

WA/2020/0558 - Outline application with all matters reserved for erection of 24 apartments with underground parking following demolition of existing bungalow The Old Mission Hall (revision of WA/2018/1879) (as amplified by Transport Assessment, Travel Plan, updated ecology report, and amendment to proposed housing to include 7 of the 24 dwellings as affordable units) at The Old Mission Hall, Hookstile Lane, Farnham GU9 8LG

Ward: Farnham Firgrove
Case Officer: Rachel Lawrence
Extended Expiry Date: 26/03/2021 (expired)

Recommendation **That the reasons for refusal (as drafted) are agreed**

1. Introduction

The above application was reported to the Western Area Planning Committee on the 15/06/2021. The committee voted to refuse permission (contrary to the officer recommendation) for reasons relating to:

1. Visibility splays (highway safety)
2. Detrimental impact on use of shared surface area for pedestrians and cyclists (highway safety)
3. Use of narrow access by pedestrians, cyclists and cars (not demonstrated to be safe in highway safety terms)
4. Adverse impacts on neighbouring dwellings due to quantum and bulk
5. Standard of accommodation for future occupants having regard to light, outlook and amenity space
6. Out of keeping with character of area due to quantum of development
7. Effect on Thames Basin Heaths SPA (lack of legal agreement)
8. Failure to secure affordable housing (lack of legal agreement)
9. Insufficient provision for play
10. Loss of employment

The full reasons were to be agreed in writing with the Chairman and Local Ward Member. The Local Ward Member (Councillor Jerry Hyman) is unable to agree to the officer drafted reason for refusal in respect of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. This item is therefore referred to committee in order to allow the drafted reasons for refusal to be debated.

The original committee report is contained as an appendix to this report.

2. Recommended reasons for refusal

- 1) It has not been demonstrated that the proposed development could provide the required visibility splays and that the proposal would not result in an obstruction to the free and safe flow of traffic on Firgrove Hill. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the objectives of Policy ST1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2018, paragraphs 108, 109 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and FNP30 of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2032.
- 2) It has not been demonstrated that the proposal could be achieved without causing a detrimental impact on the highway safety for pedestrians and cyclists using the shared surface area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the objectives of Policy ST1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2018, paragraphs 108, 109 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and Policy FNP30 of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan (2013-2032).
- 3) It has not been demonstrated that the safe movement to and from the site by pedestrians, cyclists and cars associated with the development could be achieved using the existing narrow access driveway. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the objectives of Policy ST1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2018, Policy FNP30 of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan (2013-2032) and paragraphs 108, 109 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
- 4) It has not been demonstrated that the proposal, having regard to its close proximity to neighbouring dwellings, together with the quantum and bulk of the development, could be achieved without resulting in material adverse impacts to neighbouring occupiers by way of overbearing form and a loss of privacy. The proposal would thereby conflict with Retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002, Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites) 2018, the Farnham Design Statement, the Council's Residential Extensions SPD and paragraphs 127 NPPF 2019.
- 5) The proposal, having regard to the indicative plans submitted and the constrained nature of the site, has failed to demonstrate that an acceptable level of standard of accommodation could be achieved for future occupants having regard to the internal space, outlook and amenity space. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan Part 1, Policy FNP1 of the Farnham Neighbourhood

Plan 2013-2032, retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002, the Farnham Design Statement and paragraphs 127 NPPF 2019.

- 6) The proposal, having regard to indicative plans and the constrained nature of the site, has failed to demonstrate that the proposed quantum of development could be accommodated on site in an acceptable manner that would be in keeping with the character of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan Part 1, Policy FNP1 of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2032, retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002, the Farnham Design Statement and paragraph 127 of the NPPF 2019.
- 7) The applicant has failed to enter into an appropriate legal agreement under s 106 TCPA 1990 to secure a financial contribution towards the maintenance and enhancement of the SANG at Farnham Park, together with the provision of SAMM. In the absence of such legal agreement the proposal (in combination with other projects) would have a likely adverse effect on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and the Wealden Heaths I (SPA) in that it is now recognised that increasing urbanisation of the area around the SPA has a continuing adverse effect on its interest features, namely Nightjar, Woodlark and Dartford Warbler, the three internationally rare bird species for which it is classified. The proposal conflicts with Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan, Policies NE1 and NE3 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, Policies FNP12 and FNP13 of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2032 and the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance Strategy Review (2016).
- 8) In the absence of 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 Policy AHN1 of the Local Plan Part 1 (2018) and paragraph 64 of the NPPF 2019.
- 9) The applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed development would be capable of achieving appropriate play provision within the application site and the proposal would thereby conflict with Policies LRC1 and TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, Policy FNP1 of the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2032, retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002 and Paragraph 127 of the NPPF 2019.
- 10) It has not been demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for employment uses. The proposal would therefore

conflict with Policy EE2 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and paragraph 80 of the NPPF 2019.