

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

- \* Councillor Fiona White (Chairperson)
- \* Councillor Vanessa King (Vice-Chairperson)

- |                             |                            |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| * 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 in attendance.

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lizzie Griffiths, James Jones and Sue Wyeth-Price. No substitute was in attendance for Councillor Griffiths. Councillors Phil Bellamy and Catherine Young attended as substitutes respectively.

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

Councillors Howard Smith and Catherine Young declared a non-pecuniary interest in application 23/P/00219 – Car Park, Royal Horticultural Gardens, Wisley Lane owing to the fact that they were both RHS members.

### **PL3 MINUTES**

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 21 June 2023 were approved and signed by the Chairman as a true record.

Councillor Mills raised a query in relation to the minutes for 10 July 2023 at the meeting where the Wisley Airfield application was considered. The minutes had not yet been published. Concern was raised that owing to tight time pressures to report back to the Planning Inspectorate, reassurance was sought that the minutes, and any other statement submitted from the Council, about its views on

Wisley, were not sent, until the Committee had first approved those minutes. Whilst the Committee had voted unanimously to refuse the application, which was the recommendation to the Planning Inspectorate, concern was raised that the reasons that were being put forward for refusal did not adequately reflect additional reasons for refusal that could be added.

The legal advisor, Angela Watson confirmed that the Planning Committee could not go back on what had originally been agreed at the meeting. Minutes were not meant to be a verbatim record of a meeting and it was not possible to retrospectively add things in that were not said at the time and consequently agreed on. When minutes are confirmed at a meeting, minor corrections and/or amendments are permitted to be addressed but not fundamental changes to what was actually agreed.

The Joint Director for Planning, Claire Upton-Brown confirmed that the Statement of Case had already been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate and was wholly reflective of the decision the Committee made.

Councillor Young confirmed that she would personally be writing to the Planning Inspectorate to ask that additional reasons for refusal were considered.

#### **PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Committee noted the Chairman's announcements.

#### **PL5 21/P/01211 - LAND AT MAY AND JUNIPER COTTAGES, ASH GREEN ROAD, ASH, GUILDFORD**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned reserved matters application pursuant to outline permission 18/P/02308, approved on 18/02/2020, to consider appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of the erection of 93 dwellings.

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

- Mr Norman Bristow (Ash Green Resident's Association) (to object);
- Ms Louise Robertson (to object) and;
- Ms Rebecca Fenn-Tripp (Bloor Homes) (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Hannah Yates. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which included an update to the planning history and an up-to-date version of the proposed site plan which replaced the version in the agenda. An additional objection had also been received from Ash Green Resident's Association.

The application site was located within the urban area of Ash and Tongham. The site formed part of the large site allocation for housing under Policy A31 of the Local Plan Strategy and Sites. The key site constraints to note was an area of ancient woodland, a railway line to the north which abutted the site and a number of TPO trees along the western and southern boundaries. To the west of the site were a number of dwellings and farm structures, a Grade II star listed building and a number of other Grade II listed buildings as denoted by the Ash Manor complex. The site was at the edge of the urban area. The Committee noted that there were a number of other applications either awaiting determination or had been recently determined close to the site.

The site was generally flat but did fall away gradually from south to north in the direction of the railway station. A strong existing landscape was present between the application site and the adjacent Ash Manor complex. Additional supplementary planting was proposed along the boundary which was controlled by condition.

The Committee noted that throughout the application process, a number of amendments and additional supporting documents had been received from the applicant in response to concerns raised and improvements made to the scheme. The 93 dwellings, in officer's opinion, had been designed appropriately for the constraints, along each of the site boundaries, responding to the context and most relevant policy requirements. Along the western boundary, the layout had been designed to minimise harm to the nearby heritage assets of the Ash Manor complex, by locating an area of open space in the south-west corner of the site and providing a landscape buffer along the western boundary, ensuring that the built development did not come too close to this boundary. The existing boundary trees and hedges would be protected and secured by conditions 5 and 10. A 15-metre buffer was proposed from the ancient woodland to the east of the site. The development would overlook the boundary with the railway line to the north. Owing to the potential for noise from the railway line, acoustic fencing would be incorporated. The proposed layout ensured that the development integrated well with the existing adjacent properties and the wider character of Ash Green Road. Plots 80 – 85 would continue the building line with May and Juniper Cottages and was set back from Ash Green Road, to allow for the creation

