

Update Sheet attached below:

**This page is intentionally left blank**

**JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**UPDATE SHEET – 27 APRIL 2016**

---

Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the agenda

---

**Item A1**

**WA/2015/1569**

**Land at West Cranleigh Nurseries and North of Knowle Park between Knowle Lane and Alfold Road, Cranleigh**

**Update on 5-year housing supply as at 1st April 2016**

The Council has updated its assessment of the 5-year housing supply with a new base date of 1st April 2016.

Pending the completion of the new Waverley Borough Local Plan, the starting point for the assessment of housing supply is the evidence of housing need identified in the West Surrey Strategic Housing market Assessment (SHMA) September 2015. This identifies an annual need for 519 homes.

The attached Table 1 sets out the housing requirement for the next 5 years based on the SHMA figure. The overall requirement includes the number of homes needed to meet the backlog of unmet need. The figures also include the additional 5% buffer required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Table 2 sets out the various components of housing supply that the Council expects to come forward in the next five years. It will be noted that, as it stands the housing supply is 4.52 years.

In updating the housing supply position, the Council has also had to review the methodology used to calculate the five year supply, in the light of two recent appeal decisions. In the last update the method used to address the backlog of unmet need was to distribute this over the whole of the proposed Local Plan period to 2032. From these recent appeal decisions it is clear that the expectation is that any unmet need should be addressed within the 5 years and not spread over the whole Local Plan period. In addition, in the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the government says that local authorities should aim to deal with any undersupply within the first five years of the plan period where possible.

The effect of this is that the amount of housing required in the first five years has increased. Therefore, although the expected housing supply from planning permissions etc. has increased, the Council does not yet have a 5-year housing supply based on the new methodology.

**Additions to the report**

Page 50 of the agenda confirms that an update to the current number of those on the Council's register will be reported as an oral update to the Committee. Officers can

now confirm that there is currently 22 individuals registered on the Council's register, with an interest in self build housing within the Borough.

#### Amendments to the report

Page 8, 2nd paragraph – this should refer to a 'Statement of Community Involvement'

Page 33, "Creation and management of a significant area of former land as wildflower meadow, providing opportunities for ground nesting birds...."

Page 46, Location of Development 4th paragraph "It is also material that the land directly to the **south North** of Area B is being considered for housing development under WA/2015/0478 (Little Meadow)."

Page 48, Housing Land Supply, 3rd paragraph "The proposed development offers ~~44~~ **28** self build units as part of this proposal..."

Page 64, Exception Test, 2nd paragraph (just before Fluvial Flood Risk) "...safety of the development for its lifetime **in is** dependent on the location of the proposed housing outside of any areas at risk of flooding..."

Page 64, Fluvial Flood Risk, 3rd paragraph (first for this section) "...the risk of flooding varies across the site, therefore consideration ~~of~~ **of** Areas A, B and C."

Page 64, 6th paragraph "...subject to a condition, requiring **all** that all 'more vulnerable' development..."

Page 67, Air quality, 7th paragraph "...and the potential sensitivity **of the area** of the area or proposed development to adverse effects from pollution...."

Page 69, Archaeological considerations, 4th paragraph "...On this basis **the**, it is recommended that a condition requiring the applicant..."

Page 73, cumulative effects, 5th paragraph "....and that being considered **following** this application, planning **reference** WA/2015/0478."

Page 73, 7th paragraph "...there may **be** some impact upon foul sewage capacity..."

Page 76, last paragraph on page "...The new homes can be delivered speedily, as confirmed by the **appellant applicant**."

Page 77, 5th paragraph "The proposal would **not** result in the loss of agricultural land, however, it would not result in the fragmentation of an agricultural holding..."

