

PLANNING COMMITTEE

- * Councillor Fiona White (Chairman)
- * Councillor Vanessa King (Vice-Chairman)

- | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| * Councillor Bilal Akhtar | * Councillor George Potter |
| * Councillor David Bilbe | Councillor Maddy Redpath |
| * Councillor Lizzie Griffiths | Councillor Joanne Shaw |
| * Councillor Stephen Hives | * Councillor Howard Smith |
| Councillor James Jones | * Councillor Cait Taylor |
| * Councillor Richard Mills | * Councillor Sue Wyeth-Price |
| * Councillor Patrick Oven | |

*Present

Councillors Dawn Bennett (online), Carol Morson (online) and Katie Steel (online) were in attendance watching the meeting. Councillor Catherine Young, was also in attendance in her capacity as ward councillor.

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Councillors James Jones, Maddy Redpath and Joanne Shaw sent their apologies. Councillors Merel Rehorst-Smith, Joss Bigmore and Jane Tyson attended as substitutes respectively.

PL2 ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

The Committee elected Councillor Vanessa King as Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee.

PL3 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest.

PL4 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 26 April 2023 were approved by the Committee and signed by the Chairman as a true record.

PL5 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the Chairman's announcements.

**PL6 19/P/02096 - WATERLOO FARM, OCKHAM ROAD NORTH, WEST
HORSLEY, LEATHERHEAD, KT24 6PE**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed erection of one single storey detached dwelling and four two storey detached dwellings with garaging, associated landscaping and modification of existing access. (amended description)(as amended by plans received 4 March 2023).

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

- Cllr Guy Murray (on behalf of West Horsley Parish Council) (to object) and;
- Mr Richard Goodall (Agent on behalf of the Applicant) (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the planning officer, Victoria Bates. The Committee noted that the site was accessed from a private road leading from Ockham Road North. The site currently formed part of Waterloo Farm and was bound by Horsley Camping Caravan Site to the south-west and residential properties on Nightingale Crescent to the south. The site had been inset from the Green Belt in the Local Plan and formed part of the allocated site A39. The site was also allocated within the 400 metre to 5km buffer zone of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA).

The application sought to deliver approx. 120 homes and the site formed a small parcel of land to the south of the allocation. The site was close to the Green Belt as well as to residential development to the south and along the Ockham Road. An application had also been submitted to the Council which was pending consideration for 86 dwellings. Planning permission had also been granted elsewhere for a total of 35 dwellings plus four consented dwellings that were currently being constructed. Access to the site would be taken from the private road. The dwellings proposed are two storeys in height and had been designed in the Surrey vernacular using a palette of traditional materials and incorporated pitched roofs.

The plot which is closest to the boundary with properties on Nightingale Crescent had no upper floor windows proposed on the side elevation. Along the boundary with the campsite were conifer hedges which would form the rear boundary of the gardens to plots 1 and 2 as well as mature trees to the rear of plots 3 and 5.

In summary, the proposal for residential development was acceptable in principle and would deliver 5 new dwellings within an allocated site. The proposed

dwelling would provide a good level of internal and external amenity for future residents and was fully compliant with the national space standards. The proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the area and would not result in any adverse impacts upon the amenities of neighbouring residents. The County Highway Authority had raised no objections to the proposals subject to a condition to secure a package of highway improvements. The proposal was also considered to be acceptable in terms of the impact on trees, ecology, sustainability, flooding and drainage. The objection from the Council's recycling and waste officer had been withdrawn following the submission of a swept path analysis. Surrey Wildlife Trust had reviewed an updated ecology report and confirmed that there would be no unacceptable ecological impacts subject to additional conditions which had been included on the supplementary late sheets. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to securing a SANG and SAMM contribution.

