

WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 NOVEMBER 2016

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

Present

Cllr Peter Isherwood (Chairman)	Cllr Jerry Hyman
Cllr Maurice Byham (Vice Chairman)	Cllr Anna James
Cllr Mike Band	Cllr Stephen Mulliner
Cllr Carole Cockburn	Cllr Jeanette Stennett
Cllr Kevin Deanus	Cllr Stewart Stennett
Cllr Mary Forszewski	Cllr Chris Storey
Cllr Pat Frost	Cllr Nick Williams
Cllr John Gray	Cllr John Ward
Cllr Christiaan Hesse	Cllr Jim Edwards
Cllr Stephen Hill	Cllr Denis Leigh
Cllr Nicholas Holder	

Apologies

Cllr Brian Adams, Cllr David Else and Cllr David Hunter

69. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (Agenda item 1.)

The Minutes of the meeting which took place on 8 November 2016 were confirmed and signed.

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Brian Adams, David Else and David Hunter.

71. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS (Agenda item 3.)

Councillor John Gray declared a non-pecuniary interest in item B1 as he had been in discussions with applicant regarding the proposal.

72. APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION (Agenda item 5.)

72.1 ITEM B1 - WA/2016/1766 - LAND TO THE NORTH OF NUGENT CLOSE, DUNSFOLD (Agenda item 5.1)

Proposal

Erection of 42 dwellings (including 17 affordable) together with associated development, including the construction of a new access road, parking, associated landscaping, public open space, and the provision of pedestrian/cycle links connecting with Nugent Close (as amended and amplified by plan and Transport Statement Addendum received 27/10/2016) (revision of WA/2016/0777)

Officers update

With reference to the report circulated with the agenda, Officers presented a summary of the proposed development, including site plans and an indicative The Committee noted from the update sheet that additional infrastructure contributions had been agreed for woodland management work to Dunsfold Village woodland adjacent to the site and 10years management for the Dunsfold Village Woodland adjacent to the development site as with new houses an access road the Parish Council would have to do more than it has previously been required to do. At the meeting it was noted that the figure for VAT had been incorrect and this should say £12,000 (not £11,000).

The Committee was also informed that the recommended conditions 43 and 44 in relation to fencing of the cycle/pedestrian links and the provision of these, should be excluded as the requirements of these would be covered within the Section 106 Agreement.

Committee deliberations

The Committee considered the officers report and presentation, and discussed the application.

The Committee noted that the site was located within the Countryside beyond the Green Belt, outside of the defined settlement area, therefore, the development would not be considered acceptable when considered in line with the adopted Local Plan. However, the site had been identified as a green site within the Council's Land Availability Assessment and the draft Local Plan – Part 1, which set out a requirement for Dunsfold to deliver 80 dwellings. Officers also felt that the proposal would be a natural extension to the edge of the village and not in isolation.

The Committee raised concern about the loss of trees but Members felt that the development was of high quality and there was a good mix of houses. Members welcomed the positive consultation the developers had with the community and ward members and the S106 agreement and infrastructure contributions would really benefit the centre of the village. There was also generous parking on the site and it was well laid out.

The Committee was slightly concerned about the affordable housing being in one area and not spaced out, and Members also felt that there should be a condition preventing permitted development rights into the roof. They also requested that the footpath route be moved which offices agreed would be acceptable.

The Committee then moved to the vote on the revised Recommendation A, including the new condition and deletion of conditions 42 and 43 and the vote was unanimous. In relation to Recommendation B, the vote again was unanimous. Therefore, the recommendations were APPROVED.

Decisions

Decision A

RESOLVED that subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure appropriate contributions in respect of early years education and primary education; recycling containers; Playground refurbishment at King George V playing field; LEAP and LAP on site; leisure contribution; environmental enhancements; provision of 40% affordable housing; off-site highways works; Woodland improvement; Parish Council 10 year maintenance plan; the setting up of a Management Company for open space, play space, landscaping, footpath and cycle links, and SuDS; conditions 1 to 42 and informatives 1 to 23, permission be APPROVED

Decision 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 planning permission, then permission be REFUSED.

Following consideration of this item, Councillor Mary Forszowski gave her apologies as she had to attend an important Parish Council meeting of which she was chairman.

72.2 ITEM A1 - WA/2016/1234 - BAKER OATES STABLES, GARDENERS HILL ROAD, WRECCLESHAM (Agenda item 5.2)

Proposal

Approval of reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale) following the outline approval for the erection of 43 dwellings (as amended by plans received 06/10/2016, 24/10/2016 and 01/11/2016).

Officers update

The Committee was advised that the principle of development and the means of access had been approved and established along with all the technical matters unrelated to the reserved matters required to assess whether the site would be suitable for the development of 43 dwellings. These included issues relating to air quality, archaeology and effect on the SPA. Members were made aware that these were not for consideration under this application, but they could discuss appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

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 noted from the update sheet that following discussions with the applicants, a number of amended conditions were proposed and these were detailed in the update.

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:

Richard Walker – Objector
Cllr Kika Mirylees – Farnham Town Council
Viv Hall - 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 application. Members reiterated their concerns for this site which they had refused but which had been granted on appeal. They felt that the design was not in keeping with the character of the area and that, although not under consideration for application, the road was unsafe. It was suggested though, that the applicants should consider a footpath leading through the site to mitigate this.

The Committee was disappointed that the applicants, knowing Members concerns about the site, had not carried out any consultation with them or local residents prior to submitting the application. If they had, concerns about the shape size and form of the development could have been discussed and addressed. It was recognised that the site was difficult because of lying on a hill, however, the design of the dwellings was felt to be poor, too urban and Members did not like 15 dwellings all in a line. They also didn't like the different road surfaces around the development.

Following further discussion, the Committee then moved to the vote on the revised Recommendation A (as noted in the update sheet) and it was unanimously voted down by Members. Therefore, a motion to refuse the application was put forward and the vote was 19 for and 1 abstention.

Decision

RESOLVED that the application be REFUSED for the follow reasons:

1. The proposal, as a result of its linear nature and lack of architectural variety would be of poor design and layout that would be out of character with the surrounding area and would fail to take the opportunities available for improving character and quality of the area, contrary to Policies D1 and D4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002, paragraphs 17, 58, 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, the Farnham Design Statement 2010, Policies TD1 of the Pre-Submission Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2016 and FNP1 of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2016; and
2. In the absence of an acceptable layout, insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the design of the sustainable urban drainage system (SuDS) could be implemented in connection with the proposed development and that the proposal would not result in unacceptable increase in surface water runoff that could increase flood risk elsewhere contrary to Policy D1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002, paragraphs 17 and 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policies CC1 and CC4 of the Pre-Submission Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2016.

The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and concluded at 8.53 pm

Chairman