



Minutes of the Planning/General Purposes and Finance Committee meeting held in the Council Chamber, Unit 2 Saxton, Parklands, Railton Road, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 9JX at 7.30pm on Thursday 14 March 2024

2024-79 - Present

Councillors:

Cllr G Adam (Chairman), Cllr B Ahier, Cllr P Cragg, Cllr S Ellahi, Cllr N Mitchell, Cllr B Nagle, Cllr M Price, and Cllr T Wright.

Officers of the Council:

Mrs G White - Clerk to the Council
Mrs V Fear - Assistant Clerk

Members of the public:

Mr Grant Sessions, Mr Clive Mather and four other members of the public were present.

2024-80 - Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman gave the H&S announcement.

2024-81 - To accept apologies and reason for absence in accordance with the LGA 1972, Sch 1, para 40

Apologies and reason for absence were received from Cllr D Bird. Apologies and reason for absence duly accepted. Cllr B Nagle substituted for Cllr D Bird. Cllr S Ellahi stood in following Cllr J Messinger's resignation.

2024-82 - Public Participation

Mr Mather and Mr Sessions both addressed their concerns to the committee about planning application 24/P/00166.

The Chairman thanked both gentlemen for addressing the Council.

2024-83 - Declaration of Non-pecuniary Interests

No declarations were made.

2024-84 - Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs) - by councillors in accordance with the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012 (SI 2012 No 1464)

No declarations were made.

2024-85 - To receive and consider written requests for new DPI dispensations, if any

No requests were received.

2024-86 - Amendments to the Register of Interests

No declarations were made.

2024-87 - Declaration of gifts or hospitality over £50

No declarations were made.

2024-88 - Planning Applications for consideration:

Planning Application No: [24/P/00166](#) - Maryland, Perry Hill, Worplesdon, Guildford, GU3 3RB - Erection of replacement dwelling following demolition of The Cottage including landscaping and associated works.

Two members of the public arrived at 19:44.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Parish Council submit the following objection:

The Parish Council **OBJECTS** to this application and asks the planning authority to refuse permission for the proposed dwelling.

Summary of our Objection

The proposal is for the development of an isolated dwelling in the countryside and in the Green Belt, contrary to local and national policy. The proposal would be harmful to the spatial and visual openness of the Green Belt. Even if the proposed building meets the design standard necessary to achieve support from Paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF'), which the Parish Council disputes, that is not sufficient to constitute a 'very special reason' why this particular development in the Green Belt should be allowed. There are no other very special reasons that would justify overriding Green Belt protection. Any benefits claimed for the proposal are either mitigation (i.e. works to reduce the harm that it would create) which should therefore be discounted or are entirely achievable without the construction of the dwelling. They do not outweigh the harm that would be caused.

The demolition of the building known as The Cottage is proposed solely because the applicant claims that it is within the exclusion zone of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area ('TBHSPA'). By demolishing The Cottage before building the proposed dwelling it is asserted that there will no net increase in dwellings within the exclusion zone of the TBHSPA. However, as the applicant's own drawings show¹ (confirmed by our own enquiries) the residential component of The Cottage is not within the exclusion zone and the proposal would therefore create an additional dwelling in the exclusion zone. This attempt to manipulate the planning system is fatally flawed. Even if the planning authority were to determine for some reason that The Cottage is within the exclusion zone, it is on the outer most edge. In comparison, the new dwelling would be squarely within the exclusion zone and considerably closer to the boundary of the TBHSPA than any current building on the site. It must therefore cause additional harm to the integrity and condition of the TBHSPA.

¹ Design and Access Statement Part 1A Drawing 1.3 and 1.6

The construction of a new vehicular access will cause harm to a designated Biodiversity Opportunity Area and habitat within an otherwise undisturbed area of woodland. The whole development would constitute a package of urbanising form and, just as importantly, on-going disturbance from the occupation of the dwelling.

In short, the application is a gratuitous intrusion of a large and entirely unnecessary private house into an important area of open countryside accorded multiple levels of protection by national and local policy and must be refused.

The Proposal

The proposal is described as a ‘replacement dwelling’. We have previously raised our concerns with the planning authority that they were willing to accept this description which we believe is not just incorrect but deliberately misleading.

The proposal is not for a replacement dwelling for the purposes of Policy P2 of the Guildford borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015 – 2034 (‘the local plan’) which is the relevant criterion for this description. It is for a wholly new, very large dwelling on an isolated countryside site in the Green Belt which is within the exclusion zone (as it is properly described) of the TBHSPA. The site is subject to saved policy NRM6 of the otherwise abolished South East Plan which has been incorporated into the local plan within Policy P5.

