

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 Ramsey Nagaty, Patrick Sheard and Catherine Young were also in attendance.

PL73 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

There were no apologies for absence.

PL74 ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Following Councillor Jan Harwood's resignation as Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee on 23 September 2019, the Committee was required under Council Procedure Rule 29 (b) to elect his successor for the remainder of the 2019-20 municipal year. Councillor Tony Rooth was nominated to stand as Vice-Chairman and was agreed by the Committee.

PL75 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

18/P/02308 – Land at May and Juniper Cottages, Ash Green Road, Ash Green, Guildford, GU12 6JH

Cllr David Bilbé confirmed that he had a non-pecuniary interest in relation to Aspen Homes Ltd and would leave the meeting for the consideration and decision made in relation to this application.

PL76 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 14 August and 11 September 2019 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

PL77 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Committee noted the procedures for determining planning applications.

PL78 18/P/02308 - LAND AT MAY AND JUNIPER COTTAGES, ASH GREEN ROAD, ASH GREEN, GUILDFORD, GU12 6JH

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

- Ms Sue Wyeth-Price (Ash Green Resident's Association) – objected
- Mr Norman Bristow – objected and;
- Mr Joe Jelley (Applicant) – supported

The Committee considered the above-mentioned outline application for development of 100 dwellings (including 40 affordable homes) with access to be determined, with associated garages, parking, open space, landscaping and play areas (layout, scale, appearance and landscape to form the reserved matters).

The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which detailed updates which had been made to the Heads of Terms. Following discussion with the applicant, it had been agreed that the development should make a contribution of £50,000 towards the provision of a pedestrian footbridge adjacent to the road bridge on White Lane. Should this not be delivered the contribution should be used for other measures to improve walking and cycling routes in the vicinity of the site. The Heads of Terms now also include a contribution to SANG as well as SAMM.

The Committee considered the application and their concerns regarding the proximity of the development in relation to the setting of the Grade II star and Grade II listed buildings. Concerns were also raised regarding the potential extension of the settlement area and that the sequential test had to be applied as per the NPPF. It was confirmed that the sequential test was not applicable in this instance because it was an allocated site. The Local Plan had allocated the site in the Sustainability Appraisal and a sequential flood risk assessment had been undertaken as part of that process. The Committee also considered concerns raised that there was no overall masterplan of the site showing how it connected to the adjacent surrounding sites that were also earmarked for development. Planning officers had worked with the developer and other landowners to ensure that planning applications in associated sites came forward in a logical way. The conditions applied did not define the route to be taken through the site. It was noted that the site was linked from the north-west corner to the south so that would be the most appropriate route to be adopted.

The Committee considered the housing mix proposed and noted that the submitted housing mix would accord with a range of mixes. Concern was expressed that the developer could therefore provide a scheme with significantly more of the larger houses and fewer of the smaller houses. The housing mix proposed was contradictory to the numbers proposed in the SHMAA. The Committee agreed that an informative was therefore added to ensure that the developer reviewed the housing mix as required by the SHMAA.

The Committee also noted that the County Highway Authority had carried out a junction assessment at Foreman Road/Ash Green Road and was found to demonstrate that it had sufficient capacity for additional vehicles.

The Committee agreed that the proposed application was located on a site that had been allocated in the Local Plan. It was an outline application and therefore matters of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping would be dealt with at a later stage. The principle of development was therefore acceptable, and the benefits afforded by the scheme outweighed any harm caused to heritage assets.

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

RESOLVED to approve application 18/P/02308 subject to an additional informative about the SHMAA and:

- (i) That a S106 agreement be entered into to secure:
- The delivery of 40 affordable housing units (a minimum of 70% to be affordable rent with mix as agreed);
 - Provision of SANG and SAMM contributions;
 - contributions towards early years, primary and secondary education projects;
 - contribution towards health care infrastructure;
 - contribution towards amendment of TRO on Foreman Road;
 - contribution towards highway safety improvements and pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure improvements in the area;
 - contribution towards Ash Road bridge;
 - contribution to a footbridge over the dismantled railway line at White Lane;
 - Contributions to public recreation grounds and
 - Contribution towards provision of public art in the area.

If the terms of the s.106 or wording or 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.

PL79 18/P/02456 - LAND AT ASH MANOR, ASH GREEN ROAD, ASH GREEN, GUILDFORD, GU12 6HH

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

- Ms Gill Squibb (Ash Green Resident's Association) – objected;
- Mr David Weller – objected and;
- Mr Andrew Morris (Applicant, Bewley Homes) – supported

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for erection of 77 dwellings with associated vehicular and pedestrian access from Ash Green Road, parking and secure cycle storage, on site open space, landscape and ecology management and, servicing.

The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which stated that the healthcare contribution secured by this development could also be used for other GP practices in the local area if an appropriate case was demonstrated. The current practice being considered for expansion was the Border Practice. The s.106 agreement would reflect the healthcare contribution could be used towards the improvement of primary care facilities in the local area. In addition, a further seven letters of objection had been received which raised similar points already summarised in the report.

In relation to comments raised by public speakers, concerns raised in relation to the pond had been assessed by the Lead Local Flood Authority who had requested additional information from the applicant. Based on that information, they were satisfied that the SUDs scheme was

acceptable with the proviso of two additional conditions that secured the exact details of the SUDs scheme.

The Committee was advised by the Principal Policy Planner that the SHMAA housing mix percentages were calculated across Waverley, Woking and Guildford and were just a guide to be used over a nineteen-year period. Policy H1 stated that new residential development was required to deliver a wide range of homes to meet a range of accommodation needs as set out in the SHMAA. It referred to new residential development but did not refer to individual site proposals. New development should provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes appropriate to the site size, characteristics and location. The policy was not prescriptive but sought a mix of tenure types and sizes of dwellings.

