

## 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 Howard Smith
* Councillor Stephen Hives	* Councillor Cait Taylor
Councillor James Jones	

\*Present

Councillors Angela Goodwin, Merel Rehorst-Smith and Catherine Young were also in attendance online.

### **PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies were received from Councillors Bilal Akhtar, Joss Bigmore and James Jones with no substitutes.

### **PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

Councillor Richard Mills declared a non-pecuniary interest in application 24/P/01438 – Turret House, 1 Jenner Road, Guildford, GU1 3PH. This was owing to the fact that he lived 150 yards away from the site. However, Councillor Mills stated that this would not affect his objectivity.

### **PL3 MINUTES**

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 18 December 2024 were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairperson, Councillor Vanessa King.

### **PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Committee noted the Chairperson's announcements.

**PL5 24/P/00520 - SHEEPLEAS HOUSE, EPSOM ROAD, WEST HORSLEY,  
LEATHERHEAD, KT24 6AL**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of 4 detached dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping (revised plans received 25/11/2024).

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

- Mr Guy Murray (West Horsley Parish Council) (to object) (attending online) (Democratic Services read speech on Mr Murray's behalf owing to a bad internet connection);
- Mr Simon Leary (to object) and;
- Mr Ben Mitchell (Planit Consulting) (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, John Busher. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which detailed a small change to condition 16. The site was located to the north of Epsom Road and formed part of the garden of a large, detached dwelling which was known as Sheeplea's House. The site was inset from the Green Belt and was also within the settlement boundary of East Horsley. The Surrey Hills National Landscape and the AGLV were located on the other side of Epsom Road. Natural England were currently considering expanding the National Landscape which would include the curtilage of West Horsley Place. The boundaries to the north and west of the site were agricultural land currently. There was also an existing listed building on Epsom Road.

The four detached dwellings proposed would be located behind Sheeplea's House and would continue to be accessed from Epsom Road. The existing garage would be demolished to make way for the access. Three of the properties would run along the eastern boundary of the plot with a further property in the northwestern corner of the site.

Plot one was a barn dwelling which would contain three bedrooms and had a vernacular architectural style. The largest of the four properties would have four bedrooms and was two stories in height and located in the northwestern corner of the site. This was probably the most sensitive part of the development, and it was worth noting that the case officer had succeeded in securing amendments to the scheme which originally proposed five dwellings. In addition, the case officer had managed to get the barn style dwelling in the north-western corner where it

transitions from the settlement area to the Green Belt to provide a more appropriate transition from the more residential area into the countryside.

In summary, the application site was located within the settlement area and therefore there was no in principle objection to the construction of new dwellings. The nature, scale and the quantum of the proposal was in keeping with the character of the surrounding area and provided an adequate transition between the more densely populated residential area into the Green Belt. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Chairperson permitted Ward Councillor Catherine Young to speak for three minutes online. The objections raised by both East and West Horsley Parish Council and residents were noted. The development proposed would harm the rural local character and did not respect West Horsley's surrounding landscape. It was a back garden development in a particularly sensitive location edged by the Green Belt, the agricultural fields of West Horsley Place and Farm and flanked by the hills of the Surrey National Landscape. The application conflicted with West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan, policy WH2 which states that development proposals must maintain an attractive rural edge and maintain countryside views. In addition, the proposal did not meet the test of Local Plan policy D1(4) place shaping. This specifies that all new development must be designed to reflect the local character of the area and would respond and reinforce locally distinct patterns of development, including the landscape setting. There was no development of this type in the area. Neither did it meet the test of Development Management Policy D4(3) which states that development proposals are required to incorporate high quality design, which should contribute to the local distinctiveness by demonstrating a clear understanding of place. Development proposals should respond positively to the history of the place, its heritage, significant views to and from the surrounding context, the prevailing character and the landscape. The design might be good, but it was in the wrong location. The policies were adopted to protect and enhance the character of our villages. If allowed, this development will harm the character of West Horsley and change the pattern of development and ruin the landscape setting.