#### Additional comments from the agent

Response to letter dated 1<sup>st</sup> March from Cranleigh Civic Society regarding Great Crested Newt presence from the applicant's ecologist Sarah King of Ecosulis, dated 18<sup>th</sup> April 2016:

The initial extended Phase 1 habitat survey and subsequent Habitat Suitability Index assessment recorded that the lakes on site provide very limited opportunities for Great Crested Newts. This was based on a number of factors, but was particularly due to the presence of fish stocks in the lakes which reduces the probability of great crested newts being present significantly. Whilst the presence of great crested newts cannot be ruled out on this basis, the conditions on site indicate that great crested newts are unlikely to be present under current conditions. On this basis, further survey works were not considered to be appropriate to inform the planning application.

Consideration has been given to ponds in the local area and the Natural England rapid risk assessment, based on the amount of habitat to be lost to development within 500m of the ponds.

### Responses from Consultees

Surrey Wildlife Trust:

The Trust notes the contents of the letter from Cranleigh Society dated 1st March, and the response e-mail from the applicant's ecologist Sarah King of Ecosulis, dated 18<sup>th</sup> April 2016.

The Trust advises that as none of the ponds surveyed by ARC are found to support Great Crested Newts (GCN), as detailed in their report to Waverley Borough Council dated July 2015 (P15/01-R01), quoted by the Cranleigh Society in their letter, are within 500m of the part of the site to be developed and appear to be separated from it by roads and developed areas, the Trust advises that Ecosulis's recommendations regarding the likely effect of the proposed development on GCN are likely to be appropriate and should address the Society's concerns.

The Trust further advises that as GCN have been found in the northern part of Cranleigh, that if the development proposals were to proceed, the applicant takes a precautionary approach to site clearance, particularly when undertaking any reptile mitigation work to be aware of the possibility of finding GCN. If any are found, work should stop and appropriate ecological advice sought and Natural England consulted.

### Environment Agency

As a statutory planning consultee the Environment Agency (EA) does not model and assess the environmental or infrastructure capacity of each proposed development site. When responding to planning applications on water quality grounds the EA considers the planning merits of each development in accordance with national and local planning policy. The EA provides advice on issues within its remit to the local council who are the decision maker. It is for the applicant to provide to the Council with satisfactory evidence that the proposed development meets planning policy requirements and is appropriate for the location.

It is recommended that developers liaise with the sewerage undertaker to ensure there is sufficient capacity within their infrastructure (including sewage treatment works and the sewerage network) to meet future demand. New development must not impact on water quality and therefore Water Framework Directive (WFD) compliance. This would be contrary to paragraph 109 of the NPPF and the European WFD.

The EA also strongly recommends that Waverley Borough Council liaises with the sewerage undertaker and if necessary impose a relevant planning condition that will ensure works to improve capacity of the existing sewage treatment works/network and/or have been completed prior to the occupation of the development. Where works cannot be carried out then planning permission should not be granted.

The local authority has an obligation to have due regard for the WFD when determining the location, scale and pace of local development. Through the local plan process we will work with Waverley Borough Council and Thames Water to ensure that housing growth in the area is sustainable.

As part of any Local Plan consultation we would review the Local Council's evidence relating to the impacts of potential multiple developments on environmental capacity. This would normally be via a water cycle study or similar evidence base. We would not ask for a water cycle study assessment for individual developments.

The local plan evidence base would need to demonstrate that the planned housing numbers would not:

1. Lead to a deterioration in class status of the Cranleigh Waters, for any element Biochemical Oxygen Demand, Ammonia or Phosphorous, or
2. Compromise our ability to get the Cranleigh Waters to 'Good Ecological Status'.

Additional water quality modelling would need to be completed to support all of the developments cumulatively to identify whether there would be a deterioration risk to the Cranleigh Waters as a result of growth alone. This will need to be set out in Waverley Borough Council's Local Plan, with the evidence being gathered from the conclusions made by a required Water Cycle Study.

The current limits of technology mean that for phosphorous a permit level cannot be set below 0.5mg/l. If an assessment concludes that a limit for phosphorous of less than 0.5mg/l is required to achieve 'good status' prior to considering a new development. Then it is not the planned development that is preventing 'good status' from being achieved at point of mixing, but rather the current limits in technology. It cannot therefore be concluded that the new growth alone would be a barrier to achieving good ecological status.

