

WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE  
17<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2008

SUBMITTED TO THE COUNCIL MEETING – 21<sup>ST</sup> OCTOBER 2008

(To be read in conjunction with the Agenda for the Meeting)

Cllr Mrs J I Arrick	Cllr Ms D M-R Le Gal
Cllr C R Baily	* Cllr Dr N Lee
* Cllr M H W Band	Cllr A Lovell
* Cllr M W Byham	* Cllr P J Martin
* Cllr Mrs E Cable	* Cllr T E Martin
* Cllr Mrs C Cockburn	* Cllr B J Morgan
* Cllr S P Connolly	* Cllr S N Mulliner
Cllr J H B Edwards	* Cllr S J O'Grady
* Cllr B A Ellis	Cllr S L Pritchard
* Cllr Mrs P Ellis	* Cllr K T Reed
Cllr Mrs L J Fleming	Cllr S Renshaw
Cllr R D Frost	* Cllr S N Reynolds
Cllr Mrs P M Frost	Cllr I E Sampson
* Cllr R J Gates	* Cllr Mrs C E Savage
* Cllr M R Goodridge	* Cllr J M Savage
Cllr Mrs J P Hargreaves	Cllr R J Steel
Cllr N P Holder	* Cllr A E B Taylor-Smith
* Cllr J P Hubble	* Cllr Ms J R Thomson
* Cllr S R E Inchbald	Cllr A P Thorp
* Cllr D C Inman	* Cllr J A Ward
* Cllr P B Isherwood	* Cllr Mrs N Warner-O'Neill
* Cllr Mrs D M James	* Cllr R A Welland
* Cllr Mrs C A King	* Cllr Mrs L Wheatley
Cllr R A Knowles	* Cllr A Wilson

\*Present

19. MINUTES (Agenda Item 1)

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2008 were confirmed and signed.

20. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 2)

Apologies were received from Councillors Mrs Arrick, Mrs Fleming, Mrs Frost, Mr Frost, Mrs Hargreaves, Mr Holder, Mr Knowles, Ms Le Gal, and Mr Lovell.

21. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Agenda item 3)

The following declarations of personal interests were made in respect of application WA/2008/0788 relating to Land at Dunsfold Park:

Cllr Ellis declared a personal interest as he is acquainted with the Chief Executive of the Rutland Group.

Councillor Mr Inman declared a Personal Interest as his property was adjacent to land owned by the Chief Executive of the Rutland Group, but not the application site.

Cllr Mrs Savage declared a Personal Interest as she is a member of the Cranleigh Initiative, of which the Chief Executive is also a member.

Cllr Savage declared a Personal Interest as his wife is a member of the Cranleigh Initiative, of which the Chief Executive is also a member.

Cllr Reed declared a Personal Interest as he is a member of the Cranleigh Initiative, of which the Chief Executive is also a member.

### **PART I – RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNCIL**

There were no matters raised under this heading.

### **PARTS II AND III- MATTERS OF REPORT**

#### **Background Papers**

The background papers relating to the following items in Parts II and III are as specified in the Agenda for the meeting of the Joint Planning Committee.

#### **PART II – Matters reported in detail for the information of the Council**

There were no matters raised under this heading.

#### **PART III – Brief summaries of other matters dealt with**

22. APPLICATION WA/2008/0788 RELATING TO LAND AT DUNSFOLD PARK, STOVOLDS HILL, CRANLEIGH GU8 4BS (Agenda Item 5)

Part OUTLINE application for a new settlement of 2,601 new dwellings comprising 2,405 independent dwellings, 150 sheltered housing/warden accommodation and 46 student accommodation; Erection of buildings to provide the following (the maximum amount of floor space is given in brackets): A1 Shops (1,035m<sup>2</sup>); A3 Restaurants/Cafes (230 m<sup>2</sup>); A4 Public House (115m<sup>2</sup>); A5 Take Away (115m<sup>2</sup>); B1a and B1b Business use including Offices and Research and Development (9,440 m<sup>2</sup>); B1c and B2 Light and General Industrial use (6,099 m<sup>2</sup>); B8 Storage and Distribution (7,624m<sup>2</sup>); C1 Hotel (7,015m<sup>2</sup>); D1 Non-Residential Institutions including health centre, two schools, place of worship, museum and community centre (9,906m<sup>2</sup>); D2 Assembly and Leisure use including sports centre (2,185 m<sup>2</sup>); Monument; combined heat and power plant; together with associated works following demolition of 8, 029m<sup>2</sup> of existing buildings and removal of runways.

