

WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26 SEPTEMBER 2016

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

Present

Cllr Maurice Byham (In the Chair)	Cllr David Hunter
Cllr Brian Adams	Cllr Anna James
Cllr Mike Band	Cllr Andy MacLeod
Cllr Carole Cockburn	Cllr Stephen Mulliner
Cllr Kevin Deanus	Cllr Chris Storey
Cllr Pat Frost	Cllr Nick Williams
Cllr John Gray	

Apologies

Cllr Peter Isherwood, Cllr Brian Ellis, Cllr David Else, Cllr Mary Forszewski, Cllr Christiaan Hesse, Cllr Stephen Hill, Cllr Nicholas Holder, Cllr Jeanette Stennett, Cllr Stewart Stennett and Cllr John Williamson

Also Present

Councillor Bob Upton (Substitute)

47. MINUTES (Agenda item 1.)

The Minutes of the last meeting of the Joint Planning Committee held on 14 September 2016 were confirmed and agreed as a correct record.

48. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTES (Agenda item 2.)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor's Peter Isherwood, Brian Ellis, David Else, Mary Forszewski, Christiaan Hesse, Stephen Hill, Nicholas Holder, Jeanette Stennett, Stewart Stennett and John Williamson.

Councillor Bob Upton was in attendance as a substitute.

49. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS (Agenda item 3.)

There were no declarations of interest declared by Members.

50. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC (Agenda item 4.)

There were no questions from members of the public received.

51. APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION - WA/2015/1935 - LITTLE ACRES NURSERY, ST GEORGES ROAD, FARNHAM GU9 9NT (Agenda item 5.)

Proposal

Outline application with all matters reserved for the erection of up to 80 dwellings (Including affordable) and a building to provide commercial/retail use following

demolition of existing buildings (revision of WA/2015/1057) (as amended by plan received 28/06/2016 and Transport Assessment received 24/03/2016 and as amplified by ecology report received 25/07/2016).

Officers presentation

Officers began their presentation by updating the Committee on a number of issues.

There were a few changes of principle that Members needed to be aware of since the last application for outline planning permission on a green field site was presented to the Committee.

Firstly, the Councils draft Local Plan had been published for consultation and it was considered that Members should give the policies in the draft Local Plan significant weight. The Farnham Neighbourhood Plan had been submitted to the Council and was also currently out for consultation. This should also be afforded some weight.

The starting point for the proposal was however still the 2002 Local Plan which was the most up to date adopted development plan. On the back of the site allocations of the Local Plan, the Council considered that it could demonstrate a five year housing supply.

This meant that the Council could give substantial weight to policies which sought to restrict the supply of housing. This included policy C2 which sought to control development of the countryside away from existing settlements. Members were asked to note that they should not give full weight to this policy as it was not entirely consistent with the NPPF.

This was because the NPPF referred to the protection of the countryside for its intrinsic character and beauty but policy C2 sought to protect the countryside for its own sake. Members had to consider the proposal in relation to its impact on the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Members were also made aware that the site was not allocated in the draft Local Plan as it only included site allocations at sites capable of accommodating in excess of 100 units. It was however, an allocated site in the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan and that added weight to the support for the proposal.

Members were further advised that the current application was an outline application with all matters reserved. Therefore, at this meeting, Members were being asked to determine the principle of delivering up to 80 dwellings and a retail or commercial use of the site and matters with regards to site access, layout, scale and appearance were all reserved matters which were only to be considered at reserved matters stage.

Following a short presentation on the specifics of the application, officers directed Members attention to the Update Sheet and Further Update Sheet, both of which contained details about correspondence received and matters arising following the publication of the agenda.

The Update Sheet set out officers view that although the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan required a community facility for use by the recreation ground as a sports facility such as changing rooms, it was unreasonable to refuse

permission on that basis. The Neighbourhood Plan had been published after the application had been submitted and only limited weight could be attached to the Neighbourhood Plan at the current stage. Four additional representations had also been received raising a number of objections which officers considered to have been comprehensively covered in the Report.

The Further Update Sheet contained a revised officer recommendation including amendments to conditions 1 and 3 plus an additional condition 18.