### Phosphorus trials

In the summer of 2015, the EA carried out a review of the permit levels for phosphorus that would be required at sewage treatment works in order to reach good ecological status in Water Framework Directive (WFD) water bodies. The EA identified that a very stringent phosphorus permit would be required at Cranleigh

STW to achieve good ecological status in Cranleigh Waters. At present, this is technically infeasible, which means that the water companies do not have the technology available to treat effluent to this level.

The water industry in England and Wales is currently undertaking a series of extensive trials to identify the effectiveness and cost of technologies that would be capable of treating phosphorus in sewage effluent to much more stringent limits than are currently achieved. The EA is involved with monitoring the progress of these trials which will be completed in 2017. Once we have the results, we will review which improvement measures are required to meet the objectives of the WFD, taking into account a balance of costs and benefits to the environment and society. This may result in permits being revised and water companies may be required to invest in new technology as part of the Periodic Review process.

Whether as part of the local plan or planning application's process, future development should not compromise the objectives of the WFD. This includes that Cranleigh Waters does not deteriorate from its current WFD status or does not compromise Cranleigh Waters achieving good ecological status in the future.

Officer comment:

In summary, the EA response has not raised any overriding objection to the scheme.

#### Additional representations

20 additional representations have been received, including a further letter from the Cranleigh Civic Society and a report from the Cranleigh Civic Society raising objection on the following grounds:

- Application should be refused as it comes on top of approval given for 754 homes to be built in Cranleigh. Previous applications approved, despite the fact that Thames Water say the sewers are at capacity.
- Residents of Elmbridge Road have experience of household toilets backing up, and also sewage leaking onto their gardens.
- The local roads are already clogged and in a state of disrepair, worsening with additional construction traffic.
- Waverley must pay attention to the needs of local people, and not think of satisfying Government 'housing needs' targets which are neither achievable or sustainable.
- Would like to know how the proposed developments will be supplied with water and sewerage systems and how it will affect a resident's supply or removal as the case may be.
- Who will be responsible to stop parking on the pavement and the dropping of litter around the One Stop Shop on the corner of the Alfold Road as it is already a problem getting passed illegally parked vehicles. These vehicles also make it difficult for traffic to pass now let alone when there will be another 600-800 vehicles needing to pass when the developments are done.
- The proposed expansion will be unmanageable; the local infrastructure will be unable to cope. Much attention to date has been focussed on transport and

local roads but sewage and water supplies, barely adequate to cope with current demand, will not be able to absorb any additional load.

- Thames Water has raised concerns over the impact of the Cala Homes site on Amlets Lane, yet the council officers seem to be blind to this and to the concerns of Cranleigh residents with regards to applications due for consideration.
- The Berkeley Homes site has apparently already been given approval (by a government official who has clearly never even visited Cranleigh) and with these and other applications it is possible that almost 900 new homes could be built off of what is basically a narrow country lane feeding on to the Elmbridge Road which is already a dangerous bottleneck as a main route in to Cranleigh (despite its obvious limitations as such due to two single lane bridges).
- If these applications are granted permission the sewage cannot be accommodated and it will have a severe effect on the amenity of existing residents who already suffer from regular and ongoing sewage issues, as well as a deterioration of Cranleigh Waters bad status, in direct contravention of the Water Framework Directive and a threat to the drinking water abstraction point downstream.
- Furthermore, it affects the deliverability of these sites as defined in the NPPF of housing within 5 years.
- The disruption to Cranleigh's local roads over the next 5 years if all of these projects are given the go-ahead and construction traffic brings gridlock to our rural roads and traffic pollution to the whole area
- Officers have not recommended, as suggested by Thames Water, any condition in relation to water supply infrastructure on either application. The matter is simply ignored. Furthermore, cannot find any evidence of Thames Water's request for impact studies being met and reports being supplied.
- A highly irregular hybrid decision making process is outlined within the officer's report (Appendix A - See Recommendation A Pages 5 & 97). Should councillors approve these significant applications on 27<sup>th</sup> April, subject to receiving further information from statutory consultees, officers will then make the final decision on these important points under delegated powers. This seems to contradict the point that Waverley Councillor Brian Ellis called-in the application for KPI to the JPC as officers were minded to refuse it in delegated powers.
- Believe that the EA is failing in its responsibility to implement and uphold the regulatory measures of the WFD by failing to issue a new permit and in allowing the status of Cranleigh Waters to deteriorate further. It is no defence not to issue a new licence simply because the EA are aware that the water quality standards cannot be met.
- The EA has confirmed that the matter of water quality is a wider catchment issue and it is of more than local importance.