Additionally, further consideration should have been given to the access straight onto the increasingly busy and congested A246. Surrey County Council should have taken the opportunity to reduce the speed limit along this stretch to 40mph, given the prospect of further development in this area, and this could have been conditioned.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that Sheeplea's was a big house with a large garden. A committee member noted that they had visited the area and walked down Fern Close which was just around the corner from the proposed development. The houses in Fern Close were not as large and were more densely located together. Therefore the argument that the proposal would change the character of the local area was questioned. Neither was it accepted that the development would increase noise and pollution significantly. Further information was required about the green energy provision onsite and biodiversity net gains.

The Senior Planning Officer, John Busher confirmed that the applicant had agreed to provide the Local Plan requirements of 20% biodiversity net gain and was secured by condition 16 amended on the late sheets. In terms of sustainability, this was referred to in the report on pages 50 – 51 where a fabric first approach was taken. Policy officers were happy with how the building had been designed to reduce the energy consumption that would impact upon climate change. The applicant had also committed to using an air source heat pump which was secured by condition 11.

The Committee noted comments made that the plan provided showed the layout of the houses to the east of the site but was completely blank as regard the layout to the west. To the immediate left was West Horsley Place which was a grade I listed building of national importance. We were not solely looking at the locality heading into the village but all of the surrounding area with the west side being entirely different from the east. The development failed to achieve high quality design that responded to the distinctive local character. It appeared that the existing house provided a transition between the more urban area of Horsley itself and then the more rural area.

The visibility from the access road was also noted to be of concern, whilst accepted that Surrey Highways had no objections, the speed limit was 40mph which made turning right very dangerous. On this basis, it was suggested that the proposal failed to comply with paragraph D1 and also D1(4) and WH2 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

The Committee noted comments that the Local Plan carried some weight in relation to this application but was not definitive. Similar applications to these had been approved by the Planning Committee which involved land inset from the Green Belt. Frustration was expressed with Surrey Highways who had made no comments in relation to the access to the proposed development. Overall, the proposal was not perceived as harmful to the character of the local area. It was noted that an informative would be applied so that habitats for reptiles were

checked for prior to development taking place. Clarification was sought on the details of that informative. The Director of Planning, Claire Upton-Brown confirmed that certain species were protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act and therefore doing anything to damage their habitat was an offence under that Act. The Council had no legal powers under that Act, and it was Natural England that enforced it. The informative was applied so to make the applicant aware of their duties.

The Committee noted comments that a councillor had visited the application site and observed the fast-moving traffic and shared concerns regarding the dangers of turning right out of Epsom Road. It was confirmed by planning officers, that condition 6 would require prior to first occupation, the proposed vehicle access to Epsom Road to be constructed and provided with the visibility splay in accordance with the scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the visibility splay shall be kept permanently clear of any obstructions over 3.6 metres in height. Further details were therefore required to demonstrate visibility in both directions.

The Committee also noted concerns raised regarding the transition between the development and the Green Belt as well as concerns about the density. Since the application had been modified, concerns were allayed particularly about the design of plot four being smaller and set back from the western boundary. The tree retention along this boundary also assisted in screening the development.

The Chairperson, Councillor King moved the motion to approve application 24/P/00520 and Councillor Stephen Hives seconded that motion which was carried.

<b>RECORDED VOTE LIST</b>				
		<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
1	Cllr Richard Mills	X		
2	Cllr Stephen Hives	X		
3	Cllr Cait Taylor			X
4	The Deputy Mayor, Cllr Howard Smith	X		
5	Cllr Maddie Redpath	X		
6	Cllr Lizzie Griffiths	X		
7	Cllr David Bilbé	X		
8	Cllr Yves de Contades	X		
9	Cllr Dominique Williams	X		
10	Cllr Pat Oven		X	
11	Cllr Vanessa King	X		
12	Cllr Joanne Shaw			X
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 24/P/00520 subject to the amendment to condition 16 as detailed on the supplementary late sheets, and conditions and reasons as set out in the report.

