

ALFOLD PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Alfold Parish Council Meeting held on **Tuesday 9th February 2016** at Alfold Village Hall, Alfold.

Present: Mr N Pidgeon (Chairman); Mrs Betty Ames; Mrs P Mayne;
Mr Wayne Mouring; Mr Adrian Erricker; Mrs B Weddell (Clerk)

Waverley Borough Councillor Kevin Deanus and 28 members of the public were in attendance.

Apologies: Apologies had been received from Mr Budd and Mr Denton-Miller.

Before the business of the meeting, the parish council received comments from members of the public regarding a planning application for a new settlement at Dunsfold Park. Residents' comments and questions are summarised as follows:

Residents commented that there had been little or no consultation with the community prior to the application being submitted to Waverley. The Chairman advised that there had been one consultation event held in Cranleigh, however the parish council would raise the issue with Waverley.

As this is an application for a new settlement, are there different criteria? The Chairman advised that the parish council would research this point.

The proposed development is supposed to be self-contained but that seems far-fetched. Shouldn't the applicant go further to prove it would be self-contained? The Chairman commented that it would be self-contained in certain aspects, but that a lot of the services will be accessed in Cranleigh, which raises questions regarding sustainability.

Dunsfold Park say they will build a school but will Surrey County Council pick up the bill and run the schools?

What grounds do we have to object, as it seems the applicant will put up a fight re traffic and a brownfield site has an unspoken endorsement of policy to develop given the housing need? Other parts of Waverley have voted for it in the Making Waves consultation so it could be presented as looking pretty positive. The Chairman commented that WBC have been told how many houses need to be built and they're coming under pressure to find land to put them. Due to Green Belt restrictions, the majority of available land is at Dunsfold Park, Farnham and Cranleigh. The Farnham housing need can't be satisfied by one development on the opposite side of the borough. In 2009 the Secretary of State said that Dunsfold Park is in the wrong place and shouldn't be developed. Dunsfold Park are saying that the introduction of the NPPF has changed that, however we disagree.

Whereabouts in Alfold would the parish council support housing development? The Chairman replied that the parish council is in the process of putting together a Neighbourhood Plan in consultation with the village, which would identify where development may be appropriate and in conjunction with that the borough council would stipulate how many houses Alfold will be required to take. The parish council can't begin work on the Neighbourhood Plan until Waverley provide us with that number, which they have advised will be in April. We have carried out a housing needs survey, which indicated we should be looking for small pockets of development. This application is out of that concept.

Dunsfold residents say that only 20% of the site is brownfield, Dunsfold Park have always promoted the site as brownfield but it isn't. The Chairman responded that Dunsfold Park claim 70% of the land

is brownfield. A small area is classified AGLV. Alfold Parish Council has never accepted that it is a brownfield site and it is relevant to point out that it isn't all brownfield and also to point out it is abutting AGLV and overshadowed by AONB. The site must be looked at in the context of where it is.

Dunsfold Park would provide affordable housing for people in the village. The Chairman responded that the parish council is in favour of small developments providing affordable housing for local people.

It was agreed that the consensus from those present was that residents wished the parish council to object to the application.

The meeting of the Parish Council commenced at 20:45.

