

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Councillor Fiona White (Chairman)

* Councillor Vanessa King (Acting 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 Bob Hughes and David Shaw were also present.

PL1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors George Potter, Maddy Redpath, Joanne Shaw and Fiona White. Councillors Catherine Houston, Joss Bigmore and Jane Tyson attended as substitutes for the above detailed councillors respectively.

PL2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Councillor Sue Wyeth-Price declared a personal interest in application 22/P/00367 The Firs, Ash Green Road, Ash, Guildford, GU12 6JJ. Councillor Wyeth-Price would speak as a Ward Councillor on this application and then leave the room for the duration of the consideration and decision made.

PL3 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 24 May 2023 were approved by the Committee and signed by the Chairman as a true record.

PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the Chairman's announcements.

PL5 22/P/00367 - THE FIRS, ASH GREEN ROAD, ASH, GUILDFORD, GU12 6JJ

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for residential development of 7 houses and associated bicycle and garden stores and associated landscaping and extensions and alterations to The Firs (existing dwelling).

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

- Mrs Debra McLeod (to object) (Democratic Services Officer read out speech);
- Mrs Gill Squibb (Chairman of Ash Green Resident's Association) (to object) and;
- Mr Patrick Reedman (DHA Planning) (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Jo Trask. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which included updated comments from Surrey County Council Highways, Natural England and Surrey Wildlife Trust. Two additional letters had been received and some proposed amendments to the wording of conditions 2, 3, 4 and 6.

This application was previously due to be considered by the Planning Committee at its meeting on 1 March 2023. However, planning officers deferred the application to allow them to further consider the previously proposed culvert and biodiversity enhancements. The current scheme had been amended to remove the culvert and now proposed a bridge section over the water body. Surrey Wildlife Trust were now satisfied that the ecology of the current stream would be improved.

The application site was located within the Ash urban area, located to the north of Ash Green Road, the railway line was to the west with an area of ancient woodland located close by and to the south, Green Belt and countryside. The site was also located within the 400m – 5km Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA) and Flood Zone 1 where a body of water ran from north to south through the site.

The application was for seven two bedroom dwellings and a part single, part two storey extension to the current dwelling onsite. All units would have vehicular access via the creation of a new access onto Ash Green Road. A small bridge section, 3m wide would provide vehicular access across the stream linking the

east and west portions of the site. A 15metre buffer zone to the ancient woodland would provide visual amenity only. The details of the buffer zone and its enclosure would be secured under condition.

The existing water body runs north-south through the site and was culverted both as it left the site to the north and again to the south. The application offered an opportunity to secure ecological enhancements to the existing water body to improve the biodiversity and ecological value. A buffer to the water body and its enclosure would be secured by condition.

The existing access would be removed and replaced with a new separate pedestrian access and new bicycle and bin storage. The new access point was 6m in width.

The proposed dwellings were sited to maximise the opportunities on the site, being located closer to the rear boundary, the northern boundary, which backed onto the railway line, maximising the amount of amenity space with a southern aspect, so each dwelling would be afforded a small, north-facing private garden to the rear, with the greater proportion of municipal space to the south.

The proposed terrace of dwellings were staggered to address the entrance. Secure cycle parking was provided in these areas for two spaces for each dwelling. Thirteen spaces for vehicular parking would be provided on site, of which three were visitor spaces.

A communal bin store was proposed and no objection had been raised by cleansing officers on capacity or collection grounds. The development had adopted a fabric first approach and included the provision of air source heat pumps in addition to roof-mounted photovoltaics.

Whilst the proposed extension would be flush to the existing building line, it was not considered to be harmful to the scale of the host dwelling and, furthermore, would help to rebalance the semi-detached pair of properties. The existing pitched roof would be extended terminating in a gable end. Materials would be secured through condition with clay tiles to the front hanging and a translucent paint finish to the back.

The proposed floor plans for the Firs demonstrated that the single storey projection was 2.3 metres beyond the rear wall of the neighbouring property, with the two-storey section limited to a small area. The proposed elevations for the terrace of three properties were gable design, brick to ground level and tile

hanging to the upper level building. The heights were a maximum of 7.9 metres of which 4.4 metres was to eaves height. These were modest modern cottages building depths of 9 metres by 5.5 metres.

