

WEST HORSLEY PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 2 July at 7.30pm in the Rubin Room, West Horsley Village Hall

Present Cllr Murray, Cllr King, Cllr Rogers, Cllr Mattock, Cllr Walker

26.PE.085 **Apologies for Absence:** None

26.PE.086 **Declarations of Interest:**

Cllr Rogers for 26.PE.089 d: 26/P/00115 Manorwood Padel Courts; Cllr King for 26.089 e: 26/P/00590 2 Wix Cottages: Cllrs King and Walker for 26.PE.089 a: 26/P/00694 Jury Farm. For each of these Agenda items, the Councillor(s) was excluded from the discussion and decision.

26.PE.087 **Minutes of the last Planning Committee Meeting** held 4 June 2026 were approved and signed.
Public Forum: None

26.PE.088 **Significant Correspondence** (not covered by other Agenda items):

- **Housing Needs Survey** sent to all households in the village. Closing date is Monday 13 July. All residents are encouraged to complete the survey as this will inform the review of the Neighbourhood Plan and future planning applications.
- **Regulatory Licence Application:** Hammonds Glamping at Lower Hammonds Farm, Ripley Lane, West Horsley KT24 6JP have submitted a licence application to offer the sale of alcohol to guests from a drinks trailer. This will be considered at the Full Council Meeting on 21 July.

26.PE.089 **Consideration of applications received since the planning committee meeting** held on 4 June:

- a) **Change of Use (retrospective): 26/P/00694: Jury Farm, Ripley Lane**
WHPC Response: No objection
- b) **Planning Application: 26/P/00698: Oak Cottage, 189 The Street**
WHPC Response: No objection
- c) **Listed Building Consent: 26/P/00724: The Lodge, West Horsley Place**
WHPC Response: No objection
- d) **Amended Planning Application: 26/P/00115: Manorwood Padel Courts**
WHPC Response: Objection
- e) **Application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 190: 26/P/00590: 2 Wix Cottages, Shere Road**
WHPC Response: No objection
- f) **Non Material Amendment: 26/N/00053: Ashley Cottage, Silkmore Lane**
WHPC Response: No objection

Signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record: _____

Date: _____

- g) **Planning Application: 26/P/00578: Land on the east side of, Alms Heath, Ockham**
WHPC Response: Objection
- h) **Non-material Amendment: 26/N/00054: Sheepleas House, Epsom Road**
WHPC Response: No objection
- i) **Non-material Amendment: 26/N/00043: Horsley Down, 117 East Lane**
WHPC Response: No objection

26.PE.090 **Consideration of Other Applications** between 30 May and 28 June (Appendix 1).

26.PE.091 **Consideration of decisions reported by Guildford Borough Council** between 30 May and 28 June (Appendix 2).

26.PE.092 **Consideration of Appeals Open and Closed** as of 26 June 2026 (Appendix 2)
25/P/01546: Land south of Green Lane
It was agreed that no further response was required.
25/P/01459: Land on the east side of, Alms Heath, Ockham
It was agreed that no further response was required.

26.PE.093 **Local Plan Update:**

- a) **Site A37:** Land to the West of West Horsley: Village noticeboard is being relocated to the front side of the building where there will be great visibility.
- b) **Site A39:** Land to the North of West Horsley:
The amended planning application 22/P/01538 was considered by GBC Planning Committee on 18 June. The Parish Council spoke in objection. The planning application was approved.
- c) **Site A38:** Land near Horsley Railway Station, Ockham Road North, East Horsley: Nothing to report.

26.PE.094 **Special Projects:**

Site A35 Land of Former Wisley Airfield: Taylor Wimpey have commenced sales marketing for the site.
Site A25 Gosden Hill Farm: Nothing to report.

26.PE.095 **To agree any requirement for external advice in relation to applications considered:** None

26.PE.096 **Terms of Reference for the Planning Committee:**

It was agreed that no changes were required to the existing Terms of Reference and will be put forward to the Full Council for approval at the next meeting on 21 July.