Officers' comments:

In terms of the matters raised with regard to highway impacts, the County Highway Authority has considered the application in detail and has not raised any objection to the proposed application on highway safety or capacity grounds, subject to appropriate contributions being made towards the delivery of highway infrastructure



improvements. In terms of monitoring / controlling illegal parking in Alfold Road, this remains the responsibility traffic enforcement officers.

The recommendation to the Joint Planning Committee in the main agenda is subject to further comment from Thames Water, Environment Agency and Surrey Wildlife Trust. Importantly, the outstanding matters are subject to this written update for committee decision, not for officer decision. It is clear within the report that these further responses are required, to ensure that matters raised have been addressed in full and will be reported to the Committee meeting.

It should be noted that further comments have now been received from both the Environment Agency and Surrey Wildlife Trust, and no objection has been raised. Surrey Wildlife Trust is satisfied that the information submitted in support of the application adequately demonstrates that the applicant's ecologists recommendations regarding the likely effect of the proposed development on GCN are appropriate and should address the Society's concerns. The Environment Agency has clearly stated their position, and whilst no objection is raised as per its original response, it has strongly supported the approach taken by Officers, to contact Thames Water to clarify the water quality and sewer capacity matters raised.

The final response from Thames Water remains outstanding. However, officers confirm that following discussions with Thames Water, the position regarding the sewer capacity and water supply will be clarified for the Committee Members by way of an oral update. However, from those discussions, no overriding objection from Thames Water is anticipated.

In addition, it is appropriate to advise Members that this matter was discussed in great detail at the recent Appeal Inquiry, in relation to planning reference WA/2014/0912, for 425 homes on land to the north of the site. At paragraph 68 of the appeal decision, the Inspector considers the matter of concern raised in regard to the Water Framework Directive and sewerage capacity and stated the following:

"The inquiry was informed by the Cranleigh Society that allowing the development to proceed could be in contravention of the Water Framework Directive, as the sewage treatment capacity is unlikely to support the anticipated increase in demand. Again, the matter has to be considered in the context of expected growth and additional homes to be provided in Cranleigh. The EA has not objected to the proposal and it would be for the statutory authorities to take the necessary measures to satisfactorily accommodate the new development."

Whilst an update will be provided, the above response is a material consideration and confirms the appropriate method for the matters with regard to water supply, sewerage capacity and its discharge from the waste treatment works.

### Revised Recommendation

#### Recommendation A:

That, subject to consideration of a further response from Surrey Wildlife Trust and Thames Water, completion of a S106 legal agreement to secure 40% affordable

housing, infrastructure contributions towards off-site highway improvements, early years and primary education, off-site highway works, play spaces and open space and the setting up of a Management Company to manage the Country Park, POS and SuDs within 3 months of this date of resolution to grant permission and conditions 1-42 and informatives 1-21 within the agenda **and additional informative 22 within the report update**, permission be GRANTED.

Recommendation B remains as set out in the agenda:

That, if the requirements of Recommendation A are not met permission be REFUSED for the reasons 1-3 set out in the agenda report.

#### Additional Informative

The following additional informative is recommended:

22. The applicant is reminded to take a precautionous approach to site clearance, particularly when undertaking any reptile mitigation work to be aware of the possibility of Great Crested Newts. If they are found work should stop immediately and agreement should be obtained from Natural England prior to the recommencement of works.

