

JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE – 1 OCTOBER 2008

Addendum to report of Head of Planning

Item 5 Application WA/2008/0279 Land at East Street, Farnham

Representations

10 further letters of representation have been received,

9 raising objection on the following grounds:

- 1) loss of the Redgrave Theatre as a community and cultural asset and of historic interest; continuing need for theatre;
- 2) contrary to Local Plan policies CF1, LT1, HE1, HE4 and TC1
- 3) overdevelopment of site;
- 4) effect on trade of Woolmead shops by traffic changes;
- 5) Woolmead Road is too narrow to carry volume of traffic if The Woolmead is pedestrianised;
- 6) cinema proposal will be a white elephant in a year or two – query need;
- 7) no account taken of recommendations of South-East Regional Design Panel;
- 8) revisions should be sought seeking change to reflect SERDP's comments in terms of context, layout, Building D4 and architecture;
- 9) adverse impact upon parking and traffic;
- 10) inadequate parking;
- 11) traffic danger will occur at The Borough/South Street/Bear Lane junction;
- 12) 34 out of 62 of "saved" Local Plan policies are conflicted with;
- 13) correct density for development is 141 units per hectare – which is out of keeping with Farnham and more suited to an inner city site. Calculation is flawed, should exclude open spaces serving wider area;
- 14) Drainage and Flooding
 - latest Flood Risk Assessment is flawed to extent of rendering flood alleviation and run-off attenuation measures unworkable;
 - fails the sequential and exception tests;

- assumes groundwater levels lower than that recorded in boreholes;
- Brightwell Gardens soakaway is set at groundwater level;
- main attenuation tank is in groundwater or below ordinary river level so would be full of water on permanent basis;
- lowering of ground levels at bottom of
- could avoid land within Zone 3a;
- contravenes Sir Michael Pitt's final report recommending a presumption against building in high risk areas;
- Brightwell Gardens will impinge on water table;
- contrary to PPS25;
- inadequate consideration has been given to groundwater flooding issues, including localised flash flooding and pooling outside Falkner Court and in Dogflud Car Park;
- the maximum groundwater level has been suppressed;
- drainage system is incompatible with ground conditions and topography and would therefore flood;
- existing flooding – no consideration of existing problems;
- existing groundwater levels and flow assumption are inaccurate;
- miscalculation of impact of basement car park on groundwater flow;
- surface water drainage strategy is flawed;
- assumed flood levels are misleading and inaccurate;

15) loss of public amenity space;

16) inappropriate built form and layout:

- height of building
- impact on listed building
- mezzanine in D20 represents an additional floor
- amphitheatre is inappropriate and non-functional, too close to A31, part of flood alleviation scheme, noisy;

17) traffic assessment flawed;

18) AQAP (Air Quality Action Plan) fails as it is dependent upon a traffic plan that sets out to cause congestion increase in pollution;

- 19) loss of 100 parking spaces; Riverside development will not compensate as drivers will seek first central choice of parking and hence increase traffic movements;
- 20) high level of third party objection;
- 21) inadequate provision of play space;
- 22) overshadowing of public open space;
- 23) loss of trees and insufficient replacements;
- 24) unsatisfactory replanting scheme;
- 25) existing number of car parking spaces should be 528, not 514 as quoted;
- 26) Riverside development is only temporary;
- 27) parking occupancy survey gives a significant underestimate of peak period usage;
- 28) plans still contain references to balancing pond.

One letter of support has been submitted on the following grounds:

- 1) Farnham Public Art Trust welcomes proposals for public art.
- 2) In line with guidelines for public art in the development.

Environment Agency – Additional Comments

A further consultation response has been received from the Environment Agency responding to emails sent to the EA from Mr J Hyman (local resident) in respect of flooding and drainage issues.

The full response is attached to this Addendum.

The Environment Agency confirm that the proposal is PPS 25 compliant and the appropriate measures are being taken to mitigate any increase in impermeable surfaces, increase in built footprint and increase in vulnerability of development in the flood plain..

Typographical Errors in Original Report

- | | |
|---------|--|
| Page 51 | First paragraph, fourth line, omit word “compared”. |
| Page 55 | Paragraph 10.39, ninth line, omit “16”, insert “17”. |
| Page 56 | Paragraph 10.43, line 17 should read “all <u>too</u> frequently”. |
| Page 57 | Paragraph 10.46, fourth line should read “pages 132 – 136” not “122 – 126”. |
| Page 89 | Paragraph 10.159, sixth line should read “we recommend that this may form part of the construction ...”. |

Page 152 Third line of paragraph (a) should read “reasonably”.

Page 182 Fourth line of Condition 45 should read “reasonably”.

Page 186 Condition 67, first word should read “ALL”.

Conclusion

Officers have considered the additional representations that have been received. It is considered that the material matters have already been dealt with in the body of the main report. Members should note that the flooding and drainage representations have been addressed by the further response from the Environment Agency (attached).

In relation to concerns about the continued reference to a balancing pond, officers are satisfied that the amended plans received on 15/8/08 are clear that the balancing pond has been omitted, however, in the interests of avoiding any ambiguity, it is recommended that the following additional informative be included within any permission granted.

9. “The applicants are advised that the permission hereby granted does not include a balancing pond”.

This will be carried forward to the revised recommendation.