CRANLEIGH PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD AT 7.00 PM
ON MONDAY 29TH OCTOBER 2018
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, VILLAGE WAY, CRANLEIGH

Cllr B Freeston* (Chairman of the Committee)
Cllr R Cole* (Vice Chairman)
Cllr J Betts*
Cllr R Burbridge*
Cllr K Fernandes*
Cllr A Richardson*
Cllr R Tyler*

PRESENT*
ALSO PRESENT: Two members of the public, one representative from Renaissance Retirement, Administration Clerk L Glazier

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None received.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

WA/18/0572 - Penwerris, 51 Horsham Road, Cranleigh. Cllr R Tyler declared a pecuniary interest as she is a resident of 51 Horsham Road.

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on 8th October 2018 were AGREED and signed by the Chairman as a true record.

4. CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

The Chairman informed Members that an email has been received from WBC in regard to Members objection to application TM/2018/0128 - Acres End, Bookhurst Road. The Chairman read the email to Members which explained the reasons the proposed work is reasonable.

5. PUBLIC SESSION

Two parishioners raised the following concerns for application WA/18/1659 - Windy Way, The Common:

- It was stressed that this is the sixth application in two years, which is causing great stress and health problems to the neighbouring residents and question why they keep submitting applications.
- The plans are unacceptable.
- Within the application they have not addressed the removal of the workshop, which is part of a garden wall and will affect two neighbouring properties.
- The pitched roof from the workshop currently blocks the view from Windy Way.
- The inspectors mentioned the removal of the workshop would be wrong.
The neighbouring properties gardens are higher than Windy Way, so a wooden fence would not hold the garden soil.

There are many mature shrubs and trees on the site, will they be replaced?

The parking would be insufficient and it’s impossible to reverse a car out of the site.

There are a lot more younger families and dog walkers now in the area using the access road.

The road leading to the High Street is a one-way road, if cars are waiting to exit on to the High Street no cars can enter the road, causing congestion for the High Street.

The access road would not cope with large construction vehicles.

The Inspectors report agrees with many of the reasons for objection.

The proposed side gate would look directly in The Larches window, but there is also no walk way here as there is a stream and the plans don’t correctly show the closeness of the building to The Larches.

6. NEW PLANNING APPLICATIONS - LIST 18/41,18/42 and 18/43

WA/18/1659  Windy Way, The Common, Cranleigh, Surrey, GU6 8SQ
Erection of a building to provide 4 flats and erection of a chalet bungalow with associated works following demolition an unlisted building in a conservation area.

It was agreed to consider application WA/18/1659 at this point in the meeting.

Cllr A Richardson left the meeting due to a prior commitment.

OBJECTION – Members agreed the design is contrived and incongruous. They highlighted the Inspector’s comments have not been addressed and it is still proposed to remove the workshop. Members also agree that the harm to the amenity of the neighbouring properties is still very evident. Also highlighting that the building has moved closer to The Larches now being 2 metres from the boundary, this combined with the proposed ridge height would further increase overlooking and the overbearing nature of the proposed building. The proposals also still do not provide sufficient amenity space for any potential residents.

Members would like to repeat all previous comments:

OBJECTION – Members highlighted that this is within the conservation area and that the 5-year housing supply has been met, this development is not needed.

The proposals are overbearing in nature and an overdevelopment of the site, having a negative impact on the residents of The Larches and Winscombe.

There is insufficient amenity space provided for the flats. The six parking spaces provided are inadequate and unrealistic. With the parking spaces for the chalet bungalow being impractical, with the large number of manoeuvres needed to park in the spaces.

Members highlighted the Inspector’s report and that there are no significant changes to address the impact on Winscombe.

Members questioned if new rights of way have been or will be sought, especially for the proposed chalet bungalow.

It was considered that the arboricultural statement and report is not properly represented and inadequate. With lack of justification for the removal of category C trees and other mature trees and shrubs on site.

Members would also like to repeat their previous comments:
OBJECTION – Members agreed that proposed plans would be an overdevelopment of the area in bulk and height, too dense and cluttered. There would also be a loss to neighbour amenity, loss of light and overlooking to the neighbouring properties. The proposed access to the site is suitable for single car traffic, would have a damaging effect to the Common and be detrimental to the visual appearance of The Common. Members raised concerns about the access for emergency vehicles.

Members would like to repeat their comments from the previous application WA/16/1544:

The Committee highlighted that this is a very confusing and convoluted application that needs more clarity in its ambiguous nature, due to the planning documents being for 6 flats and 2 semi-detached houses, but it has been described as 2 buildings to provide 8 flats. With concerns also being raised, as this application is double the invalid application. It was also highlighted that in the application it is said that a bridleway cannot be seen, this is untrue as there is a bridleway that can be seen from the site. It was also raised that the height of the proposed building is not 2 and half stories as in the documents but 3 stories high.