In conclusion, the proposal was for a windfall development on a site in the urban area, providing a net increase of seven, two-bedroom dwellings, which contributed to meeting the borough's housing need. A satisfactory living environment for future occupants was provided, no harm to residential amenities had been identified. Surface water flooding to and from the site had been considered by the Lead Local Flood Authority and no objection was raised, subject to conditions 10 and 11. The proposal would secure measures which increased the ecological value of the existing water body and a 15 metre buffer zone would be secured to the ancient woodland. A completed unilateral undertaking dated the 24 of February 2023, had secured the Thames Basin Heath mitigation, in accordance with the Council's adopted strategy. No objection was raised on highway safety grounds, subject to conditions which included a level plateau for the access and visibility zones to be provided in accordance with the submitted transport statement plan. The proposal for seven dwellings was not considered to result in a significant increase in vehicular trips on the surrounding highway network, however, due to its cumulative impact, a contribution was sought towards Ash Road Bridge, which should reduce the overall number of vehicles using Harper's Road and Ash Green Road. The site was located directly opposite a public byway 521 and the pub, with a public bridleway 594 also close by. These would provide further links to the wider public rights of way network for pedestrians. The application was therefore recommended for approval, subject to conditions as set out on pages 24 to 32 of the agenda, the amended wording on the late sheet and a section 106 to secure the Ash Railway Bridge contribution.

The Chairman permitted Councillors Sue Wyeth-Price and David Shaw to speak in their capacity as Ward Councillors for three minutes each. Councillor Wyeth-Price, left the room after her speech, owing to the personal interest she had declared in this application.

The Committee noted concerns raised that whilst the application was recently amended to take account of the culverting of the watercourse, it had not been updated to account for the Local Plan Part 2 as the parking provision proposed failed to meet those requirements. The proposal also did not accord with policies H4, D4, D8, or ID10 as it provided chimneys and wood burning stoves which was against policy D17 despite being cited as decorative. The Surrey Highways comments did not take account of the refuse and recycling teams comments that

waste would be collected from the roadside on a narrow road, next to a blind hump back bridge with a T-Junction immediately the other side which was dangerous. The site was outside policy A31 but immediately adjacent to it. It was across the road from the Green Belt but was on the boundary of the urban extension to Ash. The site was described as rural on GBC maps and within the Ash fringe character policy A31 described Ash Green Road as forming part of Ash Green village. Therefore the policies which applied to the village also extended to this site. Regard should be had to policy D1 and the transition from urban to rural. The development was piecemeal and had no connectivity with the existing area.

The Committee noted further concerns raised that the site was proposed to be located along a country lane with no footpaths. The proposal did not meet the requirements of policy H4 for housing extensions. The 45 degree rule had not been assessed and the proposal was not subservient to the existing house. The application was too densely packed and was an overdevelopment of the site. The houses were notably different and did not integrate with the surrounding area and character and didn't meet the requirements of policy D8 for residential infill developments. The access off the site was too close to the bridge where there was a blind spot for cars and failed to provide direct walking and cycling routes to nearby facilities. There was no external bin storage therefore the bins would be collected from the roadside which was unsafe. The public areas, including the new bridge over the stream and the tree maintenance was not detailed as one of the estate management charges.

The Senior Planning Officer, Jo Trask in response to comments made by the public speakers and ward councillors, confirmed that Surrey Highways were not objecting to the creation of an access point onto Ash Green Road. A condition had been added that required maintaining vegetation to a height of 0.6 metres so to retain visibility when turning into and out of the road. The maximum parking provision requirement was for 14 spaces. In this case, 13 spaces were proposed and three of which were visitor parking spaces with one unallocated. With regard to the proposed extension at The Firs, under permitted development the projection along the boundary could be greater and therefore planning officers were satisfied that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact upon residential amenities of the neighbouring dwelling. Whilst the extension was not subservient, it was felt to be in character with the surrounding area. Lastly, environmental health officers had assessed the application in terms of the proximity to the railway line and associated noise and living environment for future occupants. A condition had been applied to ensure that noise mitigation would be managed.

The Committee discussed the application and noted concerns raised regarding the safety of children in the front garden and the lack of footpaths. A query was raised with regard to how safe and secure the back gardens were owing to their proximity to the railway line. With regard to the installation of wood burning stoves, it was queried whether they were usable as opposed to being cosmetic as it would go against the Council's principles of offering other forms of heating besides the use of fossil fuels.

The Committee noted comments that whilst this was not an allocated site, the Council should not accept housing at any cost. A recent appeal decision on a site nearby that was allocated, upheld refusal of the scheme owing to the proposal being out of character by virtue of its scale and layout which was overly urban. This scheme was not acceptable given it was on the boundary between the urban area and the Green Belt. In addition to refuse vehicles parking on the road, the houses would also have delivery vehicles parking up which was unsafe owing to the narrow nature of the road. Clarification was also requested on the height of the hedge which was either to be kept to a height of 1m or 0.6m and who would carry out those works? Lastly, it was queried if the parking provision was compliant with the SPD?