Part FULL application for the Change of Use of 36,692m<sup>2</sup> of existing buildings as specified, retention of aviation use solely for helicopter flights including air ambulance service, use of land for outdoor sports and recreational facilities. (abbreviated description)



- 22.5 The Committee noted the direction from GOSE that the Council could not grant planning permission for the application without authorisation from the Secretary of State.
- 22.6 During the Committee's deliberations consideration was given to a wide range of issues. Members' principal concerns related to the transport plans; nomination rights for the affordable housing; the implications in relation to Waverley's regional housing allocation; and, upholding Local Plan Policy C2.
- 22.7 Members were concerned at the impact of the proposed development on traffic volumes on the A281 and surrounding network of B- and C-roads. They felt the estimated increase in traffic volume was unrealistic, as it failed to take into account the impact of other major developments and in particular Broadbridge Heath, and was based on optimistic assumptions about the behaviour of residents that could not be relied upon in the absence of an infrastructure for alternative modes of travel (e.g. a train line, or A3-standard road).
- 22.8 Members were sceptical of the practicality, and acceptability, of the road charging proposals for residents taking their cars off the site. Whilst it was noted that the technology was available for such a scheme, there was concern it might encourage some residents to try and park off-site, and would penalise those who could not afford to pay the tariff to leave. There needed to be more attractive public transport alternatives available as a 'carrot' to counter-balance the imposition of this 'stick', which was untested in a rural setting. It was noted that a road-charging regime was not being considered for the Bordon eco-town as a measure to limit increases in traffic volumes.
- 22.9 Members noted the proposed cascade of eligibility criteria for the affordable housing and the restrictions this placed on Waverley's nomination rights. There was concern that people moving into Waverley to take up employment at Dunsfold Park would have higher priority than those already on Waverley's Housing Needs Register with more urgent requirement. It was also unclear what the impact would be in a situation where a property was let to someone under the criteria of being employed on Dunsfold, who then changed job to work elsewhere in Waverley. Would they have to give up their home?
- 22.10 Members noted the applicant's argument regarding the contribution Dunsfold Park would make to Waverley's regional housing allocation under the South East Plan. However, Members also noted that the housing allocation represented a minimum target, and achieving half of this by granting the Dunsfold Park application would not make it easier to refuse other planning applications in the future.
- 22.11 Notwithstanding the criticisms relating to transport plans and affordable housing, a number of Members commended the applicants for their innovative, visionary and exciting plans. Taken in isolation these had many attractive features, not least being the proposals for on-site waste management and energy generation. However, it was felt that, on balance, the positive aspects of the proposal were outweighed by the transport issues, and the unsatisfactory arrangements for Waverley with regard to the affordable housing.
- 22.12 Members were also concerned to uphold Waverley's Development Plan principles, particularly Policy C2 relating to the protection of countryside beyond the Green Belt. This policy had been applied rigorously by Waverley's planning committees

and it was felt that taking into account all material planning considerations, there was insufficient justification in this case to make an exception.