#### **Item A2**

#### **WA/2015/0478**

#### **Little Meadow, Alfold Road, Cranleigh**

#### Update on 5-year housing supply as at 1st April 2016

The Council has updated its assessment of the 5-year housing supply with a new base date of 1st April 2016.

Pending the completion of the new Waverley Borough Local Plan, the starting point for the assessment of housing supply is the evidence of housing need identified in the West Surrey Strategic Housing market Assessment (SHMA) September 2015. This identifies an annual need for 519 homes.

The attached Table 1 sets out the housing requirement for the next 5 years based on the SHMA figure. The overall requirement includes the number of homes needed to meet the backlog of unmet need. The figures also include the additional 5% buffer required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Table 2 sets out the various components of housing supply that the Council expects to come forward in the next five years. It will be noted that, as it stands the housing supply is 4.52 years.

In updating the housing supply position, the Council has also had to review the methodology used to calculate the five year supply, in the light of two recent appeal decisions. In the last update the method used to address the backlog of unmet need was to distribute this over the whole of the proposed Local Plan period to 2032. From these recent appeal decisions it is clear that the expectation is that any unmet

need should be addressed within the 5 years and not spread over the whole Local Plan period. In addition, in the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the government says that local authorities should aim to deal with any undersupply within the first five years of the plan period where possible.

The effect of this is that the amount of housing required in the first five years has increased. Therefore, although the expected housing supply from planning permissions etc. has increased, the Council does not yet have a 5-year housing supply based on the new methodology.

### Responses from Consultees

#### Lead Local Flood Authority

The Government has strengthened planning policy on the provision of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) for 'major' planning applications which is being introduced from 6 April 2015 (Paragraph 103 of National Planning Policy Framework and Ministerial Statement on SuDS). As per the guidance issued by the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG), all 'major' planning applications being determined from 6 April 2015, must consider sustainable drainage systems.

Developers are advised to assess the suitability of sustainable drainage systems in accordance with paragraphs 051, 079 and 080 of the revised NPPF Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) for Flood Risk and Coastal Change. Sustainable drainage systems should be designed in line with national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS. Hydraulic calculation and drawings to support the design need to be provided along with proposed standards of operation and maintenance in accordance with paragraph 081 of NPPF (PPG).

The LLFA is satisfied that the proposed drainage scheme will adequately drain the site. The LLFA has reviewed the application against the requirements set out in the aforementioned documents, and would recommend that should planning permission be granted, that suitably worded conditions are applied to ensure that the SuDS Scheme is properly implemented and maintained throughout the lifetime of the development.

Conditions recommended.

#### Environment Agency

As a statutory planning consultee the Environment Agency (EA) does not model and assess the environmental or infrastructure capacity of each proposed development site. When responding to planning applications on water quality grounds the EA considers the planning merits of each development in accordance with national and local planning policy. The EA provides advice on issues within its remit to the local council who are the decision maker. It is for the applicant to provide to the Council with satisfactory evidence that the proposed development meets planning policy requirements and is appropriate for the location.

It is recommended that developers liaise with the sewerage undertaker to ensure there is sufficient capacity within their infrastructure (including sewage treatment works and the sewerage network) to meet future demand. New development must not impact on water quality and therefore Water Framework Directive (WFD) compliance. This would be contrary to paragraph 109 of the NPPF and the European WFD.

The EA also strongly recommends that Waverley Borough Council liaises with the sewerage undertaker and if necessary impose a relevant planning condition that will ensure works to improve capacity of the existing sewage treatment works/network and/or have been completed prior to the occupation of the development. Where works cannot be carried out then planning permission should not be granted.

The local authority has an obligation to have due regard for the WFD when determining the location, scale and pace of local development. Through the local plan process we will work with Waverley Borough Council and Thames Water to ensure that housing growth in the area is sustainable.