The Senior Planning Officer, Jo Trask confirmed that the boundary treatment would be kept to a height of 0.6 metres as required by Surrey Highways and detailed by condition. The works would be carried out by the occupants of the development. The vehicle transport statement confirmed that vehicles, including delivery and refuse vehicles, would be able to enter and exit the site. The applicant had adopted a fabric first approach and were utilising photovoltaics and air source heat pumps. The reliance upon wood burning stoves was therefore limited. With regard to the boundary treatments to the front gardens, there was a segregated access onto the parking area and cycle store. The gate could be opened but the gardens were enclosed. The rear boundary treatment was subject to a landscaping condition. It was also confirmed that if the Committee was minded to approve the application, then a condition could be applied requiring a detailed dimensions plan of the size of the site ensuring that the dimensions met with the requirements of the parking spaces SPD.

The Committee also noted comments supporting the proposal for additional housing that would offer an opportunity for people to either down size or get onto the property ladder.

The Committee noted concerns that the development represented a form of overdevelopment that was out of character with the rural area. It was noted that

windfall sites were needed to contribute to the Local Plan and it was queried what percentage of housing would be dealt with by windfall applications. Was there a danger that windfall sites would subsume the Local Plan allocations?

The Head of Planning, Claire Upton-Brown confirmed that the grant of planning permission did not mean that it translated into that housing getting built out. Nationally, there were significant numbers of unimplemented planning permissions which resulted in a housing shortage. An annual Local Authority Monitoring Report detailed the number of houses which had been granted permission and the number of completions. There was therefore no danger of overriding the Local Plan with windfall applications. The Local Plan was also adopted pre-standard methodology and was not in line with the way that housing need was currently assessed in the NPPF.

The Committee considered on balance that the proposal would deliver 7 additional homes which was well designed and would result in no adverse impact upon neighbouring residential amenities.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Catherine Houston	X		
2	James Jones	X		
3	Vanessa King	X		
4	Howard Smith	X		
5	David Bilbé			X
6	Bilal Akhtar	X		
7	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
8	Joss Bigmore		X	
9	Patrick Oven	X		
10	Jane Tyson		X	
11	Stephen Hives			X
12	Cait Taylor	X		
13	Richard Mills		X	
	TOTALS	8	3	2

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

RESOLVED to approve application 22/P/00367 subject to the updated conditions as detailed on the supplementary late sheets (as shown below) and following the completion of a Unilateral Undertaking to secure SANG and SAMM and an Ash Road Bridge contribution.

Updated conditions:

Condition 2 drawing numbers:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 7005 REV P3 Site Plan Levels, PA05 REV P2 Existing Cross Section AA BB CC, PA06 REV P2 Proposed Cross Section AA BB CC, PA07 REV P2 Proposed floor plan 2 bed house, PA_08 REV P2 proposed 2 bed cross section, PA09 REV P2 Proposed elevations 3 No. 2 bed house, PA10 REV P2 Proposed elevations 4 No. 2 bed house, PA11 REV P2 Proposed rear elevation 2 bed house, and PA15 REV P2 3 bed car port proposed elevations, **and Drawing No. H-01 Rev P3 (within the Transport Statement)** received on 25 February 2022, PA22 REV P2 Existing Roof Plan 3 bed house received 21 March 2022, PA21 REV P2 Existing floor plans 3 bed house received 22 March 2022, PA00 REV P3 Site Location Plan, PA01 REV P3 Existing site plan, ~~PA02 REV P3 Proposed site plan~~, and PA20 REV P2 Existing elevations 3 bed house received on 23 March 2022, PA 17 REV P3 Proposed elevations 3 bed house, PA18 REV P3 Proposed floor plans 3 bed house and PA19 REV P3 Proposed roof plan 3 bed house received on 15 November 2022, ~~PA_03 REV P3 Site/Block Plan~~, ~~PA_04 REV P3 Site/Block Plan 2~~ and PA_16 REV P3 communal bin store received on 22 December 2022.

PA_03 REV P5 Site/Block Plan 1; PA_04 REV P5 Site/Block Plan 2; Bridge and Typical Section through Watercourse, Martin Edwards architects, May 2023, revision P2, document reference: A088 PA_23, and Stream Enhancement Plan received on 19 May 2023

PA_02 rev P5 Proposed site Plan received on 13 June 2023

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

Condition 3

The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until the proposed vehicular access to Ash Green Road has been constructed and provided with a level plateau and visibility zones in accordance with **the approved plans, Drawing No. H-01 Rev P3** ~~a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority~~, and thereafter the visibility zones shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction over ~~0.6m~~ **1m** high.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and are in recognition of Section 9 “Promoting Sustainable Transport” in the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Condition 4

The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plan, **Drawing No. PA_023 Rev P5**, for vehicles to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking and turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purposes.

