

JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE – 26th May 2010

Addendum to report of Head of Planning

Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the agenda

Item 5 Application WA/2010/0372 Land at East Street, Farnham

E-mails of amplification from Applicants' Agents

An e-mail of amplification, dated 17/05/2010, has been received from the agent. It provides a response to the queries raised by AEA (the independent consultants commissioned by the Council's Environmental Health Service to review the submitted air quality impact assessment) in relation to the submitted Air Quality addendum to the original Environmental Statement. Specifically, clarification was sought by AEA regarding the consideration of diurnal and seasonal variations in road traffic emissions and the benefits of implementing an appropriate PM₁₀ monitoring regime during construction. The following response was provided by the agent:

"In response to the queries raised by the air quality report, RPS comment as follows:

Diurnal and seasonal variation:

Detailed modelling has been undertaken for annual average daily traffic flows. The results of the modelling have been verified by comparison with the results of local monitoring. LAQM.TG(09) provides technical guidance to local authorities in discharging their Review and Assessment duties and states that: "*The traffic flow data should be AADT24 but also include local daily and day of the week variation information for peak hour exceedence calculations, where available.*"

The key objectives for traffic-related pollutants set out in the Air Quality Strategy (AQS) are based on an annual averaging period. The AQS also makes provision for a short-term objective for NO₂: an hourly-mean concentration of 200 $\mu\text{g.m}^{-3}$ not be exceeded more than 18 times in a calendar year. For comparison with the hourly-mean NO₂ objective, the ES states that: "*Research has indicated that the AQS hourly NO₂ objective is unlikely to be exceeded at a roadside location where the annual mean NO₂ concentration is less than 60 $\mu\text{g.m}^{-3}$. Following this guideline, the hourly objective is not considered further within this assessment if the annual mean NO₂ concentration is predicted to be less than 60 $\mu\text{g.m}^{-3}$.*" The maximum annual-mean NO₂ concentration predicted within the ES is 34.7 $\mu\text{g.m}^{-3}$. As

stated within the ES, this is well below 60 $\mu\text{g}\cdot\text{m}^{-3}$. On this basis, further modelling to determine potential exceedences of the hourly-mean objective is not deemed necessary.

PM₁₀ monitoring:

Nuisance Dust

If the findings of the visual inspection or the nature of any complaints received suggest that the mitigation measures set out in the air quality statement are not being adhered to or the mitigation measures are not effective, then we would undertake nuisance dust monitoring at the nearest sensitive location, and downwind and upwind around the site, according to the following sampling strategy:

- DustScan (DuskDisk) horizontal sticky-pads soiling gauges both upwind and downwind, at the nearest practical sensitive receptors; and
- A standard Frisbee gravimetric dustfall gauge, co-located with the downwind horizontal sticky pad samplers.

Suspended Dust

A significant increase in concentrations would be required to increase levels to such an extent that the AQS objective is approached. In the circumstances, RPS considers that expensive gravimetric monitoring of suspended dust to allow comparison with the AQS objectives is an unreasonable expectation. We would undertake PM₁₀ monitoring if there was evidence from the nuisance dust monitoring of significant dust emissions from the site. Because results of nuisance dust monitoring are averaged over the period of one week to one month, this technique does not indicate when peaks in dust generation occur. It is usual to assume that emissions causing peaks of PM₁₀ dust will also cause peaks of nuisance dust. Therefore if it is necessary to resolve short-term dust events, this would be carried out by monitoring simultaneously for PM₁₀ using a direct reading instrument. Should an indication of peaks in dust generation be required, we undertake recommend monitoring using an OSIRIS light-scattering PM₁₀ instrument.”

A further e-mail of amplification has been received from the agent dated 21/05/2010. It addresses questions raised by officers in relation to details of all traffic flows on the construction routes from commencement of excavation through to completion, whether the A31 access route was intended to serve the duration of the construction, a rough estimate of the number of on site staff and contractors during construction and whether the construction access routes through Dogflud Car Park would necessitate the closure of the car park?

The following responses were provided:

In terms of traffic flow data on the construction routes, the following table pertains to the three relevant phases (existing, during construction and post development).

