



**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 19:30 on Thursday 5 February 2026**

**2026-28 - Present**

**Councillors:**

Cllr B Ahier, Cllr S Busby, Cllr N Crampin, Cllr N Mitchell, Cllr B Nagle, Cllr M Price (Chairman), Cllr R Watson, and Cllr T Wright.

**Officers of the Council:**

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

**Members of the public:**

Simon Schofield – Chair of Normandy Parish Council

**2026-29 - One-minute silence in memory of the late Peter Harris**

Chairman of the Council, Cllr N Mitchell, reported the sudden and unexpected passing of Mr Peter Harris of the Safer Guildford Camera Partnership.

Mr Harris had worked closely with the Parish Council, providing valued advice and practical assistance with the installation of the Council's Speed Data Recorders (SDR) and Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) at key locations across the parish in support of efforts to reduce vehicle speeds and improve road safety for residents.

Members noted their appreciation of his commitment to community safety and the assistance he had provided to the Parish Council over a number of years.

A one-minute silence was observed as a mark of respect.

**2026-30 - To accept apologies and reason for absence in accordance with the LGA 1972, Sch12, para 40**

None received.

**2026-31 - Public participation session**

Simon Schofield Chair of Normandy Parish Council addressed the Parish Council about planning application [25/P/01725](#). The Chairman of the Council thanked Mr Schofield for attending the meeting and raising Normandy Parish Council's concerns with the Parish Council.

**2026-32 - 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.

**2026-33 - Amendments to the Register of Interests**

No declarations were made.

**2026-34 - To receive and consider written requests for new DPI dispensations**

No requests were received.

**2026-35 - Declaration of non-pecuniary interests in accordance with the Parish Council's Code of Conduct**

No declarations were made.

**2026-36 - Declaration of gifts or hospitality over £50**

No declarations were made.

**2026-37 - Planning Applications for consideration:**

It was **RESOLVED** that planning application no: 25/P/01725 would be brought forward for the benefit of Mr Schofield.

**Planning Application No: [25/P/01725](#) - Land off, Glaziers Lane, Normandy, GU3** - Outline Planning Application (all matters reserved except for principal access(es)) for the demolition of existing stables buildings and the phased, residential-led development, including up to 950 dwellings (including older persons accommodation) (Class C3); up to 2,500 sqm two form entry primary school (Class F1) and up to 5,000 sqm Special Educational Needs school (Class F1) and in addition associated playing fields; up to 2,500 sqm neighbourhood centre, comprising 1) community hub/facilities including café facilities (Class F2 / Class E(b)), 2) retail floorspace (Class E(a)), 3) medical facility (Class E(e)) and 4) nursery/early years provision (Class E (f)), associated Green and Blue Infrastructure including drainage, a Forest Building including café facilities (up to 250sqm) (Class F2 / Class E(b)); a bike and transport hub; and other associated infrastructure and earthworks of land at Normandy and Flexford.

The Members carefully considered this planning application and were not satisfied that the development can be delivered in a manner which complies with national or local planning policy, nor that the impacts on the existing community and environment have been adequately addressed.

It was therefore agreed that the Parish Council would object to this planning application on the following grounds:

**1. Nature of the Application (Outline Permission)**

This application is submitted in outline form with all detailed matters, including layout, scale, appearance and landscaping, reserved for later approval.

The Parish Council considers this to be a significant concern. The proposal is a large, urban-scale development on Green Belt land, yet the matters which determine the extent of planning harm - building heights, density, massing, landscape impact and relationship to neighbouring properties - are not fixed.

Granting outline permission would establish the principle of development before the Local Planning Authority and residents can properly understand what will actually be built. Once the principle is accepted, the ability to resist the development at Reserved Matters stage becomes substantially limited.

Members are therefore concerned that the acceptability of development on this Green Belt site is being sought in advance of the information necessary to properly assess its impacts.

## **2. Green Belt and Previously Developed Land (“Grey Belt”)**

The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt and is not allocated for development in the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2019.

Through the Local Plan process the Borough Council identified specific locations where exceptional circumstances justified the release of Green Belt land following independent examination. This site was not selected for allocation. The current proposal is therefore a speculative application on unallocated Green Belt land.

National policy states that inappropriate development in the Green Belt is, by definition, harmful and should not be approved except in Very Special Circumstances. The proposal comprises a residential-led urban extension including housing, retail uses, community uses, medical facilities, and schools, introducing extensive permanent built form onto land which is currently open.

