

WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 27 NOVEMBER 2019

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

Present

Cllr Richard Cole (Chairman)	Cllr John Gray
Cllr David Beaman (Vice Chairman)	Cllr George Hesse
Cllr Brian Adams	Cllr Daniel Hunt
Cllr Peter Clark	Cllr Peter Isherwood
Cllr Carole Cockburn	Cllr Anna James
Cllr Steve Cosser	Cllr Jacquie Keen
Cllr Martin D'Arcy	Cllr John Neale
Cllr Sally Dickson	Cllr Peter Nicholson
Cllr Brian Edmonds	Cllr Liz Townsend
Cllr David Else	Cllr George Wilson
Cllr Paul Follows	

Apologies

Cllr Val Henry

Also Present

Councillor Patricia Ellis (Eastern Area)

31. MINUTES (Agenda item 1.)

The minutes of the meeting which took place on 30 October 2019 were confirmed and signed.

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

There were apologies for absence from Councillor Val Henry. There were no substitutes.

33. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS (Agenda item 3.)

Councillor Richard Cole advised that he had a non-pecuniary interest in A1 because of his role on the Cranleigh Planning Committee that of sufficient weight that could be a perception that wouldn't consider with an open mind. He will leave the meeting for this item and Cllr Beaman will take the chair.

Councillor Paul Follows advised that he had a non-pecuniary interest in item A1 because

- In his capacity as Deputy Leader he had met with a number of residents (in the presence of officers) to discuss the wider context of this application;
- He had received multiple emails and letters from residents and from representatives of the applicant / their agents; and

- He had met with planning officers on a number of occasions in regards to the planning process for this application.

He believed none of the above prevent him from taking part in the debate and voting.

Councillor Liz Townsend declared a non-pecuniary interest in item A1 as she was a Cranleigh Parish Councillor but had heard the application with officers present. She also declared a non-pecuniary interest in item A2 as the site was part of the Cranleigh Neighbourhood Plan which she had been involved with.

Councillor Patricia Ellis declared a non-pecuniary interest in applications A1 and A2 but she was not a member of the Committee nor attending as a substitute. She had been involved in, and had supported, the exchange of land. In relation to the school she had been a governor of the school and had resigned prior to the application being received.

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

There were none.

35. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS (Agenda item 5.)

There were none.

36. APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION (Agenda item 6.)

37. WA/2018/1966 - CRANLEIGH NURSING HOME, JOHN WISKAR DRIVE (Agenda item 6.1)

Councillor David Beaman was in the Chair for this item.

Proposal

Erection of a building to provide an 80 bed care home including 20 community beds together with a building to provide health workers accommodation with access from Knowle Lane, associated parking and ancillary works

Introduction

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 then outlined the proposed development including site plans and the layout. Officers outlined the determining issues and those matters of a more subjective nature.

The Committee was advised that since the agenda papers had been published there had been 38 additional representations from the public. There were 11 in objecting to the scheme and 27 in support. Cranleigh Parish Council had also reconsidered the amended access and highways layout and now had raised an objection on further grounds. There was also an amendment to the second reason for refusal of which is detailed in the update sheet.

The Committee was advised that the application had come to committee because of the level of public interest both for and against the application. The Head of Planning had, therefore, waived his delegated authority to refuse the application and brought it to Committee. Members noted that the Council had previously granted planning permission for the site to be developed for medically related purposes, however, this was prior to the National Planning Policy Framework and the adoption of the Council's new Local Plan Part 1. The proposal was for a significantly greater amount of development, the design and layout of which resulted in a very much more sprawling development that gave the appearance of filling the site significantly when compared to previous schemes. Officers advised that they felt that the benefits by way of 20 community beds, 60 private nursing beds and affordable health worker accommodation were not sufficient to outweigh the (visual) harm and adverse (landscape) impacts. It was, therefore, recommended that permission is refused.

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:

Cathy Plank	-	Objector
Cllr Rowena Tyler	-	Parish/Town Council
John Sneddon and Giles Mahoney	-	Supporters]

Councillor Patricia Ellis also spoke on this application as the local Ward Councillor.

Councillor Jerry Hyman also spoke on the application.

Debate

Prior to commencing debate a motion was put forward and seconded to defer consideration of the application as it was felt that there were a number of issues that needed to be addressed. Put to the vote there were 5 in favour of deferral, 14 against and 1 abstention so the motion was not carried.

