

**JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE – 16<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2011**  
**UPDATE SHEET**

---

Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the agenda

---

**Appendix A**

**WA/2010/1650**

**Land to the South of East Street, Farnham**

**Update to the report**

- An email has been received from the applicants making a formal application for the footpath Diversion Order.
- 1 further email from applicant dated 15/3/11 confirming that the footpath and underpass as proposed are shown in drawing nos 13512-TPN, TCA 001A, 002D, 003D, 004E, 005C, 006C and 1005/121C

**Amendments to the report**

- Page 47 Reason for Condition 14: omit “M4” insert “M14”.
- Page 50 Condition 19 last word: omit “process” insert “processes”.
- Following receipt of acceptable amended plans in relation to the underpass: omit criterion b) of Condition 18 regarding straightening of Subway entry points.
- Page Condition 4 omit “135/2” and replace with 13512. Omit “1005 12/C and replace with “1005 121C”

**Responses from Consultees**

- **Surrey Wildlife Trust**  
Amended Scheme: The amendments do not appear to have any significant ecological associations; No further concerns over previous comments.
- **County Highway Authority (including County Rights of Way Officer)**  
Having considered the development in the light of the Regulation 19 information and amended plans, no objection subject to conditions and Informatives.  
Recommends a further condition regarding limiting lane closures to off peak period.
- **Surrey Police**  
Original comments stand.
- **Open Spaces Society**  
No further comments received.

- **Byways and Bridleways Trust**  
No further comments received.
  
- **West Surrey Badger Group**  
No comment received.
  
- **Additional representations**  
17 additional letters have been received, including from the Farnham Society and the Farnham (Building Preservation) Trust, raising objection on the following grounds:
  - ♦ Matters raised under Regulation 19 Request have not been fully addressed.
  - ♦ Points in summary have been addressed but not some earlier in letter.
  - ♦ Effect of lane closure during construction would result in drivers seeking alternative routes causing impacts on traffic congestion and air quality effects.
  - ♦ Modelling assumes no work to occur in peak times (morning and evening). However, given lack of robustness of modelling and levels modelled, it is likely that saturation will occur with knock on effects.
  - ♦ If consent is granted, conditions should include detail of periods for when setting out of cones will happen and when 2 lines eastbound will be available.
  - ♦ If access to the site is restricted in peak times construction workers will use the town access points.
  - ♦ Installation of bridge supporting works will require access from South Street – impact not assessed.
  - ♦ Lack of clarity on total closure period.
  - ♦ Transport Statement transposes eastbound and westbound figures. If corrected saturation level is 115%.
  - ♦ Grass cutting problems provides experience of closure of one lane, causes queuing back to Coxbridge and traffic diverting through the Town Centre.
  - ♦ Changes to Royal Deer signal timings will result in more congestion.
  - ♦ Suggest an experimental lane closure period prior to a decision being made.
  - ♦ Works should not allow for easy pedestrian access to the north side of the A31.
  - ♦ Contrary to Farnham Design Statement.
  - ♦ Loss of tree belt
  - ♦ Will not achieve objective of avoiding traffic problems.
  - ♦ East Street scheme is not appropriate for Farnham/
  - ♦ Regulation 19 issues relating to the effects on traffic flows and air quality should not be handled by condition – contrary to EIA regulation.
  - ♦ Application should not be determined until necessary information has been received.
  - ♦ The Environmental Statement is in breach of the EIA Regulations.
  - ♦ Assessment of the proposed Royal Deer alterations under proposed condition 10 (xi) shows Crest have provided insufficient information.
  - ♦ Original ES for East Street Development was inadequate.

- ♦ Closure of eastbound lane during off peak hours will cause extreme congestion.
- ♦ Omission of in-combination effects with Riverside enabling development.
- ♦ An appropriate assessment of the effect upon SPA is necessary.
- ♦ Omission of vital data including crucial flood level and a non technical summary for the whole development.
- ♦ Unlawful claim that investigation of the extent and treatment of contamination from Gas works and Old Council Coal Yard can be placed under conditions.
- ♦ Original East Street Decision unlawfully changed by officers by informal extension to 12 month deadline.
- ♦ Public servants are perverting the course of justice.
- ♦ Flood risk matters not properly handled.
- ♦ Crest has done a U turn on favouring A31 access
- ♦ Will create permanent blight on town centre by loss of trees.
- ♦ Threat to wildlife in SNCI
- ♦ Threat to water quality
- ♦ Traffic study is flimsy – does not capture peaks and bursts
- ♦ Contract between Crest and WBC not publicly available.
- ♦ Legal challenge likely on impact on SPA

#### **Officers' response to additional information received**

Many of the matters raised have already been handled in the main body of the report. Officers have carefully considered the additional objections raised on grounds that the application is unacceptable under the EIA regulations. Officers have had full regard to the requirements of the Regulations and associated leading case law in their interpretation. Officers consider that the information required for the Council to come to a conclusion regarding whether there would be a likely significant environmental effect has been received and evaluated. This is in relation to the relevant issues namely contamination, air quality, flood risk, ecology, noise and vibration; Case law does not rule out the use of conditions to mitigate such effects. This is the approach that has been taken.

