PLANNING COMMITTEE

Councillor Cait Taylor (Chair)

* Councillor George Potter (Vice-Chair)

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	Councillor Howard Smith
Councillor Stephen Hives	* The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Dominique Williams
* Councillor Masuk Miah	

*Present

Councillor Fiona White was also in attendance.

PL164 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from the following councillors:

- Cllr Bilal Akhtar [no substitute]
- Cllr Lizzie Griffiths [no substitute]
- Cllr Stephen Hives [Substitute: Cllr Catherine Houston]
- Cllr Richard Mills [no substitute]
- Cllr Patrick Oven [no substitute]
- Cllr Howard Smith [no substitute]
- Cllr Cait Taylor [no substitute]

PL165 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest.

PL166 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 22nd July 2026 were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Vice-Chair.

PL167 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the Vice-Chair's announcements.

The Joint Assistant Director for Planning provided Members with an update following the publication of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Members were advised that the revised NPPF was a material planning consideration relevant to the determination of applications before the Committee.

Update sheets had been provided for each application being considered at the meeting, identifying any changes arising from the revised NPPF and their implications for the Officer's recommendations.

PL168 26/P/00089 - 9 NORTH STREET, GUILDFORD, GU1 4AF

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for the installation of a mechanical extraction system as received by amended plans 5 June 2026.

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

1. Bonnie Buchanan [to object]
2. Yogi Poonai [to object]
3. Fezal Yurdakul [to support]
4. Waseem Sherwani [to support]

The Committee received a presentation from the Development Management Specialist, who outlined the proposal and the location and design of the proposed mechanical extraction system. Members were advised that the application site comprised a Grade II listed building within Guildford Town Centre and the Conservation Area. The change of use of the premises from retail to restaurant use did not require planning permission, and the application before the Committee related solely to the proposed mechanical extraction system.

The Development Management Specialist advised that the extraction flue would extend from the existing single-storey rear extension and upwards adjacent to the rear wall of the building. The Council's Listed Buildings Officer had assessed the proposed works and concluded that there would be no impact on historic fabric or the historic plan form of the building. While a low level of harm to the heritage asset had been identified through the introduction of modern development, this was considered to be outweighed by the public benefit of bringing the historic building back into use.

Officers clarified that the application had originally included an extension to the existing building, but this element had subsequently been removed from the proposal. Members were therefore considering only the mechanical extraction system. Environmental Health Officers had assessed the submitted noise and odour information and raised no objection, subject to the proposed conditions. Members were also advised that the use of the premises as a restaurant could not be controlled through the application as the change of use was permitted under the relevant use class provisions.

During the debate, Members acknowledged the concerns raised by neighbouring occupiers, but noted the limited scope of the application and the absence of objections from statutory consultees. Members considered that the identified harm arising from the extraction system was outweighed by the benefits of the proposal.

Members sought clarification regarding the control of cooking odours and the maintenance of the extraction system. Officers advised that a condition required the system to be installed and maintained in accordance with the submitted specification. Should unacceptable odour subsequently arise, the Council could investigate the matter with Environmental Health Officers and consider whether there had been a breach of planning conditions.

The Committee also discussed concerns raised by public speakers regarding the relationship between the application premises and the neighbouring Quaker Meeting House. Officers reiterated that the previously proposed extension had been removed and that the application would not alter the existing structure. Any separate issues relating to the existing building would therefore need to be addressed outside the determination of the application.

The Chair moved the motion to approve application 26/P/00089, subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the Officer's report. The motion was seconded by Councillor Miah and was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
		FOR	**AGAINST**	**ABSTAIN**
1.	Councillor Joss Bigmore	**X**		
2.	Councillor David Bilbe	**X**		
3.	Councillor Catherine Houston	**X**		
4.	Councillor Masuk Miah	**X**		
5.	Councillor George Potter	**X**		
6.	Councillor Maddy Redpath	**X**		
7.	Councillor Joanne Shaw	**X**		
8.	Councillor Dominique Williams	**X**		
9.	Councillor Yves de Contades	**X**		
	TOTALS	**9**	**0**	**0**

RESOLVED: That application 26/P/00089, be APPROVED, subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the Officer's report.

PL169 26/P/00194 - 9 NORTH STREET, GUILDFORD, GU1 4AF

The Committee considered the above-mentioned listed building consent for the installation of a mechanical extraction system as amended by plans received 5 June 2026.