The defining characteristic of the Green Belt is openness and permanence. The introduction of substantial built development, including buildings of up to four storeys, would fundamentally alter the spatial character of the land and result in a permanent loss of openness.

The applicant refers to the land as “Grey Belt” and relies on the presence of existing structures including stables. The Parish Council does not consider this alters the policy position. The NPPF definition of Previously Developed Land excludes land occupied by agricultural buildings, and equestrian use is a countryside activity which does not urbanise a site. The limited presence of stable buildings and associated hardstanding does not remove the site’s Green Belt function.

Furthermore, national policy makes clear that land does not cease to be Green Belt because it contains structures or is visually contained. Openness is a spatial concept rather than a visual one.

The Parish Council has not identified any site-specific Very Special Circumstances that would justify a departure from national policy or the adopted spatial strategy. Approval would amount to an unplanned release of Green Belt land outside the plan-led process.

The proposal therefore conflicts with Local Plan Policy P2 (Green Belt) and national policy contained within NPPF paragraphs 152–155, which state that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should not be approved except in Very Special Circumstances.

## **3. Traveller Accommodation Provision**

The Parish Council notes that the proposal is of a scale comparable to a strategic residential development. The adopted Local Plan identifies a need to provide accommodation for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Show people households as part of meeting the Borough’s overall housing requirements. Local Plan Policy H1(7).

The application does not appear to include provision for traveller pitches, nor does it set out how the development contributes toward meeting the identified need.

National planning policy requires local planning authorities to plan positively for all forms of housing need. The development plan similarly seeks to ensure that accommodation needs are addressed in a coordinated and plan-led manner.

The Parish Council is concerned that a development of this scale would deliver general market housing without addressing other identified accommodation needs, thereby placing additional pressure on the plan-led allocation of sites elsewhere in the Borough.

The absence of any clear consideration of traveller accommodation indicates that the proposal has not fully demonstrated compliance with the development plan housing strategy. The proposal therefore fails to demonstrate that it contributes to meeting the full range of identified housing needs within the Borough.

#### **4. Character, Scale and Density**

The surrounding area is characterised by predominantly two-storey development within a rural settlement pattern. Buildings of up to four storeys would introduce a scale and massing more typical of an urban environment and would be out of keeping with the existing character of the adjacent hamlets.

Members consider the development represents over-intensification of the site and would materially change the character of the area, conflicting with Local Plan policies relating to design and place-shaping.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Local Plan Policies D1 (Place Shaping) and D4 (Character and Appearance) and NPPF paragraph 135, which requires development to be sympathetic to local character and surroundings.

#### **5. Highways, Traffic, Accessibility and Sustainability**

The Parish Council has significant concerns regarding the transport implications of the proposal and is not satisfied that the submitted Transport Assessment demonstrates that the development can operate safely.

The surrounding highway network is rural in character, with constrained carriageway widths, and incomplete pedestrian provision. Continuous footways are not available along Westwood Lane or Glaziers Lane and pedestrians are required to cross the carriageway twice in order to reach Wanborough railway station. The absence of continuous footways limits safe active travel and conflicts with the objective of promoting sustainable transport modes.

The development relies upon proximity to the railway station to demonstrate sustainability, yet pedestrian access is incomplete and inclusive access to the station is not secured. Increased vehicle movements associated with the development would increase conflict between vehicles and pedestrians using routes without continuous footways. Without accessible infrastructure, the site cannot reasonably be regarded as sustainably located for all users.

The application documents do not clearly demonstrate safe junction operation. Swept-path analysis, visibility splays and stopping-distance information are not sufficiently evidenced. Without this information the Local Planning Authority cannot reasonably conclude that safe access can be achieved.

Increased vehicle movements on constrained rural roads and at the A31 junction are likely to worsen local air quality. The application does not demonstrate that air quality impacts have been adequately assessed contrary to para 199 of the NPPF.

The surrounding rural road network is regularly used by equestrians. The proposal does not include provision for horse riders and increased traffic levels would increase conflict between vehicles and vulnerable road users.

#### **Special Educational Needs school transport**

The proposed Special Educational Needs school materially alters the transport characteristics of the development. Unlike a mainstream school, pupils typically arrive by arranged taxi or minibus transport and are accompanied by escorts. Vehicles frequently carry only one or two pupils and require assisted boarding and alighting. The proposal is likely to result in increased vehicle dwell times on the public highway, particularly at peak periods, to the detriment of highway safety and the free flow of traffic.

