

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Councillor Marsha Moseley (Chairman)
* Councillor Jan Harwood (Vice-Chairman)

* Councillor Jon Askew	* Councillor Bob McShee
* Councillor David Bilbé	* Councillor Susan Parker
* Councillor Chris Blow	* Councillor Caroline Reeves
Councillor Dennis Booth	* Councillor Tony Rooth
* Councillor Colin Cross	* Councillor Paul Spooner
Councillor Angela Gunning	* Councillor Fiona White
* Councillor Liz Hogger	

*Present

Councillors Nagaty, Sheard and Bigmore, were also in attendance.

PL61 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dennis Booth, Angela Gunning and Marsha Moseley. Councillors John Redpath and Graham Eyre attended as substitutes for Councillors Dennis Booth and Marsha Moseley respectively.

The Vice-Chairman, Councillor Jan Harwood was acting as Chairman for the meeting in the absence of the Chairman, Councillor Marsha Moseley.

The following councillors were also in attendance Joss Bigmore, Ramsey Nagaty and Patrick Sheard.

PL62 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest.

PL63 MINUTES

The approval of the minutes for the Planning Committee held on 14 August 2019 were deferred owing to concerns raised by Councillor Colin Cross that the minutes in relation to application 19/P/00919 – 48 Newark Lane, Ripley, Woking, GU23 6BZ were not comprehensive enough and had not included the fact that he had tried to move a motion to approve the application.

Councillor Susan Parker also endorsed Councillor Cross' comments and stated that she objected to the minutes in relation to application 19/P/00027 – Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send, Woking, GU23 7EF and asserted that it was a matter of opinion rather than a statement of fact in regard to the following text on page 34 of the Planning Committee Agenda for 11 September 2019: "However, the Committee had no substantive and robust material planning considerations to move a motion to refuse or defer the application...."

The Chairman advised that both Councillors Colin Cross and Susan Parker raise these issues outside of the meeting with the Committee Officer. The minutes would be re-presented to the Committee for approval at its meeting on 9 October 2019.

PL64 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the procedures for determining planning applications.

PL65 APPLICATION WITHDRAWN AND WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNING COMMITTEE - 19/P/00703 - 408 AND 410 LOWER ROAD, EFFINGHAM, LEATHERHEAD, KT24 5JP

The Committee noted that the above application had been withdrawn by the applicant and would therefore not be considered.

PL66 19/P/00328 - PORTH, SEND HILL, SEND, WOKING, GU23 7HR

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

- Mr Simon Kirkpatrick (to object)

In accordance with the procedure for determining planning and related applications, the following Ward Councillor was permitted to speak by the Chairman for three minutes:

- Councillor Patrick Sheard

The Committee considered the above-mentioned application for erection of three detached dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping following demolition of the existing dwelling and outbuildings.

The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets where additional comments had been received from Operational Services advising that they had no further objections. In addition, two further letters of representation had been received in response to the amended plans, reiterating the original comments and making further points.

The Committee agreed that owing to concerns raised regarding the distance residents would have to travel to put their bins out for collection as well as the lack of visitor parking, that condition 14 in respect of bin collection would be revised and a new condition included regarding the requirement for visitor parking. Both conditions would be agreed in liaison with the ward councillors.

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

RESOLVED to approve application 19/P/00328 subject to the revised condition 14 and a new condition to require visitor parking and agreed in liaison with the ward councillors:

- (i) That a S106 agreement be entered into to secure:

A SANGS contribution and an Access Management and Monitoring Contribution in accordance with the adopted tariff of the SPA Avoidance Strategy to mitigate against the impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.

- (ii) That upon completion of (i) above, the application be determined by the Director of Planning and Regeneration. The preliminary view is that the application should be granted subject to conditions.

PL67 19/P/01039 - 14A TANGIER ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DE

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

- Ms Emma Shaw (Downsedge Residents' Association) – to object and;

- Mr Pulak Rakshit (applicant) in support

In accordance with the procedure for determining planning and related applications, the following Ward Councillor was permitted to speak by the Chairman for three minutes:

- Councillor Joss Bigmore

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of a two-storey side extension, single storey front extension and raising the height of the roof to create habitable accommodation (amended plans received on 12/08/2019 showing the single storey front extension reduced in depth by 1.8m, in line with the lean-to element).

The Committee considered that the application proposed for the two-storey side extension was an over-bearing form of development, that was out of character with the surrounding properties by virtue of its mass and siting over the established front building line.

A motion was proposed and seconded to approve the application which was lost. A subsequent motion was proposed and seconded to refuse the application which was carried.

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 19/P/01039 for the following reasons:

1. The proposal, by virtue of its size, design, scale and height, combined with encroachment beyond the established front building line of the immediate locality, would result in an unduly prominent and incongruous form of development materially harmful to the distinctive local character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal therefore fails to comply with policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034, policies G5 and H8 of the saved Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003, and the guidance set out in the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2018, and the relevant provisions of the NPPF 2019.

Informatives:

1. This decision relates expressly to plans received on 21/06/2019 and amended plans received on 14/08/2019.
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:
 - Offering a pre-application advice service
 - 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
 - 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 case pre-application advice was sought and provided which addressed initial issues, the application has been submitted in accordance with that advice, however, further issues were

identified during the consultation stage of the application. Officers have worked with the applicant to try to overcome these issues, however the application has been refused by the Planning Committee.

