

Update Sheet attached.

This page is intentionally left blank

JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE
UPDATE SHEET – 8 November 2016

Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the agenda

Item A2

WA/2016/0517

**LAND SOUTH OF AMLETS LANE AND NORTH OF ROBERTS WAY,
CRANLEIGH**

Update to the report

The overhead power lines will be re-located underground.

Amendments to the report

Within the neighbour representation section of the report, the total number of representations received should read as 56, to include two letters included on the update sheet for the previously presented scheme. The contents of these letters are considered and addressed within the published report before Members this evening.

Responses from Consultees

Lead Local Flood Authority	The proposed changes to the layout would not change the agreed principles for surface water management scheme for the site.
Surrey Wildlife Trust	No further comments to make.
Cranleigh Parish Council	No comment received.
County Archaeologist	No comment received.
County Rights of Way Officer	No comment received.
Environment Agency	No further comments to make.
Natural England	No further comments to make.
Thames Water	No comment received.
Southern Gas Network	No comment received.
Council's Environmental Health Officer - Air Quality	No comment received.

Additional representations

Following publication of the Agenda, 6 letters of representation have been received raising objection on the following grounds:

Third party comment	Officer response
<p>Concern over access to the site and the legal situation with regard to future access into the site once the development is complete.</p> <p>Any permission should ensure no vehicular connection be allowed with Roberts Way or Summerlands.</p> <p>The proposed plan shows several roads ending in open space, with one near the entrance which leads to woodland but could be a precursor to a request to build more dwellings at the entrance. Similarly a wide path at the bottom of the site behind Roberts Way could be developed into an access to the village centre.</p>	<p>With regards to the concern over potential future access and further development on the site, Officers are required to assess the application before them on its own merits and cannot restrict or assess the scheme on potential future development of the site.</p> <p>Were permission to be granted, the applicant would be required to develop the scheme in complete and strict accordance with the details approved.</p> <p>Were further planning applications to be received in the future, they would be assessed in full against the relevant planning considerations at that time.</p>
<p>No development should be allowed until the Cranleigh sewerage system has the capacity to cope with the existing load, proposed load and any future loads.</p>	<p>Foul drainage has been addressed within the main body of the report. The relevant consultees have been consulted. A condition was imposed on the outline permission to address this issue.</p>
<p>Concern that the proposed drainage scheme would not be sufficient to deal with the amount of water run-off.</p> <p>Surface drainage issue is still to be addressed in a satisfactory manner.</p> <p>Who would maintain the drainage scheme?</p>	<p>Surface water drainage has been addressed within the main body of the report. The relevant consultees have been consulted and conditions imposed where appropriate.</p> <p>The drainage maintenance has been captured by Condition 6 on page 126/7 of the Agenda.</p>
<p>Permanent fences should be erected to make clear where the boundaries of the new properties terminate so that they do not encroach into the proposed swales.</p> <p>Furthermore, this should be included within the deeds.</p>	<p>Condition 4 on page 126 of the Agenda requires details of all boundary treatments to be approved by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>It is not within the responsibility of planning to determine the contents of</p>

	Deeds.
Original plans show an orchard field, along with number of allotments only. Concern over large apartment blocks on higher land will impact existing neighbours as well as immediate properties within the site.	With regard to the impact of the proposed apartment buildings to the neighbouring existing dwellings, there would be a separation distance of greater than 30m to the western boundary of the site and greater than 60m to the northern boundary of the site. As such, Officers are satisfied the proposed apartment buildings would not cause harm to the residential amenities of the dwellings to the north or west of the site by way of overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light or overbearing impact.
Loss of amenity space as a result of additional apartment buildings.	Whilst the amended layout would result in the loss of one allotment space when compared to the previously presented scheme, given the overall amount of open space on the site, the loss of one allotment space is considered to not be materially harmful.
Assurances of a 20m buffer zone along northern edge of development which appears to have been removed from the amended plans. Reinstatement of this would be much more important given the proposed apartment buildings.	With regards to the concerns regarding the 20m buffer zone at the edge of the site, a condition has been recommended requiring submission of a full landscaping plan which would include details of the ecological buffer zone. This matter can be addressed at the time of submission of these details.
Block of flats to south of allotment would cause greater damage to the countryside and AONB views.	Officers consider that given the scale, height and style of the buildings, which would appear as large domestic dwellings of no more than 2 storeys, the proposed development would fit well within the context of the site and would not appear intrusive within the Countryside. Furthermore, the apartment buildings would be screened by trees along the current field boundaries. These

	trees are protected by a Tree Protection Order.
Road along the north boundary was going to have lighter traffic, which has not been followed through on the plans. Harm in terms of noise and light pollution.	The proposed road along the northern boundary would be a minimum of 13.6m from the closest boundary and greater than 50m from the nearest neighbouring dwelling. As such, Officers are satisfied that there would be sufficient separation that the proposed road network would not cause harm to the neighbouring amenities of existing dwellings to the north and west of the site.
Lack of communication regarding the proposed amendment to the plans	Officers can confirm that the neighbour notification and statutory consultation procedure has been undertaken in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015. All neighbours and consultees were re-notified/consulted following receipt of the amended plans.
Why have these changes been made, and who supported it?	The proposed changes have been made following deferral of the application at Committee on 14 September 2016.

Revised Recommendation

That, ~~subject to the consideration of any further representations and consultation responses,~~ subject to Conditions 1 to 20 and Informatives 1 to 5 as set out on pages 124 - 132 of the Agenda, Reserved Matters be AGREED.