The Chairman permitted Councillor Catherine Young to speak in her capacity as ward councillor for three minutes. The Committee noted concerns raised regarding a lack of adequate measures to prevent surface water flooding and drainage. West Horsley was identified within Guildford's flooding hotspots which was not mentioned in the officer's report. Surface water from Nightingale Crescent drained down to the site via the gardens of bordering properties and sewage was regularly seen after heavy rainfall. Five houses with garages and an access road with large areas of paved driveways and the removal of the mature willow tree would exacerbate the flooding to this site and the adjacent gardens. The requirement of Local Plan policies A39 4.5.1 and the Neighbourhood Plan Policy WH13 had not been met as the proposal did not demonstrate sufficiently that the development would adequately deal with surface water flooding on the site and locally. The scale and height of the proposed buildings were not sympathetic to the existing built environment and out of keeping with the adjacent properties. Nightingale Crescent and the nearby cottage densities were higher. Garaging was not placed subservient to the plots and the gardens were extremely small. The design and height of the buildings would be in conflict with the local character and setting contrary to Local Plan Policy, D1 place-shaping, DMP Policy D4 and policies WH2 and WH3. West Horsley was located within a biodiversity opportunity area. The Neighbourhood Plan identified on page 40 of policy DH12 a number of wildlife corridors that crossed the village and this site which would be severely disrupted by this development.

The Planning officer in response to statements made by the public speakers and ward councillor confirmed that the south-west corner of the application site was prone to surface water flooding as the site was located within Flood Zone 1.

Therefore condition no 8 had been included which demonstrated that a sequential approach was deemed acceptable by Thames Water by which to dispose of surface water drainage. With regard to biodiversity, the ecological reports had been updated owing to the fact that the original reports submitted had expired. The updated report had concluded that there would not be any unacceptable impact upon biodiversity subject to condition number 16 which would secure enhancements to biodiversity and nature conservation. With regard to dark skies, condition number 5 would restrict external lighting on the premises and any changes to that would require approval to be sought from the local planning authority. It was also acknowledged that the properties and the plot size were not carbon copies of neighbouring properties on Nightingale Crescent and it was worth bearing in mind that this proposal was part of wider site allocation. Therefore it had to be looked at in the emerging context of the site, not just what's existing on the ground.

The Committee discussed the application and noted concerns raised that the scheme proposed did not comply with policies WH2 and WH4. The housing mix sought by WH4 was a mix of one, two and three bedroom open market homes. The proposed scheme was for two, three and four bed open market homes. The built form and transitional edge here was inappropriate given that the existing site provided a green barrier between the existing built up area as already extended by the building in front of Waterloo Farm and the existing houses in Nightingale Close. The proposal also failed to comply with D1 and was not an example of good design. It represented a form of over urbanisation which was overly dense with small gardens and concerns were also raised regarding surface water flooding.

The Committee also noted comments that the principle of development on this site was clearly established by the wider site allocation of A39. The site was inset from the Green Belt and there was a housing need. However, concerns were raised that the neighbourhood plan policies had not been adequately addressed in the officer's report particularly in relation to the housing mix. The proposal would also result in a higher density of development than the surrounding area and had uncharacteristically small gardens.

In response to the Committee's concerns raised so far, planning officers confirmed that it was an allocated site and in planning terms the proposal represented a low density form of development with good gaps between the dwellings which helped to contribute towards the transitional point into the countryside. Whilst concerns had been raised about drainage, Thames Water who were the statutory consultee had not objected. There was also a condition

which would adequately address the surface water drainage. It was also confirmed that amended plans had been submitted during the course of the application and the height of the originally proposed dwellings were reduced of plots 1-3.

The Committee raised concerns regarding the sustainability of the development given that there were no air source heat pumps or solar panels proposed. The narrowness of the access road which was a shared surface was a concern given it was not wide enough for two vehicles to pass each other and the location of the caravan site which used the same access. Clarification was sought on how many trees would be removed onsite.

Owing to continued concerns raised, planning officers re-affirmed that the site was a comprehensive allocation with multiple site owners. As a result the parcels of land coming forward were the shape they are because of the ownership constraints. At the top of the site there was quite a short back garden but there was considerable space between that and the adjoining property. With regard to housing mix the neighbourhood plan policy did not state that 1, 2 and 3 bedroom properties had to be built but that it was encouraged. It was acknowledged that the proposal was a very small part of the overall site and that to provide smaller homes may not be viable.

With regard to concerns raised about the access road, County Highways did not raise objections but they had considered the impact of the caravans being towed along the access road with the campsite access at the end of the private road. The passing point was deemed adequate for these purposes.

The arboricultural report submitted confirmed that the trees to be removed from the site were all considered to be low classification trees and were not worthy of retention. The Willow tree proposed to be removed was also in poor health. The vast majority of trees on site would however be retained.

Planning officers also confirmed that the conditions included were necessary, reasonable and included sufficient detail for the Committee to make a decision on whether or not the site would deliver a sustainable development in accordance with the allocation and the Neighbourhood Plan.

The Committee also noted comments that the scheme represented a well thought out development that had well spaced out dwellings that were sympathetic to the size of the plot. The development was also a five minute cycle

ride away from the closest train station. The biodiversity onsite would also be increased by the proposal.

The Committee wished to confirm who would maintain the trees and hedges and whether the proposal would include the installation of heat pumps and solar panels.

Planning officers confirmed that condition 4 required the submission of an energy statement to the planning authority to demonstrate how the development would satisfy a 20% reduction in carbon emissions. There were significant changes proposed to the Building Regulations that would require this to happen in future. If the Committee was therefore minded to approve the application, the requirement for heat pumps and solar panels could be made more explicit by the re-wording of condition 4 in consultation with the Chairman.

A motion was moved and seconded to refuse the application. The Committee voted on the following policies and reasons put forward to refuse the application by a show of hands:

Policy D1 Place Shaping – 4:10

Policy D4 Character and Design – 4:10

Policy WH2 Design Management in the Village Setting – 3:11

Policy WH4 Housing Mix - 1:12

The vote was lost to refuse the application based on the above policies.

A subsequent motion was moved and seconded to approve the application which was carried. This was subject to amend condition 4, which would be agreed in consultation with the Chairman, to include the requirement for alternative sources of energy to be used rather than gas.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Merel Rehorst-Smith			X
2	Joss Bigmore		X	
3	Howard Smith	X		
4	Bilal Akhtar	X		
5	Vanessa King	X		
6	Cait Taylor	X		
7	Richard Mills	X		
8	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
9	Patrick Oven		X	
10	David Bilbe	X		
11	Jane Tyson	X		
12	George Potter		X	
13	Steve Hives	X		
14	Fiona White	X		
15	Sue Wyeth-Price		X	
	TOTALS	10	4	1

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

RESOLVED to approve application 19/P/02096 subject to updated condition 4, as outlined above, as well as additional conditions 18, 19 and 20 and updated condition 16 as detailed on the supplementary late sheets.

18. Prior to the commencement of development a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) for this site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. This should include the following:

- a) description and evaluation of features to be managed;
- b) ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management;
- c) aims and objectives of management advised by the recommended mitigation/compensation actions for habitat and species as detailed in section 6 of the EIA;
- d) appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives;
- e) prescriptions for management actions, together with a plan of management compartments;
- f) preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period);
- g) details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan;

h) ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To increase the biodiversity of the site, to protect protected species and to mitigate any impact from the development.

19. 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 to mitigate any impact from the development during the construction process.

20. No development shall take place until an Arboricultural Method Statement (detailing all aspects of construction and staging of works) and a Tree Protection Plan in accordance with British Standard 5837:2005 (or any later revised standard) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed method statement and no equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought onto the site for the purposes of the development until fencing has been erected in accordance with the Tree Protection Plan. Within any area fenced in accordance with this condition, nothing shall be stored, placed or disposed of above or below ground, the ground level shall not be altered, no excavations shall be made, nor shall any fires be lit, without the prior written consent of the local planning authority. The fencing 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 which are to be retained in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

Condition 16 to be reworded as follows: No development shall take place until a scheme to enhance the biodiversity and nature conservation interest of the site, in line with the recommendations set out in the consultation response from Surrey Wildlife Trust dated 22 March 2023, has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented in full prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved.

Reason: In order to preserve and enhance the natural environment including protected species.

PL7 22/P/00956 - 12A WORPLESDON ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU2 9RW

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of an extension at first floor level to create a two bed self-contained residential unit including a side Juliet balcony and changes to lower ground floor rear fenestration following demolition of existing rear element.

The Committee received a presentation from the Planning Officer, Victoria Bates. The application had been referred to the Committee by former Ward Councillor Pauline Searle, on the basis of concerns regarding the impact on the amenities of residents at the neighbouring property of Francis Court.

The proposal related to a three storey end terraced property on Worplesdon Road. The site was located within the Guildford urban area and was within the 400 metres to 5km buffer zone of the Thames Heath Basin Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). The application building was currently in commercial use at ground floor level with an existing flat at first-floor. The proposal would involve the removal of the existing first floor flat roof extension and the erection of a first floor extension over the footprint of the existing building to create a 2-bed self-contained flat. The footprint of the existing building would not increase as a result of the works proposed. The proposal included internal access to the existing and proposed first floor flats. The existing extension would be replaced by a crown pitch roof finished in brick work and tiles to match the existing building. No windows were proposed in the rear elevation.

In summary, the proposal for the creation of one 2-bed dwelling within the Guildford urban area was considered to be acceptable in principle. Whilst the proposal would increase the bulk and massing of the existing building, officers considered that the resulting development would be more sympathetic in terms of its design and appearance than the existing first floor extension. It would also have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. Having regard to the objections received from the neighbouring residents at France's Court the proposal was considered to be sufficiently distanced from these neighbours so as not to result in any unacceptable adverse overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy. The proposal would comply with the national space standards and not result in any detrimental impacts on highway safety and biodiversity enhancements would be secured by condition. The proposal was therefore recommended for approval, subject to a unilateral undertaking to secure a SANG and SAMM.

The Committee discussed the application and considered that the proposal was an improvement upon what was currently in situ. The extension was well designed and proportionately in scale with the surrounding area.

A motion was moved and seconded to approve the application subject to the additional condition 8 and updated condition 2 as detailed on the supplementary late sheets.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	George Potter	X		
2	David Bilbe	X		
3	Merel Rehorst-Smith	X		
4	Sue Wyeth-Price	X		
5	Joss Bigmore	X		
6	Fiona White	X		
7	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
8	Bilal Akhtar	X		
9	Steve Hives	X		
10	Vanessa King	X		
11	Howard Smith	X		
12	Cait Taylor	X		
13	Patrick Oven	X		
14	Jane Tyson	X		
15	Richard Mills	X		
	TOTALS	15	0	0

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

RESOLVED to approve application 22/P/00956 subject to the conditions, additional condition 8 and updated condition 2, and reasons as detailed in the report.

8. No development shall take place until a scheme for the fitting of suitable ventilation and filtration equipment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such a scheme and details shall include equipment to suppress and disperse all fumes. The approved equipment shall be installed before the use commences and thereafter shall be operated and maintained in full working order in accordance with manufacturer's instructions throughout the proposed use.

Reason: To protect adjoining premises/residential amenities.

Condition 2 is to be reworded as follows:

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

WR 207 - Site Plan and Block Plan received on 13/06/2022

WR 501 P1 – Existing Plan 1 received on 13/06/2022

WR 500 P1 – Existing Plan 2 received on 13/06/2022

WR 502 P1 – Existing Elevations 1 received on 13/06/2022

WR 503 P1 – Existing Elevations 2 received on 13/06/2022

WR 504 P1 – Existing Elevations 3 received on 13/06/2022

WR 206 – Proposed Roof received on 14/06/2022

WR 208 – Proposed Elevations (1) received on 14/06/2022

WR 209 – Proposed Elevations (2) received on 14/06/2022

WR 206 – Proposed Elevations (3) received on 14/06/2022

WR 205 P2 – Proposed Plans received on 11/08/2022.

WR 211 P2 - Floor area received on 11/08/2022

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

PL8 22/P/02104 - ST CLERE, BROOMFIELD CLOSE, GUILDFORD, GU3 3AW

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for conversion of roofspace to habitable accommodation including raising of the roof height and a rear dormer window. Changes to fenestration.

The Committee received a presentation from the Planning Officer, Ben Mitchell. The application had been referred to Committee as over ten letters of objection had been received. The proposal was for a very small single storey infill extension at the back of the property. The site occupied a corner plot with a mix of residential dwellings surrounding it of differing styles and was also located in the Guildford urban area. The proposed floorplans showed two additional bedrooms being formed within the roofspace as well as a small single storey infill extension at the rear which extended 1.5 metres beyond the elevation.

There were two relevant previous planning applications on this site, one was a householder application for a proposed hip to gable end roof alteration with rear dormer, together with raising the ridge height and changes to the fenestration on the rear elevation. This was refused on the grounds that the roof alterations would be overly large and out of character. This application included all the elements of the refused application, however the current application included a smaller dormer size. A second application had also been submitted for a

certificate of lawfulness, to establish whether a hipped gable roof extension of a rear dormer and single storey rear extension would be lawful. This application was approved and established that the alterations proposed were considered to be permitted development and as such did not require full planning permission.

The fallback position was a material consideration. This application would result in an increase in the ridge height of 0.5 metres and an enlarged dormer at the rear, including the hip to gable conversion. This application also included a side-facing first floor window within the dormer and could be conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed shut to avoid any overlooking concerns to neighbouring dwellings.

In summary officers considered that the application would not represent significant harm over what could be achieved under permitted development and recommended for approval.

The Committee discussed the application and agreed that the proposal represented an acceptable form of development. The resulting increase in ridge height of 0.5m was considered minimal and not harmful when compared to the scheme which could be carried out under permitted development rights.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jane Tyson	X		
2	Fiona White	X		
3	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
4	Merel Rehorst-Smith	X		
5	Steve Hives	X		
6	Sue Wyeth-Price	X		
7	Richard Mills	X		
8	Cait Taylor	X		
9	Patrick Oven			X
10	Joss Bigmore	X		
11	Bilal Akhtar	X		
12	Howard Smith	X		
13	David Bilbé	X		
14	George Potter	X		
15	Vanessa King	X		
	TOTALS	14	0	1

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

RESOLVED to approve application 22/P/02104 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL9 23/T/00021 - LAND TO THE NORTH, NORTH MOORS, WORPLESDON, GUILDFORD, GU3

The Committee considered the above-mentioned Tree Preservation Order application for works to trees as listed in tree schedule (Tree Preservation Order P1/201/266).

The Committee received a presentation from the Planning Officer, Ben Mitchell. The application was by the Council for health and safety works to a TPO group of trees. Works were proposed to six ash trees and one oak tree. Three ash trees were to be felled and the others to have a crown reduction as well as the removal of dead wood from the oak trees. The works to the ash trees were required owing to Ash Dieback disease which caused the trees structure to become brittle and presented a health and safety issue in this instance. It was considered that

there was enough natural tree regeneration within the woodland and therefore a specific replanting scheme had not been considered necessary by the Tree Officer.

The Committee considered the application and agreed that the works were necessary to be undertaken for health and safety reasons.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Steve Hives	X		
2	Sue Wyeth-Price	X		
3	Joss Bigmore	X		
4	Jane Tyson	X		
5	Richard Mills	X		
6	Vanessa King	X		
7	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
8	David Bilbe	X		
9	George Potter	X		
10	Fiona White	X		
11	Howard Smith	X		
12	Merel Rehorst-Smith	X		
13	Cait Taylor	X		
14	Bilal Akhtar	X		
15	Patrick Oven	X		
	TOTALS	15	0	0

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

RESOLVED to approve application 23/T/00021 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL10 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee discussed and noted the appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 9pm.

Signed

Date

Chairman