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

Condition 6

The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless and until each of the proposed dwellings and at least **2 1** of the visitor parking bays are provided with a fast charge socket (current minimum requirements - 7 kw Mode 3 with Type 2 connector - 230v AC 32 Amp single phase dedicated supply) in accordance with a scheme to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To encourage the use of electric cars in order to reduce carbon emissions.

Informatives

Informative 3 Highways add:

The developer is advised that Public Byway Number 521 is located opposite the application site and it is an offence to obstruct or divert the route of a right of way unless carried out in complete accordance with appropriate legislation.

PL6 22/P/00977 - STREAMSIDE, HARPERS ROAD, ASH, GUILDFORD, GU12 6DB

The Committee considered the above-mentioned outline application for the demolition of existing house and outbuildings and erection of 22 dwellings with associated parking and creation of new vehicular access (all matters reserved except access, layout and scale).

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

- Mr Rahim Vellani (to object);
- Cllr Paul Golding (Ash Parish Council) (to object) and;
- Mr Andrew Kamm (Applicant) (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Peter Dijkhuis. The Committee noted that agreement had been confirmed with the applicant in terms of the conditions, the informed terms and a broad agreement of the S106 financial contributions regarding private SANG land that would make the scheme applicable to policy. The scheme would be in reserved matters for one year with commencement in two years which evidenced the delivery of the application.

The site was located at the edge of the northern allocation and was within the edge of the Green Belt. The site was close to Ash Station, the village and community facilities. The Committee was given an overview of the various schemes within the allocation in the immediate area that were either under construction or coming forward and the various planning applications/or appeals.

The Committee noted that if the Orchard Farm site was approved, a green meadow to the north of the site would provide connectivity through to the Woodlands and Streamside sites onto the Green Belt. This was compliant with the policy requirement of creating a green wedge between the various settlements. The character of the settlements was suburban with private gardens and landscaping. Ash Road Bridge was elevated over the railway line to about 6 metres and was a visual intrusion and prominent within the settlement area.

The site was effectively in three portions, the southern portion, the Woodlands which was in the middle and northern portion and southern portion.

The first matter to highlight was in relation to access and movement onto Harpers Road. It was a narrow rural lane with a ditch on one side which collected water from the southern part of the railway. It was screened by a large landscape frame with the woodlands maintaining the rural character.

Surrey County Highways had confirmed that in order to reduce the safety concerns with regard to children and cyclists on the lane that improved signage was installed to highlight public rights of way, pedestrian movements and crossing points with new traffic speed limit signs. This was secured by condition and subject to its implementation, the County Highway Authority had no objections.

In terms of visibility, the private estate road would have good visibility in the northern direction as well accessing the site from the southern portion. Vehicle tracking movements studies had been undertaken and resulted in no objections being raised by Environmental Health or Surrey Highways. The site sat as a parcel as part of a bigger strategic allocation. There were various other adjacent sites that collectively contributed to a new accessibility network for pedestrians and cyclists. An existing public right of way ran through the middle of the site. Each site would eventually have unfettered access across to the other sites. The network of routes collectively would take the majority of pedestrian and cyclist movements off Harper's Road.

In terms of layout, Wildflower Meadows was currently under construction and was a far more rigid suburban type of development. To the north were more semi-detached houses with generous landscaping. The Inspector at the Inquiry had deemed that the northern portion was acceptable in layout between Wildflower Meadows which was a more dense and loose development. Towards the Green Belt and to the other side of Harper's Road with the enhancement of the woodlands, the Inspector felt comfortable that this layout was acceptable. The southern portion was more dense and structured in an L-shape with houses facing onto the streets with the majority of the movement down the centre of the site. The Inspector felt that this aspect needed some work to reduce densities and ensure that there was stronger screening at the front of the site to create a transition from the other site, through Streamside towards Harpers Road and the Green Belt.

The applicant had in turn reduced the number of units onsite and had increased some of the landscaping. Affordable housing had been clustered together and was deemed acceptable by the housing officer.

The proposal was comprised mainly of two storey buildings, detached with car ports and pitched roofs. It was in character with the area and the spaces between the properties created a feathered approach of blending detached houses towards the edge of the settlement.