Road Link	Baseline 2012		During Construction		(Construction Vehicle Estimates)		With Development 2012	
	AADT	HDV%	AADT	HDV%	Light	HGV	AADT	HDV%
The Borough (Castle St-South St)	17737	3.7	17840	3.7	103	0	18856	3.7
South St (N of site)	15855	4.1	15958	4.1	103	0	16334	4.1
Union Road	14723	4.0	14796	4.0	73	0	15227	4.0
Downing Street	15719	4.0	15822	4.0	103	0	15756	4.0
Bear Lane (Woolmead Road to Borough)	9925	4.0	10028	4.0	103	0	16124	4.0
Woolmead Road	8554	4.0	8657	4.0	103	0	15368	4.0
East Street (South St- Dogflud Way)	8143	3.5	8311	4.2	103	65	108	100.0
East Street (Woolmead Rd-Dogflud Way)	10746	3.2	10913	3.2	167	0	11362	3.2
Dogflud Way east	12118	4.0	12350	4.5	167	65	12668	4.0
Dogflud Way west	12042	4.0	12274	4.5	167	65	12215	4.0
Castle Street	8301	3.2	8343	3.2	42	0	8771	3.2
East St(Dogflud Way-Hale Road)	18160	4.0	18354	4.3	129	65	19000	4.0
Hale Road	14420	4.0	14483	4.0	63	0	14750	4.0
Guildford Road	8960	4.0	9092	4.7	67	65	9420	4.0
South Street (south of Union Road)	7400	4.0	7507	4.8	42	65	7590	4.0
Long Bridge	9390	4.0	9450	4.0	60	0	9620	4.0
The Borough (West St-Castle Street)	18581	4.0	18684	4.0	103	0	18995	4.0
West St (west of Downing Street)	15010	4.0	15070	4.0	60	0	15110	4.0

Estimates of construction vehicle volumes obtained from the following:

Heavy: 130 HGVs per day, 65 inbound via Guildford Road, Dogflud Way and East Street for a worst case assessment; 65 outbound via South Street to Hickeys Corner.

Light: 334 light vehicles two-way total per day (estimated by assuming that HGVs are 28% of the total construction traffic); arriving and departing via all main routes into Farnham, according to the trip distribution for the retail element of the development, as given in the Transport Assessment. It is assumed that all light vehicles will be parking on or very near the site, accessed from Dogflud Way. This is a worst case scenario for the Dogflud Way/East Street (eastbound) part of the one-way system.

The agent states that the data has been compiled using the original TA and subsequent Construction Access Routing reports (Transport and Air Quality) and given where they are in the project they have had to estimate the number of general construction traffic, and the data provided can only be seen as a best guess.

The agent states that it would be impractical to maintain full access to the A31 for the duration of the construction period and other vehicles would have to utilise the existing highway network to some extent during the course of the construction period.

The submitted Transport Statement dated 5 March 2010 estimates around 300 operatives (para 2.11 refers) and this would reflect a projected variation in staff numbers of between 200 and 400 for a development of this size and type.

It is stated that the first phase of construction will be in the vicinity of Dogflud Car Park. This will necessitate the closure of the car park from an early stage. The section 106 agreement and condition 10 of WA/2008/0279 require improvements to Riverside Car Park and implementation before this phase commences.

Representations

16 further letters of objection have been received raising the following concerns:

- 1) The road structure cannot support the great increase of traffic
- 2) The application will make life intolerable for anyone who lives in the town centre
- 3) There is already heavy traffic in Castle Street. The proposal would exacerbate the traffic situation in the town
- 4) There are pot-holes in Hale Road, the surface will not take lorries pounding up it every day. This will contribute to wear and tear on people's vehicles
- 5) Hale Road is a residential area, the quality of peoples' lives should be utmost in planning considerations, any change to the plan already agreed is putting commerce before people
- 6) Hale Road is busy at the best of times, and additional regular traffic would be intolerable. There are many elderly residents who have to cross the road to get to the local shop or visit the Hospital who would be scared to venture out
- 7) If Crest Nicholson is allowed to use Hale Road and Guildford Road for construction traffic plain chaos will ensue
- 8) Every reason for Condition 37, regarding the development not affecting safety, the free flow of traffic and most of all not causing inconvenience in accordance with policy M2 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002, would be compromised
- 9) Any change to the original construction plan would have a detrimental effect on the residents of Farnham
- 10) Safety risk to young children/pedestrians from lorries close to the pavement or mounting the pavement
- 11) Noise pollution. An air quality assessment has been carried out but none of noise quality or vibration affecting residents and their property
- 12) Deterioration to property from vibrations, dirt and fumes caused by heavy traffic
- 13) Congestion on Hale Road and Guildford Road will increase beyond peak hours. Parking along these roads means that they are in effect single lane
- 14) Congestion will affect air quality. Children walk along these roads
- 15) Residents of Hale Road already have to put up with speeding vehicles, noise and traffic pollution, in addition to properties shaking from vibrations. Objection is raised to the suggestion that it would be acceptable for the number of proposed lorries to use Hale Road and Guildford Road
- 16) The use of Hale Road by lorries is supposedly a temporary measure but it could become permanent
- 17) Noise and vibration has already increased on Hale Road
- 18) The purpose of the ring road is to divert heavy traffic from residential areas, this application will do the opposite
- 19) The use of Hale Road will cause traffic delays and degradation of the environment

