

## 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

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bilal Akhtar and Lizzie Griffiths. Councillors Bob Hughes and Catherine Houston attended as substitutes respectively.

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

Councillor Pat Oven declared a non-pecuniary interest in applications 22/P/01742, 23/P/00473 and 23/P/00606 owing to the fact that he had recently become a member of the AONB Partnership Board. This would not affect his objectivity in the consideration of these applications and had an open mind.

Councillor Sue Wyeth-Price declared a non-pecuniary interest in application 21/P/01211 – Land at May and Juniper Cottages, Ash Green Road, Ash, Guildford, GU12 6JH. This was owing to the fact that up until 2019, she was Chairperson of Ash Green Resident's Association (AGRA). In 2019, Sue stepped down from this position and had not attended any further meetings of AGRA. This would not affect her objectivity in the consideration of this application and had an open mind.

### **PL3 MINUTES**

The minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 10 and 19 July 2023 were agreed and signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record.

**PL4 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Committee noted the Chairman's announcements.

**PL5 23/P/00473 - UNIT 3A, KINGS COURT, BURROWS LANE, GOMSHALL, SHERE, GUILDFORD, GU5 9QE**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for change of use of part of building (Use Class E) to two x 1 bedroom flats (C3) including minor fenestration changes and associated minor external alterations.

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

- Mrs Jane Dent (to object);
- Mrs Kim Graham (to object) and;
- Mr Luke Margetts (applicant) (In Support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Katie Williams. The site was located within the Green Belt, and was outside of the settlement area. It was also within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). It was located on the western side of Burrows Lane to the south of the village.

The site was comprised of a recently constructed new development, made up of four detached buildings, comprised of eight units all with commercial use, with the exception of unit 2 which had a work/live unit. Unit 3c had also recently obtained planning permission for conversion into two residential flats. The wider King's Court site was surrounded on all sides by residential dwellings, including Meadowside and Mill Cottage and adjoined the western boundary of the site. Unit 3A was set within the largest building on the site. There was existing parking along the eastern boundary and between the buildings.

Planning officers were satisfied that comprehensive marketing of the units, in its current commercial use had been carried out for over 12 months, in line with the requirements of policy E3 of the Local Plan. The units were completed over two years ago and had been on the market for four years.

It was the planning officers view, that the proposal would result in the re-use of an existing building and therefore would not result in inappropriate development within the Green Belt. The proposal would deliver a net increase of 2-one bedroom dwellings in a sustainable location. It had been demonstrated that

comprehensive marketing of the property has been carried out and the loss of the employment unit had been sufficiently justified. Planning officers considered that the proposal would not harmfully affect the character or appearance of the site or surrounding area, would not materially impact on neighbouring amenity and would not give rise to conditions prejudicial to highway safety. The application was therefore recommended for approval, subject to the conditions as set out.

The Chairman permitted Councillor Bob Hughes to speak in his capacity as ward councillor for three minutes. [Councillor Hughes left the meeting after giving his speech so that he was not party to the debate or decision made]. The Committee noted concerns raised that there was insufficient parking available for the proposed flats, given that the site was full of vehicles for businesses already in use. The track to the six bungalows was frequently used for parking and access impeded, particularly affected was the property called Meadowside. If the Committee was minded to approve the application then clear and enforceable conditions needed to be in place regarding parking.

The Committee discussed the application and queried comments made by public speakers about roof lights and if there was condition about not installing external lighting. The Committee noted concerns raised regarding the lack of electric vehicle charging points onsite and the fact the parking was mixed between residential and business use which was unusual. Sustainable transport solutions were not apparent in the local area. In addition, the site had a sign up requesting that visitors reversed into the site, when for safety reasons, vehicles should be able to drive in and out of the site in forward gear.

The Committee noted comments made that the site had a reasonable layout and scale for commercial office development. However, housing did appear inappropriate, with windows facing brick walls and a range of viewing lines that were clearly intrusive to other properties. However, given that one of the other units had already been approved to be turned into flats, a precedent had been set.