For a school of the size proposed, a substantial number of arrivals and departures would occur during the morning and afternoon peaks on narrow rural roads already experiencing congestion. The Parish Council considers the submitted Transport Assessment risks underestimating both the number and operational nature of these movements.

The Parish Council is therefore not satisfied that safe and suitable access for all users has been demonstrated. The proposal conflicts with Local Plan Policy ID3 (Sustainable Transport for New Developments) and NPPF paragraph 115,

which allow refusal where highway safety would be unacceptable or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

## **6. Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage**

The site is known locally to experience surface water drainage problems. The drainage strategy relies on swales, soakaways and attenuation ponds, but the application does not clearly demonstrate infiltration rates, groundwater conditions or exceedance flow routes.

It remains unclear where water would flow during extreme rainfall events once on-site storage is exceeded. The exceedance flow routes have therefore not been demonstrated. National policy requires development not to increase flood risk elsewhere and to be safe for its lifetime. Climate projections indicate flood risk is likely to increase over time.

The long-term management and maintenance of the drainage infrastructure is also unclear at this outline stage. The Parish Council is therefore not satisfied that the development would avoid increasing flood risk to neighbouring land or future occupants.

The Parish Council therefore considers the proposal fails to demonstrate that the development would be safe for its lifetime or would avoid increasing flood risk elsewhere, contrary to Local Plan Policy P4 (Flooding), Policy D2 (Sustainable Design and Construction) and NPPF paragraphs 173–175 – sequential testing.

## **7. Foul Drainage Infrastructure**

Capacity and blockage issues are known locally within the foul drainage network, which is served by the Hockford Sewage Pumping Station. The application does not provide confirmation that sufficient sewerage capacity exists to serve the development.

The proposal appears to rely upon future infrastructure upgrades which are uncertain in timing and delivery. Without evidence of available capacity, there is a risk of network surcharge affecting existing properties and the environment.

The Parish Council therefore considers the applicant has not demonstrated that adequate utilities infrastructure is available to support the development.

National policy requires development to be supported by adequate infrastructure. In the absence of confirmed network capacity, the proposal conflicts with infrastructure requirements of the development plan and NPPF annex 3, which seeks to ensure development does not create unacceptable environmental or pollution impacts.

## **8. Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure**

The site lies within a Biodiversity Opportunity Area and forms part of a wider ecological network contributing to habitat connectivity and the emerging Local Nature Recovery Strategy. The site therefore forms part of a functioning ecological network rather than an isolated parcel of land.

National policy also requires planning decisions to have regard to Local Nature Recovery Strategies. The scale and density of development, together with limited green infrastructure at outline stage, risks fragmentation of habitats and loss of ecological function. The Council is also concerned that accessible green space provision appears limited relative to the scale of development, potentially increasing recreational pressure on surrounding sensitive habitats.

The proposal has not demonstrated protection of ecological networks or meaningful biodiversity enhancement. The proposal therefore conflicts with Local Plan Policy P5 (TBHSPA) and NPPF paragraphs 192-195, which require protection and enhancement of ecological networks and biodiversity.

## 9. Overall Planning Balance

The proposal would result in loss of Green Belt openness, introduce urban form into a rural settlement, place pressure on constrained highways, rely on uncertain infrastructure provision, present unresolved drainage concerns and reduce ecological connectivity.

Although proximity to the railway station is referenced, practical accessibility is limited and the development would remain largely dependent on private vehicle use.

The cumulative impacts of the proposal have not been shown to be acceptable, and the Parish Council does not consider the scheme represents sustainable development.

When assessed against the development plan as a whole, and having regard to national policy, the adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

### Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, Worplesdon Parish Council respectfully requests that planning permission be refused.

At 20:03 Mr Schofield left the meeting.

**Planning Application No: [24/P/00466](#) - Land rear of Worplesdon View Care Home, Worplesdon Road, Guildford, GU3 3LQ** - Erection of a detached, three-storey building to form a care home (use class C2) with associated car/cycle parking, amenity space and landscaping.

It was **RESOLVED**: that the Parish Council send a secondary objection (original objection submitted May 2024) following the recent publication of additional documents by the applicant.