**PL6 24/P/01374 - FAIRWAYS, BEECH AVENUE, EFFINGHAM, LEATHERHEAD, KT24 5PJ**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of a self-build replacement dwelling following demolition of existing dwelling.

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

- Mr Tim Butler (Applicant) (in support) and;
- Ms Alexandra Hall (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, John Busher. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which included an updated version of the site location plan, as an incorrect version had been

included with the agenda. The application proposed the erection of a replacement dwelling following the demolition of the existing property onsite as well as two detached garage buildings. The application site was located within the Green Belt. Effingham Golf Club was located to the west of the property and was outside of the village centre of Effingham. Although there was development on both sides of Beech Lane, it was mostly on the western side of Effingham Golf Club. The proposed location of the replacement dwelling would marginally overlap with the footprint of the existing dwelling but would be more centrally located. In terms of the front elevations, the proposed dwelling would be much larger than the current property. The side and rear elevations would also be replaced by a substantially greater volume, bulk and massing.

Whilst it was noted by planning officers that the maximum height and depth dimensions had decreased, these are minimal reductions and the increase in the width of the dwelling would represent a greater increase than both the height and the depth reductions together. The maximum ridge height had also only reduced by 10cm. The maximum ridge height of the existing dwelling only extended over a width of 6.1 metres whereas the maximum ridge height of the proposed dwelling would extend across a width of 11 metres. The replacement dwelling would have over a 40 % greater floor area than the existing property and 100 % greater volume than the existing dwelling and the two garages combined. A large amount of additional volume came from the extent of the first-floor accommodation as well as the roof space.

The Committee noted the existing vehicular access for the application site which would remain as existing, but the replacement dwelling would be more visible than the existing due to the proposed central location on the site. The character of Beech Lane had a significant rural feel. The front elevation of the dwelling proposes a roof form designed in part to be utilised for the first-floor accommodation with a very small gable element on the side as well as the cat slide roof on the front elevation and fully hipped nature of the dwelling.

It was the planning officers view that due to the design, height and bulk of the new dwelling; it would be more prominent in the new centrally located position from the Green Belt than the existing situation. Planning officers did not object to the proposal with regards to design or amenity. The main issue was that the application represented inappropriate development in the Green Belt and no very special circumstances applied. The application was therefore recommended for refusal.

The Committee discussed the application and noted comments that in terms of this proposal, whilst acknowledging its location in a sensitive Green Belt area,

there were properties either side of the existing dwelling that were considerably larger. Those larger dwellings were built in the 1980's when the NPPF did not apply, but they would have a greater impact upon the Green Belt than the proposal before the Committee. The Committee noted that there had previously been an application on the same site which proposed an additional house as well as the existing. This was refused by the Planning Committee and turned down at appeal. This proposed a replacement house which was more centrally located and had a considerable amount of space around it. Whilst the volume of the house would increase, it was questioned to what extent it would fundamentally affect the Green Belt and the visual openness, when a house was already located on the site. It was also noted that the site was located only on the very boundary of the Green Belt on already developed land.

The Committee noted further comments that given the application site was located in the Green Belt the NPPF rules should apply. The proposal did represent a significant increase in volume and floor area.

The Committee noted comments that the issue of scale and mass was subjective and had to be looked at in context. In this instance, the proposal should be permitted. A query was raised in relation to how much of the 100% garage volume increase was habitable space. It was confirmed by planning officers that the volume for the first garage was 142m<sup>2</sup> and the second garage was 26.7m<sup>2</sup>. In terms of floor area this represented a 40.3% increase when you considered the garages as well as the existing property versus the proposed.

The Committee noted further comments that the benefits of the scheme outweighed the harm caused in this instance. The Committee did not support the officer's recommendation to refuse the application and an alternative motion was invited by the Chairperson.

