

WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE

3RD SEPTEMBER 2008

SUBMITTED TO THE COUNCIL MEETING – 21ST 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

15. MINUTES (Agenda Item 1)

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 28th May 2008 were confirmed and signed.

16. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 2)

Apologies were received from Councillors Mrs Arrick, Baily, Mrs Fleming, Mrs Frost, Mrs Hargreaves, Hubble, Ms Le Gal, P Martin, Morgan, Mulliner, O'Grady, Pritchard, Reynolds, Sampson, Ms Thomson, Thorp, Mrs Warner-O'Neill, Welland and Mrs Wheatley.

17. 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:

Councillor Ellis declared a Personal Interest as they were acquainted with the Chief Executive of the Rutland Group.

Councillor Mr Inman declared a Personal Interest as he lived next door to the Chief Executive of the Rutland Group

Councillors Mr and Mrs Savage declared Personal Interests as Mrs Savage was a Member of the Cranleigh Initiative of which the Chief Executive also attended.

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

18. **TECHNICAL BRIEFING RE APPLICATION RELATING TO LAND AT DUNSFOLD PARK, STOVOLDS HILL, CRANLEIGH GU8 4BS** (Agenda Item 5)

A briefing report, relating to land at Dunsfold Park, Cranleigh had been circulated with the agenda as Appendix A. Site visits for Members had been arranged and had taken place before the Technical Briefing.

Members were reminded that the purpose of the meeting was to provide an opportunity to hear from the applicant, and statutory consultees, with a view to clarifying any matters relating to the planning application about which they were unclear or on which they required further information. There was also an extended programme of public speaking by interested parties.

In accordance with the guidance for public participation at meetings, the following representations were made in respect of the applications and were duly considered:

Applicants: Gerry Forristal
Ian McDonald
Andrew Beharrell

Statutory consultees: Mike Green, SCC, Highways
John Swanton, WBC, Housing

Town and Parish Councils: Peter Woodham, Bramley
Nick Pigeon, Alford
Alan Ground, Dunsfold
Charles Orange, Hascombe

Cllr. Nick Holder, Witley
John Anderson Hambledon
Mary Foryszewski, Cranleigh

Other interested parties: Peter Stephenson, Stop Dunsfold Park New Town
Gareth Wilson, Scott Wilson
Philip Russell, Stop Dunsfold Park New Town

Members were invited to ask questions of the planning officers, applicant, and statutory consultees, and a summary of questions and responses is attached as Annexe 1.

Members noted that the date of the decision-making meeting would be 17th September, starting at 7pm.

The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and concluded at 9.40pm.

Chairman

ANNEXE 1

DUNSFOLD PARK NEW SETTLEMENT

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RAISED AT THE TECHNICAL BRIEFING 3 SEPTEMBER 2008

ANSWERS PROVIDED BY DPL – DUNSFOLD PARK LIMITED, SCC – SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL, WBC – WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Have the implications of the increase in commercial development been assessed and how is that being phased?

All commercial traffic from the existing and new commercial development is included in the traffic assessment and it will be phased over a number of years (DPL)

Whose responsibility is it to consult the Highways Agency?

It is the Planning Authority's responsibility and there are statutory requirements that must be met to consult on Motorways and Trunk Roads. These requirements don't apply in this case and had the Highways Agency been consulted they would almost certainly have returned the consultation and advised that Surrey County Council are the Highways Authority (WBC)

Why is it necessary to depart from the usual convention of an RSL owning the affordable housing?

PPS3 asks developers to consider alternative mechanisms to deliver affordable housing through RSLs. An RSL will manage the affordable homes and will be tied in by any legal agreement. The nomination procedure is set out in the Housing Strategy and will relate to priority for Dunsfold Park workers and the local people (DPL).

One of the issues outstanding is that WBC want to know more about the proposed Trust that will own the affordable homes. The Council will need reassurance about the arrangements for ensuring availability in perpetuity. In other places Independent Trusts have been set up. The Council are awaiting detailed arrangements. (WBC)

The arrangements for the Trust will follow Housing Corporation standards. The tenant will have the right to purchase in line with RSL provisions but the Trust will look to reinvest in the stock (DPL).

How many journeys off the site have been modelled for school runs and have these been modelled?

The Traffic Assessment models two scenarios, first all journeys from the development without any of the mitigation measures and second with the mitigation measures. Both

models include school run journeys (DPL).

Where will the students living in the proposed accommodation be studying?

This is a relatively small number of units for vocational and tertiary students on placements at Dunsfold Park or studying at nearby colleges e.g. Guildford College of Law (DPL).