Councillor Brian Adams opened debate on the application. He agreed with the officer recommendation feeling that the proposal was over development of the site. Councillor Jacqui Keen also was concerned and felt that 20 community beds which might not be gifted to the community in perpetuity was not a huge benefit. Councillor Keven Deanus was concerned about the state of the roads to the site which were already strewn with pot holes and suggested that there were several policies that the proposal conflicted with. Councillor Carole Cockburn also agreed with the officer recommendation for refusal because of the mass and scale of the proposed development.

Councillor Liz Townsend was not convinced that there was a big enough community benefit and there was an absence of wildlife surveys. Councillor Sally Dickson was concerned about the increase in traffic along the road and the impact on the wildlife and trees with such a large building.

Councillor Peter Isherwood disagreed with the officers, citing a recent NHS report which referred to carers living close to homes. Councillor Anna James also

disagreed with the officer recommendation and felt that these were much needed beds in the area and was in the right place for it.

Officers advised that the amount of development sought had been justified via independent assessment as the minimum that was financially necessary to deliver the 20 community beds – the key community benefit. The 60 private nursing beds would also be of benefit to the community. The health workers accommodation was subsidised and as such was considered to provide affordable accommodation that would be a benefit to the community. Councillors were correct about the community beds only receiving funding for 5 years, however, the applicant had confirmed their willingness to enter into a legal agreement to secure community benefits. Despite this, The assessment of all the planning considerations that applied to the proposed development the officers conclusion was to recommend refusal as the scale of the development would result in unacceptable impacts on the countryside and protected views that could not be overcome by the community benefits arising from the scheme.

The Committee moved to the recommendation for refusal and there were 15 for the recommendation for refusal, 1 against and 5 abstentions.

Decision

That permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. Reason.

The proposed development by reason of its location within the Countryside beyond the Green Belt would result in the loss of a Greenfield outside of a defined settlement boundary. The proposed development would therefore be in conflict with the Council's Spatial Strategy and the proposal would be contrary to Policies SP2, RE1 and TD1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2018 (Part 1) and retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002 and the NPPF 2019.

2. Reason

The Site Lies within an Area of Strategic Visual Importance within which the landscape character is to be conserved and enhanced. The proposal is inconsistent with this aim and conflicts with national, strategic and local policies set out in Policy C5 of the retained policies of the Waverley Local Plan 2002.

3. Reason

In the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure a travel plan such to maximise the use of sustainable travel modes, the proposal would conflict with Policy ST1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and section 8 of the NPPF 2019 (Promoting Sustainable Travel).

38. WA/2017/1389 - CRANLEIGH C OF E PRIMARY UPPER SCHOOL & CRANLEIGH C OF E LOWER SCHOOL, PARSONAGE ROAD & CHURCH LANE, CRANLEIGH, GU6 7AN, GU6 8AR (Agenda item 6.2)

Councillor Richard Cole returned to Chairing the meeting.

Proposal

Outline Application for the erection of 91 dwellings (including 27 affordable dwellings), provision of new and altered access, amenity space, landscaping and associated infrastructure with all matters reserved except access, following demolition of all existing buildings (as amplified by additional information received 27/07/2018 and amended by additional information and plans received 17/09/18)

Introduction

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 then outlined the proposed development including site plans and the layout. Officers outlined the determining issues and those matters of a more subjective nature.

The Committee was advised that since the agenda papers had been published there had been several amendments to conditions. As these were not noted in the update sheet but spoken verbally, these amendments are noted below:

Condition 3 – Plan numbers conditions

It was recommended that a note is added to the proposed wording to confirm that plans 15013/C101C, 15013/C102A, 15013/SK21B, 15013/SK22B, 15013/SK23A, and 15013/SK24A are indicative only for all matters other than access.

Condition 4 – Provision of school and play facilities prior to implementation

This condition was recommended to be deleted as these matters would be covered by the legal agreement.

Condition 8 – Water supply impact studies

It was recommended that this condition is amended to the following:

“Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted, the developer shall ensure that sufficient water supply to serve the development (without harm to existing water supply to other sites) has been provided in accordance with detailed impact studies of the existing water supply infrastructure which have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Thames Water).”

Condition 13,14 and 15 – Noise – It was recommended that these conditions are deleted as they are sufficiently covered by (amended) condition 18.

Condition 18 – Construction Environmental Management Plan

It is recommended that point c is amended with the following addition: “Such details of measures to minimise noise shall include details of how the first occupiers of the development will be protected from noise within the rest of the development site.”

Condition 19 – No flood lighting

It was recommended that this condition is re-written as:

“No floodlights or other forms of external lighting shall be installed at the development (either for the carrying out of the development or for use when the development is occupied) other than as agreed in relation to condition 18(d).”

Condition 21 – Biodiversity enhancements

It was recommended that the date of the report referred to in point d is amended to relate to the July 2018 report.