Councillor Patrick Oven moved a motion to approve application 24/P/01374 which was seconded by The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Howard Smith which was carried.



<b>RECORDED VOTE LIST</b>				
	<b>COUNCILLOR</b>	<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
1	The Deputy Mayor, Cllr Howard Smith	X		
2	Cllr Joanne Shaw			X
3	Cllr Yves de Contades	X		
4	Cllr Cait Taylor	X		
5	Cllr David Bilbé	X		
6	Cllr Stephen Hives		X	
7	Cllr Richard Mills	X		
8	Cllr Dominique Williams			X
9	Cllr Maddie Redpath	X		
10	Cllr Vanessa King		X	
11	Cllr Pat Oven	X		
12	Cllr Lizzie Griffiths		X	
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 24/P/01374 subject to the following reasons and conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: · SH3875 Rev A Sheet 1 of 3; SH3875 Rev A Sheet 3 of 3; AHBA-007; 2018/47; 01 Rev A; 12 Rev B; 18 Rev D; 19 Rev D and 20 Rev C received on 19/09/2024. · SH3875 Rev A Sheet 2 of 3 received on 24/09/2024. · 14 Rev H received on 30/09/2024. · 11 Rev B; 13 Rev G; 17 Rev E; 25 Rev A; 26 Rev A; 27 Rev A and 28 Rev A received on 26/11/2024.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in the interests of proper planning.

3. Prior to the commencement of any development above slab level works, a written schedule with details of the source/ manufacturer, colour and finish, OR samples on request, of all external facing and roof materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This must include the details of embodied carbon/ energy (environmental credentials) of all external materials. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory external appearance of the development is achieved and to ensure materials that are lower in carbon are chosen.

4. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until facilities for the secure, covered parking of bicycles and the provision of a charging point with timer for e-bikes by said facilities have been provided within the development site in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the said approved facilities shall be provided, retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users.

5. The development hereby permitted must comply with regulation 36 paragraph 2(b) of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended) to achieve a water efficiency of 110 litres per occupant per day (described in part G2 of the Approved Documents 2015). Before occupation, a copy of the wholesome water consumption calculation notice (described at regulation 37 (1) of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended)) shall be provided to the planning department to demonstrate that this condition has been met.

Reason: To improve water efficiency in accordance with the Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy SPD 2024.

6. No external lighting shall be installed on the site or affixed to any buildings on the site unless the local planning authority has first approved in writing details of the position, height, design, measures to control light spillage and intensity of illumination. Only the approved details shall be installed.

Reason: In the interests of minimising the impact of development on protected species.

7. The approved Arboricultural Report, which includes a Tree Protection Plan (TPP), prepared by dpa arboricultural consultants and dated November 2022, must be adhered to in full, and may only be modified by written agreement from the LPA. No development shall commence until tree protection measures, and any other pre-commencement measures as set out in the report and TPP, have been installed/implemented. The protection measures shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details, until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been moved from the site.

Reason: To protect the trees on site or adjacent which are to be retained in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality. It is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition because the adequate protection of trees prior to works commencing on site goes to the heart of the planning permission.

8. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting or amending those Orders with or without modification), no development within Part 1, Class E shall be carried out on the dwellinghouse(s) hereby permitted or within their curtilage.

Reason: Having regard to the size of the dwelling approved and that the demolition of existing outbuildings on site was used to justify the approval, it is necessary for the local planning authority wishes to retain control over any future outbuildings at the property, in order to safeguard the openness of the Green Belt.

9. No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a Biodiversity Enhancement Plan detailing how the development will deliver biodiversity enhancements is submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The Biodiversity Enhancement Plan should be based on the impact avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures specified in the submitted ecological reports and should include, but not be limited to the following: a) Description and evaluation of features to be provided b) Location plan of all ecological enhancement features being provided c) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management d) Prescriptions for management actions e) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures

Reason: To increase the biodiversity of the site and mitigate any impact from the development. It is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition because the ecological value of the existing site will need to be considered to assist with the design of an enhancement plan.