In response to queries raised by the Committee, the Senior Planning Officer, Katie Williams confirmed that in relation to roof lights, reference was actually made to roof windows. The condition was relating to actual lighting which could be fixed to the outside and was being restricted as much as possible owing to the rural location. In relation to electrical charging units, these had not yet been installed but were required by condition 5. The proposed parking spaces were to be positioned along the edge of the site as it would be easier to get the chargers in situ there. In terms of the parking plan, it was important to point out that two

one bed flats would result in a lesser demand for parking compared to business use. In terms of a sustainable location, it was fairly close to Gomshall. Whilst it was accepted that there was not a footpath linking the site, it was a rural lane, there was provision for cycle parking and use. Lastly, in relation to a potential precedent being set, by the fact that a unit had already been granted onsite for residential use, the Joint Executive Head of Planning, Claire Upton-Brown confirmed that it was a material consideration, but that it didn't mean of itself that the Committee was obliged to accept a further change of use if there were good planning grounds to resist that change of use.

Further comments were noted that the principle objections raised seemed to be in relation to the building itself rather than to its change of use. A distinction could be drawn between unit 3A and 3C. 3A overlooked Meadowside considerably. However, both units had roofs at similar inclines, served by velux rooflights, however you could not see into the building. The provision of two small flats was welcomed and much needed.

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

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

RESOLVED to approve application 23/P/00473 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report and updated conditions 2 and omitted 10.

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
		FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Vanessa King	X		
2	Joanne Shaw	X		
3	Sue Wyeth-Price	X		
4	David Bilbé	X		
5	Patrick Oven	X		
6	Cait Taylor	X		
7	James Jones	X		
8	George Potter	X		
9	Stephen Hives	X		
10	Howard Smith	X		
11	Fiona White	X		
12	Maddy Redpath	X		
13	Catherine Houston	X		
14	Richard Mills	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**PL6 23/P/00606 - ABINGER FIELD, SUTTON PLACE, ABINGER HAMMER, DORKING, RH5 6RP**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of an outbuilding (retrospective application).

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

- Mr and Mrs Trotman (to object) (Democratic Services Officer to read on their behalf);
- Mrs Suzanne Woods (to object) and;
- Ms Hannah Staples (Planner) (in support)

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Katie Williams. The application sought retrospective planning permission for the erection of an outbuilding that was previously granted planning permission under application 20/P/01850 for a detached outbuilding following the demolition of two existing outbuildings. However, the building that had been constructed on site was slightly different from the plans approved under the 2020 consent. This application subsequently sought retrospective consent for the building as constructed onsite.

The site was located within the Green Belt, within the Surrey Hills AONB and within an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). The site was located in a rural area comprised of open fields and detached dwellings lining the road. The site itself was comprised of a detached two storey dwelling with an outbuilding which was the subject of this application. The two outbuildings previously onsite had now been demolished. The total floor area of those buildings equated to 40sqm. The maximum height of the elevations of the approved scheme to the ridge height was 4.3 metres, 10.2 metres in length and 4.7 metres in width. The floor plan of the approved scheme was 45sqm. The built out scheme had a very similar length and width as required per the approved scheme and the ridge height was 300mm less. The design and detailing had also been simplified compared to the approved scheme in design, incorporating a pitched roof and traditional materials to match the main dwelling in keeping with the rural character of the surroundings.

In conclusion, it was the planning officers view that paragraph 149d of the NPPF set out that within the Green Belt, the replacement of a building was not inappropriate development, providing the new building was in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaced. This building replaced a previously existing ancillary garage building which stood in a similar position on the site. The outbuilding previously approved, resulted in a 50% increase in floor area from the previously existing outbuilding. This retrospective proposal would result in a further 13% increase, resulting in a total uplift of 63% in floor area from the previously existing outbuilding. However, the floor area of the proposed outbuilding would only be 5sqm greater than the approved scheme and 300mm less in overall height and of a very similar length and width. Furthermore, the approved scheme also incorporated the demolition of another previously existing timber outbuilding located towards the rear of the site which had resulted in an improvement in openness at the rear of the site. As a result, it was considered that in this instance, very special circumstances existed that would outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt. No objections were raised with regard to the character of the area, the AONB, neighbouring amenities or on sustainability factors. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Committee discussed the application and queried that if it were refused what would be the consequences for the already built out proposal? The Joint Executive Head of Planning Development, Claire Upton-Brown confirmed that the applicant would have the right of appeal against refusal. However, in the absence of such an appeal, an enforcement notice would be served to require demolition of the existing structure.

