

## Dear WEAG Supporters

There is still much to do in defending West End against inappropriate large-scale development. Two big issues are demanding our immediate attention: an appeal against the Council's refusal of permission to build on the fields around Malthouse Farm, and (believe it or not) a fresh (and third) application for 85 dwellings on land north of Beldam Bridge Road.

## **Southern Heritage Developments: 95 dwellings on fields at Malthouse Farm**

Southern Heritage's planning application last year to build 95 dwellings on land around Malthouse Farm, Benner Lane (reference 15/0445) was refused by Surrey Heath Borough Council (SHBC) through their Planning Applications Committee (PAC). The developer has now lodged an appeal (reference APP/D3640/W/15/3139682). No doubt they will cite the precedent of Planning Inspector Mr Boniface giving approval to developer William Lacey to build 84 dwellings on land south of Kings Road. No date for the appeal Hearing has been announced yet, but there is a strict deadline of 17 May for sending in objections.

WEAG has been taking legal advice, and it is our intention to object that Mr Boniface's decision on Kings Road was fatally flawed and should not be used as a precedent for the Malthouse Farm site.

These 'reserve' sites are safeguarded with the potential to meet longer-term development needs (into the 2020s) if required, in accordance with Policy H8 of the Local Plan, and paragraph 85 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). These safeguarded sites can only be released for building if allocated for development following a Local Plan review. There has been no such review, therefore the land should remain safeguarded.

We will argue that Mr Boniface's decision was flawed because he did not take due account of this fact.

The same argument about the status of the safeguarded land, and the need for a new Local Plan before it can be altered, also means that the Malthouse Farm site should not be given planning permission.

In addition there are the objections with which we are all familiar, about the unsustainability of the Malthouse Farm development, the infrastructure cannot cope, the extreme problems about traffic volumes and congestion, access to medical facilities, insufficient school places, damage to the character of the area, and so on.

Every objection made against the original application, before SHBC rejected it, has been sent to the Inspectorate, so it is not necessary to object again – unless there are fresh points you wish to make or you decide to emphasise your original objections by sending them in again. Objections, quoting the appeal reference APP/D3640/W/15/3139682, can be made at <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk> or by emailing [TeampNI@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:TeampNI@pins.gsi.gov.uk), or by post to Mr Ian Wallis, The Planning Inspectorate, Room 3/18, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Bristol BS1 6PN (you need to send three copies).

## **Taylor Wimpey: 85 dwellings on land north of Beldam Bridge Road**

There has been a complex sequence of events, stretching from 2014 to 2016:

- Taylor Wimpey (TW) submitted an application (reference 14/0594) to build 85 dwellings on 'safeguarded' land, with SANG land attached. Every large residential development must have allocated to it some new open recreational land available to the public; this is known as SANG (Suitable Alternative Green Space)
- SHBC PAC refused the application
- TW appealed, and a date for a Hearing in April 2016 was agreed
- At the end of 2015 Planning Inspector Boniface gave permission for 84 dwellings on safeguarded land south of Kings Road
- TW sent in a second application (15/0884), citing the Kings Road permission as a precedent
- SHBC PAC controversially succumbed and gave approval
- TW and the Planning Inspectorate agreed to suspend TW's appeal until 6 May
- In Windlesham, SHBC PAC reversed their stance on safeguarded land by refusing permission for a development of 140 dwellings on Windlesham's safeguarded site
- A West End resident, Diane Doney, began legal proceedings to challenge SHBC's approval of TW's application and the manner of it
- TW have therefore resurrected their appeal against the original refusal, and are asking for a date for the Hearing
- TW submitted yet another application (16/0323), this time an identical plan for the 85 dwellings but without the SANG land – citing SANG land at Chobham Meadows instead of the new SANG land next to the development. The deadline for objections to SHBC regarding this new application is 25 May.

Since 16/0323 is a fresh application, the objections sent against the previous applications will not be carried forward to this application, so if you wish to object you will need to do so again, by the deadline of 25 May. Objections should be submitted to SHBC, quoting Reference number 16/0323. Details are at [www.surreyheath.gov.uk](http://www.surreyheath.gov.uk), and click on 'Planning Applications Search'. Objections can be emailed to [development.control@surreyheath.gov.uk](mailto:development.control@surreyheath.gov.uk) or by post to Duncan Carty, Regulatory Services, SHBC, Surrey Heath House, Knoll Road, Camberley GU15 3HD.

WEAG will be objecting, using the same arguments against Mr Boniface's Kings Road precedent as noted above, and attaching our original objections.

WEAG will also keep an eye out for the date of the Hearing and arrangements for submissions to the Hearing, and will keep you informed.

Best regards

Guy Consterdine

Secretary, WEAG  
[contact@weag.info](mailto:contact@weag.info)