of a green buffer where existing planting was retained and supplemented. Planning officers acknowledged that the A31 policy requirement for a green buffer around properties on Ash Green Road had not been met in its entirety, as a sufficiently large green buffer had not been provided to maintain the cottages. However, officers considered that the proposal had significant design benefits with open space provision which was in excess of that required by the current development plan. The open space included a central community space with a Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) in the south-west corner of the site. Generous buffers had also been created to the eastern and western edges which were fronted by development, ensuring that it was outward looking and did not appear cramped.

The Committee noted the Strategic Development Plan, which was an illustrative plan, showing one way in which this part of the allocation could be developed. It envisioned a green buffer along Ash Green Road where the housing fronted onto it. It was important to note that the Strategic Development Framework was published by the Council as a guide for future master planning and development of the strategic sites. Members were reminded that whilst SDF's had been subject to consultation and their content was a material consideration, it did not form part of the development plan and did not attract the same weight to be given to local plan policies.

The Committee noted that 40% of the dwellings would be affordable (rented or shared ownership) which equated to 37 dwellings that were spread across the site and agreed by the Council's Housing Manager.

It was the planning officer's view that the principle of development had been established under the outline planning permission and the site as allocated under policy A31. The application sought approval for layout, scale, appearance and landscaping and the application for reserved matters was consistent with current development plan policies. It was concluded that the proposal was in accordance with the development plan as a whole. Some conflicts with policies ID10 and A31 and the Strategic Development Framework had been identified but no material harm would result and were therefore attributed modest weight. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm at the lower end of the scale to the heritage assets nearby. This level of heritage harm was considered to be acceptable at the outline stage, given the public benefits of the scheme. The application had minimised harm to the designated heritage assets at the adjacent Ash Manor complex and the application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Chairman permitted Councillor David Shaw to speak in his capacity as ward councillor for three minutes. The Committee noted concerns raised regarding the lack of infrastructure and that it was not possible to apply a Grampian condition to overcome this. Only one access point into and out of the development was proposed along a country lane. Footpaths down Foreman Road towards the station were incomplete and there was currently no street lighting planned for the site. Thames Water would not upgrade the water treatment works as a result of this development despite being at capacity. The historical context of the area should be considered as well as the prevention of the urbanisation of a rural landscape. The provision of a green buffer was essential. The buffer zone between the existing houses and the proposed development would be reduced to a footpath and a wall. Traffic would also be a problem with it increasing exponentially over the forthcoming years.

In response to comments made by the public speakers and ward councillor, the Senior Planning Officer, Hannah Yates confirmed that the site had got outline planning permission already for up to 100 dwellings. The second point was that the access was not for consideration under this application as that was determined at the outline planning permission stage. The outline planning permission assessed the effect of 100 units onto Ash Green Road as the only access, as part of the submitted Transport Assessment. The site access would be closed after Ash Road Bridge was constructed and associated link roads as secured by the S106. Access would then only be permitted to the seven plots proposed. With regard to the buffer around the existing Ash Green Road this was addressed extensively in the report. Infrastructure had also been dealt with at outline permission stage and the S106 agreement required that a variety of infrastructures made the development acceptable in planning terms. Thames Water lastly did not object to the application.

The Committee discussed the application and noted concerns raised that whilst the proposal failed to provide an adequate buffer between the countryside and housing, it was not enough to refuse the application. The condition in relation to increasing biodiversity onsite should be more rigorous given the overall decline of natural habitats in the UK given over for development. Further concerns were raised regarding traffic flows which had potentially not been measured adequately on Ash Green Road. Clarity was also sought on how sustainable the development was given there was no bus service proposed and the scheme was heavily car reliant where the road narrows in places to 5.5 metres. The importance of a buffer zone was reiterated given the site bordered the boundary of open countryside and the Green Belt. The SPD was also cited as a guide which should carry more than moderate weight when assessing strategic sites.

