



SEND PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 1st AUGUST 2022 AT 7.15 PM in the Upper Room at the Lancaster Hall

Present: Cllr P Oven (Chair), Cllr J Manktelow, Cllr J Osborn, and Coral Davis (Deputy Clerk)
Cllr P Beddoes was also present

1. Apologies for Absence

Cllr A Beames and Cllr C Heath did not attend the meeting

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 25th July 2022 were approved

4. Planning applications responses:-

22/P/01079 Land to the south end of Burnt Common Nurseries, London Road

Proposed commercial development comprising of 4,170sqm floor space for light industrial and research and development (Use Class E(g)), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B*) uses, internal access road, 55 car parking space, 6 HGV delivery vehicle bays, bicycle parking, bin stores and landscaping

Agreed response: - Objection – see response in Appendix 1

22/P/01069 Land to the north of Heath Drive

Outline planning application for up to 40 residential units with all matters reserved except for access

Agreed response: - Objection – see response in Appendix 2

22/P/01136 1 Heath Farm Cottages, Tannery Lane

Proposed two storey side extension together with a detached garage following demolition of car port and existing garage

Agreed response: - Objection. The Parish Council feels that this is overdevelopment of an already extended house and notes that it will result in the loss of parking spaces

5. Other applications

There were no other applications.

The online meeting with National Highways relating to the Ripley South Scheme was noted

6. Waterside Farm Cottage Development

A response has been received from GBC to the initial letter from the Parish Council and an application to make the garages an Asset of Community Value will be submitted

7. Garlicks Arch development street naming proposals

It was agreed to comment on the use of 'Westfield Road' as there are other examples of this road name within a local radius

8. Update on previous applications and enforcements

21/P/02354 Meadow View, Send Marsh Road-erection of gate onto public footpath 41 (retrospective)	APPROVED
22/P/00229 2 Elm Close – erection of a single storey side/rear extension	APPROVED
22/P/00858 7 Potters Lane – single storey extension	APPROVED

9. Date of the next Planning & Environment Committee

The next Planning & Environment Committee meeting will be on Monday 15th August 2022 at 7.15pm

The meeting closed at 8.02pm

APPENDIX 1

22/P/01079 Land to the south end of Burnt Common Nurseries, London Road

Proposed commercial development comprising of 4,170sqm floor space for light industrial and research and development (Use Class E(g)), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B*) uses, internal access road, 55 car parking space, 6 HGV delivery vehicle bays, bicycle parking, bin stores and landscaping

Send Parish Council (SPC) raises the following objections to this proposal:-

1. Lack of major local road infrastructure improvements to accompany Phase one or Phase two of this development at Burnt Common

Send Parish Council acknowledges this is a site that has been allocated in the Local Plan, which establishes the principle of development for commercial (B1(c), B2 and B8 uses) for this parcel of land.

However, when this land was proposed for release from the Green Belt (as site A58) in the draft Guildford Local Plan 2017 it was designated for approximately 7,000sq meters for development. At the Local Plan Inquiry in July 2018 this was significantly increased to a 'minimum' of 14,800 square meters of land for industrial development. There was no opportunity for public consultation on this doubling of floor space for industrial development at Burnt Common and it makes this site one of the largest industrial spaces allocated in the local plan. The GBC 2014 Settlement Hierarchy document which formed part of the evidence base for the Guildford Local Plan had scored Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common as a 'large village capable of accommodating an extension but unsuitable for substantial growth'. SPC contends that releasing 14,800 plus sq meters for industrial development at Burnt Common is MAJOR DEVELOPMENT and is not in keeping with the evidence base of the Plan. Accordingly, such a deviation would require a **major upgrading of local transport infrastructure**, as well as to other infrastructure such as the Send sewers which recently burst and required 24 hour pumping while damage was repaired.

