

ALFOLD PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Alfold Parish Council Meeting held on **Tuesday 9th January 2018** at Alfold Village Hall.

Present: Mr Nik Pidgeon (Chair); Mrs Penni Mayne; Mr Adrian Erricker; Mr Nigel Budd; Mrs B Weddell (Clerk)

Three members of the public were in attendance.

Apologies: Apologies for absence had been received from Mr Alasdair Denton-Miller, Mrs Betty Ames, Mr Wayne Mouring and Cllr Kevin Deanus.

18/001 **Declarations of interest pertaining to agenda items**
Mr Erricker declared a non-pecuniary interest in planning application WA/2017/2286.

ACTION

The meeting was suspended to allow comments from members of the public: A member of the public commented that the hedge to the north of the village hall entrance had not been cut back sufficiently. A member of the public raised concerns about hedging being removed in front of the new development in Dunsfold Road.

18/002 **Minutes**
The minutes of the parish council meetings held on 7th November and 7th December 2017 were approved as a correct record of the meetings and signed by the Chairman.

18/003 **Chairman's report**
The Chairman reported the following:

Regarding the planning application for Chapel Field, the Chairman and the Clerk had met the applicant, who had indicated that the current application would be either withdrawn or amended.

Members of the parish council and the Clerk had met with Cala Homes regarding Sweeters Copse, who had submitted a revised scheme taking into account the parish council's comments.

The Chairman had previously spoken with the developer concerning the two new houses being built in Dunsfold Road and the removal of the recreation ground hedge. The developer had agreed to plant a new hedge but this had not been done; the Chairman would chase. Regarding the removal of hedging at the front of the site, the Clerk would check the landscaping and block plans to see whether the hedge removal was permitted.

N Pidgeon/Clerk

18/004 **Clerk's report**
The Clerk reported that a tree branch had come down in the playground and Mr Budd confirmed it currently did not present a safety hazard. The tree surgeon, who was due to carry out work at Jubilee Pond, had been asked to inspect the tree to quote for possible felling or remedial work. The tree surgeon was awaiting approval from Waverley before proceeding to do the work at Jubilee Pond.

	<p>The Clerk had reported concerns about the foul water drainage from recently converted residential units at Alfold Business Centre to Waverley enforcement and was awaiting a response.</p> <p>Mr Erricker advised of a fallen tree on the Common, possibly blocking surface water drainage. The Clerk would report this to Nick Laker at Waverley.</p>	
18/005	<p>Neighbourhood Plan Update A meeting of the Steering Group was scheduled for 18th January.</p>	
18/006	<p>Playground Inspection Report and recommended actions The Clerk would highlight items for action on the Playground Inspection Report and send to Mr Budd for advice and/or quotes.</p>	Clerk
18/007	<p>Waverley CIL Draft Charging Schedule Consultation The proposed CIL Draft Charging Schedule was discussed, particularly in relation to the proposed setting of a £0/sqm rate for Dunsfold Park. It was agreed the Clerk would draft a response, which is appended to these minutes.</p>	Clerk
18/008	<p>Correspondence Tom Horwood, the recently appointed Waverley Chief Executive, had written to invite Waverley Clerks to attend a meeting with him, WBC Directors and Monitoring Officer to discuss relationships between councillors, parishes and the borough, long-term financial challenges, ongoing, regular and trusted communication between the councils and other items of concern. The Clerk would attend and report at the next meeting.</p>	Clerk
18/009	<p>Accounts for Payment The attached order for payments was approved by the council.</p>	
18/010	<p>Precept for the year ending 31/3/2019 The Clerk had made some minor amendments to the budget proposals following the Draft Precept discussions at the December meeting (copy appended). It was resolved that the Budget for the year ending 31/3/19 be approved and that the Precept on Waverley Borough Council for the year would be £24,777, which represented a 2% increase.</p>	
18/011	<p>Planning. Summary of the status of recent planning applications for information only There were no decisions to report.</p>	
18/012	<p>Planning After full consideration of the following applications, the parish council resolved to comment as follows:</p> <p>WA/2017/2304 Change of Use of existing barn to provide 2 dwellings together with extensions, alterations and associated works. High Stovolds Farm, Stovolds Hill, Cranleigh. Letter of objection appended.</p>	

WA/2017/2286 Erection of 3 dwellings following demolition of existing dwelling. Alfold Farm Bungalow, Loxwood Road, Alfold. **Letter of objection appended.**

WA/2017/2366 Provision of 18 customer parking spaces following demolition of existing car wash, plant room and store. Alfold Filling Station, Horsham Road, Alfold. **Letter of comment appended.**

WA/2017/1250 Amendment – approval of reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) following outline approval for the erection of 55 dwellings. Land West of Sweeters Copse, Loxwood Road, Alfold. **Letter of comment appended.**

18/013 Items of business for information

Mr Budd advised that he had a meeting with the Community Payback coordinator and they would be starting work in the village next month.

18/014 Next meetings

Planning – 8th February, 7.30pm, Green Room, Alfold Village Hall – this may be rescheduled.