The application does not respect the local resident’s amenity and is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site in mass, bulk and height. The proposed building would create overlooking to the neighbouring properties where there currently is not any, creating a further impact to the resident’s amenity. Due to this the committee would ask that a WBC officer revisit the site. The proposals are also seen as not in keeping with the conservation area, as this is now part of the conservation area.

The application contravenes WBC’s parking guidelines, along with the stipulations set out by WBC in a previously agreed application in relation to parking near the stream on the boundary.

The proposed access road would have a damaging effect to the Common and not conserve it, this would be detrimental to the visual look and cause material damage to the Common. The Committee see a safety issue for cars accessing the site from the High Street, which is the main road into and out of Cranleigh, this is highly likely to increase the density of traffic and cars backing up in the High Street also the potential for cars to back onto the main road. The Committee highlighted the easement that is in place for the access road has not been set to take into account for high volumes of vehicle movements each day.

It was agreed that WBC’s Environmental Health should look at and be involved with the placement of refuse bins, as the suggested area shown is too close to the adjacent property, which will create excess noise and odours. Along with this there appears to be no proper access to the bins for the refuse vehicles.

The Committee Members agreed that with WBC’s current 5yr supply there is no longer a need for this type of housing and for the volume proposed to be crowded into the site.

WA/18/1669 Lemans Barn Farm, Wykehurst Lane, Ewhurst, Cranleigh, Surrey, GU6 7PF

Erection of a dwelling following demolition of existing agricultural buildings.

It was agreed to consider application WA/18/1669 at this point in the meeting.

OBJECTION – Members agree there is not enough information in the impact analysis and provision for protected species on site. Members would like to see more detail provided along with a more detail survey for the protected species on site.
The Studio, New Park, Horsham Road Cranleigh, Surrey, GU6 8EJ
Application under section 73 to vary condition 1 of WA/2017/2406 (plan numbers) to allow changes to design and external materials.

OBJECTION – Members strongly agree that this should be subject to a new planning application as the amendments are not minor and it would be inappropriate to consider this application in this way as there are so many changes to the original plan. With the removal of trees, change in materials and the repositioning of the dwelling being some.

Members are also concerned with the removal of mature trees from the site, particularly for the oak tree with a TPO as the wording within the application states the TPO is to remain for 5yrs after consent, the concern raised is what will happen to the TPO once 5yrs has past.

Land at Ruffold Farm, Guildford Road, Cranleigh, Surrey, GU6 8LT
Outline application for the erection of 20 dwellings (including 7 affordable) with access and layout to be determined together with associated works.

OBJECTION – Members strongly object to this application as it is outside the settlement boundary, the site is countryside outside of the Green Belt, the site is adjacent to the Green Belt, the proposed access is on a dangerous bend and there are Great Crested newts nearby.

The biodiversity report is from a 2008 survey, more information is needed along with up to date survey’s.

SCC have said they would refuse permission as there is insufficient site drainage.

Members would like to make it clear that there has been meaningful progress on the Neighbourhood Plan and the housing requirements are being met. The site was considered as part of the Neighbourhood Plan site assessment but is not a considered option at this time.

Members agreed that this application is premature and should not be considered at this time.

Land South Of High Street Between Alfold Road And, Knowle Lane, Surrey
Application for removal of trees subject of tree preservation order 01/17

OBJECTION – Members strongly object to this removal as a significate number of trees have already been removed from the site and there is not sufficient justification for the removal. Members would advise the developer to find an alternative route for drainage system.

Members highlight that unless there is disease or potential for significate damage to housing trees should be retained on the site.

1 Cranleigh Arts Centre, High Street, Cranleigh, Surrey, GU6 8AS
Erection of 3 extensions to provide an extension to the pottery rear meeting room with link and backstage storage area.

NO OBJECTION.

AMENDED PLANNING APPLICATIONS

7.

(one declaration of interest - Cllr R Tyler left the meeting.)

WA/18/0572 – Penwerris, 51 Horsham Road, Cranleigh – Based on the amendments made Members agreed to withdraw their previous objection.

(Cllr R Tyler returned to the meeting)
8. **APPEALS**

None received.

9. **ENFORCEMENT**

WA/17/2011- Site Of Swallow Tiles Land Centred Coordinates 507, Bookhurst Road – It has been reported that work has stopped on the site due to a breach of planning conditions 13, 14 and 16 not being discharged. Some conditions have now been discharged, but there is contractor and construction parking condition to be resolved.

10. **NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

Members agreed not to comment on the neighborhood plans.

11. **WAVERLEY DESIGN AWARDS 2018**

Members have no nominations to put forward.

12. **PARISH AND TOWN COUNCIL PLANNING FORUM**

Members would like to know more on infrastructure considerations and improvements to the website.

13. **EFFICIENCY PROCESSES**

Members discussed several ideas but agreed these would not make any significant changes.

14. **ATTENDANCE AT AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE (EASTERN) AND JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE**

It was AGREED for an available Cllr to speak on behalf of the Parish Council.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.39pm.

The next Planning Committee Meeting will be held on **Monday 19th November 2018 at 7.00 pm**.

---

**Signature**...........................................  

**Date**...............................................