		ACTION
16/015	Declarations of interest pertaining to agenda items Mrs Ames declared a personal interest in WA/2015/2395.	
16/016	Planning. Summary of the status of recent Planning Applications for information only WA/2015/2341 Erection of a two-storey rear extension and front dormer windows. Grasslands, Loxwood Road, Alfold. Full permission WA/2015/2191 Erection of a brick boundary wall following removal of existing fencing. Cow Shed Cottage, Loxwood Road. Full permission	
16/017	Planning After full consideration of the following application, the parish council resolved to comment as follows: WA/2015/2395 Hybrid Planning Application; Part Outline proposal for a new settlement with residential development comprising 1,800 units (Use Class C3), plus 7,500sqm care accommodation (Use Class C2); a local centre to comprise retail, financial and professional, cafes/restaurant/takeaway and/or public house up to a total of 2,150sqm (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5); new business uses including offices, and research and development industry (Use Class B1a and B1b) up to a maximum of 3,700sqm; light and general industry (Use Class B1c and B2) up to a maximum of 7,500sqm; storage and distribution (Use Class B8) up to a maximum of 11,000sqm; a further 9,966sqm of flexible commercial space (B1(b), B21(c), B2 and/or B8); non-residential institutions including health centre, relocation of existing Jigsaw School into new premises and provision of new community centre (Use Class D1) up to a maximum of 9,750sqm; a two-form entry Primary School; open space including water bodies, outdoor sports, recreational facilities, canal basin and nature conservation areas; public transport routes, footpaths and cycleways; landscaping; the removal of three runways; all related infrastructure including roads, car and cycle parking, energy plant and associated equipment, water supply, telecommunications, drainage systems and waste water treatment facilities; Part Full application for the demolition of 8,029sqm of existing buildings and the retention of 36,692sqm of existing buildings, for their future use for a specified purpose as defined by the Use Classes as specified in the schedule of buildings and their uses; and the temporary use of Building 132 for a construction headquarters. Dunsfold Park.	

The Chairman reported that he, along with Mrs Mayne, Mr Erricker and the Clerk, had attended a meeting of joint parish councils, which had proposed to commission a review of the applicant's Transport Assessment, as an update to the Motion report commissioned in 2015. It was agreed Alfold Parish Council would contribute to the review.

The Parish Council's initial letter of objection is appended. It was agreed the parish council would reserve its right to make further representations, once Waverley's Strategic Transport Assessment is available for review, after Waverley's Spatial Strategy is published and after the Transport Assessment Review has been completed. There are also other areas requiring study to produce a full response and the Chairman would suggest areas of responsibility to be shared amongst members.

N Pidgeon

WA/2015/2261 Outline application with all matters reserved except access for the erection of up to 55 dwellings. The parish council had already submitted its objection to this application. The Clerk reported that the application was due to be decided by Waverley's Joint Planning Committee on 17th February, and it was agreed that Mr Erricker would speak at the meeting to address the Officer's Report which recommended that the application be approved.

16/018

Items for information or inclusion on a future agenda

Surrey County Council's Deputy Director of Adult Care had requested to make a presentation to the parish council at the March meeting to discuss plans for Lindon Farm.

The owner of Tollgate Cottage had enquired about purchasing a small piece of parish council owned land that abuts his property. This would be discussed at the next meeting.

During the recent heavy rain, Thames Water had had tankers on site at Rosemary Lane and Loxwood Road tankering away sewage.

16/019

Next meeting

8th March, 7.30pm, Alfold Village Hall

There being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 21:35.

ALFOLD PARISH COUNCIL

2 March 2016

Mr Peter Cleveland
Planning Department
Waverley Borough Council
The Burys
Godalming
GU7 1HR

Dear Mr Cleveland

RE: WA/2015/2395 Part outline proposal for a new settlement with residential development comprising 1800 units, plus a local centre to comprise retail, financial and professional, cafes/restaurant, businesses uses, two-form entry primary school and all related infrastructure. Dunsfold Park, Stovolds Hill, Cranleigh.

Further to our letter of 27th January 2016, Alfold Parish Council (APC) have now met, with villagers invited to attend, ask questions and voice opinions, and considered this application.

The views strongly voiced by the residents of Alfold and accepted by APC means that APC objects to this application.

This is a large application covering both residential and commercial proposals, which no doubt took and applicants and their many advisers some considerable time to prepare for submission. APC are, with other parish councils, commissioning report(s) and reviewing not only the application material itself, but the supporting contentions expressed within the application. They are therefore not at this stage able to provide a comprehensive response but will do so as soon as all necessary information has been obtained and reviewed.

However, it is appropriate at this stage to set out the main principles supporting the objection, which are as follows:

1. The Application

The application is for initially 1800 houses incorporating retail and social amenities together with additional commercial buildings (notwithstanding the recent grant of 10,000sqm additional commercial buildings under permission WA/2015/0695).

