

Questions from Councillors:

20/P/02155 – Weyside Urban Village

1.Cllr Chris Blow: Have really struggled to understand vehicle circulation. Drawings not available and references on page 246-7 are not clear. A picture or plan is better than words – note page 247. If the presentation before the debate, as is normal at PlanCom, does not include a plan showing vehicle routes, bus-gates, one-way SMC, etc, can the late sheets please have one.

Answer: the presentation has one – it's called the Access and Movement Parameter Plan. Our system does not allow you to send a URL – however if you look for it on Public access you'll see it. It's in the report but it's an A3 plan shrunk to A4 so it's hard to read the text.

2.Cllr Ruth Brothwell: I would like to ask whether we can just adjust the motion so as not to land Dan with the whole responsibility of decision as per the motion?? There are those of us who feel that any final tweaks should be brought before a cross party group of PlanCom before the very final final decision is made. I and I am sure others are being bombarded with emails about the issues and fear for an incomplete decision even though we support the plans in principle. A simple change to the motion wording would solve many issues. I look forward to hearing from you.

Follow ups from Cllr Spooner, Cllr Young, Cllr Gunning, Cllr James Walsh and Cllr Ramsey Nagaty on the same point

Answer: recommendation updated on the late sheets to include consultation with Chairman and review with groups leaders/ward councillors/lead councillor for DM

3.Cllr Gunning: Is it too late for a decent index for this massive document?

Answer: A contents page has been circulated to councillors via the late sheet.

4.Cllr Gunning: Could we have a colour-coded diagram to show the heights of all the buildings surrounding the site. For example dwg 01715 [jtp] . currently showing only bdg hgts within the site – in various shades of orange/yellow/brown.

Answer: We don't have this information, asking for all buildings surrounding the site is excessive. The Design and Access Statement includes some images of nearby buildings

5. Cllr George Potter:

Paragraph 7.5.7 of the report states (in relation to parts of the site unsuitable for use as SANG due to noise pollution and flooding):

"With these changes it seems certain that Burpham Court Farm would be too small alone to fully mitigate Weyside Urban Village as a SANG, until the pedestrian crossing on clay Lane is built, however as the report on Weyside Urban Village explains Tyting Farm is also available as a SANG."

Given that Tyting Farm is located south of Guildford, below Merrow Downs and Pewley downs, how can it be considered available as SANG for Weyside given that Tyting Farm is accessible only by car and that Weyside is being envisaged as a development where the majority of residents will not need (and will not have room to have) a car?

Answer: Tyting Farm is available and within the English Nature pre-approved scheme for SANG for the Thames Basin Heaths, but you are right would be far less accessible to residents of this application site, it nevertheless meets the requirements of distances from

development sites to be acceptable. Should also be noted that the scale of the WUV development means it will come forward in phases, therefore whilst the full SANG amount needs to be available at the outset later phases will take some time to deliver giving more time for the pedestrian crossing element to be put in place.

Paragraph 7.5.8 states that:

"The confirmed area considered suitable for SANG is 27.9ha (note exclusion zones identified for noise, wintering bird interest and anticipated likely odour plume ('unpleasant intrusions') from the Thames Water proposed new Sewage Treatment Works)"

Given that this paragraph does not mention exclusions for flooding, does the calculation of the 27.9ha figure involve excluding the areas which flood, or have these areas not been taken into account in reaching the figure? If the latter, then what is the relevant figure for usable SANG area once areas which flood have been excluded?

Answer: No the 27.9ha excludes all areas of flood risk (non flood zone 1). A major reduction given total farm area of over 40Ha

7.Councillor Tony Rooth

5.5.2(page 36)-when and with what result are National Trust objections to be resolved?

Answer: The Trust has sold the site to the applicant. Though a key stakeholder they hold no veto over the no limited range of differences other than works to the River Wey. The only change to the Wey proposed in the draft management plan is the Eel passes which the trust supports. On ecology issues the Trust appears to have misread a paragraph in the ecology surveys on where protected species lie on the site. The other big issue is North of Clay Lane where a condition is proposed on pedestrian access improvements to make crossing Clay Lane safe. There is agreement with the Trust on almost all farm management plan issues. Finalising stakeholder agreement with the Trust depends on them replacing the area manager who has left. GBC is struggling to find a person at the Trust to speak to on local matters.

5.1.10- (page 95) ditto re Highways England" ask that the application (is not determined other than a refusal) until such time as we have resolved our concerns in order to provide a Formal Recommendation "

Answer: National Highways (formally Highways England) and recommended the approach in the recommendation to us. Lawfully the application cannot be determined until the holding objection is withdrawn anyway, so there is no risk of prematurity of decision.

Response from Cllr Rooth: Not sure I follow. Can cttee approve these applications before NH give formal or has to be subject to condition?