The Parish Council's objection is not to the provision of care accommodation as a land use in principle, but to the suitability of this constrained site to accommodate an intensive residential institution within the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) 400m buffer zone in the absence of robust ecological and hydrological evidence.

#### 1. Land Ownership and Application Validity

The Parish Council has identified a discrepancy between the submitted site location plan and the land within the applicant's ownership and control, together with an apparent error within the Flood Risk declaration.

The amended proposed site plan does not clearly distinguish land within the applicant's ownership from land in third-party ownership. A Land Registry search undertaken on 27 January 2026 confirms that the land between the roundabout and Worplesdon View Care Home is owned by Surrey County Council (Title No. SY196863).

Where works are proposed on land outside the applicant's ownership, the correct ownership certificate and notice requirements must be satisfied under Article 13 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

The Parish Council therefore requests confirmation that the appropriate notice has been served on all relevant landowners. Until this matter is clarified, the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that the application has been properly made.

#### 2. Highway Safety, Swept Path Analysis and Accessible Pedestrian Provision

The application proposes access arrangements and a new footway on land owned by Surrey County Council, yet no adoption or long-term maintenance arrangements appear to have been identified.

The submitted swept-path analysis indicates that vehicles exiting the site would cross the centre line and that ingress movements would obstruct left-turning traffic. The proposed “left turn only” arrangement would not be enforceable through the planning process and therefore cannot be relied upon in assessing highway safety. The proposal therefore conflicts with:

- Guildford Local Plan Policy ID3 (Sustainable Transport for New Developments), which requires safe and suitable access for all users; and
- NPPF paragraph 115, which states development should be refused where there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

### **3. Accessible and inclusive pedestrian environment**

The development relies upon proximity to services and public transport to demonstrate sustainability, yet it does not provide a continuous, safe or inclusive pedestrian route.

Existing footways:

- are obstructed by vegetation and parked vehicles,
- fall below recognised accessible width standards (approximately 1.8 m),
- and have adverse camber towards the carriageway, creating difficulty for wheelchair users and those with mobility impairments.

A footway on only one side of the road would not resolve these deficiencies. Consequently the site cannot reasonably be regarded as accessible for all users.

The proposal therefore conflicts with:

- Local Plan Policy ID3
- Local Plan Policy D1 (Place Shaping) – inclusive design
- NPPF paragraphs 110 and 112 (priority for pedestrians and people with disabilities)

### **4. Evidence of Need and Concentration of Use**

The Parish Council considers that the application has not demonstrated a policy-based need for the proposed development.

Within the immediate locality there are already four operational care homes providing approximately 277 bed spaces:

- QEP Care Home – 77 beds
- Claremont Court – 57 beds
- Worplesdon View – 78 beds
- Silverbirch House – 65 beds

In addition, application 25/P/01124 for a further 80-bed care home is currently under consideration. No robust, up-to-date needs assessment has been submitted demonstrating a local shortfall in provision. The proposal therefore conflicts with:

- Guildford Local Plan Policy ID1 (Infrastructure and Delivery), which requires infrastructure provision to be justified; and
- NPPF paragraph 124, which requires planning decisions to plan positively for community facilities based on assessed need.

The Parish Council also draws attention to appeal decision APP/Y3615/W/25/3364374 – North Wyke Farm, Guildford Road, Normandy (6 August 2025), where insufficient evidence of need was a material consideration.

## 5. Cumulative Impact on Healthcare Infrastructure

Care homes generate a predictable level of demand for primary healthcare services, ambulance provision and hospital admissions.

The locality is primarily served by Fairlands Medical Practice and the Royal Surrey County Hospital. The application documentation contains no assessment of the cumulative healthcare demand created by existing and proposed care homes within the area.

Without such assessment, the Local Planning Authority cannot determine whether sufficient healthcare capacity exists to support the development.

The proposal therefore conflicts with:

- Local Plan Policy ID1 (Infrastructure and Delivery); and
- NPPF paragraph 34, which requires development to be supported by appropriate infrastructure.

## 6. Thames Basin Heaths SPA, Flood Risk and Hydrology

The site lies within 400 m of Whitmoor Common, which forms part of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA).

Under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, the Local Planning Authority must undertake a Habitats Regulations Assessment where a proposal may give rise to a Likely Significant Effect on a European protected site.

