

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

- \* Councillor Fiona White (Chairman)
- \* To be Elected (Vice-Chairman)

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

\*Present

Councillors Tony Rooth and Catherine Young were also in attendance.

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

Apologies were received from Councillors Chris Barrass and Ruth Brothwell. Councillor Bob McShee was in attendance as a substitute for Councillor Ruth Brothwell. Councillor David Bilbé was not in attendance and Councillor Angela Gunning was not in attendance for the consideration of the first application 22/P/02589 – Unit 32, Kings Court, Burrows Lane, Gomshall, Shere.

### **PL2 ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

The Chairman asked the Committee for nominations for Vice-Chairman for which none were received. The Chairman stated that this item of business would therefore be placed on the next agenda of the Planning Committee meeting on 29 March 2023.

### **PL3 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

#### **21/P/02036 – Land adjacent to 12 Oak Hill, Wood Street Village, GU3 3ER**

Councillor Fiona White declared a personal interest in the above application. Given that the applicant was the husband of Councillor Julia McShane who Councillor White knew well, owing to this personal interest, she would leave the room for the consideration and vote taken in respect of that application.

Councillors Liz Hogger and Pauline Searle would also leave the room for the consideration and vote taken in respect of the above application for the same reasons.

**PL4 MINUTES**

The minutes of the following meetings; 22 November 2022, 4 January, 1 and 7 February 2023 were approved by the Committee and signed by the Chairman.

**PL5 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Committee noted that Chairman's Announcements.

**PL6 21/P/02589 - UNIT 3C, KINGS COURT, BURROWS LANE, GOMSHALL, SHERE, GU5 9QE**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for change of use of part of building (Use Class E) to two residential units (C3) including minor fenestration changes and associated external alterations.

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

- Ms Janet Dent (to object);
- Mr Luke Margetts (Bakersgate Development Ltd) (to object) and;
- Mr Matt Smith (D&M Planning) (In support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Katie Williams. The proposal was for the change of use of part of an existing building currently in business use to two residential units, including minor fenestration alterations and associated external alterations.

The Committee noted that the site was within the Green Belt outside of a settlement area, it was also within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and an Area of Great Landscape Value. It was located on the western side of Burrows Lane to the south of the village of Gomshall.

The site was comprised of a recently constructed new development made up of four detached buildings, comprised of eight units all with commercial use, with the exception of Unit 2, which was a work/live unit. The wider Kings Court site was surrounded on all sides by residential dwellings, including Meadowside and

Mill Cottage which immediately adjoined the western boundary. Unit 3C was set within the largest building on the site, there was existing parking along the eastern boundary of the site and between the buildings.

Planning Officers were satisfied that comprehensive marketing of the unit in its current commercial use, had been carried out for over 12 months, in line with the requirements of Policy 3 of the Local Plan. Information submitted with the application confirmed that the units were completed over two years ago and had been on the market for four years. Unit 3 was currently vacant and a unit to the front was occupied by a business use.

The proposed floor plan layout showed the two proposed one-bedroom flats, one at ground floor level and one at first floor level. The flats would be accessed via a shared access. The only external alterations would be an increase in the size of an existing dormer window and the provision of a balcony in set within the roof slope, and also a new side door on the side elevation and changes to a window on the front. Alterations were proposed to enlarge the existing dormer window and the proposed balcony, which would provide an area of outdoor amenity space. Each proposed unit would have an allocated parking space. The Committee noted the existing parking spaces and the proposed space that would be allocated to the first floor flat and ground floor flat, as well as the area proposed for outdoor amenity to the side of the unit.

In conclusion, the proposal would result in the re-use of an existing building and therefore would not result in inappropriate development within the Green Belt, the proposal would deliver a net increase of 2 one-bedroom dwellings in a sustainable location. It had been demonstrated that comprehensive marketing of the property had been carried out and the loss of the employment unit had been sufficiently justified. The proposal would not harmfully affect the character or appearance of the site, or surrounding area, would not materially impact on neighbouring amenity and would not give rise to adverse impacts to highway safety. The application was therefore recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out on page 74 of your agenda and amendments to conditions 9 and 10 as set out on the supplementary late sheets.

The Committee considered the application and noted concerns raised regarding the number of applications that had been made for the site, notably 12 applications in the last 15 years. Four previous applications for residential accommodation had also been turned down. Concern was raised regarding the location so close to the residential dwellings at Meadowside.

The Committee noted that on page 88 of the report it said that no changes were proposed to the west elevation towards Meadowside. However, it did seem possible to see the top of the ground-floor window above the fence. Was it therefore possible to have obscure glazing installed on at least the top part of the window.

The Senior Planning Officer, Katie Williams confirmed that there was a window but that the fence sufficiently screened the window from being able to see over the fence line. It was also further clarified that ground-floor windows would not be required to be obscure glazed. If it was a first-floor window, obscure glazing would be considered. 1.7 metres in height was the industry standard for fences and the proposal was for the re-use of an existing building.

The Committee noted concerns raised regarding the pedestrian access to and from Burrows Lane being a problem as well as the boundary line of 1 metre from the rear wall appeared incredibly close.

The Chairman, Councillor White reminded the committee that they could not consider legal disputes as they were not material planning considerations. The Senior Planning Officer, Katie Williams confirmed that in terms of rights of access and land ownership these were civil matters separate to the determination of the application. The plans did nevertheless show that the rights of access had been taken into account. If subsequent proposals came forward for additional units they would have to be considered according to their own merits. The separation was as had been built out, what had been approved under the previously consented scheme for the office development which had not changed. The distance to the boundary was therefore considered acceptable under the previously consented schemes.

A motion was moved and seconded to approve the application which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jon Askew	X		
2	Chris Blow		X	
3	Ramsey Nagaty		X	
4	Fiona White	X		
5	Angela Goodwin	X		
6	Bob McShee	X		
7	Pauline Searle	X		
8	David Bilbe	Absent		
9	Liz Hogger	X		
10	Maddy Redpath	X		
11	Marsha Moseley	X		
12	Colin Cross	X		
13	Angela Gunning	(was not in attendance for this application)		
14	Paul Spooner	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 21/P/02589 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report and amended conditions 9 and 10:

Condition 9:

Prior to occupation of the new residential units hereby approve, a scheme for protecting the proposed dwellings from noise from the adjacent residential and commercial units shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The agreed details shall be implemented before any permitted dwelling is occupied unless an alternative period is agreed in writing by the authority.

Reason: As occupiers of the development, without such a scheme, are likely to suffer from noise to an unacceptable degree.

Condition 10:

No works shall take place to install the new balcony at first floor or amenity area at ground floor until detailed drawings of the new balcony (including balustrade design, materials and finish) to the first floor flat and boundary treatment to the amenity area for the ground floor flat (including design and height of proposed

fencing) have been submitted and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory.

**PL7      22/P/00738 - IPSLEY LODGE STABLES, HOGS BACK, SEALE, GUILDFORD, SURREY, GU10 1LA**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for change of use of part of land for the proposed creation of 4 Gypsy/Traveller pitches, comprising the siting of 4 Mobile Homes, 4 Touring Caravans, and the erection of 4 Dayrooms.

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

- Councillor Matt Furniss (Surrey County Council, Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth) (to object) and;
- Resident (to object) (to be read by the Democratic Services Officer)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Lisa Botha. The proposal was a retrospective application for the change of use of the land for the creation of for gypsy traveller pitches, comprising the siting of four mobile homes, 4 touring caravans and erection of four day rooms. It was recommended that a personal and temporary permission be granted, subject to a legal agreement, to secure the necessary mitigation against the impact of the proposal on the Thames Basin special protection area.

The application had been called to the Committee due to receiving more than 10 letters of objection. The Committee also noted the supplementary late sheets where an additional letter of objection had been received. The number of applications received for the site had also been updated and an unknown numbered condition omitted from the report. Lastly, an appeal decision for the Pines, Green Lane East, Normandy had been summarised. The appeal was relevant to the determination of this application as, in short, the Inspector considered that, despite the Council demonstrating that Guildford Borough Council had five year's worth of sites, none were currently available and as such, the occupants of that site, if that appeal were to be dismissed, would likely have to resort to a roadside existence or would need to double up on another pitch which would likely result in issues arising from overcrowding. Inspectors took

into account the best interests of the children on the site, and this provided the very special circumstances that outweighed the harm to the Green Belt when considering whether to grant temporary planning permission.

The site was located within the countryside beyond the Green Belt and was located on the border with the Green Belt, Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and Area of Great landscape Value (AGLV). The site was also in the Blackwater Valley strategic Open Gap and was located within 400m to 5 kilometres of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). It was also clarified that the site should not be confused with the adjacent site as there had been previous applications associated with it. The application site was now outside of the ownership of Ipsley Lodge Stables.