The Committee noted that permission had been granted for a replacement outbuilding with a floor area of 45sqm and had been constructed with a floor area of 49sqm. In the report it alluded to the building being replaced by a single outbuilding with a floor area of 39sqm. The Committee queried if an error had been made in the report of 39sqm as that represented a bigger increase overall from the approved scheme. In making the calculations, the planning officer referred to a single outbuilding as regards the 2020 application which led to a 50% increase. In going on to consider the new application, the planning officer considered not only the one outbuilding that was demolished but also the second outbuilding. Either the second outbuilding was not relevant or if it was relevant it had to be relevant for both purposes.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that in terms of the outbuildings that had been demolished, there were two. One was 30sqm and the second was 10sqm. A typographical error had occurred in the report and it should have read 30sqm on page 186. In terms of the previous application, it was felt that they had to look at the single outbuilding that was being replaced like for like. It wasn't needed to take into account the other outbuildings because it was felt that the percentage uplift in floor area wasn't too great and could be satisfied in policy terms. However, because this proposal incorporates an enlarged floor area compared to the previous scheme, that was why the second outbuilding had been brought into the equation as the consideration for very special circumstances.

The Committee considered further comments that the harm caused to the Green Belt was not outweighed by virtue of the building proposed and built out and should be refused. The Committee queried whether additional windows had been added to the scheme which was confirmed by the senior planning officer, that this was not the case. The Committee noted comments made that the replacement building was not a garage and had yet replaced a garage and should therefore be a like for like replacement?

The Joint Executive Head of Planning Development, Claire Upton-Brown confirmed that the fact the replacement building was not a garage did not mean it was unacceptable in planning terms. The Committee was being asked to consider a retrospective application for an ancillary building in the curtilage of a dwelling. The Committee was not being asked to approve another dwelling and therefore speculation over what that building would be used for was not necessary.

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	Howard Smith	X		
3	Vanessa King	X		
4	Stephen Hives	X		
5	Sue Wyeth-Price	X		
6	David Bilbé	X		
7	James Jones	X		
8	Richard Mills	X		
9	Fiona White	X		
10	Bob Hughes		X	
11	Patrick Oven		X	
12	Cait Taylor		X	
13	Maddy Redpath	X		
14	George Potter		X	
15	Joanne Shaw	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>

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

RESOLVED to approve application 23/P/00606 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

**PL7      21/P/01211 - LAND AT MAY AND JUNIPER COTTAGES, ASH GREEN ROAD, ASH, GUILDFORD, GU12 6JH**

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.

The Committee noted that the application had been deferred at its meeting on 19 July in order for members to undertake a site visit which was held on Tuesday 15 August.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Peter Dijkhuis. The site was located within the urban boundary. Orchard Farm was located nearby and subject to a public hearing for which the Inspector's decision was yet to be issued. Streamside was another site that had been refused by the



Planning Committee and Foreman Road was being discussed currently with a planning officer to come forward. The Ash Manor Site had gone to a public hearing and was refused. The applicant of that site had initiated a planning performance agreement to look at the application. Ash Road Bridge was now under construction which would enable the crossing of the railway line.

The Committee noted the existing planting along Ash Green Road and the beginnings of the ancient woodland and hedge planting between the site and adjacent site. The hedgerow and planting, some of which were TPO registered trees also screened Ash Manor, which was a Grade II listed building.