In a 'Statement of Common Ground' providing at the Local Plan hearings on the 3rd of July 2018 between Guildford Borough Council, the promoter of site A58 (at Burnt Common) and site A42 (land at Garlicks Arch) it stated at point 2: "it is unlikely that more than 7,000 sq metres of Use Class B1 (c) / B2/ B8 floor space will be delivered at an early stage of the Plan period". If we take the application 20/P/00816, for Phase one of this development comprising of 3,303 sq meters which has been approved and this application 22/P/01079 comprising of 4,170 sq meters this will collectively deliver 7,473 sq meters at an early stage of the Plan period. This application for phase two of the development at Burnt Common nurseries therefore takes this site to and above the upper limits of what was considered achievable at an early stage of the Plan period. Furthermore, the statement of common ground (dated 3rd July 2018) acknowledges the link between delivering 7,000 sq meters of development with the completion of Highways England RIS1 M25 J10/A3 improvement scheme which the statement of common ground acknowledges could be delayed beyond completion in 2022/2023. **As of today, 3rd of August 2022, the Highways England RIS1 M25 J10/A3 improvement scheme has not yet commenced and will almost certainly not be completed in this timeframe.**

SPC wishes to draw the Council's attention to our earlier submission and objection to Phase one of the development, which you will find attached. SPC considers that many of these points remain pertinent to this application for phase two of this development and that this development should not receive approval until the Highways England RIS1 M25 J10/A3 improvement scheme is completed. SPC also considers that delivering 7,473 sq meters plus of industrial space at Burnt Common will also **require the delivering of A42 slips** to ensure the impact on Send and other surrounding villages is appropriately mitigated and request that this infrastructure is commenced/delivered **before** this application receives approval.

2: Impact on local road network not properly assessed

The Statement of Common Ground from the Local Plan hearing 3rd July 2018, also goes on to say at point three that the "precise mix of each of the Use Class B1 (c)/ B2 and B8 elements to be developed on site A58 would be defined at the time of submission of any planning application", and "Consequently mitigation for any local highway impact would be thoroughly assessed in a **future transport assessment** accompanying such an application".

SPC has considered the transported assessment accompanying the proposals for application 22/P/01079 and is deeply concerned that Section six of the report, that considers data for junction modelling, has been skewed due to the effects of Covid pandemic lockdown. SPC does not agree with the applicant that such data can be 'overly robust' and the implication of not having accurate data for such an important issue of safety of the highways could result in a serious accident in the future. SPC is concerned that neither the Police, Surrey County Council or the Highways England have challenged this data.

SPC therefore believes that the proposals do **not** comply with Policy P3 of the Send Neighbourhood Development Plan which states "Policy P3 supports business development providing the site is suitably located in terms of its impact on the environment, levels of traffic movement, ... etc". As the data supplied by the applicant for traffic movement has been affected by the Covid pandemic lockdown the levels of traffic movement cannot be accurately assessed or said to comply with Policy P3. SPC thus request that a new Transport Assessment should be requested of the applicant to take into consideration current post lockdown traffic flows to ensure the reliability of the data, which is crucial in ensuring the safety of this junction being improved.

Following an updating of this Transport Assessment, SPC requests a serious and significant section 106 contribution should be sought by the Surrey County Council Highways Authority. This would ensure that appropriate remodelling of this junction, above and beyond the current proposals, be undertaken to improve safety at the Burnt Common/Woodhill junction and appropriate mitigation for the impact to the local highways network for the A247 at Send Barns Lane, and Send Road be included. Such examples of mitigation would include traffic calming measures, speed enforcement cameras along the A247 and vehicle routing to and from the site. This should ensure that HGVs accessing the site only use trunk roads and not the local road network through the existing villages of Send, Ripley and Clandon.

3. Lack of innovative /high quality design

SPC wishes to draw the Councils attention to our submission for application 20/P/00816 and points we have made in relation to achieving high quality design. SPC contends that all of these points still apply for Phase two of this development and the current proposal of steel cladding does not achieve attractive or high quality design.

4. Demand for industrial floor space

As stated at the outset of this letter of objection Site A58 was at the last minute in the Plan making process doubled in size for industrial floor space from up to 7,000 sq meters to a minimum of 14,800 plus square meters.