The applicant’s planning statement acknowledges that the application does not constitute a replacement dwelling using the relevant Green Belt definition. Yet in every part of that statement and in every other one of their reports the applicant’s consultants repeat ad nauseum the phrase ‘replacement dwelling’ in what is clearly an attempt to hypnotise the planning authority into accepting this misdirection.

Policy Objection– Green Belt

As the applicant acknowledges the proposed site is both open countryside and designated as Green Belt. The construction of a new dwelling on the site would therefore be contrary to local and national policies unless there are very special circumstances.

The NPPF² states at Paragraph 152 that:

Inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

At Paragraph 154 the NPPF states that:

A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the green belt.

A closed list of potential exceptions to this requirement is set out in paragraph 154 but none of them applies to this application – including the fact that it is not a replacement dwelling.

Paragraph 153 states that ‘very special circumstances’ **will not exist** unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. This test is incorporated into Policy P2 of the local plan.

The applicant does not dispute, because it is indisputable, that by reference to these policies the proposal is inappropriate development and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The applicant also acknowledges that the ‘any other harm’ to be assessed is harm in the widest sense and is not restricted to its impact on the Green Belt.

² All references to the NPPF are to the latest version published December 2023.

The onus is entirely on the applicant to demonstrate that very special circumstances exist to justify consent being granted. Despite their extensive submissions, they do not succeed in making that case. There is no benefit from their proposal that requires a dwelling to be provided, and no pre-existing damage to this part of the Green Belt which might benefit from 'repair' or addition.

It is well established that Green Belt is not an environmental designation – its primary purpose is to protect visual and spatial openness and prevent the 'sprawl' of new development. There is no difference in harm from the urban 'sprawl' of this proposal and other forms of development. The proposal is fundamentally misguided in seeking to justify the construction of a new dwelling by prettifying or landscaping the Green Belt in which it is located. This amounts to nothing beyond attempted mitigation of the harm to be done to the spatial and visual openness of the Green Belt and it clearly fails.

Policy Objection - Additional Dwelling in the TBHSPA exclusion zone

The sole reason offered for the proposed demolition of The Cottage is so that the applicant can claim that there will be no increase in the number of domestic dwellings in the 400m exclusion zone surrounding sites constituting the TBHSPA. By this mechanism they seek to avoid immediately falling foul of the effective prohibition on new dwellings in the exclusion zone arising from saved policy NRM6 and policy P5 (2) a. of the local plan. The supporting text³ for that policy makes the intention of the policy very clear:

It is not considered possible to avoid impacts from increased residential development within the exclusion zone up to 400m (linear) from the SPA due to the risks of fires, fly-tipping, cat predation and other pressures. Therefore, proposals that would result in a net increase in the number of residential units within the exclusion zone will be refused.

Protection of the TBHSPA is of course a matter of the utmost importance and conflict with this policy alone should be fatal to the application.

In their application the applicant asserts that The Cottage is within the exclusion zone and yet publishes plans within its Design and Access Statement which confirm that this is not the case.

We have separately checked the boundary and we agree that for policy purposes The Cottage is not within the exclusion zone. If any part of it is in the exclusion zone, then it is not the residential part. The applicant cannot argue that it is 'nearly' in the exclusion zone because the relevant policy does not provide for that distinction. For good and obvious reasons the policy operates only on the basis that a dwelling is inside the boundary or that it is not.

NRM6 and local plan policy do not permit additional dwellings within the exclusion zone, and the demolition of The Cottage would not assist the applicant in complying with this policy. That simply leaves a proposal for a new dwelling in the TBHSPA exclusion zone which can never be permitted by the relevant policies.

There is, in any case, no reason or justification for the demolition of The Cottage. It is a serviceable residential building over 100 years old. Though it may not be of great importance or significance, it is simply untrue for the applicant to suggest that there is a benefit to accrue from its demolition. It forms an attractive part of a cluster of buildings which have time-depth and pleasing appearance. The visual impact of removing The Cottage is at very best insignificant, but even that claim is based on the idea that the relevant views improved by making them more 'open'. We can only assume that the applicant fails to see the irony of this claim given their proposal to 'infill' a site within the Green Belt with new development.

