

Cranleigh Developers - Note of Meeting

Date: 15/09/2015

Venue: Waverley Borough Council Offices, Godalming

Attendees:

Name	Organisation/role	Abbreviation
Matthew Evans	Head of Planning, WBC	MWE
Elizabeth Sims	Development Control Manager, WBC	ES
Peter Cleveland	Major Projects Officer, WBC	PCL
Kathryn Pearson	Area Team Leader, WBC	KP
Mike Green	Surrey County Council – Highways	MG
Andy Stokes	Surrey County Council – Highways	AS
Brian Ellis (chairman)	Councillor (Cranleigh West), WBC	BE
Patricia Ellis	Councillor (Cranleigh West), WBC	
Jeanette Stennett	Councillor (Cranleigh East), WBC	JS
Stewart Stennett	Councillor (Cranleigh East), WBC	SS
Mary Forszewski	Councillor (Cranleigh East), WBC – observer only	MF
Alan Young	Councillor (Cranleigh and Ewhurst), Surrey County Council	AY
Nick Uryland	K.P.I	NU
Paul Hughes	K.P.I/Douglas Briggs Partnership	PH
Alan Spriggs	K.P.I	AS
Andy Leahy	K.P.I	AL
Duncan Innes	Crest Nicholson	DI
Hamish Robbie	Crownhall Estates	HR
Julian Rooney	Thakenham Homes	JR
Adrian Brown	Berkeley Group	AB
Tim John	Columbia Threadneedle	TJ
Charlotte Yarker	Montagu Evans LLP	CY
Sandy Wilson	Columbia Threadneedle	SW

BE - Welcomed all to the meeting

MWE - Introduction to the purpose of the meeting:

- Government's agenda to increase supply of housing
- Council's lack of 5 year housing land supply means that Cranleigh and other main towns under pressure for new housing
- Outlined the need for housing to deliver maximum benefits to the community as possible and to avoid isolated housing estates

Outlined that transparency is required to ensure that negotiations are open and honest

Reminded attendees of the Councillor Code of Conduct governing discussions with developers

Reminded attendees that CIL tests need to be followed with regards to infrastructure provision

BE - Reiterated that Councillors were here to express personal views only without prejudice to determination of applications

Advised that he would like to report back to Cranleigh Parish Council on the outcome of the meeting

MF - Expressed that she was attending as an observer only to listen to the discussion

PCL – Gave an update on current sites in Cranleigh:

- Berkeleys – 425 dwellings with access onto Alfold Road. 30% affordable plus infrastructure contributions. Currently at appeal, Inquiry scheduled for 02/02/2016.
- Knowle Park Initiative – current application follows withdrawal of previous scheme. Outline only application for 265 dwellings with access onto Alfold Road. Decision due 22/11/2015.
- Little Meadow – outline only application for 75 dwellings with access onto Alfold Road.
- Hewitts Industrial Estate – application for 120 dwellings. Brownfield land with access onto Elmbridge Road. Decision due 30/09/2015.
- Amlets Lane – outline only application for 125 dwellings approved with 40% affordable. Reserved matters application expected shortly.
- Crest Nicolson – outline only application for 120 dwellings. Resolution to approve subject to completion of S106.
- Thakenham Homes – no pre-app submitted but have been invited as have interest in Cranleigh site.
- Total of 1,030 homes currently proposed for Cranleigh.

BE – Outlined infrastructure problems/requirements in Cranleigh:

- High Street is restricted at both ends (east and west) and difficult to extend
- More jobs and affordable homes needs for young people
- More public car parking needed, especially on Thursdays
- All traffic onto High Street – alternative needed and better link to A281

Noted some infrastructure has capacity:

- Local schools overcrowded but Glebelands School is under capacity
- Doctors surgery/health centre has sufficient GPs and spare capacity

SS – referred to top left of plan circulated at meeting and explained these were his personal views/ideas for development of Cranleigh:

- Concerned about traffic/parking and links to the High Street, homes for young people, jobs, flooding and beds at Cranleigh Hospital

JS – outlined that locals want village to stay as it is. Need to consider jobs as well as homes. Access to shops important – use it or lose it. Concerned that High Street full of coffee and charity shops – development is needed to help village evolve. Community land trust homes needed as even affordable homes are expensive in Cranleigh.

AY – development requires a strategic approach to properly reflect local feeling. SCC has been looking strategically at infrastructure for some time and is keen that transport infrastructure is addressed and not made worse by development.

BE – Cranleigh needs infrastructure to support modern life and jobs to retain young people

JR – NPPF clear steer to developers to come forward with applications where there is no up to date plan but this is not a satisfactory situation. Local Plan issues mean it is difficult to tread with any certainty as strategy is unknown – difficult to commit but keen to understand current policy position.

MWE – Core Strategy previously withdrawn, housing figures based on Surrey Structure Plan. Currently testing/updating evidence. Report to go to Executive in October to ascertain direction of travel including overall housing number. Still debating how much Dunsfold Park will contribute to housing requirements. Noted that Waverley can't 'wind back the clock' on developments already granted. Noted that whilst there is no plan in place, Cranleigh will need to continue to help the Borough meet the housing need.