10. No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following: a) Map showing the location of all ecological features b) Risk Assessment of the potentially damaging construction activities c) Practical measures to avoid and reduce impacts during construction d) Location and timing of works to avoid harm to biodiversity features e) Responsible persons and lines of communication f) Use of protective fencing, exclusion barriers and warning signs The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period in accordance with the approved details

Reason: To protect protected species and habitats and to mitigate any impact from the development during the construction process. It is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition because the management of the construction needs to be considered before construction commences.

11. No development shall commence until a Site Waste Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority that demonstrates how waste generated from construction and excavation activities would be dealt with in accordance with the waste hierarchy. The Site Waste Management Plan will subsequently be kept up to date throughout the development process in accordance with the established methodology.

Reason: To ensure that the development takes waste hierarchy into account to manage waste. It is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition because waste will begin to be generated as soon as any development commences on the site

12. The development hereby approved shall only be implemented by the demolition of the existing dwelling and garaging identified in drawing no. 11 Rev B received on 26/11/2024 and shall include the removal of foundations. All of the resultant demolition materials and debris that are not to be reused in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall be removed from the site.

Reason: In the interests of protecting the openness of the Green Belt.

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 in certain circumstances
- 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. In this case pre-application advice was sought and provided, however, Officers considered that there were still significant issues with the proposal. The Planning Committee determined the application and found it to be acceptable.

2. If you need any advice regarding Building Regulations please do not hesitate to contact Guildford Borough Council Building Control on 01483 444545 or [buildingcontrol@guildford.gov.uk](mailto:buildingcontrol@guildford.gov.uk)

3. The applicant is expected to ensure the safe operation of all construction traffic to prevent unnecessary disturbance obstruction and inconvenience to other highway users. Care should be taken to ensure that the waiting, parking, loading and unloading of construction vehicles does not hinder the free flow of any carriageway, footway, bridleway, footpath, cycle route, right of way or private driveway or entrance. The developer is also expected to require their contractors to sign up to the "Considerate Constructors Scheme" Code of Practice, ([www.ccscheme.org.uk](http://www.ccscheme.org.uk)) and to follow this throughout the period of construction within the site, and within adjacent areas such as on the adjoining public highway and other areas of public realm. Where repeated problems occur the Highway Authority may use available powers under the terms of the Highways Act 1980 to ensure the safe operation of the highway.

4. The applicant is advised that any alterations to existing highway infrastructure should be designed so there is no adverse effect on surface water flow routes and should not increase flood risk on or off site. It is possible to check the long term flood risk on the following Government website: Check the long term flood risk for an area in England - GOV.UK ([www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk)). For further information please contact the Flood Risk, Planning and Consenting Team [suds@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:suds@surreycc.gov.uk)

5. It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that the electricity supply is sufficient to meet future demands and that any power balancing technology is in place if required. Electric Vehicle Charging Points shall be provided in accordance

with the Surrey County Council Vehicular, Cycle and Electric Vehicle Parking Guidance for New Development 2024. Where undercover parking areas (multi-storey car parks, basement or undercroft parking) are proposed, the developer and LPA should liaise with Building Control Teams and the Local Fire Service to understand any additional requirements. If an active connection costs on average more than £3600 to install, the developer must provide cabling (defined as a 'cabled route' within the 2022 Building Regulations) and two formal quotes from the distribution network operator showing this.

6. It is the responsibility of the developer to provide e-bike charging points with socket timers to prevent them constantly drawing a current over night or for longer than required. Signage should be considered regarding damaged or shock impacted batteries, indicating that these should not be used/charged. The design of communal bike areas should consider fire spread and there should be detection in areas where charging takes place. With regard to an e-bike socket in a domestic dwelling, the residence should have detection, and an official e-bike charger should be used. Guidance on detection can be found in BS 5839-6 for fire detection and fire alarm systems in both new and existing domestic premises.