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

1. Bonnie Buchanan [to object]
2. Yogi Poonai [to object]
3. Fezal Yurdakul [to support]
4. Waseem Sherwani [to support]

The Committee had received a presentation on the proposed works during consideration of the preceding planning application relating to the same site.

Officers reminded Members that the application before them related solely to listed building consent and that their consideration should therefore focus on the impact of the proposed works on the historic fabric and significance of the Grade II listed building.

During the debate, Members acknowledged the concerns raised by the public speakers but noted that matters relating to alternative uses of the premises and the status of existing structures did not form part of the application before the Committee. Members considered that the proposed internal alterations, including the provision of customer toilets and a kitchen, would have a minimal impact on the historic fabric of the building.

The Chair moved the motion to approve application 26/P/00194, subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the Officer's report. The motion was seconded by Councillor Shaw and was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
		FOR	**AGAINST**	**ABSTAIN**
1.	Councillor David Bilbe	**X**		
2.	Councillor Joss Bigmore	**X**		
3.	Councillor Masuk Miah	**X**		
4.	Councillor Yves de Contades	**X**		
5.	Councillor Catherine Houston	**X**		
6.	Councillor Maddy Redpath	**X**		
7.	Councillor Dominique Williams	**X**		
8.	Councillor Joanne Shaw	**X**		
9.	Councillor George Potter	**X**		
	TOTALS	**9**	**0**	**0**

RESOLVED: That application 26/P/00194, be APPROVED, subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the Officer's report.

PL170 26/P/00675 - 13 HARVEY ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 3SG

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full planning application for a Three storey rear extension, addition of juliet balconies to first and second floor rear elevations, together with other changes to fenestration, changes to external material finishes and the installation of solar panels (description amended 29/07/2026).

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

1. Paul Yeung [to object]

2. Christine Badawi [to object]
3. Darren Page [to support]

The Committee received a presentation from the Development Management Specialist, who outlined the proposal and advised that planning permission had previously been granted for the proposed changes to external materials, Juliet balconies, solar panels and a single-storey rear extension, with some of those works already being implemented. The application before the Committee sought permission for a three-storey rear extension in place of the previously approved single-storey extension.

The Development Management Specialist set out the relationship between the application property and neighbouring dwellings, together with the proposed floor plans and elevations. Members were advised that the first and second floors of the proposed extension would be set back from the adjoining property and that the extension would not increase the overall height of the dwelling. Officers considered that the proposal would not unacceptably unbalance or detract from the character of the paired dwellings, would preserve the character of the Conservation Area and would not result in unacceptable harm to neighbouring residential amenity.

During the debate, Members sought clarification on the differences between the current proposal and a previously refused application for a three-storey extension. Officers explained that the previous proposal had extended further towards the shared boundary and was greater in depth at first and second floor levels. The revised scheme had reduced the scale of the upper floors and increased the separation from the boundary, addressing the previous concerns regarding overbearing impact and the relationship with the neighbouring property.

Members discussed the proposed 1.8 metre privacy screen to the first-floor balcony and its potential impact on the neighbouring property. Officers advised that privacy screening was necessary to prevent overlooking between the adjoining balconies and that the proposed screen would be lower than the maximum height of the existing screen. While there would be some encroachment upon the 45-degree guideline from a neighbouring opening, this was considered minor and would not result in an unacceptable impact upon neighbouring amenity. Members noted that replacing the existing brick screening with the proposed arrangement could improve the amount of light reaching the neighbouring property.

Members also sought clarification on the relationship between the extension and the existing windows and sun terrace of the adjoining property, which Officers illustrated by reference to the photographs and plans presented to the Committee.

The Chair moved the motion to approve application 26/P/00675, subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the Officer's report. The motion was seconded by Councillor Bigmore and was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
		FOR	**AGAINST**	**ABSTAIN**
1.	Councillor Catherine Houston	**X**		
2.	Councillor George Potter	**X**		
3.	Councillor Maddy Redpath	**X**		
4.	Councillor Dominique Williams	**X**		
5.	Councillor Masuk Miah	**X**		
6.	Councillor Yves de Contades	**X**		
7.	Councillor Joss Bigmore	**X**		
8.	Councillor Joanne Shaw	**X**		
9.	Councillor David Bilbe			**X**
	TOTALS	**8**	**0**	**1**

RESOLVED: That application 26/P/00675 be APPROVED, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the Officer's report.