It is made clear in this application that Dunsfold Park will in due course be seeking further permission for additional housing up to 3400 units.

It is also made clear that if granted this development will be a new settlement/town of its own, which must of itself bring other planning considerations as set out in the NPPF.

The application is loosely based upon the current emerging spatial strategy, which itself has yet to receive formal approval by WBC or stand the scrutiny of a planning inspector.

The application is in outline only, which is understandable, but it is vague on important issues such as mix of housing and types of industrial use, which are necessary when considering, in principle, a development in such an area.

2. The Site

It is stated that the whole of the site is considered a brownfield site, but much of the site is in effect countryside without industrial use. The site is also surrounded by land zoned as Area of Great Landscape Value (indeed the NW corner of the site is included within that zoning) and nearby is the Surrey Hills AONB.

The site has previously been examined both by Planning Inspector and Secretary of State and found to be unsuitable for development such as proposed.

3. The Local Plan

As stated, the application is loosely based upon the proposed Local Plan, although such plan did not envisage additional commercial buildings nor a new town.

In any event, it is believed the Local Plan is flawed both in respect of WBC's obligation to consult fully on its proposals and in such consultation as took place by skewing the options so that 3 out of 4 which proposed development at Dunsfold Park.

The Response to the consultation document did not reflect the view of local residents (approx. 3.3% of residents responded, most of which it is believed were not local to Dunsfold Park and naturally preferred such a development not to be local to them.

4. Sustainability (Traffic)

APC will comment on the traffic issue in due course, as it has commissioned a report on this aspect of the application and has only just received WBC's own report by Mott MacDonald, which it has yet to consider.

As stated above, the traffic issue has been previously examined by a planning inspector and the Secretary of State, who found such an increase in the inevitable amount of extra traffic on the A281 generated by this development to be unsustainable (and that was before the proposal included substantial extra HGV traffic generated by increased commercial activity).

The development would also lead to inevitable 'rat runs' created by motorists seeking to avoid the congestion on the A281, such runs travelling through rural villages (Dunsfold, Hascombe, etc.) and unsuitable roads (Markwick Lane).

The proposed traffic mitigation schemes will do little to alleviate this problem and are little more than a sticking plaster over a serious cut.

5. Sustainability (other issues)

This development of the site would put an intolerable pressure on other parts of the local infrastructure such as

- i) Social services
- ii) Health services
- iii) Public transport – such services are already diminishing and the applicant is too vague on proposals (particularly in respect of the length of time any support for extra public transport would remain in place)
- iv) Secondary Schooling – SCC figures state 1800 houses likely to generate need for educating 360 children

It is noteworthy that it has been stated that SCC has a £3 billion shortfall in its budget for a sustainable infrastructure so any increase in demand will lead to cuts elsewhere in the county.

6. Affordable Homes

The application does not set out proposals for the affordable housing benefit but if this development were to cater for most of WBC's requirement (as it must as it is the major development proposal of the Local Plan), it would mean that those who need affordable housing in the borough would have to relocate from their home territory to this site, which is in the south east corner of the borough, therefore remote from their family and friends and workplaces.

7. Rural Area

However one zone Dunsfold Park, it is surrounded by an attractive rural area of Surrey, which deserves to be preserved.

It would be wrong in planning and humanitarian terms to subject such an area to such an increase of commercial activity and traffic which would irreversibly damage the countryside and quality of life of the local residents (particularly during the long period of construction at the site).

8. Conclusion

This is a massive planning application which would have a similarly and massive and long term adverse effect on the area and which will be irreversible. It should be, at best, deferred until the appropriate authorities have properly reviewed proposals for the whole of the borough and further surrounding land (the increased traffic effect on both Guildford and the A3).

If a new town is proposed, not only should it follow criteria set out for such developments, but WBC should look at what alternative sites may be available.

The current application does not meet

- i) The criteria of NPPF
- ii) The defects affecting the site as identified in the 2008 appeal decision and Secretary of State's ruling.

It is for these main reasons that Alfold Parish Council OBJECTS to the application.

Yours sincerely

Beverley Weddell
Clerk to Alfold Parish Council