

WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 3 OCTOBER 2016

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

Present

Cllr Maurice Byham (Vice Chairman)	Cllr Christiaan Hesse
Cllr Brian Adams	Cllr Stephen Hill
Cllr Carole Cockburn	Cllr David Hunter
Cllr Kevin Deanus	Cllr Anna James
Cllr David Else	Cllr Nick Williams
Cllr Mary Forszewska	Cllr John Williamson
Cllr John Gray	

Present as Substitutes

Councillors Patricia Ellis and Richard Seabourne

Apologies

Cllr Peter Isherwood, Cllr Mike Band, Cllr Pat Frost, Cllr Nicholas Holder, Cllr Andy MacLeod, Cllr Stephen Mulliner, Cllr Jeanette Stennett, Cllr Stewart Stennett and Cllr Chris Storey

52. MINUTES SILENCE - COUNCILLOR BRIAN ELLIS

Before the formal meeting started, members held a minutes silence in respect of Councillor Brian Ellis, member and former Chair of the Committee and Councillor since 1995, who had sadly past away the week before.

53. MINUTES (Agenda item 1.)

The minutes of the meeting held on 26th September were confirmed and signed.

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

There were apologies for absence from Councillors Peter Isherwood, Mike Band, Pat Frost, Nicholas Holder, Andy Macleod, Stephen Mulliner, Jeanette and Stewart Stennett and Chris Storey.

Councillors Patricia Ellis and Richard Seabourne attended as substitutes.

55. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS (Agenda item 3.)

There were no declarations of interest.

56. APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION - WA/2016/0417 - LAND AT 106 AND THE CHANTRY'S BUNGALOW AND LAND TO SOUTHWEST OF HORSHAM ROAD, HORSHAM ROAD, CRANLEIGH (Agenda item 5.)

Proposal

Erection of 149 dwellings with access from the Horsham Road (details pursuant to outline approval granted under WA/2014/1754) This application affects footpath 378 (as amplified and amended by Addendum to Design and Access Statement; Refuse Vehicle Swept Path analysis plans; amended plans received 4/7/16; 12/07/16; 4/8/16; 9/8/16; 7/9/16; 8/9/16; 9/9/16; 15/9/16; Revised Parking schedule 13202/SCH003 Rev F; Surface and Foul Water Drainage Statement 161380 – 001B; Drainage Strategy Report 161380-003B; Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement and plan CREST20232-03D rec'd 30/9/16) at land at 106 and The Chantrys Bungalow and land to Southwest of Horsham Road, Horsham Road, Cranleigh

Officers update

The Committee was advised that the principle of development for 149 dwellings together with the associated access works to Horsham Road had been established and approved by the outline permission WA/2014/1754. The current application was in connection with the reserved matters: layout, scale, appearance and landscaping.

With reference to the report circulated with the agenda, Officers presented a summary of the proposed development, including site plans and an indicative layout and street scene, and the determining issues. The Committee was advised that the consultation period commenced in August for the draft Local Plan. In accordance with paragraph 216 of the NPPF, weight could be given to the draft Plan, but the degree to which it could be determined by the stage the Plan had reached and the extent to which there were any unresolved objections to it. It was considered that significant weight could be given to the Pre-submission Plan following its publication on Friday 19 August, given its history of preparation, the iterations of it and the extent of consultation and consideration on it to date.

The Committee noted from the update sheet additional responses from consultees. This included Thames Water who reiterated the inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of the application and suggested a Grampian Style Condition to mitigate this. Surrey Police confirmed that the revised layout was acceptable and the county Council Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) was satisfied that the documentation 161380-001B Horsham Road, Cranleigh, Surface and Foul Water Drainage Statement by Ardent Consulting Engineers met the requirements for discharging conditions 10 and 12.

The Committee also noted that there were a further 7 letters of objection which had reiterated concerns already expressed in previous letters received regarding the application.

To cover concerns regarding the provision of boundary treatment around the site, and in particular any in relation to existing properties, the update sheet suggested an amendment to condition 4. Furthermore, there was an additional informative to

address a concern raised by the Surrey Police in relation to the height of the close boarded fence and trellis.

