

SHERE PARISH COUNCIL

*Serving the villages of Gomshall, Holmbury St. Mary,
Peaslake, Shere and a large part of Abinger Hammer*

Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 24 February 2014 at 7.30pm in Tanyard Hall, 30 Station Road, Gomshall

Present: Parish Councillors R Smith (Chairman), and M Taylor-Cotter, B Grover, M Urban, C Brooke and the Clerk: C. Howard. 5 members of the public were present.

Apologies for absence – apologies were received from Parish Councillor Bob Andrews.

Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests – Cllr Grover declared a non-pecuniary interest in 14/P/00026, Cllr C Brooke in 14/P/00256 and the Council declared a pecuniary interest in 14/P/00246.

The Minutes of the meeting held on 8th January 2014 were **APPROVED AND SIGNED** as a correct record.

Short adjournment to enable the public to address the Committee:

The Chairman suggested that the late application be dealt with first as the applicant was present. The applicant did not wish to speak in the public session.

Public session was closed.

Consideration of Planning Applications:

Applications received after the agenda had been printed:

14/P/00256 Lavender House, Hoe Lane, Abinger Hammer, RH5 6RG

Two storey side extension following demolition of existing side extension (conservatory and basement below), proposed single storey side extension following demolition of existing rear lean –to extension.

Cllr C Brooke declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item.

OBJECTION. The Council felt this application was a bulky and grossly disproportionate, cumulative increase (GBC calculated figure quoted in application is 108%).

Whilst the road in which it is situated does not have a distinct character, as a mix of mid 20th century buildings, the proposed make-over in an American urban clapboard style is harmful to the character of the Surrey Hills AONB.

No floor plans are given for the attic storey; however, a dormer window is shown on the rear elevation.

The Council considered the floor areas in some detail. The existing scheme is: 120 sq metres including a 46% increase on original of 82 sq metres.

The proposed scheme is: $73.3 - 14.4 = 58.9$ sq metres – a NET increase.

This is a 72% increase on the original and a 49% increase on the existing build.

The proposer claims a net 58.9sq metre increase – 49% increase but this is against the existing dwelling NOT the original as per the policy.

The Planning Officer suggests the proposal is 67.9 sq metres not 73.3 sq metres GROSS or 58.9sq metres NET. If the agreed existing dwelling is 120 sq metres and a 46% increase is achieved then the original must be 82 sq metres and the NET proposed increase would be 72%. It was felt that whatever the exact number is, the result is a grossly disproportionate building.

Short adjournment to enable the public to address the Committee:

The public session was re-opened for the owner of “Bowline” formally “Rad Cottage” to address the Committee.

The owner explained that the application was only a 5% increase on the current size. He acknowledged that under the 2009 application the orangery was refused but felt that under the new NPPF rules the officers would find this application acceptable and would complement the house. It was constructed mainly of glass under a glazed roof. He felt it was no longer appropriate to refer back to the original dwelling and that planning officers had indicated that this application was within the current limits. The owner asked if the Council would consider supporting his application.

The Chairman explained that the Council rarely supported an application. It was usual to either Object or make no comment. He also agreed that the new NPPF had led to some ambiguities in the interpretation of the new rules.

A neighbour then spoke on the application. She indicated that the property could be seen from her house but that she did not actually wish to object to the application. She was more concerned about the principle that all around her houses were now being greatly increased in size. This house was a tiny bungalow that was knocked down and re built much larger and still appears to be increasing. She asked will she eventually have blocks of flats all around her? She asked when will it all stop.

The public session was then closed.

Consideration of Planning Applications:

As the owner of application 14/P/0217 and a number of the public interested in that application was present, it was agreed to take this application first.

14/P/0217 “Bowline Cottage” –formally “Rad Lane Cottage”, Rad Lane, Peaslake GU5 9PB - Erection of an orangery.

Cllr Urban commented that there was a removal of permitted development rights on this property and since then there has been the addition of a garage and a boot room. This was still further development at this site.