**PL7      24/P/01438 - TURRET HOUSE, 1 JENNER ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 3PH**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to vary condition 24 (restriction of use Class B1(a)) to allow Use Class E – Commercial, Business and Service for planning permission 10/P/01725, approved on 25/11/2010 for “Conversion and refurbishment of existing redundant office with addition of three storey extension fronting Epsom Road to provide twelve residential apartments and the erection of a three storey office (Use Class B1) building fronting Jenner Road with basement parking for twenty cars” to enable a Class E use class.

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

- Ms Gayle Olivia Longhurst (to object);
- Ms Dominique Vincent (to object) and;
- Mr Clive Stone (Chief Executive Oakleaf) (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Colin Begeman. The Committee noted that a late representation had been circulated to councillors from a former client of Oakleaf who supported the proposal. He

highlighted how mental health stigma prevented many from seeking help and emphasised the importance of safe spaces for connection, growth and acceptance. A new facility location and layout would improve access and service delivery for those struggling with mental health issues which could affect anyone at any time. He urged understanding, stressing that such a resource would benefit not only clients but also the broader community.

The Committee noted that the application sought to amend condition 24 of the original planning permission granted for Turret House, 1 Jenner Road. The condition currently restricted the use of the office building to Class B1A which was for office purposes only. The application proposed to allow a broader range of use under Class E, a more flexible use class introduced under recent planning regulations. The residential apartments approved under the original application were not part of this proposal. Under this proposal, the majority of the office building, around 72%, would remain in office use, ensuring that it continued to provide employment opportunities. In addition, the amendment would permit ancillary uses such as counselling and wellbeing services to support the work of Oakleaf Enterprise, a mental health charity. These services are designed to meet pressing community needs while ensuring the building remains active and fully utilised. Ultimately, the aim of the proposal was to balance the retention of employment space with the delivery of vital community services, all while securing the long-term use of the currently vacant building.

The site sits on the corner with Jenner Road, Epsom Road and Sydenham Road opposite the High Street. The outside space in the courtyard would not be used after 7pm. The plans showed the area for the well-being hub, multi-use space, a reception, stairs, lift and WC. The first four levels were mainly office use, the admin, accounts, fundraising, client services, IT, the stair, lift and WC. The top floor was mainly for office use with some rooms used for counselling.

When considering this application, there were several key factors to take into account. Firstly, the proposal retained the majority of the building, approximately 72%, for traditional office use, ensuring that the site continued to provide employment opportunities. This met the objectives of policy E3, which sought to safeguard employment generating sites. The ancillary uses such as counselling and well-being services would occupy a small portion of the building. These activities were directly tied to the operation of Oak Leaf Enterprise, a local mental health charity and would provide vital community support. The Wellbeing Hub was operated in partnership with the NHS and would operate between 6pm and 11pm as a county-wide funded support service for people experiencing

mental health crisis or emotional distress on a one-to-one basis. On an average evening, two or three clients attend with very few staying until 11pm.

In terms of marketing evidence, the property had been actively marketed for 21 months by a local commercial agent, but no viable interest had been shown in occupying the entire building for office use. This reflected a broader decline in demand for traditional office space in the area.

Residential amenity has been a key consideration. To address potential impacts, the applicant had proposed several mitigation measures, including restricting the use of the courtyard to no later than 7pm in the evening, prohibiting amplified sound in the courtyard, and limiting evening activities to low-intensity, one-to-one services within the building. These steps ensure that noise and disturbance were kept to a minimum and controlled by a condition.

The applicant was proposing that the rear courtyard will be a no-smoking area. The Committee noted that the current office use was unrestricted in terms of operating times. The courtyard use was limited to 9 am. to 7 pm, the office use 8am. to 6 pm, and the wellbeing hub from 6pm to 11pm.