The site was accessed via the Hog's Back and used an existing access, which also served the pitches on the adjacent site to the south and east. An access road was provided along the southern end of the main part of the site to access each of the four pitches. The nearest residential sites were located to the south-west, south and east, with a small number of outbuildings close to the site. The four pitches would be served via the access which was shared with Ipsley Lodge Stables. Each pitch would have a central access, with an area of landscaping either side with a mobile home, a touring caravan and a day room located towards the northern half of the site. Additional planting was proposed as part of the proposal across the site.

The distance from the site to the urban area was 340 metres or a 15- minute walk along the pavement. The elevations and floor plans of the proposed day rooms would be five metres wide and three metres deep.

In conclusion, the Council had conducted a full balancing exercise and concluded that full planning permission should not be granted in reaching this conclusion. However, taking into account the personal circumstances of the occupants on site and taking into consideration the best interests of the children, it was considered that a temporary and personal permission should be granted in order for sufficient time to pass for the provision of all of authorised sites subject to the imposition of conditions and a legal agreement to secure the necessary mitigation against the impact of the proposed development on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA).

The Chairman permitted Councillor Tony Rooth to speak in his capacity as the ward councillor for the adjacent ward, Pilgrims.

The Committee considered a request by Councillor Paul Spooner that a site visit was held in respect of this application. The reasons given were in relation to being able to see the views in and out of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). A site visit would also give members the opportunity to understand how isolated the site was as it was felt it was actually quite some distance from the local retail centre and schools. It was a rural area and the adjacent ward, The Pilgrims was very rural and it was therefore important to understand the application in that context. Policies P1, P3, H1, D1 and G5 as well as the PTTS were cited in support of the recommendation.

The Committee noted that the request for a site visit was seconded by Councillor Marsha Moseley.

The Senior Planning Officer, Lisa Botha confirmed that in her opinion the position of the mobile homes could not be seen from distant views. The benefit of a site visit in terms of viewing the impact upon neighbouring amenity was therefore doubted.

The Committee also noted comments regarding the limited benefits of a site visit, given the report and photographs provided as part of the presentation were already clear. The main consideration was the rights of the children who were in education and if those considerations over-rode the extent of giving it a temporary and personal planning permission.

The Committee finally noted that members had attended a site visit some 5-6 years ago on this site and it was felt that a new visit would be of benefit to all.

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

RESOLVED that a site visit was held in relation to application 22/P/00738 on Monday 27 March at midday. The application would next be considered by the Committee at its meeting on Wednesday 29 March 2023.

**PL8      22/P/00998 - LAND TO THE REAR OF 168, THE STREET, WEST HORSLEY,  
KT24 6HS**



The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for extension of a detached self-build / custom build dwelling with associated garaging and new access on land to the rear of Dytchleys, 168 The Street.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Katie Williams. The proposal was for the erection of a detached self-build dwelling with associated garaging and new access on land to the rear of Dytchleys, 168 The Street. The site was within the settlement boundary of West Horsley and inset from the boundary with the Green Belt. To the east of the site was the boundary and it was also within the 400 metre to five kilometres TBHSPA buffer zone. As existing, it was an overgrown open area, forming part of the garden of 168, The Street. It was bounded by dwellings to the north and south and open countryside to the east. A recent application 21/P/00182 for three dwellings on the site was refused on the grounds that the number of dwellings, along with their associated scale, would appear out of character and would not achieve a transitional edge to the village.

The proposed dwelling would be a two storey, detached dwelling sited approximately 33 metres to the east of number 168, which itself was sited adjacent to the street. The proposed dwelling would be 7.3 metres in overall height with excavation works, setting the building down from the surrounding dwellings, it would be of an Arts and Crafts style with traditional materials such as brick and clay tiles, with an oak framed double height porch. The proposed dwelling would provide 4 bedrooms and a further single storey detached garage in front to the north-west of the principal elevation, providing two designated parking spaces. There would also be additional space for parking on the driveway to the front of the house. Access would be provided off the street with a new access driveway running between number 168 and number 164 The Street.

The dwelling would comply with the nationally described space standards in terms of room, sizes and overall floor area. The existing tennis court, boundary hedging and trees would be largely retained. The bin collection point would also be provided adjacent to the highway and the County Highway Authority had confirmed no objections to the proposal. Several trees were proposed to be removed to accommodate the access these were rated to be the category of lower quality, and no objection has been raised by the Council's Tree Officer subject to recommended conditions. A landscaping condition was recommended to ensure appropriate landscaping to include new tree planting within the site if the application was approved. Some additional biodiversity enhancements had been suggested in the ecology report, and this could be secured by condition. The site was within Flood Zone 1 and was considered to be at low risk from surface water flooding. Sustainability measures were also recommended to be

secured by condition and section 106 has been drafted to secure the required SANG and SAMM contributions.