The proposal comprises a 64-bed residential institution with permanent residents, 24-hour staffing and regular visitor activity. The development would materially increase human activity within the zone of influence of the SPA. In addition, the application form states the site is not within 20 m of a watercourse. However, the site is directly adjacent to a ditch hydrologically connected to ponds which drain towards Whitmoor Common. Under Section 72 of the Land Drainage Act 1991, a ditch through which water flows is a watercourse.

The submitted drainage strategy relies principally upon soakaways and does not demonstrate that groundwater levels and surface water flows feeding the SPA would remain unaffected. Surface-water flood mapping indicates existing localised flooding in the vicinity.

In the absence of robust hydrological evidence, the Local Planning Authority cannot conclude, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that the proposal would not adversely affect the integrity of the SPA.

The proposal therefore conflicts with:

- Guildford Local Plan Policy P5 (Thames Basin Heaths SPA)
- Local Plan Policy ID4 (Green and Blue Infrastructure)
- NPPF paragraphs 173 and 180–182 (Flood Risk)
- NPPF paragraphs 192-195 (Habitats and Biodiversity)

**Planning Application No:** [25/P/01724](#) - 63 Fairlands Road, Fairlands, Guildford, GU3 3HZ - Single storey rear extension.

It was **RESOLVED**: that the Parish Council request the following condition, should planning permission be granted:

In accordance with Policy H4 3 (b) of the Local Plan 2019, the converted garage and workshop must remain ancillary to the main dwelling.

**Planning Application No: [25/P/01657](#) - Verge on Aldershot Road (behind 45 St Michael's Ave, Fairlands) -**  
Installation of battery box.

It was **RESOLVED**: that the Parish Council request the imposition of a condition requiring the equipment cabinet to be finished in a dark green, non-reflective colour to reduce its visual prominence within the street scene and the risk of glare to passing motorists.

**Planning Application No: [25/P/01656](#) - Mariners Cottage, Goose Rye Road, Worplesdon, Guildford, GU3 3RJ**  
- Certificate of lawfulness for an existing use to establish whether the use of the annex as a self-contained unit ancillary to the main dwelling began more than 10 years before the date of this application. (For information only).

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

**Planning Application No: [25/T/00294](#) - Rydes Hill Preparatory, Aldershot Road, Guildford, GU2 8BP**  
G 1 1733 (Ash): Fell trees due to Ash dieback, T 1 1734 (Common Oak): remove dead wood, G 2 1735 (Ash, Sycamore, Horse Chestnut and Common Oak): Fell ash trees due to ash dieback and remove severe ivy on all remaining trees, T 2 1736 (Common Lime): Remove basal growth, T 4 1738 (Yew): Fell tree (dead), T 8 1742: (Silver Maple): Reduce crown height by 2m. Reduce crown spread by 3m, G 3 1743 (Norway Maple, Horse Chestnut, Hornbeam, Ash and Sycamore): Fell the 3 Ash within group & the 2 dead sycamore. Lift all trees over school entrance road to 5m, T 30 1867 (Common Oak): Remove dead wood, broken and damaged branches, fungal brackets and cavity visible on stem, G 6 1868 (Sycamore and Hawthorn): Prune tree, T 32 1870 (Sweet Gum): Install non-invasive cable brace as stem bifurcates at ground level, T 39 1877 (Sycamore)/ T 40 1878 (Horse Chestnut): De-ivy, G4 and G5 (Yew, Sycamore, Common Oak, Holly, Western Red Cedar and Portugal Laurel): Remove damaged and broken branches [TPO P1/201/254].

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

**Planning Application No: [26/P/00049](#) - 71 Stringers Avenue, Jacobs Well, Guildford, GU4 7NN -** Erection of single storey front and rear extensions.

It was **RESOLVED**: that the Parish Council raises no objection in principle but asks the Local Planning Authority to confirm that the proposed front extension would not project beyond the established building line to the detriment of the street scene, and to assess the impact of the development on the retention of adequate off-street parking provision in accordance with adopted parking standards and highway safety considerations.

**Planning Application No: [25/P/00637](#) - 78 Oak Hill, Wood Street Village, Guildford, GU3 3ES -** Erection of part single storey, part two storey rear extension with roof lights, new single storey front porch and changes to fenestration. Planning Inspectorate's Ref: 6004116.

It was **RESOLVED**: that the Parish Council's original objection remained. No further comments being necessary.