Answer: No decision can be issued prior to NH withdrawing objection, however they have stated it is a matter of when not if and recommendation the broad structure of the recommendation in the report to allow members to RESOLVE to approve and then delegated authority etc. to issue decision later, subject to briefing process. They will make a decision subject to Grampian conditions which they have powers to direct e apply – these are usually technical, such as no works to A3 until x and Y etc.

5.1.16(page110) and 7.10(181-183) comments on energy provision in light of tonight's announcement of Support for alternative heat sources [Plan to drive down the cost of clean heat - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/plan-to-drive-down-the-cost-of-clean-heat)

Answer: GBC could bid for the £60 million innovation fund to help fund water sourced heat network. Report conditions entirely compatible with driving down high cost of air and ground sourced pumps (by not needing them).

Response from Cllr Rooth: Are we going to install any heat pumps, when and in how many homes. GBC will never get GOVT funding for 1500 homes x £ 5k each total £7.5m?

Answer: The application proposes Ground/air source heat pumps in energy strategy, we propose requiring they review these to consider water source heat pumps (water from Wey) as these are far cheaper per unit and more carbon efficient. The funding to local authorities is for innovation, not for bridging the gas-Ground Source heat pump cost differential – which will go to either householders or developers I understand but the subsidy process is not yet entirely clear or if the subsidy allies to all types of heat exchanger technologies. Apologies we all need to see the details of the government strategy, all we have so far is an unclear press release.

7.1.8(page 148) -is this application subject to approval of STW and CRC application and vice versa -not reviewed conditions)?

Answer: No, are reg 3 county matters. However, Phase 4 of the project needs the STW and CRC to move (somewhere) to be deliverable. Phases 1-3 and 5 are not affected.

Response from Cllr Rooth: Understand STW and CRC move to North /west of site subject to planning permission but moves have to be scheduled to provide STW/CRC to WUV and borough -all aspects of plan are connected so when can planning apps for SWT(to SCC) and CRC (GBC) be expected?

Answer: We have asked – no timescale as yet. Of course it has to be within Weyfield programme to avoid delaying phase 4.

7.4.101(221) - are these figures really accurate about population numbers eg 4bed homes with occupancy rate of 3?!

Answer: GBC policy in Thames Basin Heaths SPD, based on 2011 Census. Difference caused by under occupation of homes by empty nesters and elderly.

Noted although question whether WUV population underestimated

7.17-((page 250)-likewise accuracy of children numbers and education demands –3 bed homes often mean 4 -parents and 2kids (with education needs) ?

Answer: Same issue – pupil yield county data based on census data and agreed approach county wide on many scheme. 'Often' doesn't mean 'always' or the mean (same issue with car ownership levels).

Further comments from Cllr Rooth:

1. Understand first home can't be occupied until SANG is operational-only appropriate SANG is alongside WUV so is SANG miles away at Tyting Farm worth bothering with? Answer: Tyting Farm is an existing SANG, WUV sits within the catchment area of this SANG so it can be taken into account
2. Understand vehicular access to 1550homes etc is only via
A-single access off Woking Road currently used to get to GBC depot

B - Slyfield industrial estate which links to Woking Road through traffic lights where existing traffic levels already cause long tailbacks On Woking Road and into Slyfield itself

Answer: Traffic considerations are set out in the report

3. Number of vehicles and parking on site /overflow outside WUV-is it realistic to allot only one car per home to estimate future parking -desirable but realistic?

Answer: Parking considerations are set out in the report including the reasons for the level of parking set. This is considered a sustainable location so lower parking should be considered and model shift encouraged. Significant measures are included around cycling provision, encouraging bus usage etc. There is also provision within the Design Code requirements to revise the parking arrangements throughout the RM stages

4. Sec Of State has still to decide whether allotments should stay in Situ-if so overall housing numbers reduced and need to provide more on WUV or elsewhere

Answer: The outline consent includes a condition that the allotments cannot be built on until provision elsewhere. If consent does not come through the rest of the scheme can still be built out. It will be up to RM to decide whether numbers can be spread around the site to make up for it or whether they need to be dropped. The outline is for 'up to' amounts.

8. Councillor Spooner:

I am more worried about the short length of time members have been given to work through the amount of material presented. That would appear to prejudice the process tomorrow evening. Your thoughts on that please?

Answer: Response from legal officer

I have discussed with colleagues and the conclusion is ;-

- there appear to be no legal issues arising, on the amount of time to consider matters
- the Agenda of 20 October has been published within legal timescales under Schedule 12 Local Government Act 1972
- the application has been advertised and consulted upon in accordance with legal requirements
- the Report needs to be as comprehensive as it is to address all legal issues and so defend against any challenges
- late submissions need to be submitted and circulated to meet legal requirements to consider material considerations
- case law requires a fair-minded decision-maker prepared to take on board points that differed from their preliminary view -which means a willingness to consider these submissions
- finally specialist planning counsel is engaged to advise on any issues arising at debate