In conclusion, there was no objection to the principle of development and the proposal would deliver a net increase of one new four-bedroom dwelling in a sustainable location, the development would not harm or affect the character or appearance of the surrounding area and would not materially impact on neighbouring amenity.

There were also no concerns in terms of adverse impacts on the highway on highway safety or the Thames Basin Heath SPA. The application was therefore recommended for approval, subject to recommended conditions and the S106.

The Chairman permitted Councillor Catherine Young to speak in her capacity as ward councillor for three minutes.

The Senior Planning Officer, Katie Williams confirmed in relation to points raised by the ward councillor that there was no such thing as housing being surplus to requirements. The overriding objective of the NPPF was to boost the supply of housing overall.

The Committee considered concerns raised regarding why the proposal which appeared to be a backland development was recommended for approval when previously planning policy did not support such applications. The West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan should also be given appropriate weight. Having a six and a half year housing supply should be a safeguard against inappropriate developments.

The Committee also noted comments that the application site was not located in the Green Belt. The proposal was considered to be acceptable given it was for one property albeit with four bedrooms. The Committee noted doubts of how it could be demonstrated that significant harm would be caused through a back garden development for one unit.

The planning officers commented that the development plan was the primary principal planning consideration. The objective of the NPPF remained, subject to conforming with other policies in the plan. Therefore, some weight had to be given to the contribution of an additional dwelling but it did not mean that it could not be outweighed by other considerations. In addition, it was the planning officers view that a detailed assessment had been carried out of why the proposal was considered to be in character with its surroundings. This was

mainly because it followed a similar line to the two adjacent dwellings. In relation to other examples of other applications, it's important to stress that the Committee had to look at each application on its own merits, assessing the context and characteristics of the site in relation to the immediate surroundings.

A motion was moved and seconded to approve the application which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	David Bilbe	Absent		
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	Colin Cross			X
11	Jon Askew	X		
12	Paul Spooner	X		
13	Chris Blow	X		
14	Bob McShee			X
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 22/P/00998 subject to a Section 106 Agreement securing appropriate SANG and SAMM mitigation payments.

**PL9 22/P/01050 - WEYSIDE URBAN VILLAGE (SLYFIELD REGENERATION PROGRAMME), SLYFIELD GREEN, GUILDFORD, GU1**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned reserved matters application pursuant to outline permission 20/P/02155 permitted on 30/03/2022, to consider appearance, means of access, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of the erection of a new GBC Depot, Multi Storey Car Park, MOT Test Centre and sprinkler tank compound with associated external areas of hard and soft landscaping, parking and storage. (EIA Development).

The Chairperson, Councillor White wished to point out, so to avoid any conflict of interests, and to comply with the 1992 Regulations, Guildford Borough Council had, firstly, a corporate team that had worked on the development of the proposed scheme and secondly, the local planning officers who had undertaken negotiations with the applicant, both pre and post submission of this application, assessed the proposed development prepared the Committee report and formed a recommendation on the application, similarly, no committee member taking the decision on this application had participated in the negotiation and agreement of the proposals.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Jo Chambers. The application was a reserved matters application in respect of the proposed new council depot at Weyside Urban Village. The application site formed part of site allocation, A24 Slyfield Area Regeneration Project now referred to as Weyside Urban Village, located on the western side of the River Wey, approximately 2 kilometres north of Guildford town centre. The site was bounded on the west by residential areas and to the north and north-west by the Slyfield Industrial Estate. The River Wey ran along the eastern boundary. Hybrid planning consent was granted for the development comprising 1,500 new homes and supporting community and employment uses in March 2022.

The existing Woking Road Depot was located in the southern part of the site adjacent to the existing Thames Water sewage treatment works. Both facilities were required to be relocated to facilitate redevelopment of the area. The new depot site was located in the north eastern part of site. The application site adjoined the new Thames Water sewage treatment works to the north and the future Surrey County Council waste transfer sated stations. to the south, the site was bounded with an existing woodland belt, which extended to the north around the sewage treatment works, with an area of green space and the River Wey. Beyond the access to the new depot a newly constructed road provided access to the industrial estate from the junction with Woking Road. The transport assessment indicated that the proposed development may result in additional traffic on this junction, but the Highway Authority did not consider the potential impact to be severe and had recommended a number of conditions to be imposed in any permission granted, in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to promote sustainable forms of transport.