**Planning Application No: [26/W/00005](#) - 78 Oak Hill, Wood Street Village, Guildford, GU3 3ES**  
- Certificate of Lawfulness - The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) - Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A for the erection of a single-storey rear extension 6.0 metres, height of 4.0 metres and an eaves height of 3.0 metres. (For information only).

**Planning Application No: [26/P/00046](#) - 66 Envis Way, Fairlands, Guildford, GU3 3NJ -** Erection of a single storey side/rear extension and hip to gable extension including insertion of two front and one rear dormers along with changes to fenestration following demolition of existing chimney, conservatory and garage.

It was **RESOLVED**: that the Parish Council objects to this planning application on the following grounds:

#### **1. Overdevelopment and excessive bulk, height and massing**

The proposed two large dormers, when considered cumulatively with the recently constructed extension, would significantly increase the scale and massing of the dwelling. The development would transform the property from a

modest dwelling into a visually dominant structure within the street scene and would appear incongruous within the established pattern of development in St Michaels Avenue.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Guildford Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (2015-2034) Policy D1 (Place Shaping) and Policy D4 (Character and Design of New Development) which require development to respect the scale, height, massing and proportions of surrounding buildings and integrate with its surroundings.

## **2. Harm to the character of the area and cumulative roofscape impact**

St Michaels Avenue was originally characterised by modest dwellings with simple roof forms. The introduction of prominent full-width dormers would further erode the original roofscape character.

The Parish Council is concerned that permitting additional large dormer structures would exacerbate an emerging pattern of incremental alteration, resulting in a fragmented and discordant roofline. The acceptability of development must be considered cumulatively and not solely in isolation.

The proposal therefore conflicts with Local Plan Policy D4 (Achieving High Quality Design) and paragraph 135(c) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which requires development to be sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment.

## **3. Poor design**

The dormers would appear as dominant additions rather than subordinate roof features and would overwhelm the host dwelling. The proposal therefore fails to achieve high quality design.

This is contrary to Local Plan Policy D4 and paragraph 135(a) and (b) of the NPPF, which require development to be visually attractive and to create a strong sense of place.

## **4. Overlooking and loss of privacy**

The proposed upper-floor glazing and Juliette balcony would introduce direct overlooking of neighbouring properties and private rear gardens. Given the relatively close spacing and rear garden relationships between dwellings in St Michaels Avenue, the Parish Council considers the development would materially harm neighbouring residential amenity and reduce occupiers' reasonable expectation of privacy.

The proposal therefore conflicts with Guildford Local Plan D1(4) and Policy D4 and H4 which require development to protect the amenity of adjoining occupiers and avoid unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy.

## **5. Erosion of smaller housing stock**

The cumulative scale of extensions would materially alter the nature of the dwelling and contributes to the gradual loss of smaller dwellings within the parish, undermining housing mix.

This is inconsistent with Local Plan Policy H1 (Homes for All).

For the above reasons Worplesdon Parish Council respectfully requests that planning permission be refused.

**Planning Application No: [26/P/00075](#) - 61 St Michaels Avenue, Fairlands, Guildford, GU3 3LZ** - Addition of two Dormers, 1 x roof light and new material finish to the recently added extension.

It was **RESOLVED**: that the Parish Council object to this planning application on the following grounds:

### **1. Design, scale and massing**

The proposed dormer windows, by reason of their size, height and siting within the roof slope, would introduce excessive bulk at roof level. The development would appear visually dominant and would materially alter the

character of the host dwelling. The resulting form of development would be incongruous and out of keeping with the established pattern of development within St Michaels Avenue, where roof alterations are generally modest and subservient to the main dwelling.

The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Policy D1 (Place Shaping) and Policy D4 (Character and Design of New Development), which require development to respect local character, scale, massing and appearance, and to integrate sympathetically with its surroundings. It is also inconsistent with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Achieving well-designed places), which requires development to be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

## **2. Impact on street scene**

The scale and prominence of the dormers would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the roof space and would erode the prevailing residential character of the street, which is currently typified by modest roof forms.

As such, the proposal fails to reinforce local distinctiveness and is contrary to Local Plan Policies D1 and D4, and the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework which seek development that adds to the overall quality of the area and is sympathetic to its context.

## **3. Residential amenity**

The positioning and scale of the proposed dormer windows would result in overlooking and a perceived loss of privacy to neighbouring residential properties. The Parish Council considers this impact to be unacceptable.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Local Plan Policy D1, which requires development to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties, and to paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to ensure a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers.