As part of any Local Plan consultation we would review the Local Council's evidence relating to the impacts of potential multiple developments on environmental capacity. This would normally be via a water cycle study or similar evidence base. We would not ask for a water cycle study assessment for individual developments.

The local plan evidence base would need to demonstrate that the planned housing numbers would not:

1. Lead to a deterioration in class status of the Cranleigh Waters, for any element Biochemical Oxygen Demand, Ammonia or Phosphorous, or
2. Compromise our ability to get the Cranleigh Waters to 'Good Ecological Status'.

Additional water quality modelling would need to be completed to support all of the developments cumulatively to identify whether there would be a deterioration risk to the Cranleigh Waters as a result of growth alone. This will need to be set out in Waverley Borough Council's Local Plan, with the evidence being gathered from the conclusions made by a required Water Cycle Study.

The current limits of technology mean that for phosphorous a permit level cannot be set below 0.5mg/l. If an assessment concludes that a limit for phosphorous of less than 0.5mg/l is required to achieve 'good status' prior to considering a new development. Then it is not the planned development that is preventing 'good status' from being achieved at point of mixing, but rather the current limits in technology. It cannot therefore be concluded that the new growth alone would be a barrier to achieving good ecological status.

### Phosphorus trials

In the summer of 2015, the EA carried out a review of the permit levels for phosphorus that would be required at sewage treatment works in order to reach good ecological status in Water Framework Directive (WFD) water bodies. The EA identified that a very stringent phosphorus permit would be required at Cranleigh

STW to achieve good ecological status in Cranleigh Waters. At present, this is technically infeasible, which means that the water companies do not have the technology available to treat effluent to this level.

The water industry in England and Wales is currently undertaking a series of extensive trials to identify the effectiveness and cost of technologies that would be capable of treating phosphorus in sewage effluent to much more stringent limits than are currently achieved. The EA is involved with monitoring the progress of these trials which will be completed in 2017. Once we have the results, we will review which improvement measures are required to meet the objectives of the WFD, taking into account a balance of costs and benefits to the environment and society. This may result in permits being revised and water companies may be required to invest in new technology as part of the Periodic Review process.

Whether as part of the local plan or planning application's process, future development should not compromise the objectives of the WFD. This includes that Cranleigh Waters does not deteriorate from its current WFD status or does not compromise Cranleigh Waters achieving good ecological status in the future.

Officer comment:

In summary, the EA response has not raised any overriding objection to the scheme.

#### Additional representations

12 additional representations have been received, including a further letter from the Cranleigh Civic Society and a report from the Cranleigh Civic Society raising objection on the following grounds:

- Application should be refused as it comes on top of approval given for 754 homes to be built in Cranleigh. Previous applications approved, despite the fact that Thames Water say the sewers are at capacity.
- Residents of Elmbridge Road have experience of household toilets backing up, and also sewage leaking onto their gardens.
- The local roads are already clogged and in a state of disrepair, worsening with additional construction traffic.
- Waverley must pay attention to the needs of local people, and not think of satisfying Government 'housing needs' targets which are neither achievable or sustainable.
- Would like to know how the proposed developments will be supplied with water and sewerage systems and how it will affect a residents supply or removal as the case may be.
- Who will be responsible to stop parking on the pavement and the dropping of litter around the One Stop Shop on the corner of the Alfold Road as it is already a problem getting passed illegally parked vehicles. These vehicles also make it difficult for traffic to pass now let alone when there will be another 600-800 vehicles needing to pass when the developments are done.
- The proposed expansion will be unmanageable; the local infrastructure will be unable to cope. Much attention to date has been focussed on transport and

local roads but sewage and water supplies, barely adequate to cope with current demand, will not be able to absorb any additional load.