PL171 26/P/00611 - ANCHOR HOUSE, STATION ROW, SHALFORD, GU4 8BY

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for the erection of new plant equipment together with fencing, external alterations to the unit, erection of parcel lockers and alterations to existing access.

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

1. John Mason [to support]

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, who outlined the proposal and advised that the site was not within the Green Belt or a Conservation Area. The building had most recently been used as a veterinary surgery and offices, both of which fell within Class E of the Use Classes Order.

Members were advised that the proposed convenience store use also fell within Class E and therefore did not constitute a material change of use requiring planning permission. The matters before the Committee were consequently limited to the proposed plant and fencing, parcel lockers, external alterations and changes to the existing access.

The Senior Planning Officer outlined the proposed alterations and advised that the County Highway Authority had raised no objection. The application was supported by a noise impact assessment which had been reviewed by Environmental Health, with no objection raised subject to the development proceeding in accordance with the submitted details. Officers considered that, subject to the recommended conditions, the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the character of the area or neighbouring residential amenity, would not adversely affect highway safety and would not increase flood risk.

During the debate, Members discussed concerns raised regarding traffic movements and highway and pedestrian safety, particularly given the proximity of a school and nursery and the constrained nature of Station Row. Members also noted that part of the access was over land managed by the Council rather than the County Highway Authority. Officers reiterated that the existing Class E use did not require further planning permission and that the Committee could not therefore consider the traffic and servicing implications arising from the proposed retail use as part of the application before it. Members noted that the County Highway Authority had considered the proposed alterations to the access and had raised no objection.

Members sought clarification on whether the proposal was subject to Biodiversity Net Gain requirements given the proposed removal of a tree. Officers advised that the area of habitat affected was below the relevant threshold. Members also discussed the potential noise impact of the proposed plant and refrigeration equipment and were advised that the refrigeration units and condensers would be positioned on the western elevation, away from the neighbouring residential properties.

While Members acknowledged the concerns regarding traffic and pedestrian safety, it was recognised that these largely related to the proposed retail use rather than the works requiring planning permission. Members also noted that the alterations to the access and visibility splays would provide an improvement over the existing arrangement.

The Chair moved the motion to approve application 26/P/00611, subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the Officer's report. The motion was seconded by Councillor Miah and was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
		FOR	**AGAINST**	**ABSTAIN**
1.	Councillor David Bilbe	**X**		
2.	Councillor Catherine Houston			**X**
3.	Councillor Yves de Contades	**X**		
4.	Councillor Joss Bigmore	**X**		
5.	Councillor Maddy Redpath	**X**		
6.	Councillor Joanne Shaw	**X**		
7.	Councillor Dominique Williams			**X**
8.	Councillor George Potter	**X**		
9.	Councillor Masuk Miah	**X**		
	TOTALS	**7**	**0**	**2**

RESOLVED: That application 26/P/00611 be APPROVED, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the Officer's report.

PL172 26/P/00630 - 98 YEW TREE DRIVE, GUILDFORD, GU1 1NZ

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for a vehicular hard standing, with crossover to the highway together with conversion of outbuilding and internal alterations (amended on 16/07/2026).

The Committee received a presentation from the Development Management Specialist, who outlined the proposal and advised that the conversion of the outbuilding and internal alterations did not require planning permission. The matters for consideration were therefore limited to the proposed hardstanding and vehicular crossover.

The Development Management Specialist set out the site and surrounding context, noting that the neighbouring property already had a driveway and that the existing frontage of the application property was already used for parking.

The proposed hardstanding would be modest in scale and constructed using permeable materials. Officers considered that the proposal would not harm the

character of the site or surrounding area, neighbouring residential amenity or highway safety.

During the debate, Members noted the loss of part of the existing grassed frontage but welcomed the use of permeable materials and raised no concerns regarding the proposal.

The Chair moved the motion to approve application 26/P/00630, subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the Officer's report. The motion was seconded by Councillor Williams and was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
		FOR	**AGAINST**	**ABSTAIN**
1.	Councillor Dominique Williams	**X**		
2.	Councillor David Bilbe	**X**		
3.	Councillor Maddy Redpath	**X**		
4.	Councillor Joanne Shaw	**X**		
5.	Councillor George Potter	**X**		
6.	Councillor Masuk Miah	**X**		
7.	Councillor Catherine Houston	**X**		
8.	Councillor Joss Bigmore	**X**		
9.	Councillor Yves de Contades	**X**		
	TOTALS	**9**	**0**	**0**

RESOLVED: That application 26/P/00630 be APPROVED, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the Officer's report.