## **4. Suggested mitigation (if approved)**

Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to approve the application, the Parish Council requests that a condition be imposed requiring obscure glazing to the bathroom and dressing room windows, with such glazing to be retained in perpetuity, in order to protect neighbouring residential amenity.

For the reasons set out above, the Parish Council considers the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to both neighbouring amenity and the character of the area and therefore recommends refusal.

## **2026-38 - National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) public consultation**

Discussion took place. The following points were raised:

- The Clerk raised the issue of developers receiving consent but failing to build out the approved dwellings and questioned whether developers should be fined in that circumstance. Cllr R Watson advised that it would be politically difficult to achieve.
- With the abolition of Guildford Borough Council on 31 March 2027, the West Surrey Unitary authority will become the Local Planning Authority. In the event that a Parish/Town Council for Guildford is established, they will become statutory consultees but will not be responsible for deciding planning applications.
- Having a definition on the strategic gap required to prevent the coalescence of adjacent towns would be advantageous.

Agreeing the Council's formal response was deferred to enable the Clerk and Cllr R Watson to read the extensive consultation papers. Further consideration to take place at the next Full Council meeting.

### **2026-39 - Draft Flyer budget/precept 2026/2027**

Cllr R Watson had kindly provided some amended wording.

Following discussion, it was proposed by Cllr R Watson, seconded by Cllr M Price and unanimously **RESOLVED** that the revised flyer be approved and placed on the home page of the Parish Council's website.

### **2026-40 - Wood Street Village Community Car Park**

The Clerk reported that a meeting had been held with representatives of Wood Street Infant School on 30 January 2026.

The school advised that, from September 2026, it intends to open a nursery provision. The nursery would be accommodated within the area currently used by Reception classes, thereby creating a self-contained facility. The nursery would operate during term time only, with operating hours of approximately 9.00am to 3.00pm.

To support the operation of the nursery, the school requested permission to use the existing fire-escape gate, which leads directly into the car park, as a separate pedestrian access. Photographs of the existing fire-escape gate and the current entrance gate were shown to the Members. The school explained that retaining the current arrangements could give rise to safeguarding concerns due to the mixing of nursery children and accompanying adults together with the main school arrivals and departures along with potential issues during playtimes and lunch breaks. The school confirmed that Surrey Fire and Rescue Service had been consulted and was satisfied that adequate fire escape provision would remain. Surrey County Council's Early Years Team and also been consulted and support the proposal.

Members noted that planning permission for the car park (Ref. 11/P/00989) granted consent for access between the car park and the school, and that a subsequent non-material amendment approved the existing main gate as a further consented access.

The Parish Council confirmed that it must retain the ability to undertake repairs and maintenance to the car park during school holiday periods.

Following discussion, it was proposed by Cllr N Mitchell, seconded by Cllr M Price and **RESOLVED** that the Parish Council had no objection in principle to the school's request, subject to:

- The school obtaining all necessary legal and statutory consents from Surrey County Council as landowner; and
- All costs associated with the proposal, and any associated works, being met in full by the school, including legal fees, surveys, groundworks, installation, and the ongoing maintenance of the new tarmac path and access.

### **2026-41 - Nominations for the Mayor's Award for Service to the Community**

A number of suggestions were proposed. All nominations to be submitted by the Clerk and Assistant Clerk by the deadline being 5pm on Monday 9 February 2026.

### **2026-42 - 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 B Nagle, seconded by Cllr R Watson and unanimously **RESOLVED** that payments to the value of £19,509.30 be approved. The payment list was duly signed by the Chairman of the Council, Cllr N Mitchell, during the meeting