From a highways and parking perspective, the site was well located with the town centre with access to public transport and multiple public car parks nearby. On-street car parking was already controlled through restrictions such as pay and display and residents permits which helps minimise potential impacts. Additionally, the building includes on-site basement parking and staggered arrival times would help reduce any perceived congestion. The proposal complied with policy E3 of the Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework as it retained employment use while supporting much needed community services. It demonstrated a balanced approach to making effective use of an existing building in response to changing market conditions.

Finally, the public and community benefits of this proposal were significant. The building would be brought back into active use by a charity providing vital mental health services contributing to the local economy and enhancing community sustainability. This represented a positive outcome for both the site and the wider community. On this basis, the application was recommended to the committee for approval subject to conditions.

The Committee discussed the application and noted comments that the roads close to the proposal were predominantly residential but also included other uses such as retail and commercial. The proposal did offer social facilities for people in



temporary difficulties and no objection could be found given this was considered an appropriate site for such a facility. The primary clientele were likely to be people suffering with depression and would therefore be quieter by the nature of their problem.

The Committee noted that the potential risks had been clearly outlined by planning officers and ensured that conditions covered those risks. The area for the wellbeing hub could not expand disproportionately in any way and the problems of noise were constrained by the hours of operation.

The Committee noted comments that the area was characterised by not just residential properties but also by shops and restaurants. The building was previously used by a solicitors and the proposal was in a good location being served well by good transport links.

The Committee noted a query raised in relation to the potential to install frosted glass into existing windows. Planning officers advised that the Committee needed to ensure that when adding conditions they needed to be reasonable, necessary and enforceable. If the Committee were minded to approve the application, then they needed to assess whether the condition met those tests. In this instance the Committee concluded that it was not a material consideration.

The Chairperson, Councillor Vanessa King moved the motion to approve application 24/P/01438 and Councillor Dominique Williams seconded that motion which was carried.

<b>RECORDED VOTE LIST</b>				
	<b>COUNCILLOR</b>	<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
1	Cllr Joanne Shaw	X		
2	Cllr Cait Taylor	X		
3	Cllr Maddie Redpath	X		
4	Cllr Stephen Hives	X		
5	Cllr Pat Oven	X		
6	Cllr Dominique Williams	X		
7	Cllr Vanessa King	X		
8	Cllr Richard Mills	X		
9	Cllr Yves de Contades	X		
10	The Deputy Mayor, Cllr Howard Smith	X		
11	Cllr David Bilbé	X		
12	Cllr Lizzie Griffiths	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>12</b>		

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

RESOLVED to approve application 24/P/01438 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

**PL8 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS**

**Appeal: The Harrow Inn, The Street, Compton, Surrey, GU3 1EG**

22/P/01999 – The development proposed is change of use of public house, together with extensions and alterations following partial demolition to provide five dwellings with associated amenity space and car parking.

Officer recommendation: To Approve

Planning Committee: 3 January 2024

Decision: To Refuse

The Committee discussed the above appeal which had been refused by the Planning Committee at its meeting on 3 January 2024 and allowed at appeal. The Director of Planning stated that the decision was overturned because the reasons given for refusal by the committee were not robust enough. It was an officer overturn and the Inspector in considering the matter concluded that it was not

inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It did not have a harmful effect on the openness of the Greenbelt and no material harm was identified. The material consideration that weighed in favour of the proposal, which was that it reused a historic building and provided additional housing and accorded with the development plan and there was therefore no reason to withhold permission.

The Committee noted that it was very much a balancing of the policies, and the Inspector gave more weight to the fact that the Committee did not demonstrate the harm that would be caused. The proposal would re-used a historic building which had not fallen into disrepair but disuse. The site had also been marketed and there was no other use identified and would provide additional housing. At that time, the Council had a five-year housing land supply which if considered now would be less and therefore the provision of housing would be even more heavily emphasised. The appeal was therefore granted owing to the Council's inability to demonstrate harm.

The meeting finished at 9.30 pm

Signed .....

Date .....

Chairman