

West End Action Group (WEAG)

6 March 2017

Dear WEAG Supporters,

Several things have happened since our last newsletter.

1. SHBC's Planning Applications Committee (PAC) on 09 February considered two West End developments: William Lacey, south of Kings Road - 'reserved matters'; and Thakeham, south of Kings Road, full planning application.

William Lacey (new owner & developer: Shanly Homes): south of Kings Road 16/0554 – 84 dwellings

Both Jason Ing of Rose Meadow and I, Beulah Kingston, spoke on this application.

Jason representing the residents of Rose Meadow:

- Expressed his concerns about both the lack of a management plan and communication with the new owners Shanly Homes. Concerns also extended to the likely duration of the development with construction vehicles passing along Rose Meadow possibly over three years. This brought some questions from the PAC, concerns were stated and some reassurance given on development requirements including duration, daylight and weekends.

Representing WEAG, I spoke on the following:

a. Access

- The access via Rose Meadow being the only one is not acceptable for a development of some 84 dwellings. There should be two separate access points to such a large estate.
- The fact that Shanly Homes had options on 4 long gardens that jut into the main site, one of which had been purchased including both the garden and the house. The fact that access shown on the plans is into an already purchased house & garden and the options on the other long gardens could escalate the size of the estate by an additional 20 dwellings. It could also become a further access point onto Kings' Road. We asked that they consider this and withhold approval until this came forward to planning.

b. The cumulative impact of development and the need for infrastructure to support it

- The Housing Minister Gavin Barwell stated in January 2017 that, regarding infrastructure requirements, planning authorities should consider the cumulative impact of developments on neighbouring sites, and not piecemeal estate by estate.
- This was also backed by a report commissioned by SHBC on which consultants DSE made the same point as a recommendation to SHBC.
- A joint letter from West End Parish Council and WEAG to SHBC was then referred to, in order to add weight to this request.

No questions were asked by the PAC.

Thakeham Homes: south of Kings Road, application for 35 dwellings - 16/0679

Dr Jeff Llewellyn, WEAG's Vice-Chairman, spoke on this full planning application:

a. This reserve land is 'safeguarded'

- The land is 'safeguarded' (quoting the NPPF para 85.4), meaning that it should not be built on until the Local Plan has been reviewed and recommends such a development. As there has not yet been a review of the Local Plan no development should be approved.
- The NPPF requirements relating to the shortfall in housing supply do not apply to safeguarded land.

b. Cumulative impact of several developments

Infrastructure requirements should not be considered in isolation: with some 300 + houses being approved, the local infrastructure cannot cope, as follows:

- Holy Trinity school at capacity and no provision from SCC to expand
- West End Surgery already overloaded despite recruiting new doctors
- Local road network will be severely overloaded, especially the A322/ Fellow Green/Kerria Way roundabout which is close to capacity
- Junction of Kings Road and A322 - increased risk of accident at this junction and the mitigation proposed by SCC will not be very effective
- Loss of habitat and ecological impacts
- Design - this development is a 'mini Poundbury' which is inappropriate for West End. It does not reflect the nature of the adjacent Character area (in the VDS) of Kings Road at all
- This is a poor quality and unnecessary development squeezed into a small field which hitherto has been regarded as unsuitable for building due to its boggy nature

PAC members asked questions in relation to the ownership of the unadopted Kings Road, which was further erroneously discussed by the Shanly Homes agent. Cllr Adrian Page drew attention to the fact Kings Road was seriously pot-holed and not suitable as the main access road to the development.

In spite of these arguments, both of the above were approved by the PAC.

2. Parish Council/WEAG joint letter to the Borough Council about infrastructure

I referred above to a joint letter from West End Parish Council and WEAG to SHBC. This argued that SHBC and SCC should consider the infrastructure of the village in a holistic way, taking all 350+ houses into account, instead of dealing with it piecemeal on an estate by estate basis. We directed you previously to the letter on the SHBC website.

We have received an unsatisfactory reply from Jenny Rickard at SHBC, and as also referred to above, the PAC decided not to adopt the letter's recommendation.

3. Windlemere: 3 houses and a SANG - planning reference 16/1207

You may be aware that the Windlemere Golf Club in Windlesham Road has been closed and the owner Clive Smith is seeking planning permission for the erection of three two-storey houses with double garages on the site of the original buildings, and hard standing with access as for the golf club. The remainder of the land is proposed to be a SANG (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace) to mitigate against damage to the Special Protection Area (Brentmoor Heath).

For a change, this is a development which seems on balance to have the potential to be a positive for the village, because it opens to the public almost all the large area occupied by the golf course, as a landscaped and partially wooded parkland. The design of the proposed houses is attractive, their location approximately on the footprint of the existing buildings is sensible, and there are only three of them. There are however very strong objections

concerning the proposed location of the car park in Blackstroud Lane East (it should be in Windlesham Road where the golf course's own car park is), and the use of Blackstroud Lane East as an access road, considering its winding narrow nature.

SHBC have indicated that the proposed decision date on the full planning application will be 12 April, though these dates are not always adhered to.

4. Correspondence with Michael Gove, MP

We have been in correspondence with our MP Michael Gove throughout the last three years, about the four major planning applications. Ultimately we let him know that we are disappointed he did not offer more support to our protests about SHBC and the Planning Inspectorate ignoring policies in the Local Plan and NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) which told them not to grant planning permission.

In his latest letter, Michael Gove asked for more details about our claim that these developments on the reserve sites are not sustainable. Although we had explained all this in previous letters, we replied last week with a full answer. Our letter is attached.

5. Fairoaks 'Garden Village'

There is great concern locally about the proposal to build 1500+ houses on the land occupied by Fairoaks Airport. In addition to the impact of this number of new houses, it would form a link which would in effect create a linear town of up to 6,000 houses comprising the Longcross 'garden village' to Fairoaks' north and the proposed 'McLarens/Woodham Town' to the south.

An Action Group, initiated by the Chobham Society but including other residents associations such as those in Ottershaw and Horsell, has been formed. Named the 'No Fairoaks New Town' group, it aims to fight the Fairoaks proposal and argue that the airfield should be retained as an important regional airport.

For further information on the Fairoaks proposal go to:

<http://www.surreyheath.gov.uk/residents/planning/planning-policy/fairoaks-airport>

As a reminder, the URL for searching for applications on the Borough's website is:

<http://www.surreyheath.gov.uk/residents/planning/planning-applications-search>

Kind regards

Beulah Kingston
Chair, West End Action Group
contact@weag.info
www.weag.info