Full Council – 6th March, 7.30pm, Alfold Village Hall

There being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 21:30

ALFOLD PARISH COUNCIL

26 January 2018

Mr Graham Parrott
Planning Policy Manager
Planning Services
Waverley Borough Council
The Burys
Godalming
GU7 1HR

Dear Mr Parrott

RE: Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL): Draft Charging Schedule – Regulation 16. Parish Council response.

Alfold Parish Council welcomes the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule. As stated, the purpose of the levy is to give developers more certainty over costs and to give councils and communities more choice and flexibility in how infrastructure is funded.

The parish council is therefore disappointed to see that Waverley Borough Council (WBC) is intending to set a CIL rate of £0 per sq.m for the proposed Dunsfold Park development, which consists of 1800 dwellings in the first phase and 800 dwellings in the second phase, to be located largely within Alfold Parish.

The proposed setting of a £0 per sq.m rate for Dunsfold Park as a separate zone will deprive present and future residents of significant funding. There is no doubt that the construction of such a large development in a small parish with only 450 dwellings will have a significant impact on this community, particularly in the early years of the development when there will be no on-site facilities. Yet the impact on Alfold has been completely ignored by Waverley and the developer with no provision whatsoever in the Section 106. As stated above, the introduction of CIL gives communities more choice and flexibility in how infrastructure is funded, yet it is proposed that Alfold is denied this opportunity to help ensure the future wellbeing of current and future residents.

Having read the supporting evidence documents, the parish council does not consider that there is any justification for a zero rate to be set for the whole site. There is no published evidence to show that WBC undertook a full viability analysis of the development, as recommended in an earlier CIL Viability Study. In assessing the viability of a CIL charge for Dunsfold Park, different assumptions have been used compared to other parts of the Borough, for example house prices, and the assumptions on factors such as land use and value at Dunsfold Park do not seem to have been based on correct facts. It is stated in the evidence that the ability to pay CIL is more marginal for the very large sites, however it is expected that there would be adjustments to land value to accommodate the higher development costs associated with these types of sites, but this does not appear to be the case for Dunsfold Park.

Continued/....

.../

During the planning application decision stage and the Public Inquiry for the first phase of 1800 units, it was claimed by WBC and the developer that there was an unprecedented package of measures in the draft Section 106. Instead, it would appear that if Dunsfold Park were treated the same as any other developer, for just the first phase they would be paying a minimum of £10,000,000 more for much needed infrastructure to support the development.

Even if it could be argued that taking into account the Section 106 measures for the first phase of 1800 units, a £0 rate for Dunsfold Park would be reasonable, there is absolutely no justification for setting a £0 rate for the second phase of 800.

Alfold Parish Council believes that a CIL rate must be set for the first phase of 1800 units at Dunsfold Park that would mean the total financial contribution towards infrastructure to support the development would be the same as for any other developer, i.e. equivalent in financial term to a small S106 contribution plus £395 per sq.m. The CIL rate for the second phase of development at Dunsfold Park must be set at the same rate as the rest of the borough.

Alfold Parish Council would like to be heard by the Examiner at the oral part of the examination and wishes to be notified at all stages of the examination process.

Yours sincerely

Beverley Weddell
Clerk to Alfold Parish Council

cc. Cllr Kevin Deanus
Rt Hon Anne Milton MP

ALFOLD PARISH COUNCIL

31 January 2018

Mr Matt Smith
Planning Department
Waverley Borough Council
The Burys
Godalming
GU7 1HR

Dear Mr Smith

RE: WA/2017/2366 Provision of 18 customer parking spaces following demolition of existing car wash, plant room and store. Alfold Filling Station, Horsham Road, Alfold.

Alfold Parish Council has no objection to this part retrospective application. However, the parish council would request that the parking spaces numbered 17 and 18 on the General Works Plan are restricted to use by staff for road safety reasons, as it has been noted that vehicles exiting these spaces can present a hazard to vehicles entering the site.

The parish council would like to take this opportunity to request that the pedestrian pavement should be made good following the most recent work carried out on this site.

Yours sincerely



Beverley Weddell
Clerk to Alfold Parish Council

ALFOLD PARISH COUNCIL

19 January 2018

Ms Rebecca Clarke
Planning Department
Waverley Borough Council
The Burys
Godalming
GU7 1HR

Dear Ms Clarke

RE: WA/2017/2286 Erection of 3 dwellings following demolition of existing dwelling. Alfold Farm Bungalow, Loxwood Road, Alfold.

Alfold Parish Council has considered this application, together with objections raised by local residents, and objects to the proposal as presented.

This is a classic example of creeping development. Planning permission was granted to extend the existing bungalow, then planning permission was granted to convert the existing bungalow to three combined units and now an application is before the parish council for permission for three separate two-storey units.

Whilst it is stated that the buildings would be within the existing footprint of the bungalow, although not indicative on the plans, it must be that the usable square footage of the buildings would be considerably in excess of the existing or that granted by the extant permission.