The proposal complied with planning policy A31. The scheme would deliver 22 dwellings, 8 of which were affordable. The proposal would also make contributions towards infrastructure and highways, specifically Ash Road Bridge. An offsite SANG contribution had been agreed as well as contributions towards education, a travel plan and vouchers to encourage a modal shift towards cycling and ensuring in perpetuity an unfettered access for the public across the site so that people had the opportunity to access the public right of way without having to walk the full extent of Harper's Way. In terms of access, Surrey County Highways had no objection, subject to conditions. Parking provision complied with parking standards and smart charging points would be installed at individual houses.

With regard to layout, it was a single settlement within a strategic site and the pedestrian and cycle routes addressed the concerns raised by the Inspector. Owing to the potential harm caused to a Grade II Listed building, the Council's Conservation Officer had confirmed that less than substantial harm would be caused and the proposal would maintain Harper's Road character and the setting of the listed building.

The habitat creation site was 1.25 hectares of which 0.45 hectares was given over to habitat and woodland creation which was considerably high for the requirements of a small site. The applicant had also agreed to make financial contributions to off-site space provision in terms of more leisure activities. The scale of the proposal was compatible with the existing form both of Wildflower Meadows and in creating that graduation towards Harper's Road and the Green Belt. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to a S106.

In response to comments made by the public speakers, the Senior Planning Officer, Peter Dijkhuis confirmed that in terms of compliance with the SPD, the blue and green corridor would knit the applications together as well as the retention of the woodland would deliver the policies intent. In relation to transition, the northern portion of the site and the woodlands, the Inspector was supportive of the layout and the feathering of the development into the Green Belt. The southern portion which included Oakside Cottage formed part of that transition and had dense screening around the entire site which was deemed

acceptable. It was also confirmed that pedestrian and cycle access between the north and south of the developments across the woodland was proposed.

The Committee discussed the application and noted concerns raised that given it was an outline application, subject to a number of reserved matters, it might be preferable to defer the application, so that the outcome of appeals on sites close by become known, which could have a material effect upon this application.

The Legal Advisor, James Tong confirmed that in terms of statutory timescales, the Council had an extension of time until the end of this month to determine the application. The Senior Planning Officer, Peter Dijkhuis also confirmed that the application process had been lengthy. With regard to applications nearby, May and Juniper Cottages was at outline stage and the principle of development had already been agreed. Orchard Farm was at appeal currently and was completed today but the Inspector's decision was not yet known. The outcome of that appeal should not be perceived as a material consideration to this application.

A motion was moved and seconded to defer the application which was lost.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jane Tyson		X	
2	Vanessa King		X	
3	Patrick Oven		X	
4	Bilal Akhtar		X	
5	Howard Smith		X	
6	Sue Wyeth-Price	X		
7	Cait Taylor		X	
8	James Jones		X	
9	Richard Mills		X	
10	David Bilbe	X		
11	Lizzie Griffiths		X	
12	Catherine Houston		X	
13	Stephen Hives		X	
14	Joss Bigmore		X	
	TOTALS	2	12	0

The Committee noted concerns regarding the cumulative effect of the developments taking place in the area on the road network, despite Surrey Highways not objecting to the applications. More affordable homes were also required as part of this application.

The Committee noted the concerns raised by a public speaker with regard to the proposal's effect upon the privacy of his home.

The Senior Planning Officer, Peter Dijkhuis confirmed that the Inspector had no issues with the layout of the northern portion of the site. Enhancement measures would be undertaken to the woodlands and the biodiversity gain would enhance the site and character of Harper's Road and its setting. In the southern portion, the houses had been pulled back and reorientated and more landscaping implemented to the front of the houses. It was currently an outline application and therefore any further concerns could be addressed at reserved matters stage by ensuring that robust screening was implemented as part of the planting scheme. In relation to Safety and highways, a contract had already been signed for Ash Road Bridge, securing a Grampian condition so that the scheme could not be implemented until the enabling works for the bridge occurred. The bridge would take a significant amount of traffic off the local roads. Lastly, in terms of affordable housing, the policy allowed for the rounding down to 8 units as

opposed to 9 units. It was further confirmed that for the orientation of the houses, the applicant had ensured that there was an effective landscape screen which would mature over time and provided privacy to the existing dwellings. There was also a mature tree boundary between existing houses and the rear gardens of the proposed units.

The Committee reiterated its concerns regarding the southern section of the site which was more sensitive given that it abutted the more rural area and existing housing which it was out of character with given the proposals high density and suburban layout. The Committee cited policies G5 and D1 of the Local Plan given that the proposal failed to reflect the distinctive local character.

The Senior Planning Officer, Peter Dijkhuis confirmed that the area was in a current emergence of change, the southern portion of the proposal wrapped around the existing house. It was not a suburban development and was in character typical of villages in the area.

The Committee noted comments of support for the proposal, given it was an allocated site with a good layout and well sized gardens. The proposal also addressed issues with the culverting of the stream and provided affordable homes which were in need.

The Committee remained concerned about the screening to the proposal and that if the trees were deciduous, they would lose their leaves during the winter and would therefore expose the new residential dwellings. Planning officers maintained that the screening was sufficient to retain the privacy of the existing houses.

The Committee questioned whether the new Ash Road Bridge would prevent Harpers Road from becoming a rat run for vehicles. Planning officers confirmed that Surrey Highways had agreed that the provision of the bridge would address the traffic issues experienced currently.

The Committee noted concerns that the Grampian condition only came into effect once the bridge had been built. In the meantime, the area would experience a significant amount of traffic during the construction phase. The site next door was refused owing to access issues onto Harper's Road. Given the Committee had to be consistent in its decision making processes why was approval recommended for this application when it had two access points onto Harper's Road. The existing cottage was providing a blending in of the proposed development which was not part of the allocated site and yet was delivering

something required by policy. Lastly, whilst a lot of monies had been collected in terms of contributions they have not yet been delivered by tangible infrastructure required for this site and other sites in the area.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the applicant had agreed, as per their statutory requirement to commit to the financial and SANGs contributions delivered via a S106 agreement. This was legally binding and ensured that those monies would be spent against those requirements. Orchard Farm was an anomaly given the Committee decided to refuse that scheme on highways grounds. However, the officer's report was minded at that time of the County's recommendations that there were no concerns for highway safety and therefore supported the scheme. Highways had looked at this application and the cumulative effect of the other applications in the area and raised no objection subject to the conditions recommended. No determination had yet been issued on the appeal for Orchard Farm. The Grampian condition would ensure that the bridge was built out.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Patrick Oven		X	
2	Vanessa King	X		
3	Joss Bigmore		X	
4	Richard Mills		X	
5	Sue Wyeth-Price		X	
6	Stephen Hives		X	
7	David Bilbe		X	
8	Jane Tyson			X
9	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
10	Howard Smith	X		
11	Catherine Houston			X
12	Bilal Akhtar			X
13	James Jones	X		
14	Cait Taylor	X		
	TOTALS	5	6	3

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

The Committee voted by a show of hands on the following reasons for refusal:

1. Highways Safety 9:4 - carried
2. Loss of privacy 6:2 - carried
3. Lack of Vehicle Connectivity 1:5 - lost
4. Insufficient Design Quality 4:6 - lost
5. Lack of a S106 5:3 - carried
6. SANGs 6:4 – carried

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	David Bilbe		X	
2	James Jones	X		
3	Howard Smith		X	
4	Joss Bigmore	X		
5	Stephen Hives		X	
6	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
7	Bilal Akhtar		X	
8	Jane Tyson	X		
9	Vanessa King		X	
10	Catherine Houston		X	
11	Patrick Oven	X		
12	Cait Taylor			X
13	Sue Wyeth-Price	X		
14	Richard Mills	X		
	TOTALS	7	6	1

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 22/P/00977 for the following reasons:

1. Due to the nature and characteristics of Harpers Road, which is a narrow, rural road, the increased vehicle movements would create a dangerous environment for pedestrians and cyclists. The additional movements along Harpers Road created by the application would exacerbate and worsen the existing highway safety concerns. The proposal would therefore result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety, contrary to Policies ID3 and A31(10) of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: strategy and sites 2015 – 2034, the Strategic Development Framework SPD (2020), and NPPF paragraphs 110 and 111.
2. The proposed development would result in a material loss of privacy and overlooking to the occupants of Oakside Cottage which is located to the east of the site. The proposal would therefore result in an unacceptable impact on the amenity of this property, contrary to Policy D5(1a,b)(2b) of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2023).

3. In the absence of a completed planning obligation the application fails to mitigate its impact on infrastructure provision. This includes the following: a) the delivery of 8 (eight) affordable housing dwellings; b) provision of SAMM contributions; c) provision of SANG land to mitigate the impact of the development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area; d) contribution towards early years, primary and secondary education projects; e) contribution towards open space provision infrastructure in the area; f) contribution towards highway safety improvements and pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure improvements in the area; g) contribution towards Ash Road Bridge; and, h) provision that the Applicant, and successor in Title, gives free and unfettered access to the estate roads, pathways, and cycleways. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies P5, H2, ID1, ID3 and A31 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: strategy and sites 2015-2034, saved Policy NRM6 of the South-East Plan (2009), Policy ID6 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2023, the Council's Planning Contributions SPD (2017), and the guidance contained within the NPPF paragraphs 55-57.

4. The site lies within the 400m to 5km zone of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). In the absence of a completed planning obligation, the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that there will be no likely significant effect on the Special Protection Area and is unable to satisfy itself that this proposal, either alone or in combination with other development, would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area and the relevant Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The application would be contrary to the objectives of Policy P5 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: strategy and sites 2015-2034, the Thames Basin Heaths Avoidance Strategy SPD, and saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan (2009). For the same reasons, the application would fail to meet the requirements of Regulation 63 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) as amended, and as the application does not meet the requirements of Regulation 64, consequently the Local Planning Authority must refuse to grant planning permission.

Informatives:

1. This decision relates expressly to the following drawing(s): Location Plan – dwg. 6502-LOC1A; 30/05/2023. Proposed Block Plan – dwg. 6502-BLOC Revision C; 30/05/2023. Proposed Site Plan – Streamside Option 3 – dwg. 6502-SK-002 Revision E; 30/05/2023. Proposed Walking & Cycling Plan – Streamside Option 3 – dwg. 6502-SK-003 Revision C; 30/05/2023. Indicative Elevations – dwg. 6502-020 Revision E; 29/07/2020. Proposed Access Arrangements – dwg. 22055/001

Revision C; 05/2022. Tracking Plans: Refuse Lorry Vehicle Swept Path Assessment – dwg. 231684/TR/01; 05/2022. Tracking Plans: Fire Appliance Swept Path Assessment – dwg. 231684/TR/02; 05/2022.

2. 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:

- a) Offering a pre application advice service;
- b) 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; and,
- c) 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 instance the Local Planning Authority has worked positively and proactively with the applicant to address concerns both at pre-application and formal application stage. This has resulted in a number of amendments to the scheme which have addressed some areas of concern. Notwithstanding this, the Council's Planning Committee has identified further areas of concern and the application has been refused based on the information available.

**PL7 22/P/01898 - LAND TO EAST OF ABINGER FIELDS, SUTTON PLACE,
ABINGER HAMMER, DORKING, RH5 6RP**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for change of use from agricultural land to equestrian use including the erection of a stable building and sand school.

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

- Mrs Nicola Hetherington (to object) and;
- Ms Emily Hall (WS Architecture and Planning) (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Lisa Botha. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which clarified the comments received by Shere Parish Council as well as detailing an additional letter of objection. The site was located within the Green Belt, Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). The site was in a rural area comprised of open fields which extended to the rear of Chase Cottage and Abinger Fields northwards along to Sutton Place. The proposed sand school was 40 metres by 20 metres located to the rear of the residential curtilage of the dwelling running east to west. The proposed stable building would be comprised of an earth substrate and a condition was recommended to secure details of this. No fencing was proposed to be erected around the sand school itself and a condition was proposed to secure details should the applicant wish to install fencing at a later date. The proposed stable building would measure 11 metres by 7.35 metres at its maximum height and would have a pitched roof made of wooden boarding and corrugated sheeting. From the footpath the proposed sand school and stable building would not be visible as it was lower than the elevated ground it would be built on.

Planning officers had concluded that the change of use of land and the engineering operations to create the sand school would not represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt. The proposed use would be required for outdoor recreation and the sand school would represent an engineering operation. Both elements would preserve the openness of the Green Belt and would not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. No in principle objections were raised to these elements of the proposal. The proposed stable would constitute appropriate facilities in connection with a change of use of the land. As such it was not construed as inappropriate development within the Green Belt. The principle of development was therefore considered acceptable. The stable building would be in keeping with the character of the area, appropriately designed and in scale for its intended use. Whilst the site was positioned in an elevated position in the landscape, the site was relatively visually contained and would not be prominent from distant views. Furthermore, stable buildings such as this would not be unexpected in this rural context. Whilst the site was located on the best and most versatile land, the land could easily be brought back into agricultural use if required. It was acknowledged that the site was in a sensitive location and should the application be approved, a condition would be imposed to prevent the installation of external lighting without first obtaining permission. No adverse impacts upon neighbouring amenities would occur owing to the nature of the proposals and the separation distances proposed. No concerns were raised with regard to the impact upon the highway and the application was therefore recommended for approval subject to a S106

condition and amended and additional conditions as outlined on the supplementary late sheets.