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:

Cliff Watts and Mr Stenning – Objectors (shared time)
Norman Gillan - Applicant/Agent

Councillors deliberation

A majority of Councillors favoured this application compared to others which had been proposed in the area. They remarked on the beauty of Badshot Lea village and the need for any developer proposing to build in the area to provide an exemplary development that respected its green belt location and the amenities of existing residents. The emphasis should be on building communities, not just building housing.

Key concerns raised included:

The commercial/retail building;

The Committee expressed confusion about why the proposal included a commercial/retail building and were very concerned about the large number of use classes applied to it under condition 18.

There were concerns that the unit would attract extra vehicles into the development causing increased traffic, levels of noise and litter.

It was agreed that condition 18 be amended to reduce the number of use classes down to just A1 (shop) and B1A (office).

Parking

Members felt that it was very important that the development had enough car spaces available to prevent off-site parking causing traffic problems in the village.

Local infrastructure and amenities

Concerns were raised about the lack of a doctors surgery and post office in the village as well as other important infrastructure and Members felt it important that any development provided financial support, not just to mitigate the effects of the proposal itself, but of the wider affect on the locality.

Although infrastructure contributions were included in the plans, the Committee felt they were unreasonable and inadequate.

The Committee agreed to add an informative (26) to the recommendation to state that a change may be required to the section 106 contributions based on the impact of the final proposal at reserved matters stage.

Footpath Lighting

The proposals included the construction of street lighting on footpath 112 but Members were concerned that this would not happen until the 30th home had been occupied. They felt it was important that the street lighting was provided as soon as the first home was occupied.

Roads

Concerns were raised about the extra strain the development may have on the A324 junction and felt that this would need to be controlled rather than uncontrolled as proposed.

Members were pleased that the western end of the site would not be used as an access as it was felt this would ultimately end up being used as a rat run. However, there were concerns about emergency vehicle access.

The Committee agreed to add an additional informative (25) requiring that the access and layout should ideally propose emergency access from the west of the site onto Badshot Lea Road at reserved matters stage.

Officers response

Responding to Members concerns about infrastructure contributions, officers explained that there were rules governing how much money could be asked of developers. Contributions had to relate to the application site itself, be necessary and reasonable, and meet the Community Infrastructure Levy guidelines. If a local authority requested contributions that did not meet these requirements, a developer could in theory refuse to sign an agreement based on it being deemed unjustified.

Officers added that the development had to be viable and that the Council should be reasonable in the contributions it asked for. They were satisfied that they had placed a robust set of requirements upon the developer that were reasonable and had been informed by statutory consultees.

In summing up, officers reassured Members that their concerns about the specifics of the proposals would be addressed at the reserved matters stage and passed on to the developer to help inform their final proposals.

Decision

Recommendation A

RESOLVED that, subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure appropriate contributions in respect of the Thames Basin Heaths Avoidance Strategy, towards off-site highway works, early years and secondary education, recycling containers, playing pitches and play areas; provision of 40% affordable housing; off-site highways works; the setting up of a Management Company for open space, play space, landscaping and SuDS; and consideration of any

additional representations received, permission be GRANTED subject to conditions 2 - 17 as set out on pages 80 – 86 of the Agenda and informatives 1-24 as set out on pages 86 – 91 of the Agenda plus amended conditions 1 and 3 as set out on the Further Update Sheet plus amended condition 18 and additional informatives 25 and 26 as agreed by the Joint Planning Committee and as set out below:

18. Condition

The proposed commercial/retail building shall not be used other than for purposes of Classes A1 (shop) and B1A (office), as defined in the schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended), or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification.

25. Informative

In any future matters or full planning application that comes forward on this site, the access and layout should ideally propose emergency access, from the west of the site onto Badshot Lea Road.

26. Informative

In any future reserved matters or full planning application that comes forward on this site, a change may be required to the section 106 contributions based on the impact of the final proposal.

Recommendation B

RESOLVED that, in the event that a Section 106 Agreement is not completed within 6 months of the date of the resolution to grant outline permission, then permission be REFUSED

Both votes were passed unanimously.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm and concluded at 8.35 pm

Chairman