The principle of development had been established through the hybrid consent, and the application sought reserved matters approval only in respect of appearance means of access, landscaping, layout and scale. The design had been developed to meet operational requirements and would enable the

rationalisation of council services on a single site. It represented an efficient use of the site and the designers responded positively to site constraints and conditions.

The development comprised a new depot building including ancillary offices and conference training facilities for the council and multi-storey car parks in the north of the site including storage. An MOT test centre and sprinkler tank compound to the west and associated external areas of hard and soft landscaping parking and storage, which, by the nature of the development, were obviously quite extensive. The multi-storey car park would provide a total of 361 spaces for council vehicles, staff and visitors as well as storage, space and public car parking to replace the existing on-street spaces which would be displaced by the proposed and controlled parking zone on Woodlands Road, Slyfield Green which will be implemented as part of the wider development the building is within.

The depot building was within the maximum height parameter of 16 metres, however, the highest car parking deck, the multi-storey car park was 15.3 metres. The highest part, comprising the lift, extended to 17.3 metres and therefore exceeded the maximum height parameter by 1.3 metres. Planning Officers had explored with the applicant potentially reducing the height, but this would breach building regulations and fire safety regulations. As the height falls within the worst case parameters assessed in the original environmental statement, it was unlikely that there would be any new or different effects that would impact landscape, townscape and visual impact.

The existing woodland belt along the eastern boundary of the site provided an important screen to the River Wey and adjoining open spaces. Detailed design determined there would be a requirement for some limited loss of trees as a result of site levelling, however, the majority of the plantation woodland would be retained and the loss of a small proportion of this habitat did not affect the functionality of the woodland as a landscape feature nor its use by wildlife such as bats.

Concerns had also been raised by the local amenity groups about the impact of floodlights and at the top level of the multi-storey car park will permit car headlights to shine a look across the nature reserve into residential properties on Bowes Lane. The lighting strategy was acceptable in principle, but further details would be required to be submitted and approved, taking into account concerns regarding light spill and the need to minimise impacts of lighting, an appropriate condition was recommended. T

The design of the buildings reflects the industrial character of the area. The size of the buildings had been determined by operational requirements and officers, considered the size and massing to be acceptable within the framework of the hybrid planning consent.

Concerns had been raised by the Guildford Society about the visual impact of a relatively industrial development which borders countryside and is close to the River Wey. Planning Officers had considered this and were of the view that further consideration could be given to the materiality and colour of the building, to minimise visual impacts and different cladding designs and colours should be assessed. A condition was therefore proposed to require details of materials and sample cladding panels to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The Burpham Neighbourhood Forum had also raised concerns about the limiting scope of the landscape masterplan. However, it's noted there's limited opportunity for on street planting and landscaping because of the operational requirements of the Depot. Provision had been made for grassland, landscaping around the entrance to the site and some limited native trees and shrub planting to enhance biodiversity value. In addition areas of brown and blue roofs were proposed on the top of the buildings to enhance biodiversity value details of these will be subject to condition. The application was also supported by detailed biodiversity mitigation enhancement plan.

The new depot would provide bespoke state of the art facilities for the departments, and services would be relocated there. A major upgrade in the quality of the facilities for staff and delivery of services to the local community the new facilities would also provide benefits in terms of environmental performance. The proposed energy strategy said the site would result in savings of 86% against the baseline building using gas stick fired boilers, representing a major improvement above Policy D2 requirements.

In conclusion, the development would facilitate the delivery of the Weyside Urban Village and associated public benefits. It was considered that concerns raised regarding the visual impact of the development could be minimised by the imposition of conditions relating to materials, landscaping and biodiversity enhancement and any residual impacts would be outweighed by the significant benefits of the scheme. The officer recommendation was to grant permission subject to the conditions set out in the report and the additional informative in the late papers.

The Committee considered the application and noted comments that they were pleased to see the proposed controlled traffic zone in Woodlands Road and a vastly improved sewage works. Clarification was sought on what the brown and

green roofs related to and who was going to oversee the health of the trees proposed to be planted as well as be responsible for their replacement.

The Planning officer confirmed that the multi-storey car park had been oversized to allow for additional parking to meet the needs of the staff so to avoid parking on residential roads. Brown and green roofs related to incorporating environmental enhancements within the building by creating additional planting for example. With regard to the replacement planting, the Parks Department was moving to the site and so it would be Guildford Borough Council's responsibility to maintain the standard condition about replacement of trees if they died and an additional condition had been included in this regard. With regards to the woodland belt, which was very similar to the condition on the Thames Water sewage treatment works which will enable them, a review of the planting after a five-year period was required to see whether any further enhancement was needed. It was recognised that the buffer created a really important screen. The whole point of the facility was the replacement of the existing facilities, including the existing Woking Road Depot and Nightingale Road with an element of space to allow for future expansion, so it could meet the needs of the council the next 5-10 years.

A motion was moved and seconded to approve the application which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	David Bilbe	Absent		
2	Angela Gunning	X		
3	Pauline Searle	X		
4	Maddy Redpath	X		
5	Bob McShee	X		
6	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
7	Jon Askew	X		
8	Angela Goodwin	X		
9	Chris Blow	X		
10	Fiona White	X		
11	Paul Spooner	X		
12	Marsha Moseley	X		
13	Liz Hogger	X		
14	Colin Cross	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 22/P/01050 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

**PL10 21/P/02036 - LAND ADJACENT TO 12 OAK HILL, WOOD STREET VILLAGE, GU3 3ER**

Councillor Colin Cross chaired the following item, as agreed by the Committee, owing to the Chairman's disclosure of a personal interest in this application. Councillors Fiona White, Liz Hogger and Pauline Searle all left the room for the consideration and vote taken in relation to the application owing to the personal interest declared.

The Committee considered the above-mentioned outline application for the erection of a 4 bedroom detached house on land adjacent to 12 Oak Hill to assess the access, appearance, layout and scale.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Katie Williams. The application site was a vacant plot of land to the eastern end of Oak Hill, the site was within the urban area of Guildford and was also within the 400 metre to five kilometres buffer zone of the Thames Basin Heath SPA. The site was tree covered and was afforded a Tree Preservation Order Protection on the 26th of April 2022. The Order was confirmed without modification, on the 25th of October 2022. The existing dwelling and garden at 12 Oak Hill was located to the west. There was also an industrial yard to the east of the site.

The proposal would result in the removal of a significant number of trees, the majority B-grade to facilitate the access, the footprint of the property and to provide usable amenity space. The Council's Tree Officer had objected to the application. The tree survey plan submitted with the Arboricultural Report showed the extent of the tree removal proposed. There was also concern regarding the proximity of the trees to be retained, the proposed development in terms of future pressure for tree works and subsequent adverse impact on the trees.

In conclusion, the application was subsequently recommended for refusal due to the impact on the TPO trees. The proposed development would result in the removal of a significant number of trees, with the majority of which a B grade afforded TPO protection. In order to facilitate the new access, the dwelling and provide amenity space as such, the proposal was concluded to be contrary to



British Standard 58 37 2012 and Policy D1 of the Local Plan. A reason for refusal was also included relating to the Thames Basin, Heaths SPA, without the completion of a legal agreement to secure the required SANG and SAMM contributions, the proposal would fail to comply with the Council's Thames Basin Heaths, SPA strategy.

The Committee considered the application and noted that the track leading up to the house was a private road which could prove to be restrictive if building works were to take place for local residents. The Committee agreed with the officer recommendation to refuse owing to the impact the application would have on a large number of TPO trees.

A motion was moved and seconded to refuse the application which was carried.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Fiona White	Personal interest did not vote and was not present		
2	Maddy Redpath	X		
3	Angela Gunning	X		
4	Paul Spooner	X		
5	David Bilbe	Absent		
6	Jon Askew	X		
7	Chris Blow	X		
8	Marsha Moseley	X		
9	Bob McShee	X		
10	Ramsey Nagaty	X		
11	Colin Cross	X		
12	Angela Goodwin	X		
13	Pauline Searle	Personal interest did not vote and was not present		
14	Liz Hogger	Personal interest did not vote and was not present		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 21/P/02036 for the reasons as detailed in the report.

**PL11 APPLICATION DEFERRED: 22/P/00367 - THE FIRS, ASH GREEN ROAD, ASH, GUILDFORD, GU12 6JJ**

The above application was deferred owing to needing more time to consider the application and needing to make further engagement with consultees with regard to the culverting of the water course.

**PL12 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS**

The Committee noted that there was a lot of appeals and reflected the backlog by the Planning Inspectorate. In addition, a lot of those appeals had been allowed and the Committee were concerned that it represented a worrying trend.

The summary of the appeals was quite lengthy and the Committee supported a review of how the information would be best presented.

The meeting finished at 9.10 pm

Signed .....

Date .....

Chairman