To the east, the boundary planting formed part of the ancient woodland, and the demarcation would be set back from the woodland. It was formed of mature screening, allowing little visibility between it and the adjacent site. To the north-east the railway line ran level with the site. To the western boundary there were open fields towards Ash Manor. The applicant proposed additional supplementary planting along the boundary which would be controlled by condition. This would create an open green space and protection to the views towards the listed building and heritage asset. The existing sand school onsite had been demolished along with the barn related to that activity. The existing access onto the site would be closed with a new access further north. The level of vegetation varied on either side of the road going from Juniper Cottages northwards there was hedge planting with very mature trees that covered the road which then broke into ancient woodland that abutted the road.

The site was allocated as part of A31 of the Local Plan. A30 and A29 sites of the Local Plan had already been built out. The urban boundary ran along the road over the old railway line, along Ash Green and then back into the scheme. The Strategic Development Framework was supplementary to Policy A31 and should be seen as illustrative leading to the preparation of masterplans.

The Inspector's decision in relation to Policy A31 required that the applicant would provide a green buffer along Ash Green Road and surround May and Juniper Cottages. However, the width of that buffer had not been defined by policy. It was important to note that access and highways matters had already been determined at the outline application stage. This reserved matters application was only to consider layout, scale, appearance and landscaping.

In terms of layout, at the northern boundary there was housing with back and rear gardens facing onto the railway line. Additional screen planting was proposed to address issues of noise. To the eastern boundary, the ancient woodland and mature tree planting would be retained and a 15-metre buffer

between the trees and the development would be created. This would also be protected by a 1.2 metre timber fence to ensure the protection of the tree root area. To the western boundary a green treed hedgerow would be maintained to protect the setting of the listed building. To the left of the hedgerow, the area had been opened up with a footpath so to create amenity space and a landscape attractive to the setting of the new scheme. The applicant had used the frontage line of May and Juniper cottages to create a line across the scheme to offset the seven houses proposed to face onto Ash Green Road. The existing mature tree line would be retained along with a new entrance and extensive landscaping to reinstate the green buffer that was of concern at the last planning committee meeting when this was discussed in July. The applicant had also created a small village green in the centre of the scheme and an extensive area of open space in the bottom south-west corner so to address setting back the development from any potential harm it might do to listed buildings.

The affordable housing and shared ownership units were scattered throughout the scheme. Approximately 160 allocated car parking spaces would be created with an additional 25 garage spaces. The scheme did not completely comply with parking standards but that was because the scheme was devised recognising the provision of garage spaces. 11 visitor spaces would also be provided, EV charging points and cycle spaces all secured by condition.

In terms of scale and appearance, the Committee noted a visual indication of the design and appearance of the proposed dwellings. The streetscene showed a typical two-storey development with small front gardens, pitched roofs and indicative chimneys that would not be functional. A variety of building materials would be used creating visual interest. The one, two and three bedroom houses were virtually indistinguishable from each other creating an overall coherent and visual appearance to the scheme. The provision of adequate landscape screening to the boundary with the railway line and the properties located there was ongoing.

The buildings would use a palette of materials and detailing that was reflective of a country style facing the public realm and garage spaces to hide the cars. The scale of the housing was proportionate with similar buildings along Ash Green Road.

In terms of landscaping, the applicant would ensure the protection of existing TPO trees along the western boundary as well as the existing mature trees along Ash Green Road. A condition had been included to ensure the protection of the trees during the construction phase and the Council's Tree Officer had raised no objections.

The Committee had deferred the consideration of this application at its last meeting in July so to undertake a site visit and understand the extent of the green buffer to be implemented and the weight attached to it. Typically most new schemes would have back gardens of a depth of between 10-12 metres and in this scheme the depth proposed was 18 metres and between the proposed units and Juniper Cottage was 30 metres. The setback was 10 metres between the cottages and units 80 and 81. The area between the buildings would be landscaped to ensure the privacy of Juniper Cottages.