Cllr Taylor – Cotter agreed that she had understood that there was to be no further development at this already over-developed site. As the house could be seen from the neighbouring property she felt it was also un-neighbourly.

The Council unanimously agreed to raise an **OBJECTION** to this application on the grounds of cumulative over-development of the site. It had previously been agreed that there was to be no further permitted development on this site.

**14/P/00173 Peaslake Surgery, Peaslake Lane, Guildford, GU5 9RJ
Construction of two 2 bedroom semi-detached houses following demolition of the existing surgery.**

The Committee was concerned over the loss of another commercial property in Peaslake

There was concern about the parking issues associated with the development of two houses at this site and the fact that by squeezing two houses into the site that the site was being over-developed.

The Committee wished to raise an **OBJECTION** to this application on the grounds of increased size and bulk of the current application. The Council felt that this application is over-bearing in the street scene and has concern over the parking problems that would be created here. However, the Committee thinks it is laudable that the owner is trying to create much needed smaller dwellings for the area.

**14/P/00223 Birdlands, Felday Glade, Holmbury St Mary, RH5 6 PG
Erection of a car port and store, new entrance route and gate, rear garden terrace and relocation of rear side door following removal of existing garage.**

NO OBJECTION

**14/P/00246 Felbury House, Horsham Road, Holmbury St Mary RH5 6NL
Single storey extension to existing bin store and boiler room to house generator and storage.**

Shere Parish Council has a pecuniary interest in this application as they own part of the curtilage of the property shown as car parking (for which the current owners have a 50 year lease).

NO COMMENT

Consideration of Tree applications including those received after the agenda had been printed

**14/T/00026 Wellers Court, Gomshall Lane, Shere, GU5
Chestnut tree- crown reduce by 30% and crown lift by 4m.**

Cllr Grover declared a personal interest in this item and left the room.

It was agreed that this application be left to the judgement of the Tree Officer.

Planning Inspectorate Appeal Decisions:

Copse Cottage, Westfield, Abinger Hammer, RH5 6RS – DISMISSED

Old Vine Cottage, Ewhurst Road, Peaslake, RH5 9RW- APPEAL LODGED

Planning decision noted by Committee.

Local Plan

The Clerk drew Councillors attention to the recently submitted SHMA consultation, which, due to the short deadline, was circulated and approved via email. The Council NOTED the submission and thanked Cllr Davey for leading on the process.

The Clerk highlighted an email invitation that had been sent from Guildford Borough Council inviting members to a meeting at Millmead offices on 4th March. Cllr Smith and Cllr Taylor-Cotter are attending.

Planning Correspondence received which may be of interest to the Committee

1. Flooding on road at Weller's Court

Clerk had received a call from an elderly resident concerned that she had to walk in the road to avoid the flooding at Wellers Court. Clerk reported that she had reported the problem to Surrey County Council.

2. Improvements to Planning Enforcement Service

An email has been received and sent round that updates Councillors on the improvement to the Enforcement notification service. The list will now contain a status field to indicate what stage the process has reached.

Enforcement Action

None.

Cllr Smith asked that the Clerk chase up on the enforcement issue at the lake in Holmbury St Mary. Councillors reported that there is now ornamental planting taking place in the field.

ACTION: Clerk to enquire as to progress at the lake in Holmbury St Mary.

Councillors' Business (for noting, delegation to the Clerk or inclusion on the agenda for the next meeting).

Hollybush Tavern

Cllr Brooke proposed a letter of support be sent to the planning authority for the application to turn Hollybush Tavern into some much needed smaller accommodation in the village. All the other villages in the area had had some new smaller properties built but not Holmbury St Mary.

It was unanimously agreed to send a letter of support for this application.
ACTION: Clerk to draft letter for approval by Chairman by 25-2-14.

Date of the next Planning meeting: Wednesday 12th March 2014 at 7.30pm.

Meeting closed at 9.00pm

C.Howard 25.2.14