Did SCC object to the Broadbridge Heath development and the implications for the A281? Is it objecting to Whitehill / Bordon Ecotown?

No objection has been made. Important to understand that it is assumed that 30% of the residents of that development will use the A281 – this is not a 30% increase in traffic movements as was suggested. By the time traffic reaches Dunsfold and then Bramley its effects on the A281 will have dissipated (SCC).

In terms of Whitehill / Bordon Ecotown, SCC are involved in discussions about the highway implication for the A287 / A31 and Wrecclesham bypass (SCC).

How does the proposal compare with the Government's Ecotown initiative?

Ecotowns have a minimum size of 5,000 homes which Government equates to needing a secondary school. DPL concluded that increasing the size of the proposal to 5,000 homes would be unsustainable and undermine Cranleigh Glebelands school that was already under capacity (DPL).

Are there any arrangements for local representation? Will there be a representative body for residents?

DPL has no ideas for seeking Parish Council status. The Community Trust will manage the whole of the site and its members will be drawn from business and residents and will be elected by residents (DPL).

What is the modal split between car and non-car use in the development compared to that generally prevailing in the area?

There will be a significant difference as currently there is very little public transport in the area and little alternative to the private car (DPL). The numbers are provided at Annexe 2.

Is the developer introducing a requirement to live and work on the site for both market price and affordable homes?

Both forms of housing would be offered first to existing or new Dunsfold Park workers and then to local people. This is the foundation stone of our self containment proposal. No "Orwellian" control would be operated and people would be free to sell their homes to whoever they choose (DPL).

There are significant numbers of people on the site as residents and employees, how are they going to be compelled to abide by the Travel Plan and pay charges?

This is a commercial development but it offers an attractive way of life that people will want to buy into. There is a growing interest in the need to live sustainably and DPL hope people will want to do so here. They are not going to compel compliance or drive people

out if they cease working at Dunsfold Park (DPL).

What assumptions have been made about car ownership?

Car parking provision will be 1 space for homes up to 3 bedrooms and 2 spaces for 4 bedrooms plus. There will be a car club for those people who do not want their own car (DPL).

What charges will apply to visitors and how have they been taken into account?

The Cordon charge will only apply to residents. Visitors and deliveries will not be charged. The technology will be based on a chip being fitted to residents cars and being 'read' when leaving / entering the site (DPL).

Is the Combined Heat and Power (CHP) plant being installed at the start of the proposed development, how does the timber get to the site and how many lorry movements will there be per day?

Yes the CHP plant is in phase 1. It is of a size to provide for the peak needs of the settlement and surplus energy will be sold to the national grid.

The biomass material for the CHP would be drawn from a 10/20 mile radius and would require 4 lorry movements a day (DPL).

It was understood that Dunsfold Park has said that biomass would be produced at Holdhurst Farm. How would that be secured as part of this application or does it need a separate application?

There may have been some confusion on this point but it isn't proposed to use Holdhurst Farm to grow biomass crops. It is intended to develop it as a Community Supported Agriculture Scheme (WBC).

It is calculated that 60,000 tonnes of biomass material in the form of forest waste products will be needed a year for the CHP plant. The Forestry Commission is working on an implementation plan that will produce 500,000 tonnes of biomass a year in the south east region. Thus Dunsfold Park's need will be well within that capacity. Holdhurst Farm is not part of the application and the CHP plant will not be dependant on biomass crops produced by the farm (DPL).

What does 60,000 tonnes look like?

Difficult to provide an illustration but the material is the waste from forestry operations including brushings, branches, treetops etc all the waste material not normally used (DPL).

How can 330 people be employed in the village centre? The figures seem too high.

The figure is for the village centre as a whole and includes people employed in the schools, shops, hotel etc and there will be a number of part time employees (WBC)

The two schools and hotel will employ significant numbers (180+). The figure also includes those employed at the CHP plant and waste centre (DPL).

If the planned affordable homes were provided would WBC have any difficulty filling them?

There is considerable housing need across the borough. High level of need in Cranleigh but low stock level. The exception site scheme agreed and built recently made a difference. 910 affordable homes is a lot but there are 3,000 households on the housing needs register (probably an under estimate) and thus all the homes could be filled.

The figures on page 64 of the report relate to housing demand and should not be confused with housing need (WBC)

What was meant by the answer about traffic from Broadbridge Heath development dissipating on the A281?

