

WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 17 FEBRUARY 2016

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

Present

Cllr Peter Isherwood (Chairman)	Cllr Christiaan Hesse
Cllr Brian Ellis (Vice-Chairman)	Cllr Nicholas Holder
Cllr Brian Adams	Cllr David Hunter
Cllr Paddy Blagden	Cllr Anna James
Cllr Maurice Byham	Cllr Andy MacLeod
Cllr Carole Cockburn	Cllr Stephen Mulliner
Cllr David Else	Cllr Stewart Stennett
Cllr Mary Forsyszewski	Cllr Chris Storey
Cllr Pat Frost	Cllr John Williamson
Cllr John Gray	

Apologies

Cllr Michael Goodridge, Stephen Hill and Cllr Bob Upton

Also Present

Cllr Kevin Deanus

37. MINUTES (Agenda item 1.)

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 August 2015 were confirmed and signed.

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

There were apologies for absence received from Councillors Michael Goodridge, Bob Upton and Stephen Hill. Councillors Patricia Ellis and Nick Williams attended as substitutes.

39. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS (Agenda item 3.)

Councillor Kevin Deanus declared a non-pecuniary interest as he lived in proximity of the site but in attendance at the meeting, and speaking on the application, as a Ward Councillor.

40. APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION - WA/2015/2261 - LAND WEST OF SWEETERS COPSE, LOXWOOD ROAD, ALFOLD (Agenda item 5.)

Proposed development

Application under Regulation 3 for alterations and extension to an existing multi-use community facility to provide additional community services at Memorial Hall, Babbs Mead, Farnham, GU9 7DX (as amended by plans received 24/07/2015)

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 drew attention to the Update report and advised Members that there had been one further letter of objection raising points which had been addressed in the officers report. There was also consultee responses from the County Highway Authority and Thames Water. The applicant had also provided some points of clarification on certain issues that Members had raised, specifically in relation to foul water run-off. Officers provided additional information regarding the comparison of dwelling density between the application site, Clappers Meadow and Chilton Close.

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:

Cllr Adrian Erica – Alfold Parish Council
Grant Stevenson - Supporter

Cllr Kevin Deanus also addressed the Committee.

Discussion

The Committee discussed the application which sought outline permission for the development proposal with all matters reserved except access. Members were reminded that all other matters were to be reserved for future consideration and that this type of planning application sought a determination as to the acceptability of the principle of the proposed development.

The Committee noted that this was a much reduced scheme from that previously submitted last year which was for 120 dwellings. This scheme had been refused but was currently at appeal. Members were advised that the National Planning Policy Framework was a material consideration in the determination of this application. Paragraph 215 stated that where a local authority did not have a development plan adopted since 2004, due weight may only be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF. The report identified the relevant Policies in the Local Plan, which related to the proposals and each section concluded on the amount of weight that was afforded to those Policies.

The Committee noted the concerns from the Local Ward Councillor and the Parish Council who did not feel that the application addressed objections to the previous schemes on the site despite the reduced number of dwellings. Concerns related to the housing need and increased traffic as a result of the development, particularly on Alfold Crossways junction and the northbound A281 and when taking into account the additional traffic which would be generated from the Wildwood Golf Club development, which was soon to be implemented, and other proposed developments in the village and surrounding areas. It was not felt that the development was in a sustainable location and access by non-car modes of transport including public transport was limited with very little scope to maximise viable sustainable transport.

The Committee was concerned by the addition traffic and discussed the impact of the development on the village. Some Members did not feel that there was a need for this development and sited concerns about the sustainability of its location. Some Members also raised concern about the capacity with the existing foul drainage system and potential for flooding. There was also some concern about the density of the proposed dwellings being out of keeping with the surrounding area, and that the encroachment into open countryside would be inconsistent with the existing setting, form and pattern of the rural settlement.

Officers advised the Committee that the scale of development would not result in a significant level of vehicular movements nor was the site subject to any protected landscape designation. The Council could not currently identify a deliverable supply of housing sites from the identified sites which would sufficiently meet the housing demand for the next five years. This was a material consideration of significant weight in this assessment. Linked to this, Policy C2 was a housing land supply policies and given the lack of a 5 year supply of housing, Members were advised that Policy C2 could only be afforded limited weight in respect of constraints on development in principle.

Members noted that the proposal would not result in the loss or alienation of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and would not result in the fragmentation of an agricultural holding. The County Highway Authority had assessed the Transport Assessment submitted and concluded that the access and highway improvements put forward would be sufficient to accommodate this increase in traffic.

It was noted that the scheme would deliver a substantial level of both market and affordable housing, which would contribute significantly towards housing in the Borough. In terms of flood risk, the site was located within Flood Zone 1 and was not, therefore, at risk of flooding from rivers. Officers considered that there were no adverse impacts of the development that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

With no further comments from Members, the Chairman moved the revised recommendation contained within the update sheet.

The recommendation to grant planning permission was approved with 10 Members voting in support, 10 voting against, and 1 Member abstaining. The Chairman used his casting vote to approve the application.

Recommendation A:

That permission be GRANTED, subject to Conditions 1 – 16 within the agenda, informatives 1-14 plus additional Conditions 17 - 22 listed within the Committee update sheet and completion of a S106 Legal Agreement to secure the provision of affordable housing, management and maintenance of the SuDS, on-site foul water package treatment plant and public open space, and infrastructure improvements to the highway network and education provision within 2 months of the date of this resolution to grant permission.

Recommendation B:

That in the event that the requirements of recommendation A are not met, permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. Reason

The applicant has failed to enter into an appropriate legal agreement to secure a programme of highway improvement works to mitigate the impact of traffic generated by the development. As such the proposal would fail to effectively limit the impacts of the development on existing infrastructure. The application therefore fails to meet the transport requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policies M2 and M14 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.

2. Reason

The applicant has failed to enter into an appropriate legal agreement to secure contributions towards education and the ongoing management and maintenance of SuDS and on-site Foul Water Package Treatment Plant and public open spaces. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies D13 and D14 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 and paragraphs 7 and 17 of the NPPF.

3. Reason:

The applicant has failed to enter into an appropriate legal agreement to secure the provision of affordable housing within the meaning of the NPPF, appropriate to meet Waverley Borough Council's housing need. The proposal would therefore fail to create a sustainable, inclusive and mixed community, contrary to the requirements of paragraph 50 of the NPPF.

The meeting commenced at 7pm and concluded at 8.52pm

Chairman