SPC notes the letter attached to the applicants Design and Access Statement making an argument for the need for industrial floor space in the Guildford area. However, SPC noted that in the Employment Land Availability Assessment of 2017, a key piece of evidence submitted with the Local Plan, that there has actually been a reduction in the need for Employment land in the Borough.

APPENDIX 2

22/P/01069 Land to the north of Heath Drive

Outline planning application for up to 40 residential units with all matters reserved except for access

The Parish Council objects strongly to this application for the following reasons:-

1. **Housing Need**

The Guildford Borough Council Local Plan demonstrates a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites and indeed the recently updated figure in April 21 confirms a 7.34 years supply. This is therefore 50% ahead of the curve. The buffer for the 5 year housing supply has been reduced from 20% to 5% from the same date which demonstrates that the supply of housing provision is on target. There is therefore **no** identified housing need and any sites not included in the Local Plan, of which this is one, should be refused unless there is clear and incontrovertible evidence that the 'Planning Balance' favours development. That is not the case here.

2. **Guildford Local Plan**

This site is not allocated in the Local Plan.

There have been applications for over 220 windfall units (27 approved) since the Local Plan was introduced on top of the approved applications for 624 units in the village, giving a total increase of 651 properties in the village. The infrastructure has not been improved to cope with this increase.

The proposal is contrary to the following policies within the Local Plan:-

a. **Policy D1**

Distinctive local character of the area, in particular:-

b. **Policy D1(4)**

All new development will be designed to reflect the distinct local character of the area and will respond to and reinforce locally distinct patterns of development. The proposed scheme would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would conflict with Saved Policies G1 and G5 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan (2003) (the GBLP) and Policy D1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015 – 2034 (2019) (the LPSS). These policies, amongst other things, require new development to achieve a high quality design that responds to the distinctive local character of the area in which it is set, respect established street patterns, enhance existing natural features on the site, minimise the visual impact of traffic and associated access and parking, ensure that buildings and spaces at pedestrian level provide visual interest and a sense of place and identity, ensure that new spaces created through development have an attractive and identifiable character, and provide a high quality public realm.

For similar reasons the proposal would be contrary to Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which required well-designed places.

3. **Send Neighbourhood Development Plan**

Since the last application was submitted on this site the Send Neighbourhood Development Plan has been approved and therefore must be considered with regard to the application.

This proposal contravenes the following policies:-

a. **Policy Send 1 design**

High quality and sustainable design is expected in Send and shall conserve and enhance its heritage and environmental assets including the Wey & Godalming Navigations Conservation Area and its setting. All

development proposals will be expected to demonstrate how they promote and reinforce the local distinctiveness and high quality built and natural environment of Send with reference to the Send Neighbourhood Development Plan Character Assessment. Proposals should seek to ensure that development does not result in significant adverse effects on the key views identified in the Character Assessment and respects and retains key natural landscape assets. In particular, in the following Character Areas which includes:-

- Wey Navigation and River Wey – proposals must conserve and enhance the Wey & Godalming Navigations Conservation Area

b. Policy Send 2 housing development

Housing development in Send Parish will be supported provided that:

- It is on site allocated in the Local Plan or other subsequent Development Plan Documents which complies with the development guidelines or briefs adopted by Guildford Borough Council; ***This site is not in the Local Plan***
- Within the settlements of Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common inset from the Green Belt it comprises development that reflects the character and settlement pattern of the surrounding area and avoids or mitigates increased pressure on community or transport infrastructure in the area;
The proposal does not reflect the character and settlement pattern of the area and there are no mitigation proposals for the effect on infrastructure particularly the roads, schools, health facilities or sewerage
- The following mixture of dwelling sizes are provided unless subsequent updates to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicate a different need for Send Parish:
 - At least 85% of the open market dwellings are small units (minimum 10% one bedroom, minimum 30% two bedroom, and maximum 40% three bedroom);
 - At least 95% of the affordable homes are small units (minimum 40% one bedroom, minimum 30% two bedroom, and maximum 25% three bedroom).**This private proposal consists of 12 three bedroom and 12 four bedroom houses and for Affordable housing there are 6 two bedroom houses, 8 three bedroom houses and two two bedroom flats. This therefore fails to comply with the dwelling size mix required.**

4. Effect of development on the village

The proposal represents vast overdevelopment of the site which is in a protected area in the Wey Navigation corridor. It is also a 35% increase from the original footprint proposed in the last application on this site.