The Senior Planning Officer, Hannah Yates confirmed that condition 11 did recommend a landscape and ecological management plan which built on the BEEP. Further submissions would ensure that biodiversity was considered in the development of the scheme. With regard to traffic flow measurements, this was not a relevant consideration for this application which was to look at scale, appearance and landscaping only. With regard to sustainability and other modes of transport, part of the outline application required a footpath connection from the site to the more built up area of Ash to the north and was required to be implemented prior to occupation. If the site were to be developed and connected to other sites, then more direct pedestrian links would be created. However, that scenario was currently unknown and there was an alternative agreed at outline permission. The principle of a primary route being designed to allow for future bus use was considered and found not to be appropriate in this instance, the details of which were in the report. It was lastly confirmed that the SPD carried full weight as an adopted policy.

The Committee noted further concerns raised about the access off Ash Green Road and clarification was requested on whether any additional conditions could be applied so to limit the number of dwellings occupied whilst the access was solely onto Gaskin Road, Ash. The purpose of policy D1 was to prevent coalescence of Ash Green Road so that there was a clear separation and distinction between the communities. The suburban feel of the development proposed resulted in a failure to comply with policy and the retention of a green buffer which should be given significant weight.

The Committee noted further concerns raised about the minimal screening on the west side of the development and the harm caused by that lack of screening on the Grade II listed buildings. Comments of support were also made acknowledging the minor issues noted with screening and an adequate buffer, good quality homes such as this were needed in Guildford.

The Committee noted that whilst the highways issues had already been dealt with at outline stage, that permission was granted in 2019 prior to the judicial review held in relation to the Ash Manor site which the Council lost at appeal. Had the development proceeded, a link road would have been available from this site to Foreman Road. Currently, the Council did not know what would happen to the Ash Manor site, however, given it was an allocated site in the Local Plan it could potentially be developed in the future. Policy A31 foresaw that the link road would be in place as adopted in the Local Plan. Concern was therefore

raised whether there was sufficient mitigation to offset the harm caused to Ash Manor which was a historic site.

The Senior Planning Officer, Hannah Yates confirmed that in relation to heritage impact, the Council's Conservation Officer had raised no objection. Planning officers had acknowledged that there would be less than substantial harm to the heritage assets, but that less than substantial harm was also identified at the outline stage. It was therefore considered that the benefits outweighed those harms. At reserved matters, the applicant had gone through the process of minimising the harm, as required by policy, by providing more breathing space to that boundary with further landscaping and which was already densely vegetated with TPO trees. A condition had been applied that required all existing vegetation to be retained and a landscaping condition. In response to the query as to whether the number of dwellings to be occupied at any one time could be limited until Ash Road Bridge was fully operational was not justifiable. This was owing to the fact that the County Highway Authority did not raise any objections to 100 units being developed on Ash Green Road as part of the outline consent. The bridge was currently being implemented which may allay some of those concerns. Lastly, in relation to the fact that outline permission was granted prior to the Ash Manor appeal would not undermine the fact that access onto Ash Green Road was established as a separate consent matter.

The Committee queried whether the buffer was also part of the gardens proposed and if there was any risk of infilling eroding those buffers over time? The Senior Planning Officer, Hannah Yates confirmed that garden areas were not part of the buffer.

A motion was moved and seconded on the reasons put forward to refuse the application, which was, that the proposed development, owing to the landscaping and layout, failed to provide a sufficient landscape buffer, and provide an effective transition from the urban to the rural environment and was therefore contrary to policies A31 and policy D1. A vote was taken by a show of hands 7:6:1.

