

WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 MAY 2016

(To be read in conjunction with the Agenda for the Meeting)

Present

Cllr Peter Isherwood (Chairman)	Cllr David Hunter
Cllr Carole Cockburn	Cllr Anna James
Cllr Brian Ellis	Cllr Andy MacLeod
Cllr David Else	Cllr Stewart Stennett
Cllr Mary Forszewska	Cllr Chris Storey
Cllr John Gray	Cllr John Williamson
Cllr Christiaan Hesse	Cllr Patricia Ellis
Cllr Stephen Hill	Cllr Kevin Deanus
Cllr Nicholas Holder	Cllr Jeanette Stennett

Apologies

Cllr Maurice Byham, Cllr Brian Adams, Cllr Pat Frost and Cllr Mike Band

1. APPOINTMENT OF A CHAIRMAN (Agenda item 1.)

Councillor Peter Isherwood was confirmed as Chairman of the Joint Planning Committee for the Council Year 2016/17.

2. APPOINTMENT OF A VICE CHAIRMAN (Agenda item 2.)

Councillor Maurice Byham was confirmed as Vice-Chairman of the Joint Planning Committee for the Council Year 2016/17.

3. MINUTES (Agenda item 3.)

Councillor Brian Ellis moved a motion which was agreed to amend the minutes. At the last meeting it was incorrectly announced that he had a disclosable pecuniary interest, however, he had advised before the meeting that his intention was not to declare a pecuniary interest but to declare a non-pecuniary interest which he considered to have sufficient weight that he needed to exclude himself from consideration of the item. His interest related to his associations with the applicant over a decade ago in relation to some land for a hospital and had kept in touch periodically to ask how the hospital had been going.

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 April 2016 were confirmed and would be signed subject to the amendment noted above being made.

4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTES (Agenda item 4.)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Brian Adams, Mike Band, Maurice Byham, and Pat Frost.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS (Agenda item 5.)

Councillor Mary Forszewska declared a non-pecuniary interest in the application as she was the Chairman of Cranleigh Parish Council, a member of the Cranleigh Parish Council Planning Committee and former Chairman of the Committee. She was also a Trustee for Care Ashore and was the subject of ongoing dialogue between an individual associated with the application and officers at Waverley relating to the Members Code of which she was pursuing.

Councillors Mr and Mrs Stennett declared non-pecuniary interests in the application as they knew the family of the landowners and only knew of the applicant through conversations with their localism hats on but didn't know of them socially.

6. APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION - WA/2015/0478 - LITTLE MEADOW, ALFOLD ROAD, CRANLEIGH GU6 8NQ (Agenda item 7.)

Proposed development

Outline application, with access to be determined, for the erection of 75 dwellings to include 27 affordable dwellings with associated private amenity space and parking. This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement. (as amended by additional EIA information received 12/06/2015) at Little Meadow, Alfold Road, Cranleigh GU6 8NQ

With reference to the report circulated with the agenda, Officers presented a summary of the planning context for making a decision on the application, and the proposed development including site plans and the layout. Officers outlined the determining issues and those matters of a more subjective nature.

Officers drew attention to the Update Sheet and advised Members that there had been 3 additional letters of objection but the matters raised were considered to have been addressed within the officers report. There had also been a response from the County Council Environmental Impact Assessment Officer in relation to sewage and officers advised that the comments were sought to reassure Members that the Environmental Statement submitted in support of the application was adequate to allow for the application to be determined, with particular regard to the current foul drainage capacity and water quality. Officers had considered in detail the foul drainage position as well as the capacity of Cranleigh Waters to accommodate flows from the Thames Water Sewage Treatment Plant. It was confirmed that sufficient capacity could be provided to accommodate the proposed development and those already permitted, within a reasonable time frame

Public speaking

In accordance with the Council's arrangements for public participation at meetings, the following made representations in respect of the application, which were duly considered:

Jane Townsend - Objector
Brian Freeston – Parish Council
Hamish Robbie – Supporter

The Committee discussed the application which sought outline permission for the development proposal with all matters reserved except for access. One new vehicular access point was proposed onto Alford Road. Members were reminded that all other matters were to be reserved for future consideration and that this type of planning application sought a determination as to the acceptability of the principle of the proposed development.

The Committee noted that the proposal would assist in the provision of much needed housing in the local area and in the Borough in general and would also have an active role to play in achieving positive growth. However, Members raised concerns about the sustainability of the site and felt that the infrastructure was not adequate enough to support such a large development.

The Committee was advised that the application followed a recently allowed appeal scheme on land north of the site which was material to the determination of this application and set out the current position that the Council should adopt in its decision making. It confirmed that benefits of the scheme must be weighed against any harm resulting.

Members agreed that the 75 new dwellings (which included 27 affordable homes) would make a significant contribution to a shortfall in deliverable sites for the five-year period, and would help boost the area's supply generally. However, some local Members reiterated their concerns that the cumulative impact of this site would be harmful for the countryside and neighbours.

The Committee was advised that there economic benefits of the scheme and of all the schemes to come recently to committee a majority of members felt that this was a more sustainable location than most. The application also demonstrated that the site could be made safe from flood risk and the risk of flooding elsewhere would not be increased.

Concern was expressed about meetings that had taken place between local councillors and developers. Officers and Cllr Ellis adamantly confirmed that although there had been meetings these had been open and were about trying to have a coordinated approach to infrastructure improvements which could result if an application was approved. There was no guarantee of approval but it was ensuring benefits to the village in a coordinated way.

The Committee noted that the proposal would result in the loss of a small area of agricultural land, however, it was considered that it would not result in the fragmentation of an agricultural holding so as to seriously undermine the economic viability of the remaining holding. Therefore, some Members felt that this was acceptable.

In summing up, Officers explained that they believed there was no significant or demonstrable harm of a scale high enough to outweigh the provision of housing.

With no further comments from Members, the Chairman moved the revised recommendation contained within the Update Sheet.

The recommendation to grant outline planning permission was granted with 11 Members voting in support and 7 voting against. There were no abstentions.

Decision

RESOLVED that, subject to 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 to manage the SuDs, within 3 months of this date of resolution to grant permission, and conditions 1-39 and informatives 1-21, permission be GRANTED

The Committee further RESOLVED that, if the requirements of Recommendation A are not met permission be REFUSED.

The meeting commenced at 7pm and concluded at 9.04pm

Chairman