The importance of maintaining the character of Send has been recognised by Planning Inspectors in their recent comments regarding other refused proposed developments within the village. In particular in refusing two applications off the A247 Send Barns Lane/Send Road.

a. 19/P/02149 Land to the rear of 5 Send Barns Lane (28 dwellings)

- The area is characterised by residential development directly fronting the road and the area has a strong semi-rural character. A loose-knit urban grain exists within the village, with a variety of dwelling types and a prevalence of soft landscaping within plots, reflecting the proximity of the built development to open countryside.
- The indicative layout plan proposes to introduce an urbanising form of development onto the site, which would be strongly at odds with the semi-rural character of the area. The proposed straight, dense and regular arrangement of the majority of the new dwellings within a long L-shaped access road would be out of keeping with the more informal, loose-knit, spacious layout of built development which prevails within the locality

b. 20/P/01885 Elmsleigh Farm, Send Barns Lane (8 dwellings)

- Within the surrounding village, development mainly consists of frontage housing, with short tributary roads serving housing off these in some instances. It has a loose-knit urban grain, with a variety of dwelling types, plot sizes and shapes within a spacious and landscaped context. Many properties have long rear gardens and are within a surrounding context of fields, paddocks and landscaped areas. Together with the countryside backdrop to the village, this results in a distinctive local semi-rural character and appearance
- Many of the dwellings would be sited close to one another and where there is separation, this is dominated by hard surfaced car parking and turning, which would give rise to an overly dense form and layout of development. The overall coverage of building and hard surfaced areas, including the access road, would emphasise the overly developed nature of the proposal.

5. Ecological considerations

a. Badgers

The application notes the survey found no badgers on the site, however, this does not mean that badgers are not present. Another local site found badgers in situ once development had started so the consideration of possible sets is vital and further investigation must be undertaken

b. Bats

There is a very large roost of soprano pipistrelle bats (fourth largest in Surrey) in an adjacent property. The roost is about to split into groups and would use the woodland trees on this site as roosts and as a feeding area. There are no indications in the proposals on how to address the presence of bats or how this would be mitigated. The proposed removal of trees would limit the availability of potential roosts for the bats

c. Use of herbicide

We are advised, but have no direct evidence of this, that the area has been sprayed with an industrial strength herbicide which will kill the woodland, wildlife and damage the ecosystem including the adjacent river. This suggests, if correct, that the developer has no regard for the natural habitat and the effects of this action.

d. Wildlife corridor

This area is the last piece of woodland and wildlife corridor in this area of Send. To destroy it would mean the loss of habitat of a huge array of wildlife. There is also a considerable increase in the amount of greenery to be removed from the previous application

e. Thames Heath Basin Special Protection Area (THBSPA)

This site lies within the 400m to 5km zone of the THBSPA and there are no proposals on how to limit the damage that would occur with development so close to the river. Development in the THBSPA or adjacent zone must clearly lead to damage to it, which required mitigation measures. Without such measures the application has to be refused.

f. Flooding

There is annual flooding on this site with a natural pond in the land but this has not been taken into consideration in the flood assessment.

6. Public consultation

The public consultation required within the NPPF has not been undertaken by the developer and the claim that requirements have been met is incorrect

7. Infrastructure

The effect on the local infrastructure would be profound.

Failure of the main sewer on Send Road, about 200 metres from this site, occurred in December 2021 due to overload of the system.

There are no proposals to mitigate the increased demands on local schools or medical facilities at the Villages Medical Centre.

The parking provision is inadequate with no visitor spaces allocated. There will be no parking available in either Heath Drive or on Send Road.

Send Parish Office 28 Send Road Send Woking Surrey GU23 7ET
01483 479312 clerk@sendparishcouncil.gov.uk