

**JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**UPDATE SHEET – 8 AUGUST 2018**

---

Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the agenda

---

**Item 7**

**WA/2018/0151**

**LONGDENE HOUSE, HEDGEHOG LANE, HASLEMERE**

**Responses from Consultees**

Following comments from the applicants, Officers have re-consulted consultees regarding the recommended conditions.

Thames Water

Thames Water do not believe that there is a need for a condition based on their assessment of the application. As such, conditions 11 and 31 have been removed from the recommendation.

County Archaeologist

The application was supported by a desk based archaeological assessment produced by the Surrey Archaeological Unit that suggests that only Area D has any archaeological potential (where the 28 dwelling are proposed). An archaeological condition on this element of the scheme is therefore appropriate. The other element of the application the change of use, alterations and erection of a garage is unlikely to threaten archaeological remains and so in this case there is no need for any work and so no condition is required. As such condition 14 has been removed from the recommendation.

Surrey County Highway Authority

SCC definitely consider that condition 25 is necessary and meets the relevant tests. At the previous appeal, the inspector considered this condition was necessary on highway safety grounds. No new highway safety evidence has been submitted to show why this condition should no longer be imposed on any permission granted.

**Additional representations**

One letter of objection from Haslemere Vision has been received on the following grounds:

- Premature and undemocratic

- To allocate this site in the Local Plan Part 2 is to ignore the protection afforded by the AGLV, Landscape Character Area GW5, wooded Greensand Hills and AONB
- Narrow roads with on-street parking
- Not in the 'public interest', and there are "no exceptional circumstances"
- Conflict with Paragraphs 11, 48 and 172 of the NPPF 2018
- The development should be considered major

In response, Officers have considered the planning constraints of the area. For the reasons given in the officer report it is considered that Area A would only result in moderate adverse impact on the landscape character within Area A and only slightly adverse impacts beyond the application Area. Areas B, C and D would have no adverse impact on the AONB and in these areas the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside would be preserved. The proposal is not considered to be major development for the purposes of AONB development.

As explained on page 28 of the agenda report, to grant permission would not undermine the plan-making process and a refusal on prematurity grounds could not be justified.

The County Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposal subject to conditions 2, 3, 7, 25 and 26.

### **Amendment to conditions/informatives**

In light of the above consultee comments, conditions 11, 14 and 31 are removed from the recommendation.

### **Revised Recommendation**

#### **Recommendation A**

That, subject to the consideration of any further representations by 22/08/2018 that raise further material consideration that have not yet been considered and subject to a Section 106 agreement to secure to secure contributions towards education, recycling provision, playing pitch improvements, off-site environmental improvements, SuDS and open space management/maintenance and conditions 1-10 inclusive, 12, 13, 15-30 inclusive and 32-42 inclusive permission be GRANTED.

#### **Recommendation B**

That, in the event that the requirements of Recommendation A are not met within 6 months of the date of the resolution to grant permission, then permission be REFUSED.