Members were also alerted to an amendment to the recommendation which was amended as follows:

“That, subject to the applicant entering into appropriate legal agreement within 6 months of the date of the committee resolution to grant planning permission to secure affordable housing, **provision of an appropriate replacement educational facility**, off-site play area and playing pitch improvements, off site community facility improvements and on-site SuDS and open space management/maintenance and subject to conditions and informatives, permission be GRANTED.”

(reference to off-site environmental improvements deleted).

The Committee noted that the report had come to Committee because the proposal did not fall within the Council’s scheme of delegation. Members were advised that whilst the matters of appearance, scale, layout and landscaping were reserved, the applicant had demonstrated that 91 units could be achievable within the site subject to satisfactory details being submitted at reserved matters stage. All other technical matters including heritage, trees, ecology, archaeology, and noise were also found to be acceptable.

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:

Marian Ireland	–	Objector
Rosemary Burbridge	-	Parish/Town Council
Mrs Marclaren	-	Supporter]

Councillor Patricia Ellis spoke as Ward Councillor but was not a member of the committee.

Debate

The Committee considered the proposal and the updates to the report. Councillor Liz Townsend advised that within the Neighbourhood Plan it is clear that the proposal would only be acceptable if got planning permission for the other school. The traffic around that area was already congested and she had concerns about road safety and increase in parking pressure. The bat surveys were out of date and she was worried about the wildlife on the site. She also felt the loss of a large number of trees on the site was unacceptable of which Councillor Anna James shared her concerns. Officers advised that the County Council had an obligation to provide education and had ownership of the Glebelands site. If permission was granted, a restrictive legal agreement clause was recommended to ensure that the re-provision of both schools took place prior to the commencement of demolition of the existing buildings, to ensure that there was continuous provision of school places. Officers also advised that The Council’s Landscape and Tree Officer had raised no objection to the loss of these existing trees, noting that the illustrative layout plans supporting this application demonstrated that good relationships

between the retained trees and the proposed built form could be achieved on the sites.

Furthermore, the Council's Landscape and Tree Officer was also satisfied that the indicative planting demonstrated on the supporting illustrative layout was reasonable for the scale of development proposed

Councillor Carole Cockburn asked for clarification on the progress of the neighbourhood plan. Officers advised that the Draft Cranleigh Neighbourhood Plan was reaching an advanced stage of preparation and was currently subject to consultation under Regulation 16. The Plan carried very limited weight at this stage in the process.

Councillor Steve Cosser recognised that the school needed new accommodation. There were currently operational and functional difficulties with the existing accommodation, including operating from split sites, outdated and poorly designed building which had resulted in maintenance issues, such as leaks and poor disabled access. He recognised that this had been designated as a good site for relocation. He was, however, concerned about the loss of trees. Officers confirmed that in light of the difficulties, Surrey County Council sought a strategy to bring the Primary School onto one site. Such a strategy would bring improved facilities, further school places to meet future local demand, reduced future maintenance costs, reduced costs on utilities expenditure and a building that would comply with Disabilities Discrimination Act (DDA) regulations.

Councillor Paul Follows asked about the technical floor space standards which the report implied were below the guidelines. Councillor Kevin Deanus did not feel that the indicative schemes design was of good quality and also questioned the floor space. They were advised that whilst the majority of the proposed units would meet the standards, the internal floor area of the one bedroom houses would fall below the standard. However, Officers were confident that a reserved matters scheme could be developed on site that would accommodate for this shortfall.

Councillor Brian Edmonds asked whether or not air quality measurements had been taken. He was advised that the Council's Environmental Health Officer for Air Quality had raised no objection subject to condition.

Councillor Sally Dickson also raised her concern about the removal of 37 trees which she felt was too much as they were quite significant trees. Furthermore, she felt that the density was too much. Councillor Brian Adams agreed and raised a point about provision of parking for the school. He felt that the number of dwellings should be less.

Officers advised in response to David Beaman that if the proposal went through then they could add an informative for e-charging points. In response to some of the concerns regarding parking, she went on to advise that the means of drop off at the school of children was a matter for this Committee to consider but was something that Surrey County Council would need to look into.

Councillor George Hesse raised concern regarding potential flood risk. Officers advised that the Environment Agency had no objection. The development site was considered to fall entirely within Flood Zone 1. Therefore, the development was considered to be at low risk from fluvial flooding. The Lead Local Flood Authority had also raised no objection subject to condition.

Following debate, the Chairman moved to the recommendation to grant and 2 voted in favour to grant, 19 against and 1 abstention so the motion was lost. An alternative motion was proposed and seconded to refuse the application with 20 in favour and 2 abstentions so the motion to refuse was carried.