Contrary to the assertions by some residents, officers are not recommending conditions to obtain information to inform that conclusion. The conditions recommended secure the mechanism for mitigation of any effects and the monitoring of site circumstances to ensure any effects subsequently identified and unforeseen at application stage can be properly be controlled and mitigated against.

The concern that the in-combination effect with the Riverside development has not been assessed is noted. Officers' understanding is that there would not be any material overlap between the bridge construction works and those of the Riverside development, and therefore no likely significant cumulative effect.

The particular concerns raised by neighbouring residents and third parties upon the revised drawings and further information have been considered.

Lane closures will occur during off peak times only in order that the effects upon traffic flows and air quality are within acceptable limits. This will be captured by the additional condition recommended by the County Highway Authority. Concern that there would still be peak time construction work would be controlled under Condition 15 d).

Several of the submitted drawings show the unamended line of the Borelli Walk Footway. In the interests of avoiding any ambiguity and to maintain enforceability, a further condition is recommended to overcome this discrepancy. This complies with applicant's email of 15/3/11.

The continuing concerns of Surrey Police are noted, However, the amended scheme shows a wider visibility space at the entry and exit points to the underpass. In addition, lighting and CCTV would be provided to the underpass to enhance safety. These elements would be secured through recommended Condition 18 to be imposed if permission is granted. On this basis, and having regard to the fact that the bridge would be for a temporary period, it is not considered that the proposal should be resisted on pedestrian safety grounds.

The formal application by the applicants for the footpath Diversion Order has been acknowledged by the Head of Democratic and Legal Services. This application relates to Recommendation 2 on page 52 of the main agenda.

In conclusion, officers consider that the additional submissions received since the original report was published do not alter their recommendations, as set out below:

#### **Amendments to the Recommendation**

1. Recommendation 1 remains the same as set out in the report (page 42).

Subject to the following changes:

- a) Omit "subject to consideration of outstanding responses from consultees".
- b) Condition 4:  
Omit "135/2" and replace with "13512"  
Omit "1005 12/C" and replace with "1005 121C"
- c) Omit criterion b) of condition 18 regarding straightening of subway entry points.
- d) Add "es" to "process" in condition 19 to read "processes".
- e) Add additional condition;  
"Notwithstanding the detail shown in drawing numbers 13512-TPN-TCA 007 010B, 011B, 012B and 013B and 1005/120 the proposed position of the realigned Borelli Footpath shall be as shown on drawing number 13512-TPN-TCA 001A, 002D, 003D, 004E, 005C, 006C and

1005/121C unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority”.

Reason;

In the interests of the character and amenity of the area and pedestrian safety in accordance with Policies D1, D4, M2 and M14 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002”.

- f) Add additional condition recommended by County Highway Authority;  
Any traffic management requiring lane closures on the A31 Farnham by-pass shall not be implemented or take place before the hours of 9am or after 5pm Monday to Friday.

Reason:

In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policies M2 and M3 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002”.

- g) On page 52, omit informative 7 and replace with new informative as follows:

“The applicants are advised that in seeking the approval of the Highway Authority in regard to condition 1 above for the provision of the new access to the A31, they will first be required to submit and agree with the Local Planning Authority the Method of Construction Statement and secure the approval from the Highway Authority for the implementation of the temporary 40mph speed limit. All works will need to be carried out under the terms of a Section 278 Agreement to be entered into with the Highway Authority and subject to Stage 1,2 and 3 Road Safety Audits and achieve full technical approval”.