PL173 26/P/00492 - 1, 3 AND 5 YORK ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 4DR

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for the refurbishment of existing homeless shelter (Nos. 3 and 5 York Road) and change of use from residential (C3) to homeless accommodation (No.1 York Road) into a single homeless accommodation centre (Sui Generis) and ancillary healthcare office / facility including extension to the communal facilities in Nos. 3 and 5 with other associated works.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, who outlined the proposal and the existing and proposed floor plans. Members were advised that Nos. 3 and 5 York Road had been used as homeless accommodation

since 1999, while No. 1 comprised three vacant residential flats which would be incorporated into the expanded facility.

The Senior Planning Officer advised that the majority of the proposed works were internal, with limited alterations to the external appearance of the buildings.

Although a number of the proposed bedrooms would not meet the Nationally Described Space Standards, these were guidance and, given the transient nature of the accommodation and the improvements proposed to the existing facilities, officers considered the accommodation acceptable.

Members were advised that the site was sustainably located close to Guildford town centre and that conditions were proposed to secure cycle parking and electric vehicle charging facilities to encourage sustainable travel by staff. While the proposal would result in the loss of three Class C3 residential units, officers considered that this was outweighed by the provision of improved homeless accommodation, addressing an important housing need within the borough.

Officers considered that the development would not result in unacceptable harm to the character of the existing buildings, the surrounding area, neighbouring residential amenity or the Conservation Area.

No Members indicated that they wished to speak on the application.

The Chair moved the motion to approve application 26/P/00492, subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the Officer's report. The motion was seconded by Councillor Houston and was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
		FOR	**AGAINST**	**ABSTAIN**
1.	Councillor Maddy Redpath	**X**		
2.	Councillor George Potter	**X**		
3.	Councillor Masuk Miah	**X**		
4.	Councillor Dominique Williams	**X**		
5.	Councillor David Bilbe	**X**		
6.	Councillor Yves de Contades	**X**		
7.	Councillor Joanne Shaw	**X**		
8.	Councillor Catherine Houston	**X**		
9.	Councillor Joss Bigmore	**X**		
	TOTALS	**9**	**0**	**0**

RESOLVED: That application 26/P/00492 be APPROVED, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the Officer's report.

PL174 26P00662 - FOXENDEN QUARRY PLAYGROUND

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application to fill the void of an abandoned World War Two Air Raid Shelter to make safe the structure. Description amended 11/06/26.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, who outlined the location and condition of the subterranean structure, which was currently fenced off as it was structurally unsound.

Members were advised that the structure was not a designated heritage asset and was separate from the nearby Foxenden Quarry tunnels. Given its relatively shallow construction, it was considered likely to have been used for storage rather than as an air raid bunker. The proposal was to fill the structure with recycled aggregate to make it safe.

No Members indicated that they wished to speak on the application.

The Chair moved the motion to approve application 26/P/00662, subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the Officer's report. The motion was seconded by Councillor Miah and was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
		FOR	**AGAINST**	**ABSTAIN**
1.	Councillor Maddy Redpath	**X**		
2.	Councillor Joss Bigmore	**X**		
3.	Councillor Dominique Williams	**X**		
4.	Councillor Masuk Miah	**X**		
5.	Councillor David Bilbe	**X**		
6.	Councillor Catherine Houston	**X**		
7.	Councillor Yves de Contades	**X**		
8.	Councillor Joanne Shaw	**X**		
9.	Councillor George Potter	**X**		
	TOTALS	**9**	**0**	**0**

RESOLVED: That application 26/P/00662 be APPROVED, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the Officer's report.

PL175 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee received a report on recent planning appeal decisions.

Members noted that only one of the appeals reported had been allowed and commented on the Council's recent success in defending decisions at appeal.

The Joint Assistant Director for Planning advised that the Council was achieving a higher success rate than had historically been the case and suggested that this reflected the quality of decision-making. It was also noted that the appeals reported were predominantly in respect of smaller-scale applications, which may have contributed to the success rate.

The planning appeal decisions were noted.

The meeting closed at 9.17 pm

Signed ..... Date .....

Chairman