Decision

RESOLVED that the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The proposal by reason of the number of units proposed would result in overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the character and amenity of the surrounding area contrary to Policy Td1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, retained policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002 and the Cranleigh Design Statement.
2. The proposal would be likely to result in the loss of trees on site to the detriment of the character and amenity of the area contrary to Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and retained policies D1, D4, D6 and D7 of the Local Plan 2002.
3. The proposal by reason of in combination affects in relation to schools in the area could lead to inconvenience and harms to the visual amenity of the surrounding areas, contrary to Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, retained policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002 and the Cranleigh Design Statement; and
4. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure the provision of affordable housing, an appropriate replacement educational facility, off-site play area and playing pitch improvements, off site community facility improvements, measures to encourage future occupiers to use sustainable transport and on-site SuDS, open space and play facilities management and maintenance, the proposal would fail to provide an acceptable development. IT would thereby fail to comply with Policies TD1, ANH3, ICS1, ST1 and LRC1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and paragraph 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

39. WA/2019/1168- LAND AT WEST CRANLEIGH NURSERIES AND NORTH OF KNOWLE PARK BETWEEN KNOWLE LANE AND ALFOLD ROAD, CRANLEIGH
(Agenda item 6.3)

Proposal

Application for all remaining reserved matters for site A pursuant to the outline planning permission WA/2016/2207, comprising details of the design, construction and management of a 22.80 hectare country park including the provision of associated car parking, cycle parking, public toilets and play equipment. This application affects a public footpath. This is a subsequent application to outline permission WA/2016/2207 which was accompanied by an Environmental Statement (revision of WA/2018/2019)

Introduction

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 then outlined the proposed development including site plans and the layout. Officers outlined the determining issues and those matters of a more subjective nature.

The Committee was advised that since the agenda papers had been published the Environment Agency had been consulted on additional information to demonstrate that all proposed ground levels associated with the park land application site would either be lowered or maintained at the existing current ground level. They were advised that the Environment Agency found this to be satisfactory and had no objections to the partial discharge of condition 16 of the outline consent in relation to the application site (Site A).

The Committee noted that the application had come to committee because it was a major application for 22.80 hectare country park which fell outside of the Council's Scheme of Delegation. Permission was sought for the approval of all reserved matters relating to site A of the outline consent WA/2016/2207 for a new country park in Cranleigh. Having given consideration to the Development Plan as a whole, it was considered that the proposed development would be acceptable subject to conditions.

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:

Councillor Nigel Sanctuary - Parish/Town Council
Robert Winkley - Supporter]

Debate

The Committee considered the application. Councillor Liz Townsend opened debate saying that it was a fantastic opportunity but as it affected a Public Footpath 393 and Long Distance Footpath LT11 whether it needed a proper assessment. Officers confirmed that this was not necessary. She went on to talk about the possibility of anti-social behaviour in the car park and whether anything could be done. Officers agreed that they could put an extra condition on the permission to include barriers/bollards.

Councillor Paul Follows asked about the ongoing maintenance of the application site. Officers confirmed that this would be carried out by the management company of the associated development.

Councillor Brian Adams asked whether a defibrillator and lifebuoys would be provided in the park. Officers advised that this was covered by separate health and safety legislation.

Councillor George Wilson asked about whether or not there would be commercial activity/entertainment on the site. Officers advised that there was conditions in place and this was covered by separated legislation.

Moving to the recommendation, it was moved and seconded to grant the scheme subject to an extra condition in relation to bollards in the car park. Councillors voted 21 in favour and 1 against with no abstentions.

Decision

RESOLVED that, subject to conditions and an extra condition in relation to barriers, permission be GRANTED

MEETING ADJOURNED

At 9.25pm it was agreed by vote that the meeting be adjourned following the decision of item A3, WA/2009/1168.

40. WA/2019/1171 - LAND CENTRED COORDINATES 485710 148770 ON WEST SIDE OF GREEN LANE, BADSHOT LEA (Agenda item 6.4)

Proposal

Approval of reserved matters: layout, scale, appearance and landscaping following outline permission granted under WA/2015/2283 for the erection of up to 105 dwellings (including 32 affordable) together with associated works (as amplified by drainage information received 08/08/2019 and 12/08/2019 and amended plans and information received 20/09/2019 and 07/11/2019)

The meeting was adjourned following consideration of the previous item. This planning application would be considered as soon as possible and Members would be informed. (*Note: Date of reconvened meeting was arranged for 17 December at 6.30pm*)

The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and concluded at 10.15 pm

Chairman