- Thames Water have raised concerns over the impact of the Cala Homes site on Amlets Lane, yet the council officers seem to be blind to this and to the concerns of Cranleigh residents with regards to applications due for consideration.
- The Berkeley Homes site has apparently already been given approval (by a government official who has clearly never even visited Cranleigh) and with these and other applications it is possible that almost 900 new homes could be built off of what is basically a narrow country lane feeding on to the Elmbridge Road which is already a dangerous bottleneck as a main route in to Cranleigh (despite it's obvious limitations as such due to two single lane bridges).
- If these applications are granted permission the sewage cannot be accommodated and it will have a severe effect on the amenity of existing residents who already suffer from regular and ongoing sewage issues, as well as a deterioration of Cranleigh Waters bad status, in direct contravention of the Water Framework Directive and a threat to the drinking water abstraction point downstream.
- Furthermore, it affects the deliverability of these sites as defined in the NPPF of housing within 5 years.
- The disruption to Cranleigh's local roads over the next 5 years if all of these projects are given the go-ahead and construction traffic brings gridlock to our rural roads and traffic pollution to the whole area
- Officers have not recommended as suggested by Thames Water any condition in relation to water supply infrastructure on either application. The matter is simply ignored. Furthermore, cannot find any evidence of Thames Water's request for impact studies being met and reports being supplied.
- A highly irregular hybrid decision making process is outlined within the officer's report (Appendix A - See Recommendation A Pages 5 & 97). Should councillors approve these significant applications on 27<sup>th</sup> April, subject to receiving further information from statutory consultees, officers will then make the final decision on these important points under delegated powers. This seems to contradict the point that Waverley Councillor Brian Ellis called-in the application for KPI to the JPC as officers were minded to refuse it in delegated powers.
- Believe that the EA is failing in its responsibility to implement and uphold the regulatory measures of the WFD by failing to issue a new permit and in allowing the status of Cranleigh Waters to deteriorate further. It is no defence not to issue a new licence simply because the EA are aware that the water quality standards cannot be met.
- The EA has confirmed that the matter of water quality is a wider catchment issue and it is of more than local importance.

Officers' comments:

In terms of the matters raised with regard to highway impacts, the County Highway Authority has considered the application in detail and has not raised any objection to the proposed application on highway safety or capacity grounds, subject to appropriate contributions being made towards the delivery of highway infrastructure

improvements. In terms of monitoring / controlling illegal parking in Alfold Road, this remains the responsibility traffic enforcement officers.

The recommendation to the Joint Planning Committee in the main agenda is subject to further comment from Thames Water, Environment Agency and Surrey Wildlife Trust. Importantly, the outstanding matters are subject to this written update for committee decision, not for officer decision. It is clear within the report that these further responses are required, to ensure that matters raised have been addressed in full and will be reported to the Committee meeting.

It should be noted that further comments have now been received from both the Environment Agency and Surrey Wildlife Trust, and no objection has been raised. Surrey Wildlife Trust is satisfied that the information submitted in support of the application adequately demonstrates that the applicant's ecologists recommendations regarding the likely effect of the proposed development on GCN are appropriate and should address the Society's concerns. The Environment Agency has clearly stated their position, and whilst no objection is raised as per its original response, it has strongly supported the approach taken by Officers, to contact Thames Water to clarify the water quality and sewer capacity matters raised.

The final response from Thames Water remains outstanding. However, officers confirm that following discussions with Thames Water, the position regarding the sewer capacity and water supply will be clarified for the Committee Members by way of an oral update. However, from those discussions, no overriding objection from Thames Water is anticipated.

In addition, it is appropriate to advise Members that this matter was discussed in great detail at the recent Appeal Inquiry, in relation to planning reference WA/2014/0912, for 425 homes on land to the north of the site. At paragraph 68 of the appeal decision, the Inspector considers the matter of concern raised in regard to the Water Framework Directive and sewerage capacity and stated the following:

"The inquiry was informed by the Cranleigh Society that allowing the development to proceed could be in contravention of the Water Framework Directive, as the sewage treatment capacity is unlikely to support the anticipated increase in demand. Again, the matter has to be considered in the context of expected growth and additional homes to be provided in Cranleigh. The EA has not objected to the proposal and it would be for the statutory authorities to take the necessary measures to satisfactorily accommodate the new development."