A vote was then taken on the substantive motion to refuse the application, which was tied. The Chairperson, Councillor White decided against using her casting vote.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	George Potter	X		
2	Phil Bellamy	X		
3	Vanessa King		X	
4	Catherine Young	X		
5	Howard Smith		X	
6	David Bilbé		X	
7	Bilal Akhtar		X	
8	Maddy Redpath	X		
9	Patrick Oven	X		
10	Joanne Shaw	X		
11	Stephen Hives		X	
12	Cait Taylor		X	
13	Richard Mills		X	
14	Fiona White	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>

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



RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Howard Smith	X		
2	Fiona White		X	
3	Vanessa King	X		
4	Maddy Redpath		X	
5	Joanne Shaw		X	
6	Patrick Oven		X	
7	Cait Taylor			X
8	George Potter		X	
9	David Bilbe	X		
10	Stephen Hives	X		
11	Catherine Young		X	
12	Bilal Akhtar	X		
13	Richard Mills	X		
14	Phil Bellamy		X	
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>

A motion was moved and seconded to defer the application which was carried so that a site visit could be undertaken. The site visit would be held on Tuesday 15 August at 10am.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	George Potter	X		
2	Patrick Oven	X		
3	Howard Smith	X		
4	Fiona White	X		
5	Richard Mills	X		
6	Maddy Redpath		X	
7	Catherine Young		X	
8	Bilal Akhtar	X		
9	David Bilbe		X	
10	Joanne Shaw	X		
11	Phil Bellamy	X		
12	Stephen Hives	X		
13	Cait Taylor	X		
14	Vanessa King	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>

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

RESOLVED that a site visit was carried out on Tuesday 15 August 2023 at 10am and the application was then considered by the Committee at its meeting on Wednesday 16 August 2023.

**PL6 22/P/01834 - 188 SEND ROAD, SEND, WOKING, GU23 7ET**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of two storey side and rear extension with front and rear gables, enlarged dormer and front and rear roof-lights following the demolition of detached garage and lobby. (Amended plans received 26.062023 to change the roof and reduce the width).

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

- Mr Chris Orthodoxou (to object) and;
- Mr Sumant Doorgapershad (In Support) (online)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, James Amos. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which detailed a response from the Parish Council who had responded to amended plans as well as one further representation of objection and one of support.

The site was located on the south side of Send Road and was comprised of a semi-detached bungalow. It was part of a group of 12 properties located off an access road which ran parallel with Send Road. The property had an attached garage and a gap to the western side. The garage has already been removed and some building works commenced under permitted development rights to start an extension to the roof. Principally, the accommodation was at ground floor level and there was a very small area within the roofspace which was illuminated by the rear facing dormer. The proposed floor plans for the extension were at ground floor level and would be set back from the main front elevation and extend for the full depth of the dwelling with a small projection of less than 1 metre towards the rear garden. The boundary of the property widened at the rear, so that gap at the front was 1.6 metres and the gap at the rear was 2.1 metres. The extension would partially fill the gap between the dwelling and its neighbour. On balance however the proposal was considered acceptable and complied with the guidance in the adopted residential extensions SPD. It had a degree of subservience to the main dwelling and would not cause harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties. The application was therefore recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

In response to comments made by public speakers, the Senior Planning Officer, James Amos confirmed that kitchen were not classified as habitable rooms. The BRE Sunlight and Daylight Assessment looked at habitable rooms which included living rooms, dining rooms and bedrooms. Whilst it was recognised that the extension would have an impact, the BRE Test was not relevant in this instance. In relation to comments made about terracing, a significant gap between the flank wall of the proposed extension and the boundary was proposed and the hipped roof was orientated away from the boundary so terracing would not occur.

The Committee noted concerns raised that whilst the kitchen was not a habitable room, an elderly couple used it extensively and would have their amenities affected as a result. It appeared that no other property in Send Road had been extended to such an extent and therefore by virtue of its bulk and mass failed to comply with policy D1 due to its poor design. The Committee also noted concerns that the scheme was not in character with the surrounding area.

The Senior Planning Officer, James Amos confirmed that no.187 Send Road had been extended many years ago and the footprint was larger than what was proposed at no.188. It was a balanced judgement with regard to harm and the Committee had to consider the fact that residents had the right to apply for planning permission to extend their properties and extend them under permitted development rights. There was a small degree of subservience and the proposal was considered to be well designed in the context of what was there currently.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Joanne Shaw	X		
2	Vanessa King	X		
3	Patrick Oven		X	
4	Bilal Akhtar	X		
5	Howard Smith	X		
6	Catherine Young	X		
7	Cait Taylor	X		
8	Phil Bellamy	X		
9	Richard Mills	X		
10	David Bilbe	X		
11	Fiona White	X		
12	George Potter	X		
13	Stephen Hives	X		
14	Maddy Redpath	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 22/P/01834 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

**PL7 23/P/00219 - CAR PARK, ROYAL HORTICULTURAL, SOCIETY GARDENS, WISLEY LANE, WISLEY**

Prior to the consideration of this application, Councillor Pat Oven sat in the ward councillor seat owing to speaking in this capacity for the above application and would then absent himself from the room for the discussion and decision made.