The proposal is for the provision of an additional dwelling in the TBHSPA exclusion contrary to local and national policy. The proposed demolition of The Cottage has no relevance in planning terms since it is not within the exclusion zone. In any case the demolition should not be permitted as part of a 'choreographed'

³ Para 4.3.53 Page 60

and unjustified attempt to enable the applicant's ambition for a new house to be constructed in the Green Belt and within the exclusion zone of the TBHSPA.

Meeting Paragraph 84⁴

The principle (in our view the only) 'very special circumstance' the applicant offers to justify the intrusion into the Green Belt is that it will enable the construction of a property which he considers meets the test set out in Para 84 of the NPPF. That is also a possible (but not inevitable justification) for the construction of an isolated house in the countryside which is otherwise prohibited by national and local policy.

The judgement as to whether the design does meet the test set out in Para 84 is for the planning authority to make. The applicant offers by way of evidence the review carried out by the South East Design Review Panel. This panel of local architects and designers undoubtedly offers credible and valuable assessment of the work of their professional colleagues. But it is not infallible, and it is not a substitute for the judgement of the planning authority which was not represented on the panel.

Our view is that the design falls well short of the expectations for such a dwelling as can readily be seen when comparing it to the outstanding architecture of the relatively small number of Para 84 houses which have been approved.

For all of the warm words offered by the Design Review Panel, any reasonably informed observer would see the difference between the indecisive and tentative offering here and those designs which have met the Paragraph 84 standard elsewhere.

The applicant states that Para 84 homes have been approved in a Green Belt location. That is true but these are very rare examples. The one example provided from an appeal decision in 2016 (in the Waverley Green Belt) replaced a chicken shed and other derelict farm buildings with a decision of undoubted architectural merit. Part of the 'very special circumstance' was that the openness of the Green Belt had already been compromised, and the replacement was truly special. That is certainly not the case here.

More recent and relevant examples demonstrate that inspectors have dismissed appeals for Para 84 buildings in the Green Belt, even where their qualities are accepted.

We refer the planning authority to the 2022 decision in Northumberland⁵ where the inspector dismissed an appeal despite the fact that he accepted the proposed building was of the highest standard and clearly met the Para 84 (as it now is) threshold. The inspector said:

The exceptional quality needed to meet the requirements in Paragraph 80 of the Framework has been met however, the very special circumstances in paragraph 148 of the Framework is a different test that also needs to be met.

We do not dispute that dwellings meeting the Para 84 standard have very rarely been allowed in the Green Belt. But it is absolutely wrong to suggest that this is in any way 'normal' or that the planning authority would not have an absolutely solid policy basis for refusing the application whatever its assessment of the proposed design. The assessment of the impact on the Green Belt and 'very special circumstances' is a separate test to be met.

We repeat that whether or not it constitutes a Paragraph 84 house, or whether there are very special circumstances why it might be permitted in the Green Belt, it would be an additional dwelling in the exclusion zone of the TBHSPA and for that reason cannot be allowed.

⁴ Para 84 is now the relevant paragraph in the NPPF published December 2023 previously Paragraph 80.

⁵ APP/P2935/W/21/3276485

Harm to the Openness of the Green Belt

As the applicant correctly recognises, the assumption in national and local policy that development (unless of a specified type) is unacceptable in the Green Belt does not rely on demonstrating any particular visual or spatial harm from the proposal. Development in the Green Belt is normally unacceptable whatever form it takes.

Nevertheless, the applicant has provided a Landscape and Visual Appraisal ('LVA') which purports to demonstrate that the visual impact of the proposed development is minimal. In fact the LVA claims at various points that the visual impact of the proposed development would be 'beneficial'. The LVA sets out its working assumption before presenting any supporting evidence:

Taking into account the proposal, the Site and the surrounding landscape, it has been concluded that significant landscape or visual effects would not be expected to occur.⁶

Such a conclusion is, frankly, absurd. As a matter of fact the applicant accepts that the views across the site from public rights of way, in particular Footpath 431 and to a lesser extent 432 would encompass the new dwelling and inevitably, although this is not emphasised, the paraphernalia of domestic life. (It should be noted that the applicant may claim what they will about their own behaviour, but any future owner would be at liberty to create a wholly different visual and audible impact in the curtilage of their dwelling without planning control).

As just one example of the way in which the LVA stretches the credibility of its assessment we refer to the following example. In relation to the view across Brimstone Field from Footpath 431 towards the new dwelling the LVA reaches the following conclusion⁷:

Potential for small reduction in perception of tranquillity through development on the pasture. This is offset in part through the demolition of the cottage.

In other words, the LVA claims that the 'small' reduction caused by the prominent view of a highly intrusive new building in the Green Belt is somehow 'offset' by the demolition of a building which is not even visible in that direction. That is neither accurate nor a reasonable judgement to make, and, in our opinion, it is typical of the way in which the LVA misinterprets the visual impact of the proposal.

We also point out that the 'chestnut fence' indicated on plans (presumably for the purposes of privacy) appears to be omitted from all of the visualisations –perhaps so as to avoid demonstrating its impact on the openness of the site. The fact that this is clearly a sensitive issue where the applicant wishes to 'have it both ways' should be of considerable concern to the planning authority.

The LVA purports to suggest that the impact on the openness and visual impact of the proposal would be positive because of the additional planting and landscaping that would take place. But the applicant's plans and visualisations show clearly that the new dwelling would be the most prominent feature of the site, creating a background of built form in what is currently an entirely open landscape.

As the applicant acknowledges the openness of the Green Belt is defined by a spatial as well as a visual aspect. It is incontestable that the construction of a very large new dwelling surrounded by supporting infrastructure (including for example surface mounted photovoltaics) would fundamentally harm that openness.

Potential Other Harm to Biodiversity

Whilst the applicant highlights a range of alleged benefits – none of which require the construction of a new dwelling to achieve – they fail to acknowledge the potential harm caused by the dwelling to the TBHSPA or

⁶ LVA Page 16 Para 4.1

⁷ LVA Page 16 Table 6.1

the Biodiversity Opportunity Area within the site formally identified by Surrey Wildlife Trust and Surrey County Council adjacent to Whitmoor Common.

The construction of a new vehicular access would have an urbanising effect of the landscape and a destructive impact on the potential for biodiversity improvement in the area. There would be an inevitable requirement (now or in the future) for construction and reconstruction works along the track. We are concerned that it would not be possible to achieve the root protection zones required given the proximity of trees to the proposed access works, and we ask the planning authority to ensure that the applicant's design is carefully tested and reviewed.

These are likely to include drainage improvements given that the track is located within a Flood Zone 3 (highest risk) area. The applicant's flood risk report⁸ pays no attention to this issue and completely omits consideration of flood risk to the access road. The direct and indirect effect of any later maintenance works (whether potential subject to planning control or not) could be to disturb the existing biodiversity value of this area and to reduce the potential for improvement.

This is a much more serious issue than the applicant would wish to draw attention to, and we urge the planning authority to pay careful attention to the impact of the access road, not simply as proposed, but as a future occupier might make use of it.

The applicant prays in aid the enhancement of the Brimstone Field and the establishment of new habitat around the proposed dwelling, but must acknowledge that this would create, in effect, a huge private garden. Nothing is proposed that would guarantee or ensure that any part of the area would not be subject to lawful uses associated with a dwelling house which would - even unintentionally - have a detrimental impact on its status and undermine the alleged benefits. The proximity of the new dwelling to the boundary of the TBHSPA increases the potential for precisely the type of harm that planning policy seeks to avoid. Were the applicant to propose transferring ownership or long-term management to a third party and retaining only a reasonable private garden as the curtilage of the new house then their argument might have more credibility but that is not the proposal.

None of the improvements to Brimstone Field require the construction of a large new house for them to be carried out. It is entirely within the gift of the owners of Brimstone Field to dedicate it to habitat renewal and enhancement as described in the application, and it is highly likely that there would be financial and professional support for them to do so. These improvements are offered as if they are only capable of implementation if the proposal were to go ahead – thus constituting a benefit which might contribute towards 'a very special circumstance'. In fact they are entirely deliverable without the development and quite possibly with very little effort or expense on the part of the landowner. Additionally, to the extent that they are offered as mitigation of the impact of the development, they do not represent a benefit at all – since they only offset other harm which will be done. That is certainly the case in relation to the screening of the property from view.

Lack of consultation

The Parish Council also wishes to raise concern that the statutory notices were not displayed at either end of the public rights of way no's 431 and 432, and a number of statutory consultees were also not consulted: those not consulted included Worplesdon Parish Council, Natural England, the Environment Agency, Historic England, and the Borough Council's Conservation Officer.

Conclusion

The applicant has provided a comprehensive range of material in support of their proposal, but for all of the volume and expensive content, the essence of this application is very simple and should be seen as such.