SS – acknowledged that development will happen but wants the best outcome for Cranleigh. Announced he had stood down from the Joint Planning Committee for considering any further development in Cranleigh.

BE – reminded the meeting that at present, each application needs to be assessed on its own merits

PH – asked that applications be treated in a consistent manner. Willing to contribute their fair share and accepts that infrastructure is needed but need to know what and how much. Infrastructure plan is needed but a piecemeal approach doesn't prevent that from happening.

AL – certainty is the main issue for developers. If developers are to sign up, costs are needed and an idea of how it will be apportioned. If plan is part of the framework which has been consulted on and it is equitable, no problem. But if there is no certainty, there remains a problem. Acknowledged that locals are concerned about infrastructure but that without a planning place for infrastructure, people can't see the end result. This would not be the case if a plan was in place. Mentioned bridge over Downs Link needed and Alford Road should be one way to prevent people heading south towards the A281.

MG – SCC working together with WBC to gather evidence base for Local Plan. SCC has some idea what cumulative impacts would be. Elmbridge Road 'pinch-point' and

Nanhurst Crossroads particularly constrained. Cranleigh has a good level of services already – development needs to add to this and make the area better. Sites are locationally well related to existing services and there is scope for development south of the High Street.

AY – Would be helpful to hear from developers/landowners whether they are willing to engage in the process and what can people expect and by when – what will be the benefits to the community?

SW – happy to be involved to deliver development and other consents.

BE – asked whether developers would be willing to sacrifice land to meet infrastructure needs? Locals want commitment developers are working to a common goal

SS – Important that Cranleigh has employment sites. Hewitts perfect for housing but employment land needs to be replaced elsewhere

HR – Developers want something in return for contributions and commitment. Queried how far developers would go above and beyond a tariff approach (PIC or CIL). Tariff would need simplifying e.g. per plot. Also need to consider Dunsfold, Ewhurst and Alfold as implications beyond Cranleigh. Suggested a smaller working group would be helpful.

PH – Talks can delay development and this has a cost. There is already uncertainty with the Local Plan process. This could disadvantage developers against others so it is unrealistic to ask developers to wait until plan is drawn up.

BE – Suggested a mini/interim plan for Cranleigh?

PH – Indicated that neighbourhood planning delivers this goal

AL – Shortlist of items is needed. Developers are time constrained. Needs leadership and calculations and then developers would be more willing to commit.

SS – Suggested a list of infrastructure requirements is drawn up and circulated?

MWE – Indicated happy to co-ordinate a list and circulate. Will need advice on costings. Regarding apportionment, this will be clearer in November once housing figure for Cranleigh clarified.

AY – Agreed to help put together list of SCC requirements. Noted it will require a co-ordinated approach from developers e.g. if access is to be taken through Hewitts site.

BE – Indicated that apportion could be reduced if providing on site benefits e.g. more parking for Cranleigh

MG – Queried whether this would be in place of, or in addition to, CIL?

MWE – Indicated that preference would be to sit down and come up with a list, then think about costings.

MG – Outlined that the plan may encounter problems e.g. if third party land is required for infrastructure improvements.

ES – Reminded meeting that CIL Regulation 123 must be adhered to and cannot take more than 5 contributions for 1 project. Therefore, tariff approach may not be possible.

AL – Suggested asking developers to fund a consultant to undertake work and speak to all stakeholders e.g. Wey and Arun Canal?

MWE – Preference would be to set up a small group and draw up list.

PH – Also need to look at the feasibility of the infrastructure required.

AB – Noted that is obliged to pursue appeal but will to work with others to look at a joined up package of benefits.

SS – Reiterated that suggestions on circulated plan were his own views only and starting point for discussions. Queried whether new parkland would be publicly available?

AL – Confirmed that 3 units would be gifted to management company to rent out to fund parkland. Landscape management plan drawn up includes 60 parking spaces.

BE – Reminded meeting of need to speak to Cranleigh Neighbourhood Planning Team, for consistency, and the Chamber of Trade.

MWE – Asked developers whether:

- They can confirm support for exploring further?
- Happy to be part of a smaller working group?
- Any other infrastructure needs?

Acknowledged that costings will be required. Question of apportionment will be easier once housing figure is known. Outlined the need to look at relationships between schemes and how to make it work better.

AY – Queried timeframes and suggested response to confirm happy to continue discussions needed by end of week.

MWE – Suggested further meeting 1st week of October.

AB – Queried what guarantees can be made about existing contributions sought? Crest Nicholson would need to be apportioned correctly and ensure that S106 monies are spent locally.

MG – SCC keen to see monies spent locally.

AY – SCC has already drawn up a plan for infrastructure in Cranleigh

AS – List is required to understand demands for Cranleigh. It would have no formal status but indicates pressure points. Useful starting point for negotiations.

PH – Need to sell infrastructure improvements to the people of Cranleigh – development can seek to fix problems. PR is needed about what development is delivering.

BE – closed meeting and thanked all for attending.

Actions

Developers – email PCL to confirm whether willing to continue discussions and be part of smaller working group

PCL to collate responses and arrange further meeting

WBC to speak to SCC Highways regarding infrastructure delivery plan