26.PE.095 **Date of the Next Meeting Agreed:** Thursday 30 July at 7.30pm in the Rubin Room, West Horsley Village Hall. **Meeting Closed:** 8.10pm

Appendices and objection responses are available on the WHPC website: www.westhorsley-pc.gov.uk
Electronic or hard copies of the appendices and objections can be requested from the Deputy Clerk at:
deputyclerk@westhorsley-pc.gov.uk

Signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record: _____
Date: _____

Objections and/or Comments submitted by the Parish Council in response to the following applications. Please note that there may be a delay in these responses being uploaded to the GBC Planning Portal.

26.PE.089 d) Amended Planning Application: 26/P/00115: Manorwood Padel Courts

WHPC Response: Objection

West Horsley Parish Council (WHPC) reiterates its objection to the original application dated 25th February 2026. Although the applicant has attempted to overcome the objections, with reference to noise impact, it is not considered that this has been achieved. Our detailed grounds are set out below.

1. The mitigation relied upon is not the scheme being applied for

The suggested acoustic barrier is only 10cm above the height of the courts and has no roof. Yet the revised Noise Impact Assessment prepared by Sustainable Acoustics (report ref. 25-0078-0 R01.3), on which the applicant relies to demonstrate acceptable noise levels, models a materially different scheme.

Figures 9 to 12 inclusive – which generate the "Low adverse effect" results in Tables 9 and 10 – are each expressly captioned "with canopy structure":

Figure 9: "Padel ambient noise propagation map LAeq at 1.5 m with canopy structure"

Figure 10: "Padel ambient noise propagation map LAeq at 4.5 m with canopy structure"

Figure 11: "Padel max event noise propagation map LAmix at 1.5 m height with canopy structure"

Figure 12: "Padel max event noise propagation map LAmix at 4.5 m with canopy structure"

The revised application indicates there is to be no roof. An open-topped acoustic barrier of 4.1m is not a canopy, and it does not perform as one: sound will diffract freely over the top of an open barrier, particularly affecting first-floor windows (the assessment's own 4.5m receptor height).

The favourable predictions the applicant relies upon are therefore derived from a roofed enclosure that forms no part of this application. There is no explanation for this discrepancy, and the assessment cannot safely be relied upon to demonstrate the acceptability of the scheme proposed.

We note further that the applicant's own report describes the canopy as having "high acoustic transparency" - meaning that even the modelled canopy offers little acoustic benefit and is essentially for weatherproofing.

2. The Council's Environmental Health Officer remains unable to support the application, and the objectors' independent acoustic consultant agrees the assessment is unreliable

The Environmental Health Officer, having reviewed the revised assessment, concludes in terms: "As before, I am still unable to support this application." Her concerns – which WHPC endorses and which should be overcome before any approval – include:

The noise modelling was altered between versions to enable "reflections from all hard surfaces," which would normally increase predicted noise, yet the reported levels fell. As the Officer states, "It is not sufficient or acceptable to alter modelling input values without explanation to achieve a better result."

Signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record: _____
Date: _____

The revised report switched to a less effective acoustic panel specification (Kingspan KS1000RW LEC at Rw 25dB, in place of the previous KS1000LS at Rw 27dB) while still reporting lower noise.

Critically, "the assessment only includes noise from 1 Padel court and there are 2 courts at Manorwood, so noise levels will be far greater."

The source data derives from a single demonstration game at another venue, where players were "highly likely... less vocal than regularly occurs in Padel games."

Clarke Saunders Associates (ref. 13697.260626.L3, 29 June 2026), reaches the same conclusion: the revised assessment "does not materially address the key uncertainties identified previously" and "does not provide a sufficiently robust basis for concluding that adverse effects on nearby residential receptors would be reliably avoided in practice." They note that, because the courts already incorporate solid end elevations of approximately 4m, the proposed barrier would predominantly affect only the open sides and would provide "a more limited and directionally dependent benefit" than the modelling suggests, with the assumed attenuation appearing "optimistic."

It is also relevant that, on the applicant's own unmitigated figures (Tables 7 and 8 of the assessment), several receptors already reach an "observed adverse effect" – up to 51 dB LAeq and 60 dB LAFmax – before any mitigation, and no character correction has been applied for the impulsive nature of padel noise. The case for approval therefore rests entirely on mitigation that is both unproven for the proposed open barrier and modelled on a canopy that will not be built.