⁸ Lanmor Consulting Pre-Application Flood Risk Report November 2020

It is proposed to build a very large new dwelling in the heart of the TBHSPA exclusion zone, in the Green Belt and in an isolated countryside location. There are no benefits from that proposal except to the applicant. It does not even provide an additional dwelling to add to housing stock since if their own strategy were to be accepted the applicant is forced to demolish a perfectly serviceable residential property. The proposal does not meet the criteria for the replacement of a dwelling in the Green Belt. There are no benefits to biodiversity or the landscape which require that a new house be built. All of the improvements proposed could be delivered without it. The impact on the visual and spatial openness of the Green Belt would be profound and irreversible.

We do not believe that the proposed design can be considered to meet the requirements of Para 84 but even if it does that is not a very special justification for development in the Green Belt when weighed against the harm that would be caused.

The Cottage must be considered as outside of the exclusion zone of the TBHSPA in which case the proposal is fundamentally in conflict with highly important policy protections accorded to areas of the highest conservation value. In any case, the otherwise pointless demolition of The Cottage is a transparent manipulation of the planning system and should not be permitted.

The planning authority should not be misdirected by the applicant's submissions or arguments which for all their glossy appearance have little substance and cannot disguise the fundamental policy conflicts to which the proposal gives rise.

The planning authority should refuse the application.

It was agreed by resolution of the Council that the Merrist Wood Golf Club application would be brought forward on the agenda to enable members of the public to listen to the debate.

Planning Application SCC_Ref_2023-0185 - Land at Merrist Wood Golf Club, Holly Lane, Worplesdon, Surrey, GU3 3PB - Proposal: The importation and deposit of inert materials and soils on 55 hectares of land to construct and remodel the existing golf course, with associated water features and the creation of heathland and wetland habitat. Please find attached a copy of our formal consultation/notification letter. The application documents and plans are available to view or download from our website: https://planning.surreycc.gov.uk/Planning/Display/SCC_Ref_2023-0185

The Parish Council weighed up the pros and cons of the proposal and considered the long-term ecological benefits (additional heathland, additional wetland, and additional ponds) as well as the flooding resilience benefits would outweigh the short-term traffic harm.

At 20:43 the Chairman waived Standing Orders to enable members of the public to address the Council.

At 20:45 the meeting was reconvened.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Parish Council support this planning application but would request the following conditions be applied, should planning permission be granted:

1. The requirement for a Banksman at all times during the approved hours of operation.
2. The provision of a Construction Traffic Management Plan.
3. The provision of a Construction Method Statement.
4. The requirement for all construction traffic to enter and leave the College grounds by turning left turn only.
5. All mud to be swept from the road on a weekly basis, or more frequently, if necessary for highway safety purposes.

Approved by the Full Council – 4 April 2024

The Councillors also enquired whether it would be possible to secure a temporary alternative access into the College to alleviate potential conflict between all users of the College entrance.

All eight members of the public left the meeting at 20:46.

Planning Application No: [24/P/00030](#) - Downside Cottage, Frog Grove Lane, Guildford, GU3 3EZ - Retrospective application for a single storey conservatory extension.

It was **RESOLVED**: leave to planners.

Planning Application No: [23/P/01735](#) - Jacobs Well Village Hall, Jacobs Well Road, Jacobs Well - Partial change of use of existing car park to water filling station including retention of existing structure (retrospective application).

It was **RESOLVED**: that the Parish Council support this retrospective planning application.

Planning Application No: [22/P/00800](#) - 92 Queenhythe Road, Jacobs Well, Guildford, GU4 7NX - Variation of condition 2 (drawing numbers) of planning application 22/P/00800 approved 13/10/2022 for the erection of a part single/two storey rear extension. First floor extension to be amended to come in line with the ground floor extension.

It was **RESOLVED**: leave to planners.

Planning Application No: [24/P/00231](#) - 61 St Michael's Ave, Fairlands, Guildford, GU3 3LZ - Two-storey rear extension and side extension that links to the proposed rear extension.

It was **RESOLVED**: leave to planners.

Planning Application No: [24/P/00266](#) - 4 White Hart Lane, Wood Street Village, Guildford, GU3 3DZ - Single storey front extension.

It was **RESOLVED**: leave to planners.

Planning Application No: [23/P/02098](#) - Gooserye Cottage, Goose Rye Road, Worplesdon, Guildford, GU3 3RH - Extensions and alterations to existing garage (resubmission of 23/P/01422).