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:

Patrick Kilby – Objector
Cllr R Bryant – Cranleigh Parish Council
Chris Lees - Applicant/Agent

Committee deliberations

The Committee considered the officers report and presentation, the representations from the Objectors and the information in support by the agent/applicant and discussed the revised application. Some Councillors were disappointed that they did not think that the applicant had addressed the concerns accurately since the application had been deferred. They applauded the efforts made but felt that only small changes had been made which were not significant to address the previous concerns, in particular the drainage situation especially given that a new development was being built next door to the site.

Officers advised that the conditions imposed upon the outline permission remained in force and would be required to be discharged prior to any commencement of development, in addition to any pre-commencement conditions imposed via this application. However, the detailed information submitted at this stage in relation to Condition 10, in part where it related to surface water drainage and 12 of WA/2014/1754 indicate that those Conditions should be discharged alongside the current application. Thames Water had identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of the application. However, a Grampian style condition requiring a drainage strategy detailing on / off site drainage works would mitigate this. Members asked whether the ditch dispute would affect the strategy and officers advised that they had sought reassurance from the developer and it would be up to the landowner to deliver it and maintain. Officers were satisfied with what was proposed.

A concern was raised by Councillor James regarding the pitched roofs and the velux windows which could result in additional rooms being created by buyers and in addition, result in more cars being parked. Officers confirmed that condition 2 addressed this by removing permitted development rights.

Councillor Patricia Ellis advised the Committee that she was please that the application was deferred in August and happy that the sizes of the 1bedrooms had been increased in line with standards. However, she was disappointed that she did not feel that the other changes had addressed the Committees concerns. It was felt that parking would be a problem and the visual aids provided at the committee did not show any cars so the extent of harm to the amenity of the existing residents could not be realised. The design was considered poor and not reflective of the area and did not adhere to the Cranleigh Village Design Statement. Councillor Carole Cockburn also raised the issue of the design of the development, feeling that

it was too many houses with not much open space between them. She felt it was too urbanised and the gardens an odd shape.

Officers confirmed that they did consider the Cranleigh Village Statement when coming to a recommendation on the application. The gables and brick put forward were modern but still maintained a traditional feel. They went on to advise that if the Committee did not feel the design was “exceptional” enough and should be exemplary, they had to apply the correct tests for why this was the case. Officers considered that the appearance, layout, scale and landscaping would not cause material harm upon neighbouring residential occupiers and would provide a level of amenity and play space in accordance with Local Plan requirements and would result in a form of development which would be visually acceptable in terms of the local character of the area. Furthermore, Officers advised that the proposed landscaping, and in particular the provision of large areas of open space and tree planting / landscaping would provide a spacious and verdant character to the proposed development.

Councillor Brian Adams considered the changes to the design and layout were better and did not see how it could be changed more and still deliver the number of homes that were required and the density was no different to the Nightingales development in the North to the site. Councillor Mary Foryszewski reiterated her concerns that she did not want to see the development being of poor standard and that there was already enough new developments on the way to satisfy housing numbers. This was remote from the village centre so more cars would be travelling into and out of the village. It was noted that improvements had been made to the car parking arrangements but it was felt that the concern expressed about the layout of the affordable homes at the last meeting had not been addressed.

The Chairman concluded that he was pleased the application had been deferred at the last meeting and was satisfied with the changes that had been made. He mentioned that properties along the Downs Link had already been extended but those proposed along that side would not be able to as they were too low. He also confirmed that Councillor Stewart and Jeanette Stennett, who were the neighbouring Ward Councillors, who could not attend the meeting and whom had raised significant concern at the last meeting regarding the scheme, had written to confirm that they were now satisfied by the changes, in particular the drainage, that had been proposed.

The Committee then moved to the vote on the revised Recommendation A (as noted in the update sheet) and there were 8 in favour and 7 against. In relation to Recommendation B, there were 9 in favour and 6 members abstained. Therefore, the recommendations were APPROVED as noted in the update sheet.

Decisions

Recommendation A

RESOLVED that, reserved matters be AGREED subject to conditions 1-3 and 5-20 as detailed on pages 59 – 68 of the agenda, and amendments to conditions 4 and 21 as detailed in the update sheet, and informatives 1 – 20 on pages 68 – 71 of the agenda and additional informative 21 on the update sheet.

Recommendation B

RESOLVED that, the details pursuant to Condition 10 (in relation to surface water and pre-commencement part of condition) and condition 12 upon WA/2014/1754 be AGREED

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm and concluded at 8.11 pm

Chairman