The answer given was to clarify that the Broadbridge Heath development would not increase traffic on the A281 by 30% but that 30% of the residents may use the A281. Given the distance between Dunsfold and Broadbridge Heath traffic will dissipate to lower levels (SCC).

How will you be able to insist that elderly and disabled people don't park in the car controlled area?

They will still be able to drop off people and goods at their door. Estate Management rules will provide for disabled access in this inclusive community (DPL).

Please could the "brownfield" land position be clarified?

DPL's position is explained in the submitted documents. It is accepted that if the site is brownfield land this doesn't mean it is automatically appropriate to development for housing (DPL).

Your officer's opinion and advice on the brownfield issue will be explained in the final report and recommendation for 17 September (WBC).

What will stop people keeping cars elsewhere off site to avoid charges?

This issue comes up often with smaller schemes with restricted car parking provision. There are some people who may do this (SCC).

DPL will not adopt "Orwellian" measures to prevent this (DPL).

Is gas being brought to the settlement, and what happens if the CHP plant breaks down?

No gas is being connected (DPL).

Could not the restored canal be used for transporting biomass?

Yes – eventually. This issue has been looked into and DPL would love to see it happen (DPL).

What will be the Council's nomination rights for the affordable homes?

<p><i>Priority will be first for Dunsfold workers and then for the immediate locality (DPL).</i></p> <p>Dunsfold Primary School was closed some years ago. Could Dunsfold village children come to the new school? Has this been considered?</p> <p><i>This is the subject of discussion with SCC education and there is no reason why Dunsfold village children couldn't come to the new school (DPL).</i></p>
<p>Has Glebelands got spare capacity, will new build be required?</p> <p><i>There is spare capacity and how secondary school age children will be accommodated is still under discussion.</i></p> <p><i>DPL's approach has been not to provide a rival secondary school which might undermine Glebelands (DPL).</i></p>
<p>Can the proposed non-denominational church accommodate all faiths?</p> <p><i>DPL are in discussion with the Diocese who have models for ecumenical churches. But clearly such a church will not suit everyone and some people will want to attend religious services elsewhere (DPL).</i></p>
<p>Have you factored in that the success of Biomass marketing might lead to competition in the area for the proposed 500,000 tonnes of potential fuel?</p> <p><i>DPL consider that considerable slack exists between their need and potential supply but clearly new CHP plans elsewhere will create new economic factors but no problem is envisaged of excessive demand (DPL).</i></p>
<p>How much have you talked through the Police and PCT requirements with them?</p> <p><i>We propose making PCT provision on site. Difficult to hold discussions because of the fluidity in the PCT structure so no firm understanding of their position. DPL would like to have complementary health provisions. The detailed design points raised by the Police are accepted as is the need for an on-site base. No design discussions so far (DPL).</i></p>
<p>Is there an example of this sort of self contained settlement anywhere?</p> <p><i>No comparable site is known of (DPL).</i></p>
<p>How will the proposed living and working on site arrangements at Dunsfold Park be maintained over time?</p> <p><i>There will be no "Orwellian" controls over occupancy. Residents will be free to come and go, although it will be preferred that they work at Dunsfold Park (DPL).</i></p>

ANNEXE 2

Summary of modal share

Mode	Typical UK development	Dunsfold Park		2001 Census Travel to work data for Dunsfold Parish
		Forecast modal share (used in TA)	Maximum predicted modal share	
Public transport	5%	10%	14%	13%
Pedestrians	25%	29%	29%	9%
Cyclists	2%	4%	4%	1%
Vehicle drivers	50%	40%	37%	72%
Vehicle passengers	17%	16%	15%	6%
Electric vehicles	0%	1%	1%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Sustainable modes (inc. car share & electric vehicles)	50%	60%	63%	28%
Non fossil fuel car modes	33%	44%	48%	23%
Walk / cycle / Public transport	33%	43%	47%	23%

Notes:

1. Baseline modal share for a "typical UK development" has been derived from the TRICS2008b database and is not necessarily representative of the area around Dunsfold Park which has limited public transport.
2. The forecast and maximum modal share is derived using the modal transfer identified in the March 2008 Transport Strategy.
3. The March 2008 Transport Assessment is based on the forecast modal share rather than the maximum and is therefore robust in terms of the impact on the local road network.
4. The Dunsfold Parish Census data is extracted from the WBC website. It relates to travel to work only and is therefore not directly comparable with the rest of the table which relates to all journey purposes.
5. The Dunsfold Parish Census public transport share (13%) includes travel to work by train. This may require a vehicle trip to the station which is not included in the vehicle driver modal share.