It was **RESOLVED**: that the Parish Council request that, should planning permission be granted, a condition be applied to ensure this outbuilding remains ancillary to the main dwelling, in perpetuity.

Planning Application No: [24/P/00300](#) - 4 Hillbrow Close, Wood Street Village, Guildford, GU3 3DF - Construction of a single storey rear extension following the partial demolition of the existing garage and ground floor WC.

It was **RESOLVED**: leave to planners.

Planning Application No: [24/P/00280](#) - 83 The Oval, Wood Street Village, Guildford, GU3 3DW - Proposed single storey rear extension.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Parish Council comment as follows:

The front door access point, as well as the other two access doors do not appear to be wide enough to accommodate a wheelchair.

Approved by the Full Council – 4 April 2024

Planning Application No: [24/T/00049](#) - 28 Broadacres, Guildford - (T1) Lime - Crown lift to 3 meters on entire canopy. TPO-P1/201/106.

It was **RESOLVED**: leave to specialist tree officer.

Planning Application No: [24/T/00054](#) - 10 Cater Gardens Guildford, GU3 3BY - T1 Chestnut - Fell to ground level (Re-plant silver birch tree). TPO-P1/201/278.

It was **RESOLVED**: leave to specialist tree officer.

The Clerk left the room between 21:03 and 21:06.

Planning Appeals for information only

Inspectorate's Ref: APP/Y3615/D/24/3337878 - 142 Envis Way, Fairlands, Guildford, GU3 3NL - Proposed single storey side and rear extensions and conversion of loft space to habitable accommodation with front, side and rear dormers following demolition of existing detached single car garage.

An appeal has been made to the Secretary of State against the Council's decision for the proposed development described above.

2024-89 - Hesters Yard – Planning Appeal to be submitted by Bewley Homes to the Planning Inspectorate in April 2024

Following discussion, it was proposed by Cllr N Mitchell, seconded by Cllr G Adam, and unanimously **RESOLVED** that the Parish Council support the following elements of the planning appeal, given there were no statutory consultee objections to this planning application, two of the business units were destroyed by fire in September 2023 and Dryad Tree Specialists Limited have relocated to a business unit in Send:

- Use of Brownfield Land - as allocated by Guildford Borough Council
- Use of Previously Developed Land
- Increase of 0.14ha (140m²) Green Belt land within the site by reducing the sprawl
- Enhancement of the Biodiversity Opportunity Area – 32% Biodiversity Net Gain increase – legal requirement 10%
- Increased access to the Green Belt for residents and visitors (wildflower meadow – owned and managed, in perpetuity, by the parish council)
- Provision of Affordable Housing at 44% - more than the 40% policy requirement
- Provision of a purpose-built parish office/meeting facility/workshop/storage facility freehold in perpetuity via a section 106 Agreement for the sum of £1, including the wildflower meadow
- Enhancement of this run-down site
- Visual containment of the site
- Provision of separate rentable small office space within the Parish providing new on-site employment opportunities
- Financial contribution towards the Connect bus service
- Potential provisional increase in pupil intake to support Wood Street Infant School

2024-90 - Replacement Community Centre, Fairlands

Cllr N Mitchell advised that the Fairlands, Liddington Hall and Gravetts Lane Community Association's (FLGCA) Management Committee has now submitted its application for a replacement Community Centre to Your Fund Surrey.

Following discussion, it was proposed by Cllr G Adam, seconded by Cllr P Cragg, and unanimously **RESOLVED** that the Parish Council would express its support for this project via the Your Fund Surrey website.

If the Parish Council did wish to secure office/meeting space in the replacement Community Centre, it would be required to secure a 25-year lease. The Parish Council is legally required to pay the commercial rent; therefore an anticipated loan of £800,000 would be required. In order to fund this, the Parish Council would be required to seek a Public Works Loan Board loan, which would require the support of the communities across the Parish. This funding would be a form of matched funding, which would assist the FLGCA's application to Your Fund Surrey.

At this stage, however, Worplesdon Parish Council is unable to commit any form of financial contribution towards the proposed replacement Community Centre.

2024-91 - Christmas illuminations

The feedback from the community survey undertaken in November and December 2023, was that 97% of the respondents were in support of Christmas illuminations being provided across the parish at the following locations:

- Saint Mary's, Worplesdon Parish Council (live illuminated Christmas tree)
- The avenue of trees at Perry Hill Green (existing trees to be wrapped with illuminations)
- Wood Street Village Green (live illuminated Christmas tree)
- Fairlands Community Centre (illuminated cone to resemble a Christmas tree)
- Jacobs Well Village Hall (illuminated cone to resemble a Christmas tree)
- Pitch Place Green (live Christmas tree planted on the Green - this was actioned in February 2024)

The recommendation of the working party was to proceed with a tender to include the above specifications.

