

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

- \* Councillor Marsha Moseley (Chairman)
- \* Councillor Jenny Wicks (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Richard Billington  
Councillor David Bilbé  
\* Councillor Philip Brooker  
\* Councillor Adrian Chandler  
\* Councillor Nils Christiansen  
\* Councillor David Elms  
Councillor Matt Furniss

\* Councillor Angela Gunning  
\* Councillor Liz Hogger  
\* Councillor Susan Parker  
\* Councillor Tony Phillips  
\* Councillor Caroline Reeves  
Councillor Paul Spooner

\*Present

### **PL81 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies for absence were received from the following Councillors Richard Billington, David Bilbé, Matt Furniss and Paul Spooner. Councillor Nigel Kearsse attended as substitute for Councillor Richard Billington.

### **PL82 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

There were no disclosures of interests.

### **PL83 MINUTES**

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 7 November 2018 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

#### **Review of Reduction of Councillors on Planning Committee in its first 12 months May 2017 – May 2018 and review of Multiple Process Changes.**

The Committee noted that a template was now available for seven-day notifications and requested that a link through to the planning application search portal was now included.

The Committee also noted a request to re-open the debate regarding reducing the trigger for minor/major applications set currently at 20 letters/emails of representation. The Chairman confirmed that this was not a matter up for debate but could be considered as part of the next 12-month review of the Planning Committee processes.

The Committee noted that an error had been made on the supplementary late sheets and the text should read:

In line with the recent changes approved by the Planning Committee at its meeting on 7 November 2018, the 'Notes' page of the Planning Committee Agenda will be updated, to read the following:

4. Any councillor(s) who are not member(s) of the Planning Committee, but who wish to speak on an application, either inside or outside of their ward, will then be allowed to speak for no longer than three minutes each. It will be at the Chairman's discretion to permit councillor(s)

to speak for longer than three minutes. [Councillors should notify the Committee Officer, in writing by no later than midday the day before the meeting of their intention to speak.]

**PL84 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Committee noted the procedure for determining planning applications. The Committee also noted that they would now sit in alphabetic order by surname, however, Councillor Gunning would remain in her pre-allocated seat owing to it being the best seat for her hearing aid to connect to the loop.

**PL85 18/P/01340 - LAND REAR OF 4 AND 6, ASHDENE ROAD, ASH, GU12 6TB**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of two dwellings with garages at rear of 4 and 6 Ashdene Road.

The Committee was informed that planning permission was granted for two dwellings, one chalet bungalow and one single-storey bungalow in 2017. The current proposal sought to replace the single-storey bungalow approved under 17/P/00404 with a chalet bungalow to match the scale and design of the other chalet bungalow approved in 2017.

Planning officers considered that the proposed increase in the scale and bulk of the plot in comparison to the extant scheme would fail to respect the hierarchy of built form and result in an inappropriate form of development that would not integrate well with the existing environment. The proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the character of the area and was recommended for refusal. A financial contribution to mitigate against the harm to the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area had also not been secured.

The Committee discussed the application and considered that in comparison to the original approved development the proposal was much more overbearing, and would result in an over-development of the plot. Construction work was underway at the site and the single storey bungalow would effectively be replaced by a house, with little amenity space and was very much out of scale and character with the local area. The Committee queried whether there was a specific definition of a chalet bungalow and the planning officer confirmed that there was not a strict definition and it was therefore open to interpretation.

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 18/P/01340 for the reasons as detailed in the agenda.

**PL86 18/P/01695 - 5 CLINE ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 3NB**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for replacement timber windows and doors with like for like UPVC windows and doors (retrospective application).

The planning officer informed the Committee that the application site was located within the Charlotteville and Warren Road Conservation Area and was subject to an Article 4 Direction. The vertical sliding sash window design had been retained across the frontage of the property and in the planning officer's view continued to contribute to one of the key features of the conservation area and as a heritage asset. In addition, no objection had been raised by the Council's Conservation Officers given the various use of materials on windows in the road in general and it was considered that the windows would have no significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area overall.

The Committee discussed the application and concerns were raised that the UPVC material proposed for the windows was contrary to the Charlotteville and Warren Road Conservation Area Study & Character Appraisal 2003. The Character Appraisal recommended the use of wooden vertical sliding sash windows, which were in keeping with the Conservation Area. The Committee discussed the effect of the Conservation Area rules and felt that although it was important to uphold Conservation Area standards and original materials of doors and windows were important, in this case it noted that the neighbouring property had installed UPVC windows and, looking at the road as a whole, that the proposed UPVC window replacements were of a high quality and good design and represented on balance a good replacement which were in character with and did not detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

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

RESOLVED to approve application 18/P/01695 for the reasons as detailed in the agenda.

**PL87 18/P/01733 - 179 SEND ROAD, SEND, WOKING, GU23 7ET**

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for single storey side/rear extension following removal of existing detached garage, loft conversion including two roof lights to front elevation, windows and rooflights to rear roof elevation (as amended by plans A.05 dated 17/10/2018, A.06 dated 17/10/2018 and A.07 dated 17/10/2018 received on 17/10/2018).

The planning officer informed the Committee that the application site was located in the Green Belt and inside the Send Settlement Area, which was residential in nature and characterised by semi-detached and detached dwellings. It was the planning officer's view that the proposed extension, by virtue of its acceptable scale and design and subservience to the host dwelling, would not appear unduly prominent to the detriment of the character of the area. There would be no unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents, in terms of overbearing impact, loss of light, overlooking or loss of privacy. There was also enough space at the front of the property for the sufficient level of off-street parking places.

The Committee noted that at least ten residents had now written to object to the application which was why it had been brought to Committee and discussed concerns raised that the proposal was bulky and overbearing which did not respect the existing street pattern. There was potential for overlooking from the velux windows. It also represented the loss of a small dwelling.

The Committee considered the planning officer's view that there were significant elements of the building that were set down at full single storey level. Whilst the main ridge height did go up, a significant proportion was set down and located to the back, which meant there was an element of subservience. Nevertheless, the Committee considered that the streetscene would be dramatically altered by the much bulkier building with an unbalancing effect caused to the symmetrical current pair of semi-detached dwellings.

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 18/P/01733 for the reasons detailed below:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of the scale, bulk and design would have an unbalancing effect on the currently symmetrical pair of semi-detached dwellings.

Furthermore, the bulky appearance would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene. The proposal would therefore fail to accord with policies G5 and H9 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (as saved by CLG Direction on 24/09/2007, the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2018 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

**PL88 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS**

The Committee noted the planning appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 7.55 pm

Signed .....

Chairman

Date .....