Whilst an update will be provided, the above response is a material consideration and the issues

### **Revised Recommendation A**

That, subject to consideration of further comment from ~~The Environment Agency~~ Thames Water, completion of a S106 legal agreement to secure 36% affordable housing, infrastructure contributions towards off-site highway improvements, primary education, off-site highway works, play spaces and open space and the setting up of a Management Company SuDs, within 3 months of this date of resolution to grant

permission, and conditions 1- 8 and 14 - 38 within the agenda, **as well as revised Condition 9 – 13 within the report update**, permission be GRANTED.

#### 9. Condition

Before the commencement of the construction of the development hereby approved, the following details need to be supplied:

- Full design calculations for the 1 in 1, 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 year + CC storm events
- Calculations showing the required storage volume for the 100 year 6 hour storm event and evidence that all storm waters will be catered for
- Confirmation of the storage capacity within the pond

The development shall thereafter be carried out in strict accordance with those approved details

Reason: To ensure that the development will drain and has sufficient storage capacity onsite to accommodate the 100 year 6 hour storm event

#### 10. Condition

Before the commencement of the construction of the dwellings hereby approved, details of how the Sustainable Drainage System will cater for system failure or exceedance events, both on and offsite, must be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposal has fully considered system failure

#### 11. Condition

Before the commencement of the construction of the dwellings hereby approved, details of how the Sustainable Drainage System will be protected and maintained during the construction of the development shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in strict accordance with those approved details

Reason: to ensure that the construction works do not compromise the functioning of the agreed Sustainable Drainage System

#### 12. Condition

Prior to construction of the development hereby approved, details of the proposed maintenance regimes for each of the SuDS elements must be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority

Reason: To ensure the drainage system is maintained throughout its life time

#### 13. Condition

Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local



Planning Authority to demonstrate that the Sustainable Urban Drainage System has been constructed as per the agreed scheme.

Reason: To ensure the Sustainable Drainage System is designed to the technical standards

---

## Waverley Five Year Housing Supply 1st April 2016 (backlog addressed in first five years)

Table 1 - Housing Requirement - 1st April 2016 to 31st March 2021

Number of Dwellings		Average per annum	
a	Housing requirement 01/04/13 – 31/03/2016 (519 x 3 yr)	1557	519
b	Number of dwellings completed 01/04/13 – 31/03/16	727	242
c	Shortfall in supply 01/04/13 – 31/03/16 (a – b)	830	
d	Housing requirement to meet shortfall from 2013 - 2015 (c)	830	
e	Housing Requirement 01/04/16 to 31/03/21 (519 x 5 yrs)	2595	519
f	Total Five Year housing requirement 01/04/16 to 31/03/2021 (d+e)	3425	685
g	Total Five year housing requirement 01/04/16 to 31/03/2021 plus an additional 5% (fx1.05)	3596	719

Table 2 - Housing Supply 1st April 2016 to 31st March 2021

		Number of Dwellings	Average per annum
a	Outstanding planning permissions on small sites (net dwellings on sites less than 5 net dwellings) as of 01/04/16	394	79
b	Outstanding planning permissions on large sites (net dwellings on sites more than 5 net dwellings) as of 01/04/16	2185	437
c	Applications approved subject to legal agreement as of 01/04/16	66	13
d	Allocated sites in the adopted Local Plan 2002	0	0
e	Dwellings that can potentially be delivered between 01/04/16 and 31/03/2021 on sites to be identified in the LAA	535	107
f	Estimated contribution from small sites windfalls from 01/04/16 to 31/03/2021 (i.e. on sites where less than five net new homes can be delivered)	70	14
g	<b>Total Housing supply identified for 01/04/16 to 31/03/2021</b>	<b>3250</b>	<b>650</b>

(a+b+c+d+e+f)

346  
4.52

**Dwellings required**  
**Number of years worth of supply**

**This page is intentionally left blank**