3. The proposed hours of use are excessive and incompatible with the scheme

Although it is stated that there will be no roof or lighting, the times of use are still shown as 6.30am to 10pm. These times are not compatible with winter use with no lighting and are excessive for summer use, with players' vehicles driving through the Manorwood estate at unsuitable hours – a distinct amenity harm from the court noise itself, including car movements, doors and headlights at unsocial hours.

Both the Environmental Health Officer and Clarke Saunders specifically note that the assessment fails to consider the impact of extended hours use; the Officer warns that such use "could result in a serious loss of amenity for nearby residents."

Should the application be approved, the hours of use should be restricted to 9.30am to 6pm in summer and 9.30am to dusk in winter. The start time of 9.30am is to avoid clashes with parents bringing their children to the nursery and to prevent disturbance to residents of Manorwood.

Conclusion

Residents have the right to the quiet enjoyment of their property under Part III of the Environmental Protection Act 1990; the present application does not protect this right. The noise evidence relied upon assesses a canopy that will not be built, models one court when two exist, and has been found insufficiently robust both by the Council's own Environmental Health Officer and by the objectors' independent acoustic consultant.

West Horsley Parish Council would urge Guildford Borough Council to refuse this application. If, contrary to that view, the Council were minded approving, WHPC requests that any permission be subject to restricted hours as set out above, full construction of the barrier to the specified standard prior to first use, post-completion noise verification at the nearest sensitive receptors, and a Noise Management Plan incorporating a complaints procedure.

Signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record: _____

Date: _____

26.PE.089 g) Planning Application: 26/P/00578: Land on the east side of, Alms Heath, Ockham

WHPC Response: Objection:

West Horsley Parish Council has considered this application and strongly objects to the proposal based on the following:

The site is currently subject to an active Enforcement Notice, Stop Notice and Temporary Injunction requiring cessation of unauthorised development. A related retrospective application (25/P/01459) has already been refused and is now under appeal. There is no lawful planning approval for this site and so submission of this proposal for access is inappropriate.

1. Green Belt Harm (Guildford Local Plan Policy P2)

Guildford Borough Council has already determined that development at this site is inappropriate within the Green Belt, causing harm to its openness. The same policy conflict applies to this proposal.

2. Harm to Heritage Assets and Conservation Area (Guildford Local Plan Policies D3, D19, D20)

The site lies within Ockham Conservation Area and close to several Grade II listed buildings. The proposed access and associated fencing fail to preserve or enhance the historic character and would harm the setting of these assets.

3. Loss of Protected Trees (Guildford Local Plan Policies P6, D1)

All boundary trees along Alms Heath are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The proposal requires removal of two mature oak trees, contrary to policy and causing unacceptable harm to the street scene, local amenity and biodiversity.

In addition, there are concerns that no surveys or steps have been taken to ensure that bats and/or other protected species will not be adversely affected.

4. Highways Safety Concerns

The proposed access introduces new turning movements on a narrow rural lane, contrary to NPPF paras 115–116 and Guildford Local Plan Policy ID3 (Sustainable Transport). It also conflicts with Neighbourhood Plan Policy SL6, which seeks to protect rural lanes from engineering works that reduce safety for walkers, cyclists and equestrians.

In addition to safety concerns, the proposed access would also adversely affect neighbouring properties through increased noise, light pollution and loss of privacy.

5. Impact on Watercourse and Flood Risk (Policy P10)

Removal of mature trees will alter levels along the adjacent ditch. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate consideration of riparian responsibilities or the area's high-water table.

Conclusion

The proposal conflicts with multiple Guildford Borough Council Local Plan policies, the Lovelace Neighbourhood Plan, and statutory protections relating to Conservation Areas and TPOs and would cause significant and irreversible harm to the Green Belt, heritage assets, biodiversity, residential amenity and local character. As such, West Horsley Parish Council consider this application should be refused.

Signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record: _____

Date: _____