

WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 1 JULY 2015

SUBMITTED TO THE COUNCIL MEETING – 21 JULY 2015

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

**Present**

Cllr Brian Adams	Cllr Anna James
Cllr Maurice Byham	Cllr Andy MacLeod
Cllr Carole Cockburn	Cllr Stephen Mulliner
Cllr Brian Ellis	Cllr Stewart Stennett
Cllr David Else	Cllr Chris Storey
Cllr Mary Forszewska	Cllr Bob Upton
Cllr Pat Frost	Cllr Liz Wheatley
Cllr John Gray	Cllr John Williamson
Cllr Christiaan Hesse	Cllr Patricia Ellis
Cllr Anna James	Cllr Jeanette Stennett
	Cllr Nick Williams

**Apologies**

Cllr Michael Goodridge, Cllr Stephen Hill, Cllr Nicholas Holder, Cllr David Hunter and Cllr Peter Isherwood

19. MINUTES (Agenda item 1.)

The minutes of the meeting which took place on 24 June 2015 were confirmed.

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

There were apologies for absence received from Councillors Peter Isherwood, Michael Goodridge, Stephen Hill, Nicholas Holder and David Hunter. Councillors Jeanette Stennett, Patricia Ellis and Nick Williams attended as substitutes.

21. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS (Agenda item 3.)

Councillor Mary Forszewska declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in the application as she was a member of the Cranleigh Parish Council Planning Committee.

**PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNCIL**

There were no matters falling within this category.

**PART II - MATTERS OF REPORT**

The background papers relating to the following items are as set out in the reports included in the original agenda papers.

22. APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION - WA/2014/1754 - LAND AT 106 & CHANTREYS BUNGALOW & LAND TO SOUTH WEST OF HORSHAM ROAD, CRANLEIGH (Agenda item 5.)

Proposed development

Outline application for the erection of up to 149 dwellings and associated works with access onto Horsham Road. This application affects footpath 378, as amended by additional plans rec'd 25/2/15; additional Agricultural Land Classification Report rec'd 17/3/15 and 8/4/15 and as clarified by emails dated 22/5/15, 12/6/15, 15/6/15 and 17/6/15 at **Land At 106 & Chantreys Bungalow & Land To South West Of Horsham Road, Cranleigh**

The Chairman introduced the Officers present and referred Members to the proposed order of business for the meeting.

With reference to the report circulated with the agenda, Officers presented a summary of the planning history of the site, and the current plans and proposals. Officers showed pictures of the site and plans for the application. Officers outlined the matters of planning principle and technical assessment, and those matters of judgement; and reported on information received following publication of the agenda which was detailed in the Update report. This included two minor amendments to conditions 3 and 25 and additional comments from the Applicant. There had been 4 additional letters of representation but these did not raise any new material considerations.

Officers advised the Committee that the application was for outline planning permission with all matters reserved except means of access and landscape. The Council's preference was for previously developed land to be developed prior to green field sites. However, the Council was not able to identify a deliverable supply of housing sites from the identified sites that would sufficiently meet the housing demand for the next five years. This was a material consideration of significant weight in the assessment of the application.

The Committee noted in the presentation that the Cranleigh Society had written to the Secretary of State in accordance with the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, asking that that he re-screen the proposal. The National Planning Case Work Unit had advised officers that the Secretary of State was deciding whether or not to use his discretionary power to re-screen the application. Officers advice was that the application would not be EIA development but they had revised the recommendation to be subject to the Secretary of State's decision. The Committee was shown diagrams of the proposed improvements to the Downs Link and pedestrian access works along the Horsham Road and were provided with information about the indicative mix of dwellings for the site.

Following the Officers' presentation and before the Committee debated the application, in accordance with the guidance for public participation at meetings, each party was given the opportunity to speak for up to 5 minutes. The following people spoke to the application:

- Liz Townsend and Malcom Telsen – Objector
- Chris Rees – Supporter

Having heard the Officers' presentation as well as the representations from the objectors and the applicant and supporter, Members were invited to ask any further questions or to seek clarification on areas of concern from the officers.

The Committee discussed the location of the site and some Members felt that the proposal would result in an urbanising impact on the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Furthermore, there was concern about there not being a Local Plan in place which made areas such as Cranleigh and Farnham vulnerable and this should be looked at with some urgency. Some Members also felt that the proposal for the Downs Link to be a pedestrian route into town was not acceptable as the ground was not good and it was a long walk so residents were more likely to go into the town by car. However, it was argued that the developers were making improvements to the footpath that would make it acceptable for pedestrians and it ran alongside the existing built up area of Cranleigh and with the additional planting proposed by the developers, the proposal would be seen as a further extension of the existing built form.

The Committee raised concern about the increase in traffic movements and having only the one access point. However, it was noted that the County Highway Authority had not objected and had considered that the Transport Assessment submitted and the access as being acceptable from a highway capacity and safety point of view. Despite some of the Members concerns, the County Highway Authority also advised that the proposed highway improvements to the existing pavements and the proposed upgrading of the existing rights of way would help to encourage alternative means of travel into the village centre other than the car.

Some Members expressed concern about the lack of infrastructure in place and because of the size of the proposal did not feel the site was sustainable. Officers advised Members that the proposal had adequately mitigated its impact on local infrastructure and the proposal would comply with the requirements of the Local Plan and the NPPF with regards to infrastructure provision. Furthermore, Members were advised that development was needed to fund infrastructure improvements. The scheme would also have a management company in place to manage the SuDs scheme and maintenance of the ditch.

During discussion it was proposed and seconded that condition 11 in relation to impact studies of existing water supply infrastructure be amended. This motion was passed, and is noted in the decision below.

Members were pleased to see that the scheme would deliver a substantial level of both market and affordable housing, which would contribute significantly towards housing in the Borough. However, some Members questioned the affordability of the new homes, and did not think that the tenure mix of the affordable homes was acceptable as it did not fully meet the Council's aspirations for the precise mix of dwellings as informed by the SHMA (2014).

Finally, the Chairman moved to the recommendation to grant planning permission, with the previously agreed amendment to condition 11.

The vote was 9 in favour and 9 against, with 1 abstention. The Chairman used his casting vote to support the recommendation to Grant planning permission.

Decision

RESOLVED that permission be GRANTED subject to the completion of a S106 agreement by 31 August 2015 to secure: the provision of 40% affordable housing, the provision of Local Equipped Area of Play, highway and transport improvements; footpath improvements; infrastructure including education and environmental improvements, and the setting up of a Management Company to manage open spaces, the play area and SuDS scheme, and subject to the Secretary of State not screening the application as requiring an Environmental Impact Assessment, and subject to conditions as set out on pages 69 – 78 of the agenda and the amended conditions on the update sheet and informatives on pages 78 – 81 of the agenda as well as an amended condition 11 as noted below:

11. Development ~~should~~ **shall** not be commenced until: impact studies of existing water supply infrastructure have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority (in consultation with Thames Water). The studies should determine the magnitude of any new additional capacity required in the system and a suitable connection point.

(Councillors Brian Ellis, Patricia Ellis and Mary Foryszewski requested that their votes against the recommendation be recorded).

**The meeting commenced at 7pm and concluded at 8.47pm**

**Chairman**