The Committee considered the merits of undertaking a site visit owing to the sensitivity of the site, the lack of coalescence with the village green, the proximity of the proposed development to significant heritage assets and the associated harm caused, the layout of the site and the mix of market housing which currently offered no one-bed houses.

The Committee also noted that if archaeological remains were found onsite, Natural England had confirmed that it would not prevent development and a record would simply be taken of what was found. However, if important remains were found, condition 11 could extend the life of the permission if needed.

A motion was proposed and seconded to defer the application so that a site visit could be carried out which was carried.

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

The Committee agreed to defer application 18/P/02456, so that a site visit could be held, on a date and time to be agreed. This was owing to the sensitivity of the site, the lack of coalescence with the village green, the proximity of the proposed development to significant heritage assets and the associated harm caused, the layout of the site and the mix of market housing which currently offered no one-bed houses. The application would be considered by the Committee at a meeting to be confirmed in the future.

PL80 19/P/01234 - LAND TO THE SOUTH OF CHAMPNEY COTTAGE, CRANMORE LANE, WEST HORSLEY, LEATHERHEAD, KT24 6BW

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

- Cllr Catherine Young (West Horsley Parish Council) – objected;
- Mr Thomas Rumble (Agent) – supported

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed erection of five two storey dwellings with associated parking, landscaping and access works.

The Committee noted the supplementary late sheets which noted that an additional non-statutory consultee comment had been received from Surrey Wildlife Trust.

The Committee considered the application and concerns raised that it failed to fully recognise the requirements of the West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan. The Committee agreed that an appropriate transitional edge to the village should be maintained as well as its local character. The development was on the edge of the inset boundary and therefore on the edge of the village. The application proposed five significant bulky houses surrounded by small cottages. It

would form a significant north to south wall of development where there would be large buildings in relatively small plots. The Committee agreed that it was not an appropriate transitional edge to the village with open fields beyond. In addition, the Committee was concerned regarding the housing mix which should have full regard to deliver 1,2-3 bed houses where as this development was for 2,3-4 bed houses only. Concern was also expressed regarding the negative impacts upon the heritage assets and the developments proximity to Northern House.

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

A motion was therefore moved 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/01234 for the following reasons:

1. The proposal would, by virtue of its scale, arrangement, limited spacing and plot sizes, present a cramped appearance. The proposed design would create buildings which have a scale, height and form which is not sympathetic to the existing built environment and surrounding dwellings. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to policy D1 (1) and (4) of the Guildford Plan 2003 and policy WH2 (iii) of the West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan, 2016-2033.
2. The proposed development would, by virtue of its scale, arrangement, limited spacing and plot sizes, present a cramped appearance. The proposed design would create buildings which have a scale, height and form which is not sympathetic to the existing built environment and surrounding dwellings. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to policy D1 (1) and (4) of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites, 2015-2034, policy G5 of the saved Local Plan (2003) and policy WH2 (ii) of the West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan, 2016-2033.
3. The proposed housing mix, owing to the limited number of smaller dwellings, would not be compliant with the requirements of policy WH4 of the West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan, 2016-2033.

Informatives:

1. This decision relates expressly to drawing numbers: LP01; P03; P05; P06; P08; P09 and P10 received on 12/07/20109 and amended plans P01 Rev A; P02 Rev A and P07 Rev A received on 18/09/2019 and P04 Rev A received on 19/09/2019.

PL81 19/P/00406 - FOOTBRIDGE LINKING GUILDFORD BUSINESS PARK AND UNIVERSITY, GUILDFORD, GU2 7YB

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed six storey purpose-built student accommodation block including 360 bed spaces, support ancillary student services (such as study spaces, gymnasium, games rooms, lounge areas, student hub), car and cycle parking, access and landscaping arrangements.

The Committee noted that whilst this application was linked to the next application (19/P/00407 – Plot 5, Guildford Business Park, Guildford Business Park Road, Guildford, GU2 8XG for proposed six-storey purpose-built student accommodation block), this application had to be

considered on its own merits. The bridge proposed in this application would link the two sites and the Committee agreed that it would be an appropriate addition in this location.

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

RESOLVED to approve application 19/P/00406 subject to the conditions and reasons as detailed in the report.

PL82 19/P/00407 - PLOT 5 - GUILDFORD BUSINESS PARK, GUILDFORD BUSINESS PARK ROAD, GUILDFORD, GU2 8XG

The Committee considered the above-mentioned full application for proposed six-storey purpose-built student accommodation block including 360 bed spaces, support ancillary student services (such as study spaces, gymnasium, games rooms, lounge areas, student hub), car and car cycle parking, access and landscaping arrangements.

The Committee noted it had only that afternoon received the appellant's counsel opinion which challenged the council's reasons given for refusal of the application. Specifically, in relation to whether enough marketing for alternative suitable B class employment uses had been carried out as well as the interpretation of paragraph 3 of the Local Plan which was currently the only substantive reason for refusal. The Planning Development Manager confirmed that a QC had reviewed the application and suggested reasons for refusal prior to the officer report being published and had reviewed the applicants' QC opinion on the day of Committee and provided some initial feedback and thoughts. However, given the lateness of the appellant's counsel opinion, the Committee agreed that further advice must be sought from our own QC before they could proceed.

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

RESOLVED to defer application 19/P00407 for consideration by the Planning Committee at its December meeting so that further advice could be sought from the Council's QC.

PL83 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted the appeal decisions.

The meeting finished at 9.40 pm

Signed

Chairman

Date