A draft tender had been prepared by the Clerk which had been circulated to all Members in advance of the meeting.

It was agreed that three additional items be added to the draft tender as follows:

1. There will be no allowance for an RPI increase within the tender specification. All anticipated RPI increases to be included in the contract value from the outset.
2. The duration of the contract, in addition to the period of illumination.
3. Locations and type of illuminations to be provided, as specified above.

It was proposed by Cllr G Adam, seconded by Cllr N Mitchell, and unanimously **RESOLVED** that the tender to contain two options:

1. To rent the illuminations for a period of four years
2. To purchase the illuminations over the four-year period (as Godalming Town Council has done).

2024-92 - Biodiversity Act 2021 (Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) law applies from 12 February 2024 for sites off over 10 dwellings - for smaller sites this will apply from April 2024)

In accordance with the additional duties placed upon the Parish Council, it is now required to create a Biodiversity Policy and Action Plan for all land for which it is responsible. Surrey County Council will be providing a template and other information to assist all town and parish councils, but this is yet to be received.

This item was deferred pending receipt of Surrey County Council's recommendations and templates.

2024-93 - Finance:

a) Proposed list of payments to be tabled at the meeting for approval

The payment list was presented to the meeting. It was proposed by Cllr M Price, seconded by Cllr T Wright, and unanimously **RESOLVED** that payments to the value of £18,389.00 be approved. The payment list was then signed by the Chairman of the meeting.

Table 1: Payment list – 14 March 2024

| Code | Date | Description | Supplier | Net | VAT | Total |
|--|------------|---|--|-----------|--------|-----------|
| Accrual towards tree succession planting | 22/02/2024 | One day's labour & supply of 1.5-ton digger to plant trees at Pitch Place | Stephen Gunner | 360.00 | 0.00 | 360.00 |
| Revenue Costs Works Vehicle | 19/02/2024 | Fuel for works van | Waitrose Shell | 41.69 | 8.34 | 50.03 |
| Land Management | 20/02/2024 | Materials | Screwfix Direct Ltd | 12.49 | 2.50 | 14.99 |
| IT budget | 22/02/2024 | Website development - Wildlife counter page | Welland Creative | 550.00 | 110.00 | 660.00 |
| Staff Costs | 22/02/2024 | Salaries/ PAYE/ NI/ Mileage/ Pension Conts Ee's & Er's | Staff Costs | 13,095.92 | 0.00 | 13,095.92 |
| Staff mileage | 22/02/2024 | Mileage | Mrs G F White | 20.15 | 0.00 | 20.15 |
| Staff mileage | 22/02/2024 | Mileage | Mrs V C Fear | 7.15 | 0.00 | 7.15 |
| Parish Office | 22/02/2024 | Supply & fit new office light and repair W/C light | N.R. Jennings | 293.00 | 0.00 | 293.00 |
| IT budget | 23/02/2024 | Halo for business 1 - ultrafast 2 & value line | BT PLC | 48.95 | 9.79 | 58.74 |
| Chairman's Allowance | 23/02/2024 | Wine and hire of glasses for APM | Majestic Wine | 149.07 | 29.81 | 178.88 |
| IT budget | 27/02/2024 | HP ink cartridges | Proactive Business Supplies Ltd | 141.04 | 28.21 | 169.25 |
| Land Management | 27/02/2024 | Stihl Long Reach Trimmer and Solvent | Honey Bros Ltd | 724.98 | 145.00 | 869.98 |
| Establishment Charges | 27/02/2024 | Black ballpoint pens | Amazon EU S.a.r.L. | 8.22 | 1.65 | 9.87 |
| Establishment Charges | 27/02/2024 | Red ballpoint pens | London Soho Ltd | 8.32 | 1.67 | 9.99 |
| Establishment Charges | 27/02/2024 | 3 x Box files | Plastoreg Eastlight Limited | 11.66 | 2.33 | 13.99 |
| Establishment Charges | 27/02/2024 | Blue ballpoint pens | Frank Berry Office Supplies Ltd | 7.92 | 1.58 | 9.50 |
| Establishment Charges | 27/02/2024 | Subject Dividers | Office Star Ltd | 16.37 | 3.27 | 19.64 |
| Establishment Charges | 27/02/2024 | Tipp-Ex Correction Tapes x 3 | Amazon EU S.a.r.L. | 2.22 | 0.44 | 2.66 |
| Establishment Charges | 27/02/2024 | Square cut folders x100 | Amazon EU S.a.r.L. | 16.58 | 3.32 | 19.90 |
| Chairman's Allowance | 28/02/2024 | Civic gift - JM | Mrs G F White - National Garden Gift Vouchers | 50.00 | 0.00 | 50.00 |
| Chairman's Allowance | 28/02/2024 | Nibbles for APM | Mrs V C Fear - Lidl | 2.29 | 0.00 | 2.29 |
| IT budget | 28/02/2024 | Domain name renewal - worplesdon-pc.gov.uk 12.05.24 -11.05.26 | Datacenta | 125.00 | 25.00 | 150.00 |
| Land Management | 28/02/2024 | Hire of storage container MW - February 2024 | Activate Learning | 81.00 | 0.00 | 81.00 |
| Land Management | 28/02/2024 | Tree watering rings x 2 | Mrs V C Fear - Amazon Services Europe S.a.r.L. | 22.49 | 4.50 | 26.99 |
| Establishment Charges | 28/02/2024 | Application fee- DBS check groundsman | Mrs V C Fear - Gov.uk | 18.00 | 0.00 | 18.00 |
| Establishment Charges | 29/02/2024 | Refreshments - Flood Forum | Tesco | 19.85 | 0.00 | 19.85 |
| Revenue Costs Works Vehicle | 01/03/2024 | Service plan - 2nd instalment of 45 | PlanMyService LLP | 48.38 | 9.68 | 58.06 |
| Revenue Costs Works Vehicle | 01/03/2024 | MOT Service plan - 2nd instalment of 45 | PlanMyService LLP | 3.78 | 0.00 | 3.78 |