In relation to concerns raised about the green buffer between the scheme and the road, the applicant would ensure that the trees were maintained with additional plant screening. In response to a suggestion made at the site visit by Councillor Potter, that the access point would in effect create a gap in the screening between the development and Ash Green Road. The applicant had confirmed that they would be prepared to remove the junction in its totality and introduce additional screening in that gap. This would be secured via a pre-commencement condition that had not yet been concluded. The applicant had also made various suggestions to address the concerns of the nature of the green buffer and its width and had agreed to include additional landscaping to discharge that concern and improve the screening and the aspect of coalescence between the two schemes. A concern had also been raised by the resident of May Cottage regarding the location of the substation which was proposed to be sited at the property's boundary fence. The applicant had also agreed to remove it from that location.

The width of the landscaped area varied between 6-9 metres and overall the buildings proposed were set back 9 metres. Whilst a small estate road would exist in front of these units, the landscaped area with the additional proposals would address that concern of screening those buildings from Ash Green Road. The front of the development would have an open character that was fitting of the transition zone between an urban development and rural area to the east of the scheme.

The Committee noted that the principle of development had already been established under the outline planning application. The application was consistent with current development plan policies and was in accordance with the development plan as a whole. There was some conflict with Policy ID10 and parking standards which had now been addressed, in terms of additional landscaping to the green buffer. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that there had been several incidents and accidents along Ash Green Road. Owing to concerns about road safety, it was requested that Claire Upton-Brown, Joint Director of Planning, to submit on behalf of the Council a request to Surrey County Council to reduce the speed limit along that road to 20mph, which was agreed to.

The Committee also noted concerns raised that the applicant had effectively been given a second chance to address issues raised by the Committee and residents regarding closing off the access road and creating a buffer in its place. The residents had not had the opportunity to be consulted on this.

The Joint Director of Planning, Claire Upton-Brown confirmed that it was within the applicants gift to submit further details or amendments to their schemes during the life of an application. Following the feedback received at the site visit the day before and the concerns raised at the last committee meeting, Claire and Peter had approached the applicant to resolve the issues. The matters would always be dealt with via a S106 and conditions. It was also good planning practice to have reached an agreement with the applicant to address problems raised, by closing off the access road and re-siting the sub-station. The Committee also noted comments of support for the planning officer's in trying to resolve the issues raised with the applicant.

The Committee noted concerns that the volume of the houses as well as the scale also needed to be taken into account. The proposed site was also immediately adjacent to Ash Green Road. Policy A31 stated that the provision of a green buffer must maintain a separation between any proposed new development and the properties fronting onto Ash Green Road. This would help soften the edges of the strategic development locations, providing a transition between the built-up area and the countryside beyond. It therefore had two purposes, to create a physical buffer and secondly to create a visual buffer. Concern was therefore raised with the narrow width of the buffer which other developments along Ash Green Road were only 5 metres in width. The wording of the additional conditions was also something not yet known and a concern. The number of parking spaces provided also fell short of what was expected and lastly there was no buffer zone at May and Juniper Cottages as the gardens could not be incorporated.

The Committee noted support for the scale and landscaping proposed for the development. The possible closure of the access point and the reduction of the speed limit to 20mph as would be recommended to Surrey County Council were both positive moves forward.

In response to points raised by the Committee, the Senior Planning Officer, Peter Dijkhuis confirmed that there was no definition of how wide the green buffer should be and therefore it was for the Committee to decide what was considered sufficient. In terms of wording of the conditions, if concerns were raised, the conditions could be agreed to delegate the Joint Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chairperson to amend any conditions as required.