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application use of land as an occasional overflow car park for up to 150 days per annum; use of former cricket pavilion for purposes ancillary to the use of the car park (description amended 08/06/2023).

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

- Mr Paul Garland (to object);
- Mr Harry Salaman (to object) and;
- Mr David Alexander (Land Agent to the RHS) (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, James Amos. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets where a number of late representations had been received both in support and in objection.

The site was located to the east of Wisley Lane in the southern part of Wisley Village. The site was comprised of an area of open land formerly used for sports and recreation. The exit of the site was from Deer Farm Close coming onto Wisley Lane with residential properties located close by. The site was open in nature and surrounded by trees and a pavilion onsite to the left.

Planning permission was sought for use of the land as a car park for a period of up to 150 days per annum. The use of the site commenced over 10 years ago as a temporary use of land permitted by Part 4 Class B of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015. This allowed for the use of land for any purpose for not more than 28 days in any calendar year. Following the commencement of use over 10 years ago, the use of the car park had grown gradually and been extended through the year. This application was to regularise that use. The proposed elevations of the building were very similar to the existing elevations. The pavilion would be used as a welfare facility for staff who worked at the car park. It was not proposed to resurface the car park or provide any formal bays. A one-way system was in place and cars are directed by marshals to park in a location where there is a free space. When leaving, cars are directed by marshals to leave by Deer Farm Close. No external changes were proposed to the pavilion, although minor changes were proposed internally.

Planning officers considered that the proposed use of the car park for 150 days per annum constituted inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However, it was considered that very special circumstances had been demonstrated which

outweighed the harm that had been caused. The impact of the increased use of the car park would not have a significantly harmful impact on the amenities of nearby residential occupiers. The County Highway Authority had not objected to the scheme either.

The Chairman permitted Councillor Pat Oven to speak in his capacity as Ward Councillor for three minutes.

The Committee noted concerns raised that it was inappropriate development to permit 500 cars to be parked on this site for a significant amount of time. The openness of the land would not be preserved and contrary to paragraph 181c of the NPPF. One of the purposes of the Green Belt was to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. The use of this car park would also result in additional traffic being funnelled through Wisley Village which would have an impact upon neighbouring amenities. The traffic survey undertaken by the applicant was also done at the quietest time of the year and failed to take into account of the changes that would result from the increased use of this car park and Wisley Airfield being developed.

In response to comments made by public speakers, the Senior Planning Officer, James Amos confirmed that very special circumstances had been demonstrated to clearly outweigh the harm identified to the Green Belt. Wisley Airfield was also not an extant planning permission and therefore the effects of that scheme did not need to be taken into account.

The Committee noted further concerns raised that a car park was not a very special circumstance that outweighed the harm caused to the Green Belt. It was not mentioned in the officer's report that it was a local green space, which afforded the same level of protection as the Green Belt. The Lovelace Neighbourhood Plan policies, specifically, LNPE1 was not listed either. It was uncertain whether any consultation had been undertaken with the local community as to whether the space could be returned to a village facility. It was also noted that owing to the M25 junction improvements currently underway the traffic levels had significantly increased and people were using Pyrford Lock as a cut through which was close to the proposed overflow car park.

The Committee also noted comments that public transport links to Wisley Gardens were unlikely to be improved and therefore the requirement for an overflow car park was acceptable. If parking capabilities were reduced then local residents would be significantly affected conversely by the additional strain of parking in local areas.

