

WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 15 NOVEMBER 2017

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

Present

Cllr Peter Isherwood (Chairman)	Cllr Stephen Hill
Cllr Carole Cockburn (Vice Chairman)	Cllr Nicholas Holder
Cllr Brian Adams	Cllr David Hunter
Cllr Mike Band	Cllr Jerry Hyman
Cllr Maurice Byham	Cllr Anna James
Cllr Kevin Deanus	Cllr Nabeel Nasir
Cllr David Else	Cllr Chris Storey
Cllr John Gray	Cllr Nick Williams

Apologies

Cllr Mary Forszewska, Cllr Pat Frost, Cllr Michael Goodridge, Cllr Denis Leigh, Cllr Stephen Mulliner, Cllr Stewart Stennett and Cllr John Ward

47. MINUTES (Agenda item 1.)

The minutes of the meeting which took place on 8th November were confirmed and signed.

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

Apologies were received from Councillors Mary Forszewska, Michael Goodridge, John Ward, Stewart Stennett, Denis Leigh and Pat Frost.

49. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS (Agenda item 3.)

Councillor Kevin Deanus declared a non-pecuniary interest in the application as he lived in the village.

50. APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION - WA/2017/1250, LAND WEST OF SWEETERS COPSE, LOXWOOD ROAD, ALFOLD (Agenda item 5.)

Proposed development

Approval of reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) following the outline approval of WA/2015/2261 for the erection of 55 dwellings (including 22 affordable) associated landscaping and open space, children's play area and private drainage system (as amplified by ecological information received 21/08/2017 and amended by plans received 16/10/2017)

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 advised that since the publication of the agenda, there had been 1 additional letter of representation received. The letter made several observations of which had already been addressed in the committee report. Additional comments were also submitted by the applicant/agent in support of the application. Members noted that officers were also in receipt of some minor amended plans which were outlined in the update sheet. Officers further advised that the County Archaeologist had confirmed that most of the archaeological works were now complete

Public speaking

The public speaking scheme was not triggered for this proposal.

Discussion

The Committee considered the proposal and raised disappointment that although some initial concerns had been addressed such as the provision of a bungalow and the withdrawal of street lighting, they felt that there should have been more engagement with the Local Parish Council as there were several other issues with the proposal.

The Committee felt that the design was not in keeping with the rest of the village. The layout of the development was more urban in design than rural and the car parking was positioned in blocks with limited public space. There was no mention of the Alfold Housing Rural Initiative in the Design and Access Statement, and focused more on Cranleigh.

Members were pleased that there was provision for a play area, however, expressed concerns about the positioning of this to the far corner. It was felt that it would be more in keeping with the village hamlet to have amenity and play areas as a central feature. Officers advised that the LEAP had been positioned in that way because it would have a natural surveillance from dwellings that directly faced it and that they felt that the development provided an acceptable amount of open space and play space.

The Committee noted that the car parking did meet the council's guidelines, however, this relied on the garages being used for parking and not storage which was not common these days. A further concern was in relation to some of the dwellings, 8 in total, would not meet the minimum gross internal floor area. And, although officers advised that with the lack of a local plan policy requiring this and the degree of discrepancy, this was not considered sufficient to warrant refusal and the proposed scheme was considered to provide an overall adequate standard of accommodation for future residents. Members noted this but still did not think it was an acceptable standard.

Having concluded debate, the Committee moved to the recommendation to approve the application subject to conditions. The chairman moved the recommendation it was lost with a vote of 5 in favour, 10 against and 2 abstentions. An alternate motion was put forward and seconded that the application be refused. This was discussed with the reasons and before moving to a vote, the Development Control Manager put to the Committee that the application be deferred so that they could discuss the matters of concern with the applicants and see whether they would be

willing to make any adjustments to their application. The motion for deferral was put to the vote of which 16 voted in favour and 1 abstention.

Decision

RESOLVED to DEFER making a decision on the application. The Committee wanted more information in relation to the layout bearing in mind the concerns raised about its urban design, to re-consider the scale and positioning of the proposed dwellings and car parking and consideration of relocating the LEAP towards the centre of the development as well as the provision of public space.

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm and concluded at 8.21 pm

Chairman