A motion was moved and seconded the refuse the application, for the following reasons A31(6) which was lost:

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Sue Wyeth-Price	X		
2	Maddy Redpath	X		
3	Richard Mills		X	
4	George Potter			X
5	Joanne Shaw		X	
6	Vanessa King		X	
7	Patrick Oven			X
8	David Bilbé		X	
9	Fiona White		X	
10	James Jones		X	
11	Stephen Hives		X	
12	Catherine Houston		X	
13	Bob Hughes		X	
14	Cait Taylor		X	
15	Howard Smith		X	
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>

A subsequent motion was moved and seconded to approve the application, which was carried:

RECORDED VOTE LIST				
	COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
1	Catherine Houston	X		
2	Howard Smith	X		
3	James Jones	X		
4	David Bilbé	X		
5	Vanessa King	X		
6	Stephen Hives	X		
7	Cait Taylor	X		
8	George Potter	X		
9	Richard Mills	X		
10	Patrick Oven			X
11	Bob Hughes	X		
12	Fiona White	X		
13	Joanne Shaw	X		
14	Maddy Redpath		X	
15	Sue Wyeth-Price		X	
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

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

RESOLVED to delegate authority to the Joint Executive Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairperson, to approve application 21/P/01211 subject to any amendments to the conditions to reflect the additional information that had been put before the Committee.

**PL8 22/P/01742 - FRIARS ELM, DOG KENNEL GREEN, RANMORE COMMON, DORKING, RH5 6SU**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for installation of ground mounted solar panels (3 arrays of 21 panels). (amended description 15/06/2023).

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, Katie Williams. There was a correction to the proposal description which should read three arrays of 27 panels which made a total of 81 panels. The application stated that the proposed ground mounted solar arrays would be used solely to power outbuildings and would not be used for commercial purposes. The proposed installation would reduce the property's carbon footprint by over 50%.

Friars Elm was a substantial, detached building with associated gardens and outbuildings. The application site was comprised of an area of paddock which lay to the south of the house, outside of the domestic curtilage on land within the applicant's ownership. A public footpath ran west to east alongside the southern boundary of the site. The site was located within the Green Belt, outside of a settlement area and within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV).

Following officers concerns regarding the impact of the original proposals on biodiversity, amended plans had been submitted which showed an amended ground mounting system for the proposed panels. The system now penetrates directly into the ground and didn't require a gravel base. The maximum height of the panels would sit above ground level at 1.3 metres. The array would extend to a depth of 11.2 metres and a maximum width of 29 metres. The amended proposals also included the proposed planting of approximately 45 metres of new native hedgerow to screen the panels from the surroundings. This would be formed of a mix of beech and hawthorn to match existing hedges including those along the nearby footpath. The hedge planting would be at a height of 60cm to 90cm and secured by condition and would provide additional screening from the public footpath and provide a considerable biodiversity benefit.

The applicant had stated that it would not be possible to locate the panels within the curtilage without requiring the removal of a number of existing trees in order to avoid shading.

In conclusion, it was considered that whilst there would be some harm caused to the openness of the Green Belt, the harm would be limited. Paragraph 158 of the NPPF stated that when determining planning applications for renewable and low carbon development, local planning authorities should recognise that even small-scale projects provided a valuable contribution to cutting greenhouse gas emissions and should approve the application if its impacts are or could be made acceptable. Taking into consideration the nature of the proposals and the aim of the NPPF to support the transition to a low carbon future and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure, on balance it was considered that there were very special circumstances that outweighed the identified harm caused to the Green Belt by virtue of its inappropriateness and the limited harm caused to openness. It was also considered important to note that the proposed ground-mounted solar array was freestanding and therefore easily removable from site when no longer required. The works were therefore temporary and reversible and the land was capable of being returned to its former state.

The Committee supported the application and were happy with the fact that the structures were removable if required. The capture of free energy was welcomed as was the increase in biodiversity net gain created by the significant hedgerow.

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	Fiona White	X		
3	Cait Taylor	X		
4	Patrick Oven	X		
5	Richard Mills	X		
6	James Jones	X		
7	George Potter	X		
8	Bob Hughes	X		
9	Sue Wyeth-Price	X		
10	Stephen Hives	X		
11	Vanessa King	X		
12	Howard Smith	X		
13	Maddy Redpath	X		
14	Catherine Houston	X		
15	David Bilbé	X		
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</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/01742 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

## **PL9 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS**

The Committee discussed and noted the planning appeal decisions.



The meeting finished at 10.10 pm

Signed .....

Date .....

Chairman