The Senior Planning Officer, James Amos confirmed that the land was not used for recreational purposes anymore. It was also acknowledged that an assessment should have been made in the officer's report against the Lovelace Neighbourhood Plan. However, in the planning officer's view, a different outcome would not have resulted in terms of the recommendation to approve the application. The Committee also noted that conditions 6 and 7 required a strategy to monitor the use of the car park and enforcement action could be taken if its usage was breached beyond the 150 days per annum.

The Committee noted comments that the application should be deferred to allow for the Lovelace Neighbourhood Plan policy LNPE1 to be included which was not supported. The Committee had the policy read out to them which was taken into account.

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	Phil Bellamy	X		
3	Joanne Shaw	X		
4	Bial Akhtar	X		
5	Vanessa King	X		
6	Richard Mills	X		
7	Stephen Hives	X		
8	Cait Taylor	X		
9	Howard Smith	X		
10	Fiona White	X		
11	George Potter		X	
12	Catherine Young			X
13	Maddy Redpath	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 23/P/00219 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

**PL8 22/P/01786 - WEYSIDE URBAN VILLAGE (SLYFIELD REGENERATION PROGRAMME), SLYFIELD GREEN, GUILDFORD, GU1**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned reserved matters application pursuant to outline consent 20/P/02155 (siting, design and external appearance, access and landscaping) for the erection of 81 dwellings and associated infrastructure, parking and landscaping.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Jo Chambers. The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which set out the details of an additional and amended condition. The County Highway Authority had also confirmed that they had no objection to the development subject to these conditions.

The application site formed part of site allocation A24, the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project now referred to as the Weyside Urban Village located on the western side of the River Wey, 2 km north from Guildford's town centre. The site was bounded to the west by existing residential areas and to the north-west by Slyfield Industrial Estate. The River Wey ran along the eastern boundary.

Hybrid planning consent was granted for the development including 1,500 new homes and community and employment uses in March 2022. This was the second reserved matters application to come before the Committee and comprised the first residential phase of development. Planning permission was granted for the first reserved matters application in respect of a relocated Council depot in March 2023.

The application site was located on the south-west corner of the wider site in an area of existing allotments and the site of the agricultural club building known locally as the Aggie Club with access from Bellfield's Road. The site was bounded by Weyfield Primary School and playing fields along the western edge of the site and existing settlements along the north-western and southern edges. The Thames Water Sewage Treatment works would be relocated to a new facility within the wider area. A proportion of the Bellfields Allotment site would be retained. The Aggie Club was relocated to a new temporary facility in February 2023 and a new permanent facility would be opened later in the development programme.

The development formed part of the wider master plan for the Weyside Urban Village, the principle of development had been established through the hybrid consent and the application sought reserved matters approval in respect of



appearance, access and landscaping, layout and scale. Phase 1 would set the tone in terms of design and build quality for the new development and connected the existing Wakefield Primary School and green spaces which were accessible to all. Access from Bellfields Road was approved in detail as part of the hybrid consent and would provide one of the primary access points to the wider development area. Phase 1 had been designed in accordance with the approved parameters and design code. It was comprised of 81 dwellings, 67% of which are three to four bed units and represented a higher proportion of family housing than the overall development and reflected site characteristics and location. The overall mix would continue to be monitored through the submission of subsequent reserved matters applications to ensure the approved mix was achieved.

The heights of the development responded sensitively to existing properties in the area. The majority of the dwellings were either 2-3 storey's. The tenure mix was comprised of 40% affordable rent and 60% market housing which was in accordance with the hybrid consent. Phase 1 of the development formed the garden mews character area of the Weyside Urban Village which was described in the Design Code as medium density community living which linked the existing and new residents together. The design had been subject to extensive public consultation and revisions made to it informed by community engagement. Planning officers had also worked closely with the design team and further changes had been made to further enhance the garden character by introducing more trees and planting as well as improving pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the wider area. The site layout promoted sustainable travel modes and tertiary roads had been designed as shared surfaces. Traffic restrictions would be implemented along Bellfields Road to prevent on-street parking which would restrict access to the site. Main vehicular access to the school would remain via School Lane with improvements to pedestrian safety around Bellfield's Road school gate. The school planned to reorientate the school layout to face the new development. 26 additional parking spaces were proposed within the development. To mitigate the loss of parking on Bellfields Road, a mix of allocated spaces had been incorporated through the site. Visitor parking as well as an electric car club space was proposed too. The level of parking provision was lower than the maximum number of spaces required, applying the standards set out in Policy ID10, however, this was considered to be acceptable given the location of the site and the sustainable transport measures proposed.