**Table 1 – Payment list 5 February 2026**

Code	Date	Description	Supplier	Net	VAT	Total
IT budget	15/01/2026	Additional back-up	Apple.com	2.49	0.50	2.99
Land Management	15/01/2026	Moss remover 5L x 3	Pitchcare.com	77.80	15.56	93.36
IT budget	16/01/2026	OnePhone - phone charges - including mobile data	BT PLC	225.56	45.11	270.67
IT budget	19/01/2026	Subscription - 17.01.26 - 16.01.26	Adobe	16.64	3.33	19.97
IT budget	19/01/2026	ChatGPT Plus Subscription	OpenAI LLC	16.67	3.33	20.00
Parish Office	20/01/2026	Water and sewerage charge - Unit 2 Saxton - 01.12.25 - 31.12.25	Castle Water	21.77	0.00	21.77
Establishment Charges	21/01/2026	Index Book for Office	Mrs G F White - Send It By Ltd (Amazon)	3.72	0.74	4.46
Staff Costs	21/01/2026	Salaries/ PAYE/ NI/Pension Conts Ee's & Er's	Staff Costs	14,676.40	0.00	14,676.40
Staff mileage	21/01/2026	Mileage	Mrs G F White	27.95	0.00	27.95
Staff mileage	21/01/2026	Mileage	Mrs V C Fear	12.35	0.00	12.35
Establishment Charges	21/01/2026	Permanent Marker Pens	DLM Direct Ltd (Amazon)	3.12	0.62	3.74
Establishment Charges	21/01/2026	Printer paper	Marquee Media Ltd T/A Speedy Marquee (Amazon)	47.57	9.51	57.08
Land Management	22/01/2026	Road Stone MOT Type 1	Selco Builders Warehouse	48.72	9.74	58.46
Establishment Charges	23/01/2026	Civil Money Claims	Gov.uk	70.00	0.00	70.00
IT budget	23/01/2026	Standard Fibre 76 Pro & Digital Line	BT PLC	55.95	11.19	67.14
Revenue Costs Works Vehicle	24/01/2026	Fuel for works van	Waitrose Shell	37.52	7.50	45.02
Establishment Charges	27/01/2026	Search for land and property information	Gov.uk	14.00	0.00	14.00
IT budget	27/01/2026	Office 365 charges	BT PLC	345.33	69.07	414.40
Bank Interest/Charges	28/01/2026	Bank Charge - December 2025	Metrobank	3.00	0.00	3.00
Land Management	28/01/2026	Road Stone MOT Type 1	Selco Builders Warehouse	39.24	7.85	47.09
Land Management	29/01/2026	Hire of storage container MW - January 2026	Activate Learning	87.00	0.00	87.00
Land Management	29/01/2026	Moving bench on Perry Hill Green	Stephen Gunner	300.00	0.00	300.00
Establishment Charges	29/01/2026	PPE for Groundsman	Cluskeys CCP Ltd	34.00	6.80	40.80
Training	29/01/2026	Councillors Training - Planning - 20 January 2026	Steve Tilbury Consulting Ltd	450.00	0.00	450.00
Playground Repairs	29/01/2026	Cleaning products for Play Areas	Cluskeys CCP Ltd	18.35	3.67	22.02
Ward Improvements	29/01/2026	In Ground Unit for electrical supply - Jacobs Well Village Hall	Fabweld Steel Products Ltd	2,000.00	400.00	2,400.00
Bank Interest/Charges	31/01/2026	Bank charges - December 2025	Unity Trust Bank	6.00	0.00	6.00
Land Management	02/02/2026	Replacement slats for bench in Wood Street	A W Champion Ltd	27.40	5.48	32.88
Land Management	02/02/2026	Materials	Screwfix Direct Ltd	8.39	1.68	10.07
Revenue Costs Works Vehicle	02/02/2026	Service plan - 25th instalment of 45	PlanMyService LLP	27.08	5.42	32.50
Revenue Costs Works Vehicle	02/02/2026	MOT Service plan - 25th instalment of 45	PlanMyService LLP	3.78	0.00	3.78
Chairman's Allowance	04/02/2026	Civic gift	NR & PM Mitchell	9.60	0.00	9.60
Establishment Charges	04/02/2026	Parking - Local Plan Workshop 29 January 2026	NR & PM Mitchell (Guildford Borough Council)	4.80	0.00	4.80
IT budget	04/02/2026	Parish Online - 04.02.26 - 04.02.27	GeoXphere Ltd	150.00	30.00	180.00
<b>Total</b>				<b>18,872.20</b>	<b>637.10</b>	<b>19,509.30</b>

**b) Cloudy IT quotations**

The Assistant Clerk advised that the quotes generated on 18 December 2025 were not for urgent items and advised that these be put on hold until next year's budget is implemented and further legislative guidance has been provided. (Items associated with hybrid meetings).

The quotation for the provision of Apple iPads for Members to be considered at the Full Council meeting to be held 26 February 2026.

Meeting closed 21:28.

Signed:

Chairman of the Council  
26 February 2026