

JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE

29th October 2008

UPDATE SHEET

Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the agenda

WA/2008/0279

Land at East Street, Farnham

Letter from GOSE dated the 29th October 2008

The Secretary of State has concluded that there is not sufficient reason to warrant calling the application in for her own determination. Letter is attached at Appendix 1.

Representation from Anne Thurston, Vice-Chairman, The Farnham Society

The full representation from Anne Thurston is attached as Appendix 2 to this Update sheet.

Officer comments:

Car Club

The lawyers will take this point into account when drafting the S106 agreement. This will define what is meant by 'practically reasonable'.

Riverside Car Park

Waverley has control over the car park and does not want control fettered at this stage in the S106 agreement.

Community Services/Facilities

The Gostrey Community Centre will be relocated and re-provided to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. The S106 agreement will provide the opportunity to agree the exact terms of the re-provision.

Multi Purpose Use of 158-seat cinema screen

The exact requirements are to be negotiated as part of the S106 agreement.

Insuring the future and integrity of Brightwell House

There is no dowry. The building is to be given a beneficial commercial use, which will provide the finance to secure the building's future. It should be noted that it is a Listed Building.

The Listed Building Consent

The LBC has been granted and the condition imposed follows government Circular advice.

Phasing

It is considered that condition 1(a) should stay and that the phasing will in effect be controlled by the S106 agreement.

Conditions 4 & 7

In relation to Condition 4, it is considered that the deadline should be changed to occupation of 50% of the total residential units.

In relation to Condition 7, it is considered that this is appropriately worded and should be left as drafted in the report.

Section 278 Highways Works

These matters are already covered in the report under Appendix 2, following paragraph 9.

Representation from Hedleys Solicitors on behalf of the Farnham Theatre Association Ltd

States that the Farnham Theatre Association considers the following condition should be added:

“That the development includes the provision of a purpose built theatre and full supporting facilities of a size at least equivalent to the seating capacity, stage size, equipment and facilities of all types provided in the Redgrave Theatre prior to its closure in 1998.”

The Farnham Theatre Association contend that the decision to demolish the Redgrave Theatre without providing a replacement is in breach of Waverley Borough Council’s Cultural Strategy, the Government’s Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism and PPS6.

Officer comment: The condition suggested would make the development un-implementable and cannot be supported. The decision to demolish the Redgrave has already been made.

Letter from Cllr Alan Lovell

In addition to the letter that has been circulated to members Cllr Lovell has also E-Mailed to say he feels that there has been very little discussion about what should be done to deal with the transport situation. In these circumstances he feels that it is unwise for WBC or the SCC to commit to specific measures funded by CNS. He feels that there should be flexibility to allow future consultation and changes to what is currently proposed.

Officer comment: The letter is a re-submission of the letter presented to the Committee when it considered the application on 1st October. The points made were taken into account when determining the application at that meeting. In respect of the E-mail the proposal has been subject to detailed transport studies and assessments. The County Council are happy with the highway measures incorporated in the scheme proposals.

Letter and E-Mail from Mrs Celia Sandars

The letter and E-Mail raise a number of detailed points regarding tree and landscaping issues.

Officer response: These issues can be adequately dealt with under the terms of the landscaping conditions that are recommended.

Mrs Sandars questions whether a condition can be applied if the construction access from the A31 is not achieved. The condition would require that suitable lorry routes which do not hinder traffic flow be agreed and funds be sought from the developer for any signage or other measures required.

Officer response: It is considered that in response to this request that there would be merit in adding a clause to the Heads of Terms in Appendix 2 Para 9 to say that in the event that access from the A31 is not achievable then a scheme of access to the site, including suitable lorry routes, timing of movements and appropriate signage and other measures funded by the developer, needs to be agreed before development commences in order to minimise congestion in the town centre and surrounding area.

E-mail from Scott Brownrigg

The e-mail is attached as Appendix 3 to this Update sheet.

Officer response: It appears that the comments relate to an earlier draft of the report. Apart from the reference to Condition 14 which has already been corrected, the only matters raised requiring amendment are Condition 18 which should also refer to Building D14 and the reference to the Heads of Terms. The Heads of Terms should be clarified as suggested.

Policy references for reasons for conditions.

The officers propose to add policy references to all of the reasons for conditions recommended.

Corrections

Condition 4: Third line at end should read:- “amenity areas of that phase.....”

Condition 47: Requires numbering.

Condition 67: Section deleted should be retained. Condition should read:-

“All flood compensation storage works as specified in the FRA Appendix F shall be completed prior to the commencement of development of any buildings located within the 1 in 100 year plus climate change flood extent (up to 64 AOD)”