- 20) Parking will be reduced
- 21) A developer and Council that are looking to save money must not ignore the views of residents. Our views have to be considered in this matter
- 22) The developer has gone back on an agreed plan

Government Office for the South East

Does not require the application to be referred to GOSE.

Surrey County Rights of Way

The County Council as the Highway Authority for public rights of way has no objection to the proposed variation in condition, indeed I would probably go as far as saying we would support it.

Your authority have recently made an order stopping up sections of Public Footpaths 169, 170 & 171 Farnham and in their place creating a new public footpath over Borelli Walk. The County Council have not objected to this order because we believe that in the long run, along with the shared use paths, which will be created in the heart of the new development, the public will be getting a thoroughly useful networks of paths which will encourage sustainable modes of transport.

If this order proceeds to confirmation - and there are a variety of works which require completion before that can happen - then it would prevent the temporary access from being constructed. The County Council would be very unlikely to consider making a temporary TRO to stop up the new Borrelli Walk path in addition to those within the development, as this was the problem your authority's public path order sought to overcome.

In discussion with your colleagues I consider that the Borrelli Walk alternative is the best option to keep some form of pedestrian route from South Street east along the Wey corridor during the development. Having agreed this option the County Council would be likely to object to any further moves to restrict pedestrian access during the development phase.

South East Region Design Panel

No comments received.

English Heritage

No comments received.

Correction of INDEX

Revised 'Index' at page 6 (P6) of the report attached to show correct page numbers.

Omission in Report

Page 57 Beneath title "Letters of Representation" add: "The letters of representation have been noted. The majority of the issues raised in the representations have been handled in the main issues section."

Amended Summary of Reasons for Granting Planning Permission

Page 61 Amendment shown in bold.

The variation of condition hereby granted has been assessed against policies CC1, CC4, CC6, CC7, CC8, T2, T4, NRM1, NRM4, NRM5, NRM6, NRM9 and W2 of the South East Plan 2009, policies D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, D13, D14, C2, C5, C10, C11, C12, BE1, HE1, HE3, HE8, HE14, TC3, TC8, TC12, TC13, TC15, LT11, M1, M2, M4, M5, M9, M10, M13, M14, M15 and M17 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 and National Planning Policy Statements and Guidance. Regard has been had to the environmental information contained in the application, the Environmental Statement in connection with WA/2008/0279, the accompanying addendum to the Environmental Statement and responses to it, together with proposals for mitigation of environmental effects and material planning considerations, including consultee responses and third party representations. **Specifically regard has been had to the Air Quality Statement dated March 2010 and prepared by RPS and this has concluded that the proposal would not have a significant environmental effect.** It has been concluded that the proposal would not result in any harm that would justify refusal in the public interest.

Conclusion

Officers have considered the e-mails of amplification dated, 17/05/10 and 21/05/10, received from the agent.

It is considered that this additional information clarifies the position regarding air quality and traffic generation. The Environmental Health Officer and the Highway Authority consider the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions.

Officers have noted the additional representations received. It is considered that the material matters have already been dealt with in the body of the main report.

The comment received from the Government Office for the South East has been noted and the officer's recommendation set out on page 59 of the report, has been revised accordingly as follows:

Revised Recommendation

That having regard to the environmental information contained in the application, the Environmental Statement in connection with WA/2008/0279, the accompanying addendum to the Environmental Statement and responses to it, together with proposals for mitigation of environmental effects it is recommended that subject to:-

1. compliance with the Section 106 legal agreement entered into in connection with WA/2008/0279 (including any necessary deed of variation)
2. completion of appropriate highways agreements referred to in the Council's resolution dated 16.12.2008 to grant planning permission WA/2008/0279 and
3. the making of Orders, as necessary, for the diversion and stopping up of footpaths under section 257 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions and informatives:

Conditions 1-36 and informatives of WA/2008/0279

37. Condition
- No development shall start until a Method of Construction Statement, to include details of:
- (a) the proposed access provision to Dogflud Way prior to the commencement of development for the purpose of providing safe construction access and egress
 - (b) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
 - (c) loading and unloading of plant and materials clear of the highway
 - (d) storage of plant and materials clear of the highway
 - (e) a detailed programme of works (including measures for traffic management and access/junction, Highways works scheduling), ensuring that the following works are constructed to an operational standard prior to commencement of development (excluding site clearance):
 - (1) The signalisation of the existing junction of East Street/Woolmead/Dogflud Way;
 - (2) The modification of the existing traffic signals at the junction of East Street/Bear Lane/The Borough and South Street;
 - (3) The alterations to Woolmead to provide for two way traffic flow;
all as broadly identified in the Seventh Schedule of the S106 Agreement.
 - (4) The modifications to the junction of Brightwells Road with South Street to also include the reconfiguration of the

Sainsbury's Car Park circulation and a new access to the car park from South Street, all as generally shown on RPS drawing no. JNY4420-87A.

The programme of works shall include a construction timetable for the remaining works or remaining elements of the above works required to fulfil the requirements of the S106 Agreement.

- (f) provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones
- (g) the agreed construction and routing options as set out in the RPS report dated 5 March 2010;
- (h) an operational review of the construction routing within 3 months and no later than 6 months from the commencement of development
- (i) any phased or staged implementation of the development
- (j) travel planning initiatives as set out in paragraph 2.12 of the RPS report dated 5 March 2010
- (k) a scheme for the continuous monitoring of PM₁₀ and NO₂ readings shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include agreed trigger levels and mitigation measures. The monitoring equipment shall be installed before the development commences in accordance with the agreed scheme and thereafter maintained for the duration of the development. The monitoring equipment shall be capable of providing instant readings and hourly average readings of PM₁₀ and NO₂. If any agreed trigger levels are exceeded then mitigation in accordance with the agreed mitigation measures shall be implemented to ensure that the agreed PM₁₀ and NO₂ levels are not exceeded

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be implemented and adhered to throughout the construction period.

Reason

In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety, the free flow of traffic nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and in the interests of the character and amenities of the area in accordance with Policies NRM9 and T2 of the South East Plan 2009 and Policies M2, M3 and D1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.

Conditions 38-73 and informatives of WA/2008/0279

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANTING PERMISSION

The variation of condition hereby granted has been assessed against policies CC1, CC4, CC6, CC7, CC8, T2, T4, NRM1, NRM4, NRM5, NRM6, NRM9 and W2 of the South East Plan 2009, policies D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, D13, D14, C2, C5, C10, C11, C12, BE1, HE1, HE3, HE8, HE14, TC3, TC8, TC12, TC13, TC15, LT11, M1, M2, M4, M5, M9, M10, M13, M14, M15 and M17 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 and National Planning Policy Statements and Guidance. Regard has been had to the environmental

information contained in the application, the Environmental Statement in connection with WA/2008/0279, the accompanying addendum to the Environmental Statement and responses to it, together with proposals for mitigation of environmental effects and material planning considerations, including consultee responses and third party representations. Specifically regard has been had to the Air Quality Statement dated March 2010 and prepared by RPS and this has concluded that the proposal would not have a significant environmental effect. It has been concluded that the proposal would not result in any harm that would justify refusal in the public interest.

Amended Index

Introduction/Background	P7
Site Description	P8
Proposal	P13
Relevant Planning History	P19
Planning Policy Constraints	P23
Relevant Development Plan Policies and Proposals	P24
Summary of Consultations and Town Council Comments	P25
Community Engagement/Representations	P30
Determining Issues	P38
1) Implications of temporary access from A31	P39
Transport and Highways	P39
Trees	P40
Ecology	P42
Flood Risk	P44
Character	P45
Residential Amenity	P46
Noise and Disturbance	P46
Convenience of Footpath Users	P46
2) Implications of utilising existing road network	P47
Transport and Highways	P47
Noise and Disturbance	P50
Air Quality	P51
Trees	P55
Ecology	P55
Flood Risk	P55
Residential Amenity	P55
Character	P56
Archaeology	P56
Thames Basin Heathland SPA	P56
Environmental Impact	P56
Letters of Representation	P57
Town Council Comments	P58
Conclusion and Recommendation	P59