

**JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE
UPDATE SHEET
3RD October 2016**

Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the agenda

WA/2016/0417

**LAND AT 106 AND THE CHANTRY'S BUNGALOW AND LAND TO SW OF
HORSHAM ROAD, HORSHAM ROAD, CRANLEIGH**

Amendments to the report

Within the description of development, this should be amended to refer to plan 'CREST 20232 – 03D received 30/9/16', which reflects the revised layout.

Page 17 – 1st paragraph, after Regulations 2012, the remaining text of the paragraph should read:

The consultation period commenced in August. In accordance with paragraph 216 of the NPPF, weight can be given to the draft Plan, but the degree to which it can be determined by the stage the Plan has reached and the extent to which there are any unresolved objections to it. It is considered that significant weight can be given to the Pre-submission Plan following its publication on Friday 19 August, given its history of preparation thus far, the iterations of it and the extent of consultation and consideration on it to date. The weight afforded to the Draft Local Plan will increase as the Plan progresses through Examination and onto its adoption in 2017.

Responses from Consultees

Thames Water –

Reiterates the inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of the application – suggests a Grampian Style Condition.

In relation to surface water it is the responsibility of the developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer.

Surrey Police –

The revised layout G is acceptable.

Column lighting is appropriate and details shall be agreed;

Footpaths should be open with grass areas around them, and well managed, with tree canopies regularly trimmed below 2m to maintain natural surveillance;
Close boarded fencing 1.6m with trellis 0.3m on top will secure any gardens that border onto public area, especially footpaths and those on the boundary with the Downs Link.

County Council Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)

Satisfied that the documentation 161380-001B Horsham Road, Cranleigh, Surface and Foul Water Drainage Statement by Ardent Consulting Engineers meets the requirements for discharging conditions 10 and 12.

Additional representations

7 additional letters of objection have been received which reiterate concerns regarding :

- Siting of affordable housing – with the majority of units bordering the Nightingales Development and Horsham Road, should be greater pepper potting;
- Dispersal of foul and surface water drainage, concerns at capacity of ditch;
- Thames Water systems cannot cope, hence the septic tank and pumping stations. Adequate foul water system should be installed before permission is granted;
- Pumping station is close to northern boundary, implications for smells, flooding to existing residents
- Cumulative effect of developments in Cranleigh;
- TPOs must be binding;
- Unclear as to the boundary between existing development and proposed development;
- T junctions will result in headlights into existing properties;
- Children's play area is adjacent to main street;
- Flood risk – implications for residents;
- Proposals need to be fair to existing residents – current plans are detrimental in relation to light pollution, flooding risk, and clustering of affordable housing;
- Traffic generation and implications for local roads;
- Since application has been revised great crested newts have been found near 110 Horsham Road;
- Proposal will result in loss of amenity for existing residents;
- Cranleigh is at the limits of what its location, layout and infrastructure can support;
- A number of concerns expressed by the JPC have not been addressed in the latest revision – retention of the T junctions, all existing properties adjoining the site are detached, but the proposed dwelling are not. Members objections and recommendations have been largely ignored, the developers must take full notice
- Maintenance of the ditch needs to be secured;
- Position of northern boundary and ownership of the ditch is still in dispute by some residents and therefore cannot be used by developers in surface water drainage scheme;
- In relation to Applicants Technical summary, questions the note that the vendor has maintained the ditch and fencing and that it is cleared on a regular basis – neighbour has never seen the landowner maintain the ditch or fence.

Amendment to conditions

To cover concerns regarding the provision of boundary treatment around the site, and in particular any in relation to existing properties, it is suggested that condition 4 be amended to include after Local Planning Authority the following wording:

4. Within three months of the commencement of development, details of all proposed walls, fences, or other means of enclosure within and around the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. **This shall include details of consultations undertaken with adjoining occupiers affected by proposed fencing.** The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the dwellings and thereafter retained.

Add to condition 21 (plan numbers) the following additional plan:

CREST 20232-03D – Tree Protection Plan

Additional informatives

Informative 21:

Following conversations with Surrey Police suggest an additional informative:

21. The applicant is advised that in relation to condition 4, it is likely that a 1.6m close boarded fence and a 0.3m trellis above would be required to the private amenity areas of plots 1, 17, 18, 34, 35, 68-71, 132, 133, 141, 142 and 149.

Revised Recommendation

That reserved matters be AGREED subject to conditions 1-3 and 5-20 as detailed on on pages 59 – 68 of the agenda, **and amendments to conditions 4 and 21 as detailed in the update sheet**, and informatives 1 – 20 on pages 68 – 71 of the agenda **and additional informative 21 on the update sheet.**