PL68 19/P/01180 - 10 FORSTER ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU2 9AF

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

- Mr Punir Vadgama – to object;
- Ms Angela Kubacki – to object;
- Mr Andrew McMillen (applicant) – in support and;
- Mr Michael Wells – in support

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for first floor rear extension (as amended by plans received on 21/08/2019 and 22/08/2019).

The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which amended a typo in the second paragraph of the executive summary which should have read Forster Road.

The Committee considered the merits of undertaking a site visit owing to concerns regarding reduced parking and access for the residents of Queen Elizabeth Park Estate caused by the extension.

A motion was proposed and seconded for the Committee to undertake a site visit which was voted on and lost.

The Committee agreed that a condition was added to require that the hours of operation were specified during the construction phase as this was the period during which parking for residents could be affected by the additional construction traffic.

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

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

RESOLVED to approve application 19/P/01180 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report as well as the following additional condition:

5. Works related to the construction of the development hereby permitted, including works of demolition or preparation prior to building operations, shall not take place other than between the hours of 0800 and 1800 Mondays to Fridays and between 0800am and 13.30pm Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Bank or National Holidays.

Reason: To protect the neighbours from noise and disturbance outside the permitted hours during the construction period.

PL69 18/P/02226 - BISHOPS NISSAN OF GUILDFORD, WALNUT TREE CLOSE, GUILDFORD, GU1 1TX

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for demolition of existing building and redevelopment of the site to provide student accommodation in four blocks (5 and 6 storeys high) including communal facilities, along with associated car park, landscaping and access.

The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which detailed some amendments to the text which related to the boundary wall along the edge of the towpath which was approximately 1.6m tall as opposed to 2m as stated in the agenda. One further letter of representation had also been received objecting to the proposal.

The Committee agreed that the scheme proposed was a vast improvement upon the previously withdrawn scheme submitted in 2017. Improvements to the design had been achieved in liaison with South East Designs, the buildings were set back surrounded by large areas of landscaped open space and the four separate student accommodation blocks were well spaced and contributed to the regeneration of this part of Guildford town.

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

RESOLVED to approve application 18/P/02226 subject:

- (i) That a S106 agreement be entered into to secure:
- SANG and SAMM contributions
 - contributions towards improvements to the towpath along the River Wey
 - contribution towards the implementation of the Council's sustainable Movement Corridor
 - provision of an on-site private car club for residents
 - restriction on the occupation of the development to students

If the terms of the s.106 or wording of the planning conditions are significantly amended as part of ongoing s.106 or planning condition(s) negotiations any changes shall be agreed in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee and lead Ward Member.

- (ii) That upon completion of the above, the application be determined by the Director of Planning and Regeneration. The preliminary view is that the application should be granted subject to conditions.

PL70 19/P/00919 - 48 NEWARK LANE, RIPLEY, WOKING, GU23 6BZ

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed two-bedroom detached dwelling and extension to existing dropped kerb.

The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets where sections of the committee report had been updated on pages 108 and 109 as well as an update to the first reason for refusal.

The Committee noted that the application had been deferred and a site visit was held on Tuesday 10 September for committee members to assess the potential harm to the Conservation Area and heritage assets caused by the proposed development.

The Committee noted concerns raised that limited infilling in the Green Belt was acceptable in this instance owing to the modern small-scale property proposed as it was in keeping with its surroundings and maintained a 1.5m distance to the boundary on either side of the property. The Committee concluded on balance that significant weight should be applied to the fact that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character and significance of the identified heritage asset by virtue of its scale, height and positioning. It would result in the loss of the visual gap between the cottage row and the neighbouring building.

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

RESOLVED to refuse application 19/P/00919 for the reasons as detailed in the report and the following update first reason for refusal:

1. The proposed development by virtue of the limited plot size, combined with the scale and bulk of the proposed dwelling would represent overdevelopment of the plot, resulting in loss of the visual gap between the cottage row and the neighbouring building. The loss of the visual gap combined with a contrived layout and substantial scale of the dwelling will appear dominant adjacent to the cottage row and will erode its character, which would result in an unacceptable harm to the character and significance of the designated heritage asset and would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the Ripley Conservation Area. The development results in less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset and its setting, but no public benefit has been identified to outweigh the harm to the heritage asset. The proposal is therefore deemed to be contrary to saved policies G5 and HE7 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (as saved by CLG Direction 24 September 2007) and paragraphs 193 to 202 of the NPPF and policy D3 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: strategy and sites 2015 - 2034 adopted in 2019. Due regard has been given to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990.

PL71 19/P/01021 8 GRANTLEY CLOSE, SHALFORD, GUILDFORD, GU4 8DL

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for single storey extensions to side and rear. Two storey side and rear extension, relocate bedrooms on the first-floor, and allow access to new habitable space within the loft. Two skylights to front roof slope. New dormer window to rear. New side entrance door to east elevation. Creation of raised patio to rear.

The Committee considered concerns raised that the scheme was very similar to a previously withdrawn application and represented an overly bulky form of development that was not in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. The Committee noted that the site was inset from the Green Belt. The Committee considered that on balance the extension was not out of character with the surrounding area given it was well set back and did not jar with the streetscene.

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

RESOLVED to approve application 19/P/01021 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL72 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted the appeal decisions.

In particular, the Committee was concerned regarding the appeal made by Royal Surrey County Hospital NHS Foundation Trust against an Enforcement Notice issued by Guildford Borough Council that was allowed by the Planning Inspectorate. The Committee agreed that the matter should be reviewed by the planning officers so that improvements can be made in future associated processes where possible.

The meeting finished at 10.00 pm

Signed

Chairman

Date