

**JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**28 MARCH 2017**

**UPDATE SHEET**

---

Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the agenda

---

**WA/2016/1261**

**FORMER WEYBURN BARTEL WORKS, SHACKLEFORD ROAD, ELSTEAD**

Update to the report

Page 1 – Time Extension agreed to 30<sup>th</sup> April 2017.

Page 15 – Relevant Planning History

WA/2015/0789 – replace ‘Appeal Decision Pending’ with ‘Appeal Allowed 20/03/2017’.

Add the following paragraphs to the end of the ‘Planning History and differences with previous proposal’ section on Page 54:

WA/2015/0789 has been allowed on appeal, with its decision date as the 20<sup>th</sup> March 2017. The following provides a summary of the key conclusions drawn from this appeal decision, which is attached for reference:

- The Inspector concluded that the Council could not demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, outlining that the Council has somewhere between 4.08 years and 4.27 years (paragraph 39). Further, the Inspector recommends the application of the 20% buffer, rather than 5% buffer, as it was concluded that the under-delivery of housing against the Borough had been persistent (paragraph 27).
- The Inspector concluded that the proposed development would increase harm to the openness of the Green Belt when compared with the existing development (paragraph 56). The Inspector therefore concluded that the proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt (paragraph 59).
- The Inspector concluded that the proposal would conserve the AONB and AGLV and in some limited respects would offer modest visual improvements over that which currently exists (paragraph 73).
- The Inspector outlined that the car park demands of a neighbouring site are not indicative of a demand for employment floorspace, rather they point to the

requirement for additional car parking provision on a temporary basis to service an existing employment use elsewhere (paragraph 83).

- The Inspector concluded that, having regard to all of the evidence, there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for employment purposes and therefore no need for the site to be retained for such purposes. Consequently the proposal satisfies the policy tests of Policy IC2 of the Local Plan and the Framework (paragraph 84).
- The inspector concluded that the appeal proposal did not provide suitable on-site play space provision (paragraph 91). The current proposal has overcome this via on-site provision of a LEAP, which final details are to be secured via condition.
- The Inspector concluded that the contribution made by market and affordable housing in pure numerical terms is a positive factor in the balance. However, the particular housing mix of the proposal is out of kilter with the profile of housing need and it is a factor which counts against the development. In this respect it is contrary to policy H4 and the Inspector attributed moderate weight to the harm to policy objectives which seek to ensure an appropriate mix of housing (paragraph 98).
- The Inspector accepts the condition imposed by Natural England to ensure that the care home would not have a significant effect upon the SPA (paragraph 106).
- The Inspector concludes that final details of the SuDS for the development could be controlled via the imposition of conditions (paragraph 108).
- The Inspector accepted the level of car parking provision for the Care Home (paragraph 110). The Inspector also concluded that limited weight should be given to the provision of the Care Home (paragraph 120).
- The Inspector attached significant weight to the redevelopment of a brownfield site which is no longer needed for employment purposes (paragraph 123).
- The Inspector concluded that the cumulative benefits of the scheme outweigh the harm, such that very special circumstances exist. The Inspector then went on to confirm that Green Belt policies and considerations do not indicate that development should be restricted.
- The Inspector concluded that the adverse impacts of the proposal do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and that permission should be granted (paragraph 137).

#### Officer comment

The conclusions of the appeal decision are noted and are a highly material consideration in favour, and overcomes matters that weighed against the scheme as set out in the officers report, such as housing mix and the link with the neighbouring employment site. Officers therefore consider that the appeal decision further supports officers' recommendation to grant permission.

**Revised Recommendation**

**Recommendations A and B remain as set out on pages 127 - 149 of the agenda.**

---