The Chairman permitted Councillor Bob Hughes to speak in his capacity as ward councillor for three minutes. The Committee noted concerns raised regarding the loss of agricultural land. The Council's AONB Officer had raised concerns about the fragmentation of the field which could enable other planning applications to come in.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that the traffic to the Sand School was limited to private/commercial use. A condition had also been added to ensure that the Sand School was built on permeable land.

The Committee considered that it was difficult to demonstrate that serious damage would be caused by approving this application. Each application had to be considered on its own merits. Whilst the AONB's Officers concerns had been noted they were not a statutory consultee. The Committee was satisfied that the proposed stable and sand school could not be seen from the footpath and were typical structures of such a rural setting.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Richard Mills	X		
2	Catherine Houston	X		
3	Howard Smith	X		
4	Sue Wyeth-Price	X		
5	Joss Bigmore	X		
6	Stephen Hives	X		
7	Vanessa King	X		
8	Cait Taylor			X
9	Bilal Akhtar			X
10	James Jones		X	
11	Patrick Oven		X	
12	Lizzie Griffiths		X	
13	Jane Tyson		X	
14	David Bilbe	X		
	TOTALS	8	4	2

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

RESOLVED to approve application 22/P/01898 subject to updated and amended conditions as detailed on the supplementary late sheets.

Amended condition

Condition 2 should be replaced by the following condition to take into account an amended drawing received to correct the references on drawing J004325-DD-07 identifying the elevations of the proposed stable building.

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: J004325-DD-01, J004325-DD-2, J004325-DD-3, J004325-DD-4, J004325-DD-5, J004325-DD-6 received on 09/11/22 and J004325-DD-7 AV received on 20/06/23.

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/01847 - 24 ALEXANDRA ROAD, ASH, GUILDFORD, GU12 6PJ

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for construction of three houses with associated parking, landscaping and access following demolition of the existing building.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Lisa Botha. The application was recommended for approval subject to conditions and a legal agreement. There was an amended condition on the supplementary late sheets which took into account sustainability factors with regard to materials to be used and an additional condition to deal with surface water drainage on the site.

The site was located within the urban area of Ash and was within the 400m to 5km TBHSPA. It was also located within a residential area and comprised of a mix of detached, semi-detached and terrace properties which were predominantly two storeys in height.

The site was comprised of a detached bungalow with an L-shaped footprint with double garage on a wide plot in need of modernisation. The southern side of Alexandra Road was comprised predominantly of more narrow plots to the west of the application site there were wider plots with large detached properties.

The existing bungalow would be demolished and replaced by three detached dwellings onsite.

Cycle stores were proposed to the rear and two parking spaces for each dwelling. Planning officers were satisfied that the loss of the existing building was of no particular architectural merit. The site represented a transition between smaller plots to the south-west and wider plots with detached properties. The three detached dwellings would sit comfortably on the site and would retain good separation distances to the side boundaries with rear gardens provided with a depth of over 10 metres. The frontages of the properties would be mainly hard surfaced to provide parking with some landscaping proposed to soften the visual impact. No objection had been raised by the County Highway Authority. No trees would be felled to enable the development and suitable measures were proposed in order to prevent damage to trees located close to the boundary of the application site. The proposed dwellings would provide good living conditions for any future occupants and would not materially harm the amenities of neighbouring properties.

The Committee discussed the application and agreed that the development provided wider plots and separation distances than other neighbouring dwellings. The proposal was considered to be a good use of space whilst also providing much needed housing.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	David Bilbe	X		
2	Sue Wyeth-Price	X		
3	Vanessa King	X		
4	James Jones	X		
5	Jane Tyson	X		
6	Patrick Oven	X		
7	Joss Bigmore	X		
8	Richard Mills	X		
9	Catherine Houston	X		
10	Lizzie Griffiths	X		
11	Howard Smith	X		
12	Stephen Hives	X		
13	Cait Taylor	X		
14	Bilal Akhtar	X		
	TOTALS	14		

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

RESOLVED to approve application 22/P/01847 subject to the amended and updated conditions as detailed on the supplementary late sheets.

The following additional condition:

The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by planning authority. The design must satisfy the SuDS Hierarchy and be compliant with the NPPF and the accompanying PPG.

Reason: To ensure the development does not increase flood risk on or off site. This pre-commencement condition is required in order to ensure that drainage details have been considered at an appropriate time of the development.

Amended condition

Condition 4 should be replaced by the following condition to take account of the requirement to provide the environmental credentials of all external materials.

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. This must include the details of embodied carbon/ energy (environmental credentials) of all external materials. These shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be carried out using only those detailed.

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

PL9 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee discussed and noted the appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 11.00 pm

Signed

Date

Chairman