---

## **Appendix B**

**WA/2010/1489**

**Wildwood Golf and Country Club, Horsham Road, Alfold, GU6 8JE**

### **Update to the report**

### **Responses from Consultees**

#### **Surrey Wildlife Trust**

Additional comments raised. Concerns raised regarding the siting of the woodland lodges and access route through the Pickenwood Copse (Ancient Woodland). The proposed access route serving the proposed woodland golf lodges (to the south west of the existing pond) and its construction are likely to have an adverse effect on this important habitat. Although it is possible to construct a route with minimal impact on tree root zones, the ground flora and soil structure of Ancient Woodland is a major element of the ecological importance of Ancient Woodland habitat and the construction of an access route would adversely affect this important habitat. We are also concerned

that some of the proposed lodges are on or close to the edges of the Ancient Woodland and may adversely affect this part of the woodland. The Ancient Woodland has recently been re-surveyed as part of a major re-survey of Surrey's Ancient Woodland and this edge habitat was noted as being of particular importance due to its Ancient Woodland indicator and important species.

The Trust recognises that the applicant has included a considerable element of ecological enhancements in this planning application. We would advise, however, that the applicant be required to amend the development proposal to avoid direct impacts on this Ancient Woodland habitat and to ensure that there is sufficient protection for it to avoid adverse effect. A buffer zone and appropriate fencing would help protect this important habitat from impact resulting from the proposed development.

#### County Rights of Way Officer

No objection to the proposed development, subject to conditions and informatives. Note - There is an existing legal / physical route anomaly with the public footpath. The available route passes south and west of the pond adjoining the main farm buildings, whereas the legal route passes north and east of the pond. This route was on last inspection unavailable due to a fence - the legal route is the result of a 1996 diversion order made on the application of the then owner and never properly implemented. The proposed landscaping works in this area of the scheme are not fundamental to the route of the footpath, and indeed the yet to be implemented legal route of the path may now be preferable due to the presence of the proposed hole playing south from the island tee box.

#### **Additional Submissions from Applicant**

The applicant's agent has submitted a revised site plan (1:2500) amending the red line of the site, because elements of the proposed development (woodland lodges, academy lodges, landscaping and car parking areas) were located outside of the application site. The amended application site has a site area of 6.97-hectares (an increase of 0.67-hectares over the original application site area).

An additional letter from the agent's tree consultant has been submitted stating that the proposed woodland lodges will not result in indirect tree loss, contrary to the views of the Council's Tree and Landscape Officer. The letter also states that the lodges are to be accessed by footpaths (with minimal impact profile), that there are already footpaths around the pond and that infrastructure services to be routed to all the lodges will not affect protected trees.

An email from the Managing Director of Wildwood Golf and Country Club raising the following points / concerns:

- Regarding the committee site visit: Officers presented the scheme in a biased manner and incorrect information / comments were made by officers (regarding the extent and location of the development, visual impact, impact upon trees and Ancient Woodland, the location of the

public footpath and the location of the access path / route serving the woodland lodges),

- No access route / path / road proposed through the Ancient Woodland,
- Officers have misunderstood the proposal and have provided a bias report, not allowing members to form a balanced view,
- Site visit process was not democratic.

### **Representations**

2 additional letters of support received. No additional points raised.

### **Officers' response to additional Information**

Officers do not share the view that the member site visit was conducted improperly. The great majority of discussion related to the position of buildings and no information was provided to members that had not already been provided in the officers' report. At no point did members express a view regarding the merits of the application.

The value of a site visit comes in being able to identify the actual location of buildings, in addition to key relationships with certain trees and listed buildings. These relationships have been further described in the officers' report and it is for members to form their own view on each issue.

There are always going to be difficulties associated with conducting a site visit on such a large site with a large number of members. However given that opportunity exists to further clarify any outstanding issues, it is not considered that the visit compromises in any way the democratic process. Under this process, officers are required to consider the issues, form a view, and to provide a recommendation to members. It is then up to members to decide whether or not to agree with that recommendation.

Issues relating to factual inaccuracies are to be addressed in the officers' presentation to committee.

### **Questions asked by Members:**

Q1. What is the existing membership 'breakdown' of Wildwood Golf and Country Club?

A2. Juniors = 80 (Capacity 150)  
5 day members = 150 (Capacity 350)  
7 day members = 200 (Capacity 300)  
Total = 430 (Capacity 800).

Q1. Where have the 241 letters of support and 8 letters of objection come from?

A2. Letters of support:

- 23% of the letters have come from the Alfold, Loxwood and Cranleigh area,
- 50% of the letters have come from the Waverley, Guildford and Horsham area,

- 22% of the letters have come from areas in the south / south west such London, Southampton and Bath,
- 5% of the letters have come from the rest of the UK and Europe (1 letter from France).

Letters of objection:

- 100% of the letters from the Alfold area – all within 300m of the site.

### **Summary**

The officers have carefully considered the additional submissions that have been received since the report was prepared. However, these matters do not alter the overall conclusions of the officers formed in the original report.

### **Recommendation**

The recommendation remains the same as set out in the report (pages 97-98).