included a concierge valet parking service so residents could drop off their cars to be parked. Given the steep location of the parking provision and its distance from the proposed residences, the concierge facility would be secured as a Heads of Terms in the S106, to be provided in perpetuity. The Committee also noted the views identified in the landscape and visual impact assessment report.

The proposal was for a comprehensive redevelopment of a previously developed brownfield site. The proposal would result in the demolition of five existing buildings and the proposed erection of seven new buildings. 131 C2 extra care apartments would be made available to the over 65's as well as the provision of one C3 dwelling in addition to ancillary facilities. The officer recommendation was therefore to grant planning permission subject to a S106 and conditions.

The Committee discussed the application and noted a query regarding the 5-year housing land supply and whether this was still in place and if the tilted balance applied. It was confirmed by planning officers that the 5-year housing land supply did still exist and there was a reintroduction of the 5% buffer. Guildford still had a 5-year housing land supply and would continue to do so for some time. The Committee noted comments that there was a clear need for this type of housing and was much improved upon the first iteration of the scheme. The work around the heritage asset was far better than before. Concerns were however expressed regarding the guidance around the national landscape and whether the scheme conserved or enhanced the area of outstanding natural beauty. The bulk and height of the three units at the back of the proposed development were a concern.

The Committee noted that because the development was defined as C2 as opposed to C3 therefore no affordable housing was required to be provided. The Committee noted comments that the Manor House and the new building proposed next to it was in scale and appreciated the fact that it would at least now be separate from it. Blocks G and H were noted as a concern owing to their overall bulk and mass and were not designed well and possibly contravened Policy D4 of the Development Plan.

The Committee noted comments that the proposed scheme was located in an entirely brownfield site. Plot A included a tennis court, a car park and all of the developed areas of the site as well as the proposed location of J which were all inset from the Green Belt and would not constitute development in the Green Belt and therefore support for the scheme was expressed on this basis.

The Committee noted the merits of attending a site visit to view the proposal in context. The Committee noted comments that given the site was previously used by the University of Law, the traffic generated by this development would not represent an increase upon what was already previously experienced. The restoration of the Manor House and walled gardens was welcomed as they were currently in a dilapidated state. Separating out the Manor House from other buildings was also regarded as a positive step. Lastly, when considering the views from various points in Guildford, the development could barely be made out. The proposal would be built out largely upon the existing footprint and was viewed positively overall.

The Committee noted comments reiterating their support for the development on a brownfield site. The merits of preserving the footprint of the existing buildings were accepted and the amount of additional building proposed beyond that was limited. The proposal also offered some public benefits, in terms of access to the site and park land adjacent to Portsmouth Road. The height of the buildings was also barely discernable from outside of the site.

The Chairperson, Councillor King moved the motion to approve application 23/P/01850 and Councillor Stephen Hives seconded that motion which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
		FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Patrick Oven	X		
2	Jane Tyson	X		
3	Masuk Miah	X		
4	Howard Smith	X		
5	Richard Mills		X	
6	James Jones	X		
7	Bilal Akhtar	X		
8	Joanne Shaw	X		
9	Stephen Hives	X		
10	Vanessa King	X		
11	Joss Bigmore		X	
12	Yves de Contades	X		
	TOTALS	10	2	0

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

RESOLVED to approve application 23/P/01850 subject to the conditions as set out in the report and that a S106 agreement be entered into to secure:

- Primary healthcare contribution;
- Highways contribution;
- SANG (Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space) contribution;
- SAMM (Strategic Access Management and Monitoring) contributions;
- Identifying Use Class C2 accommodation qualifying person criteria & associated services to be provided;
- Securing the implementation and operation of the residents electric mini-bus, to be provided in perpetuity;
- Securing the implementation and provision of resident's concierge parking service, to be provided in perpetuity;
- Securing the implementation and operation of a car-club and the provision of a car-club vehicle for the use of residents;
- Securing the renovation and restoration, as per the approved plans of Braboeuf Manor and its associated curtilage listed buildings in accordance with agreed timeframes;
- Securing the provision of public and communal facilities, as per the approved plans, in accordance with agreed timeframes; and

- Securing free and unfettered public access to the grounds (those to the front of the site) and that Braboeuf Manor is open and freely accessible to the public and public groups under terms to be agreed.

If the terms of the S106 or wording of the planning conditions are materially amended as part of ongoing S106 or planning condition(s) negotiations, any changes are delegated to the Joint Assistant Director of Planning.

(i) That upon completion of the above, the application be determined by the Joint Assistant Director of Planning. The recommendation is to approve planning permission, subject to conditions.

(ii) If, after 12 months has elapsed since the resolution of the Planning Committee to grant planning permission, the S106 agreement is not completed then the Joint Head of Planning may refuse the application on the basis that the necessary mitigations to offset the impact of the development cannot be secured.

**PL5 23/P/01851 - THE UNIVERSITY OF LAW, BRABOEUF MANOR,
PORTSMOUTH ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU3 1HA**

The Committee considered the Listed Building Consent application for works to Braboeuf Manor and curtilage listed buildings to facilitate their use as ancillary accommodation and amenity space for the extra care housing. The curtilage listed buildings are: The Garden Cottage and attached workshops, Garage workshop, Summer House, 'The Cow Shed' and Pound Cottage (66 Sandy Lane).

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Kate Little. The largest impact in relation to the Manor House was the proposal to remove the administration block. There were some internal amendments to be made to part of the Manor House so to bring the building up to a modern standard. With regard to the Gardener's Cottage, the proposals were limited to allow for the building to be retained and repurposed to provide one two-bed C2 dwelling. The walled garden which was an existing feature was ancillary listed. The garage next to it was to be removed and to the rear of it there was a historic wall to be retained. The ancillary listed building would be repurposed to provide a studio guest suite and the introduction of some windows to the roof. The accommodation would be used by friends and family of residents which would be controlled via the S106. The C3 dwelling onsite between Sandy Lane and Portsmouth Road would be refurbished. The officer recommendation was to approve the application subject to conditions.

The Committee discussed the application, and it was confirmed by the planning officer that the Council’s Conservation Officer was content with the proposed changes and improvements that would be made to existing features.

The Chairperson, Councillor King moved the motion to approve application 23/P/01851 and Councillor Richard Mills seconded that motion which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Vanessa King	X		
2	Richard Mills	X		
3	Bilal Akhtar	X		
4	Joanne Shaw	X		
5	Stephen Hives	X		
6	Jane Tyson	X		
7	Howard Smith	X		
8	James Jones	X		
9	Yves de Contades	X		
10	Patrick Oven	X		
11	Joss Bigmore	X		
12	Masuk Miah	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 23/P/01851 subject to the conditions as detailed in the report.

The meeting finished at 8.23 pm

Signed

Date

Chairman