23. The Committee RESOLVED to agree the recommendation to REFUSE the planning permissions sought under application WA/2008/0788, for the following reasons:
1. The proposal conflicts with national, regional and local planning policy advice regarding the countryside beyond the Green Belt set out in Planning Policy Statement 7, Policy CC8a of the South East Plan (policy SP3 in the Secretary of State's proposed changes), Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policy C2 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002. Within these areas the countryside is to be protected for its own sake and development in open countryside outside existing settlements is to be strictly controlled and urban areas are to be the focus of development. The proposed development does not comply and conflicts with the requirements of those policies and there no exceptional reasons have been advanced to justify an exception to these policies.
  2. The site lies partly within and adjacent to an Area of Great Landscape Value within which the landscape character is to be conserved and enhanced. In the opinion of the Planning Authority the proposal would result in a visually intrusive development of a scale that fails to conserve and enhance the landscape and would materially detract from its character and the visual quality of the area. The proposal is considered to conflict with the strategic and local policies set out in Policy SE8 of the Surrey Structure 2004 and Policy C3 (b) of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.
  3. The proposed development represents a major quantum of development in the countryside unconnected with an existing urban area which, if permitted, would be seriously detrimental to the visual amenity and rural character of the locality contrary to Policies LO1, LO2, LO4, LO5 and SE8 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policies D1, D4, C1, C2, RD1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.
  4. In the opinion of the Planning Authority the scale and nature of the proposed development are such that the implications are of great significance and potential effect for the Borough and a wider area. Furthermore the Regional Spatial Strategy makes no provision for a new settlement in this locality. The consideration of the planning application in isolation from the Core Strategy for the Borough would not be in the interests of sound planning and could, if permitted, have materially harmful consequences for development in other more sustainable locations.
  5. Policy LO6 of the Surrey Structure Plan sets out details of the increase to be made in the housing stock within the Borough between 2001 and 2016. Policy H1 of the Draft South East Plan and the Secretary of State's proposed changes propose a house building target of 250 units per annum to 2026. The Planning Authority is satisfied that, having regard to Planning Policy Statement 3, sufficient land exists or can be allocated to meet the Borough housing requirement without having to resort to a new settlement unconnected with an existing urban centre that conflicts with the policies contained in the Draft South East Plan and the adopted Structure and Local Plans.

6. The proposal would result in undesirable expansion of commercial development in this predominantly rural area to the detriment of the character and amenities of the locality both visually and by reason of the additional activities including traffic movements likely to be generated on the site in conflict with the Policies LO4 and SE4 of Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Policies D1, D2, D4 and IC1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.
  7. The proposed development of 2,601 homes, extension of the existing employment uses and creation of other uses in this very rural location would be heavily reliant on travel by the private car contrary to Central Government Policy expressed in PPS1, PPS3 and PPG13, the Draft South East Plan policies CC1, CC2, CC3, CC8a, CC12, RE2, H3 & T1; Development Plan Policy LO1 of Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policy M1 of Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.
  8. It has not been adequately demonstrated that the limited proposed improvements to transport infrastructure in the vicinity of the development are appropriate to serve a development of this scale and nature, nor that further improvements could be implemented that would mitigate the adverse impacts of a substantial increase in travel demand in this very rural location. This would be contrary to Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policy M1 of Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.
  9. In the opinion of the Planning Authority the proposed new settlement is likely to involve a material increase in traffic movements on and along the surrounding road network which would materially detract from the rural character and amenity of the area by reason of noise, disturbance, inconvenience and visual impact contrary to Policies LO1, LO4, LO7, SE1, SE8, SE10 and DN2 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and Policies D1, C2, C12, IC4, M1, M2 and M13 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.
  10. In the opinion of the Planning Authority the proposal for affordable housing unacceptably focuses on providing homes for employees of Dunsfold Park businesses and the expanded employment floorspace at the expense of local people in housing need. This conflicts with Government policy in PPS3 to provide housing for people who are unable to access or afford market housing. It would thus fail to meet the needs of those in greatest housing need contrary to Policy H4 of the South East Plan (Policy H3 of the Secretary of State's proposed changes), Policy DN11 of the Surrey Structure Plan and the Council's approach to affordable housing in the adopted Borough Local Plan, Corporate Priorities and its Allocations Policy.
24. There being no matters needing to be dealt with in exempt session, the Chairman declared the meeting closed at 9.38pm.

Chairman