

WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23 APRIL 2019

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

Present

Cllr Peter Isherwood (Vice Chairman, in the Chair)	Cllr Jerry Hyman
Cllr Brian Adams	Cllr Anna James
Cllr Maurice Byham	Cllr Denis Leigh
Cllr Carole Cockburn	Cllr Stephen Mulliner
Cllr Kevin Deanus	Cllr Nabeel Nasir
Cllr Paul Follows	Cllr Chris Storey
Cllr Mary Forszewski	Cllr Liz Townsend
Cllr Michael Goodridge	Cllr John Ward
Cllr John Gray	Cllr Nick Williams
Cllr David Hunter	

Cllr Patricia Ellis (Substitute)

Cllr Jim Edwards (Substitute)

Apologies

Cllr David Else, Cllr Mike Band, Cllr Val Henry and Cllr Simon Inchbald

135. MINUTES (Agenda item 1.)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 17 April 2019 were confirmed and signed.

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

Apologies for absence had been received from Cllrs David Else, Mike Band, Val Henry and Simon Inchbald.

Cllrs Patricia Ellis and Jim Edwards attended as substitutes.

In the absence of Cllr David Else, Cllr Isherwood chaired the meeting.

137. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS (Agenda item 3.)

There were no declarations of interests in connection with items on the agenda.

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

There were no questions from members of the public.

139. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS (Agenda item 5.)

There were no questions from Members.

140. PERFORMANCE AGAINST GOVERNMENT TARGETS (Agenda item 6.)

The Committee noted that the Council continued to perform well against government targets for speed and quality of decision-making.

The Chairman proposed, and it was duly seconded and agreed by the Committee, that the two items on the agenda for determination be taken out of order.

141. APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION - NMA/2019/0059 - LAND AT EAST STREET, FARNHAM (Agenda item 8.)

Proposal

Amendment to WA/2016/0268 for amendments to building named 'D15' (as amended by plans received 10/04/2019).

The Chairman introduced the officers present.

The case officer presented the history of the planning permission for the East Street development and the subsequent Non Material Amendment (NMA) relating to the approved drawing numbers. The current NMA proposed a relatively minor amendment to the position of building D15 within the scheme, such that the building would move away south and west from the boundary on the north and east, by less than 1m. There were no significant changes proposed to the elevations.

In the context of the overall scheme, this was considered to be a Non Material Amendment: there were no material changes to neighbouring amenity and visual amenity; no changes to car parking or cycle parking spaces; a slight increase, or no change, to the floor area of the units within D15; and no change to the highways.

Thames Valley Housing had raised no objections to the proposal, and the County Highway Authority had also raised no objection. In particular they had confirmed that there continued to be safe access for all vehicles including articulated vehicles, and swept-path analysis confirmed that vehicles would not over-run the footpath. This part of the highway was not part of a bus route.

Officers had considered the proposal in the context of the cumulative impact of previous NMAs, and were satisfied that this was not a material amendment to the scheme. There was no prescribed definition of an NMA, and the general legal principle was that it was an amendment that was not material within the context of the overall permission. Given the sensitivity of the scheme, the NMA had been brought to the JPC to ensure transparency of decision-making.

Cllr Hyman referred to the report that he had circulated to committee members and officers earlier in the day, which set out his serious concerns in relation to the proposal and the impact on the safety of pedestrians in the vicinity of the building. He was not convinced that vehicles would not over-run the foot paths; his understanding was that this was a proposed bus route; and he did not feel that moving a substantial building could be considered 'non material'.

In contrast, the rest of the Committee members were largely satisfied that the proposal was non-material, but asked to see the swept-path analysis for vehicles.

The case officer displayed the drawings which showed that there was sufficient room for a variety of vehicles of different sizes to navigate the perimeter road without over-running the footpath. Some Committee members were disappointed that the size of the residential units still would not meet the national technical space standards, but officers pointed out that the original permission dated back to 2008 and the standards were much more recent; it was not possible to require an increase in the size of units.

The Chairman moved the recommendation, that the NMA be consented, which was approved by 17 votes in support, 4 votes against, and no abstentions.

Decision

RESOLVED that the Non-Material Amendment Application be APPROVED.

142. APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION - WA/2018/2032 - LAND NORTH OF THE RUNWAY EXTENSION, DUNSFOLD PARK, STOVOLDS HILL, CRANLEIGH (Agenda item 7.)

Proposal

Hybrid application consisting of a Full Application for the erection of Buildings C, D and Energy Centre to provide approximately 6,400 sq. m. of floor space for Design and Engineering use (Mix of B use Classes to comprise Use Classes B1 Business and B8 Storage and distribution) together with car parking, landscaping and associated works. Outline application for the erection of 4 additional buildings (Mix of B use Classes to comprise Use Classes B1 Business and B8 Storage and distribution) including Design Headquarters; Layout and Scale to be determined at Outline. This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement Addendum which is supplementary to the original Dunsfold Park ES submitted under WA/2015/2395.

The case officer presented the details of the proposal, as set out in the agenda report, together with photos of the site and artists impressions of the proposed elevations and layout of the proposed development. Attention was drawn to the updates report which detailed the consultation response from the Council's Economic Development Team endorsing the economic benefits deriving from the proposals, additional representations, and additional comments from Rutland for Dunsfold Airport Ltd expressing support and confirming that the application did not compromise the implementation of the Dunsfold Park Masterplan. The Update also advised that a planning application for a new site access to Dunsfold Park from the A281 would be submitted in May 2019.

Public speaking

In accordance with the council's arrangements for public speaking, the representations were heard from:

Simon Wakefield – Objector
Stephen Haines – Chairman, Dunsfold Parish Council
Dermot Walsh – Supporter (on behalf of the applicant)

The Committee members were broadly supportive of the application, which would secure the future of a world class innovative engineering company in Waverley. Committee members were also pleased to learn of the imminent planning application for the new access road, and noted that in due course this would remove the need for the cap on traffic movements via the Stovolds Hill gate.

There were some reservations about whether traffic movements could be contained within the cap up to the point when the new access road was operational; and whether there had been sufficient effort made to consult with the local communities.

Cllr Townsend raised a number of concerns about the proposed development: she was disappointed that it was not part of the Dunsfold Park Masterplan, and not within the existing commercial area of Dunsfold Park. The building would be visible from the AONB, she was disappointed that the mitigations suggested by Natural England and the AONB Board had not been required through conditions.

Cllr Townsend had particular concerns about the absence of a consultation response from Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT), where waste water would be sent for treatment, and the intention to have a gas boiler on site. Cllr Townsend was minded to seek a deferral to allow the SWT consultation response to be considered, and for further information on the location of the sewage treatment works for the development, but sensed that this was unlikely to be supported by the committee. However, she was not comfortable that the committee was being asked to approve the application without the SWT comments.

The case officer advised that notwithstanding the absence of the SWT comments, the Surrey County Council in-house Environmental Assessment Team had confirmed that the information set out in the Environmental Statement and its supporting appendices, in combination with any additional information or evidence from the consultation on the planning application was sufficient for the application to be determined. Officers were satisfied that ecological mitigations had been appropriately conditioned, and that the mitigations suggested by Natural England and the AONB were covered by informatives.

With regards to the sewage treatment works, Thame Water had not objected on the basis of the foul water sewage network infrastructure capacity, but had requested a condition on water network upgrades to ensure sufficient capacity for anticipated additional demand.

The Chairman moved recommendation A, that permission be granted subject to completion of a legal agreement by 23/10/2019 to secure highway sustainability improvements and travel plan auditing fee, and subject to conditions.

The recommendation to grant planning permission passed with 20 votes in support, none against, and one abstention.

The Chairman then moved recommendation B, that if the requirements of the resolution to grant permission were not met, then permission be refused.

The recommendation was passed unanimously.

Decisions

A. RESOLVED that subject to completion of a legal agreement by 23/10/2019 to secure highway sustainability improvements and travel plan auditing fee, and subject to conditions 1 to 36 and Informatives 1 to 24, permission be GRANTED.

B. RESOLVED that if the requirements of Decision A are not met, that permission be REFUSED.

The meeting commenced at 7.40 pm and concluded at 10.10 pm

Chairman