A detailed biodiversity mitigation and enhancement plan would introduce additional ecological features into the scheme such as bat and bird roosting features integrated into the new buildings. The focal point of the development

was the central green space which formed a community hub providing flexible spaces and opportunities for community events, an orchard and play spaces.

The development had been designed to exceed energy and sustainability targets. Carbon reductions would be achieved through energy efficient design and building fabrics. Photovoltaic panels would be used which would cover 40% of the building footprint and air source heat pumps.

In conclusion, the proposed development would deliver an exemplar, high quality and sustainable development which would meet the objectives of the approved design code and achieve high standards of sustainability and energy performance. As such, the application was recommended for approval.

The Committee fully supported the development and was looking forward to seeing it progress.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Vanessa King	X		
2	Jo Shaw	X		
3	Fiona White	X		
4	Howard Smith	X		
5	Richard Mills	X		
6	Stephen Hives	X		
7	Bilal Akhtar	X		
8	Phil Bellamy	X		
9	Pat Oven	X		
10	Catherine Young	X		
11	David Bilbe	X		
12	Cait Taylor	X		
13	George Potter	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>13</b>		

[Councillor Maddy Redpath had left the meeting]

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

RESOLVED to approve application 22/P/01786 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report, additional four conditions, as detailed in the supplementary late sheets and amended conditions 3, 4, 5 and 9 as well as an additional informative.

**PL9 23/P/00871 - 25 MARKENFIELD ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 4PB**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed two-storey side/rear extension, loft conversion, enlargement of the existing basement courtyard complete with glazed light well and erection of a single storey outbuilding with boundary wall.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, James Amos. The site was comprised of a two storey semi-detached dwelling on the south side of Markenfield Road. It was a two storey flint faced cottage. The neighbouring property at no.24 had been extended in a similar way to the proposal before the Committee. The property had a basement with a small lightwell, standard accommodation at ground floor level, first floor and loft

space. The basement would be extended at the front with a new light well and covered with a glazed screen as a new staircase up to the ground floor level. The extension would be set back further from the first floor and with an angled elevation to take account of the relationship with the next door property at no.24. The proposed extension had been designed not to cut into the 45 degree line but to respect the sunlight and daylight experienced by the adjoining property. The proposed front and rear elevations were unchanged. At the ground-floor level the elevation at the rear and extension had been designed in a contemporary and modern style reflective of the style of the extensions that had taken place at no.24. The extension reduced in depth as you got higher up the property so there was a degree of subservience. The elevations featured large areas of obscured glazing that were at high level and non-opening so that the neighbouring properties amenities were not affected through a loss of privacy.

On balance and taking into account the existence of other similar modern extensions on properties down Markenfield Road, such extensions always occurred at the rear and only limited changes occurred to the property at the front. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Committee discussed the application and noted a query regarding the concern raised by the Council's Sustainability Officer regarding a condition being included about overheating due to the amount of glazing incorporated. The Senior Planning Officer, James Amos, confirmed that condition 4 ensured that the development would not commence until a robust overheating risk assessment for the proposed development had been submitted and successfully demonstrated that there would be no unacceptable risk of overheating.

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

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Jo Shaw	X		
2	Howard Smith	X		
3	Cait Taylor	X		
4	Phil Bellamy	X		
5	Fiona White	X		
6	Bilal Akhtar	X		
7	Vanessa King	X		
8	David Bilbé	X		
9	Stephen Hives	X		
10	Richard Mills	X		
11	Catherine Young	X		
12	Pat Oven	X		
13	George Potter	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

[Councillor Maddy Redpath had left the meeting]

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

RESOLVED to approve application 23/P/00871 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

#### **PL10 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS**

The Committee discussed and noted the planning appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 10.45 pm

Signed .....

Date .....

Chairman