| Code | Date | Description | Supplier | Net | VAT | Total |
|------------------------------|------------|---|--|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| IT budget | 04/03/2024 | BT Business Mobile Broadband | BT PLC | 17.16 | 3.43 | 20.59 |
| Land Management | 21/02/2024 | Treegrator | Landscape Supply Company | 249.50 | 49.90 | 299.40 |
| IT budget | 06/03/2024 | Scribe - 2024-2025 | Starboard Systems Ltd | 810.00 | 162.00 | 972.00 |
| Memorial Bench - John Gunner | 06/03/2024 | Concrete base for Memorial Bench - The Late John Gunner | Stephen Gunner | 400.00 | 0.00 | 400.00 |
| Parish Office | 06/03/2024 | External window cleaning | Trevor Porter Window Cleaning Service | 20.00 | 4.00 | 24.00 |
| Land Management | 06/03/2024 | Emptying - Dumpy Bin - WSV Community Car Park | Chambers Waste Management | 31.84 | 6.37 | 38.21 |
| Establishment Charges | 06/03/2024 | SLCC Membership - VF - 01.03.24 - 28.02.25 | SLCC Enterprises Ltd | 229.00 | 0.00 | 229.00 |
| Establishment Charges | 06/03/2024 | First Aid supplies | The Safety Supply Company | 38.00 | 7.60 | 45.60 |
| Land Management | 05/03/2024 | Materials | B&Q | 6.67 | 1.33 | 8.00 |
| Establishment Charges | 06/03/2024 | 3 x Box files REFUND | Plastoreg Eastlight Limited | -11.66 | -2.33 | -13.99 |
| Revenue Costs Works Vehicle | 06/03/2024 | No Smoking stickers x 10 | Blossom Print (Amazon) | 2.99 | 0.00 | 2.99 |
| IT budget | 07/03/2024 | External back-up - March 2024 | RISC IT | 44.00 | 8.80 | 52.80 |
| Revenue Costs Works Vehicle | 06/03/2024 | First Aid Stickers x2 | Universal Silk Screen Printers & Signmakers (Amazon) | 2.91 | 0.58 | 3.49 |
| IT budget | 06/03/2024 | Printer ink | Gadstore Ltd (Amazon) | 27.75 | 5.55 | 33.30 |
| Total | | | | £17,754.68 | £634.32 | £18,389.00 |

2024-94 - Date of next Planning/General Purposes and Finance Committee meeting – 25 April 2024

Meeting closed 21:48

Signed:

Chairman of the Council
Date: 4 April 2024