However, the parish council accept the fallback position as submitted by the applicant's representative, and have viewed the application accordingly. It is also appropriate that the council must look at the application in context, and the site is in countryside beyond Green Belt and adjoining the Conversation Area. The reasons for objection are as follows:

Mass size and scale

The buildings are two storey and would overlook the nearby Black Barns. A representative of Black Barns attended the parish council meeting and pointed out that some of the rooms of the new development will be directly overlooking existing rooms of the Black Barn.

Whilst it is noted that the applicant states that the development will be the same height of the Black Barn units, the Black Barn development was a conversion of existing buildings, not construction of new buildings, and if it had been new buildings, the height may well have been a point of objection, especially taking into account that the buildings surrounding the remainder of the courtyard are single storey (some with rooms within the roofs).

Impact on the village pond and Conservation Area

The proximity of Unit 3 to the village pond and Conservation Area will have an overbearing effect on this valued village amenity. The parish council is also concerned that the proximity of Unit 3 to the western boundary may cause unacceptable harm to the trees within the Conservation Area.

Foul sewer connection

It is noted in the application form that the method of disposal of foul sewage is marked as 'unknown'.

Elsewhere in the application it is inferred that the foul sewage would drain into the pond at the front of the development. Although there is existing drainage into the pond, notwithstanding there is no right to do so. Furthermore, the Environment Agency are looking into existing pollution issues at the pond. The parish council therefore cannot see, as owners of the pond, any further connections would be permitted.

Surface water drainage

We note that, AGAIN, the applicants have submitted a SuDS report dated 2015, which relates to another building in the applicant's ownership. That report states that the drainage is unknown, but it is assumed that surface water runs off to the pond. And it is proposed to pipe surface water from this proposed development into the pond or nearby ditches. Again, for which there is no permission.

Therefore, the parish council object to the application as presented. If the applicant was minded to redesign with a lower roofline or single /1 ½ storey development with any windows in the roof not capable of overlooking neighbouring properties, (as stipulated in planning permission for the Black Barn development), the parish council would be prepared to reconsider their objection, subject to satisfactory proposals relating to the disposal of foul and surface water.

If notwithstanding the above, the council are minded to grant permission, then the parish council would request robust pre-commencement conditions safeguarding current and future residents from the risk of flooding and pollution from the site.

Yours sincerely

Beverley Weddell
Clerk to Alfold Parish Council

ALFOLD PARISH COUNCIL

19 January 2018

Mr Chris French
Planning Department
Waverley Borough Council
The Burys
Godalming
GU7 1HR

Dear Mr French

RE: WA/2017/2304 Change of Use of existing barn to provide 2 dwellings together with extensions, alterations and associated works. High Stovolds Farm, Stovolds Hill, Cranleigh.

This is an application for two additional units and substantial extension of an existing residential use. The existing residential unit is very small, and the photographs incorporated in the application question whether it's actually in use.

Alfold Parish Council object to the application in its present form on the basis that it will provide too many residential units for one building.

Paragraph 55 of the NPPF sets out criteria for isolated homes in the countryside, and whilst the applicant's comments are noted, this building is in the countryside and is isolated.

One of the criteria under Paragraph 55 is the re-use of existing buildings which would seem appropriate, but it also provides that the proposed use should not detract from the appearance or character of the existing building or (under paragraph B) character or appearance of the area.

The proposed conversion would result in a large, bulky building of a modern design with large amounts of glazing, cladding and untraditional window openings, which would be at odds with the other traditional residential properties in the vicinity.

Three units in the building would result in a crowded look and feel, and there would be insufficient garden or amenity space (see later comments re public footpath).

The application would also conflict with Policy RD7 of the adopted local plan for the same reason that the appearance and character of the building, when complete, would detract from the character of the surrounding area.

The parish council also note that there is a public footpath which runs directly through the proposed site crossing the garden area to the north, so that the new and modern building would be clearly visible and would have a negative impact on the heritage of the area as defined in Paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

Continued/....

.../

Should officers be minded to grant permission, the parish council would request the removal of Permitted Development Rights in order to prevent further overdevelopment of the site that would result in harm to the character and beauty of the countryside setting.

Yours sincerely

Beverley Weddell
Clerk to Alfold Parish Council

Alfold Parish Council

Schedule of receipts and order for payments for December 2017
To be approved under Agenda item 11 at the Parish Council meeting on 9.1.18

RECEIPTS

Payer:	Detail:	Amount:
HMRC	VAT rebate	£27,500.76
	Total	£27,500.76

PAYMENTS

Payee:	Detail:	Amount:
B Weddell	January salary	£ 579.72
B Weddell	Home Office allowance & mileage 12mo	£ 563.53
B Weddell	Mileage & expenses	£ 119.50
	Total	£1262.75

EXPENDITURE TO BE RATIFIED – paid since last Parish Council Meeting:

Payee:	Detail:	Amount:
		£
		£
		£
	Total	

Total receipts £27,500.76

Total expenditure £1262.75

Signed by Chairman: Date:

Signed by Councillor: Date:

Signed by Clerk/RFO: Date: