HAMBLEDON PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES

of the meeting of the Parish Council held on 4 October 2016 in the Village Hall

Present: John Anderson (Chairman), Mary Grove, Karen Jones, Mike Parry, Paul Pattinson

and Stewart Payne; Jane Woolley (clerk); and 18 members of the public

Apologies: Philip Underwood

QUESTION TIME

Orchard Farm: planning application

Several speakers expressed appreciation at having had an opportunity to view the draft Parish Council response to the Orchard Farm planning application. They hoped to contribute to the discussion and ensure a balanced and factually correct response by the Parish Council.

It was confirmed that the draft was exactly that; it was for discussion, not rubber-stamping. Although Waverley had extended the deadline for its submission, the Parish Council nevertheless hoped to submit it within the next few days.

Some parts of the draft were said to be inappropriate and/or incorrect. Of particular concern was the size of the development, its disregard for local and national planning policies and the inadequate provision of infrastructure, amenities and services.

It was stressed that the response must be for the benefit of all parishioners. The development was not appropriate and the first priority must be for the Parish Council to put its best efforts into getting it refused. As drafted the response was not sufficiently punchy and Waverley might decide to ignore the request that it be refused.

One speaker expressed surprise that the Parish Council response was not more positive, given the support for the proposal at the January 2015 public meeting.

Although Councillors had not expressed their personal views, ERHA must have thought that they supported the application: how could traction have been gained without tacit Parish Council approval?

An analysis of all the objections revealed that the top concern was that the development did not meet criteria for a rural exceptions site, closely followed by the inappropriateness of its location within the AONB/Green Belt. These were fundamental reasons for refusing the application.

The Parish Council was expected to reflect the views of residents. Yet, as drafted, the response suggested that the Parish Council was not committed to refusing the application, despite the fact that people had objected in huge numbers. The draft did not take on board the wishes of the community. There were over 100 comments on the Waverley web site, only five of which were in support.

It was pointed out by Parish Councillors that, although at least half the responses on the Waverley web site were from people from outside Hambledon (including from Wormley, whose concerns were reflected in the response from Witley Parish Council), Hambledon Parish Council's duty was to represent the views of the respondents from within the village.

Currently there were only four households from Hambledon on Waverley's housing register. This did not represent a significant demand: how could 12 affordable houses be justified? Was Hambledon Parish Council sanctioning building on the AONB/Green Belt for the rest of Waverley?

Although a great number of people wanted affordable housing, they did not want 12 together with a huge commercial development. The proposal would produce a large amount of affordable housing that would never be occupied by Hambledon people: would they even occupy four? Hambledon only needed enough affordable housing for Hambledon and latent demand was normally met by building one third of the perceived need. No-one from the village had supported an application to meet a mythical demand: if it were permitted it would destroy a significant part of the AONB/Green Belt. The only way of getting the numbers reduced was to reject the application outright.

In response to a request for the Parish Council to state what it felt the end game should be, Councillors pointed out that they could not express an alternative view until they had an alternative proposal to consider. At present the Parish Council was commenting on the present application. In so doing it had expressed a number of main concerns: the development was not small in scale, it was not certain that it would prioritise people with strong Hambledon connections; and there were issues with drainage, traffic and the appropriateness of locating such a development on the Orchard Farm site. Was the site a rural exceptions site or a brownfield site? It was imperative for these points to be resolved; thereafter thought could be given to the subsequent concerns set out in the draft.

Reference was made to the housing needs survey carried out in January 2015 by Surrey Community Action, whose findings were generally judged to be unacceptable (though the survey had followed the standard formula). The only hard data appeared to be the four Hambledon households on the Waverley housing register and the five comments in favour of the application that were registered on the Waverley planning portal.

Parish Councillors referred back to the support that had been expressed at the January 2015 public meeting. Mention was also made of the Parish Council's long-stated policy in favour of achieving affordable housing for local people. What the Parish Council could not do was influence apathy but individual villagers had communicated their interest in the present proposal to individual Councillors. Against this it was pointed out that the January 2015 meeting had been concerned with a principle, not a proposal. That meeting had been attended by people from all parts of the village, unlike the meeting held on 13 September 2016.

The open session concluded with the Parish Council being thanked for having been in listening mode and for having been receptive to the suggestion that some changes were required to the draft response. Whilst it was hoped that the present application would be rejected, there could possibly be agreement for another in favour of a smaller number of houses and which properly addressed the drainage issues.

The Chairman thanked all those present for their input and noted the request for a further break-out session following the Parish Council's own debate.

FORMAL BUSINESS

1. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 August 2016 were agreed and signed.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Chairman: Director, Hambledon Village Shop; Trustee, Hambledon Almshouses;

Trustee, Hambledon Football Club

Mary Grove: Member, Village Hall Committee; Trustee, Hambledon Football Club

Mike Parry: Trustee, Hambledon Almshouses

Paul Pattinson: Trustee, Hambledon Almshouses Stewart Payne: Trustee, Hambledon Nursery School.

At this point it was **agreed** to bring agenda item 4 forward as it related to Orchard Farm.

4. ORCHARD FARM

The following points were made by Councillors in their discussion, which also took account of matters raised during the open session.

- Where the objections came from was irrelevant; it was **agreed** to amend the draft in this respect.
- The proposed development provided an opportunity to alleviate drainage problems which were unlikely to be otherwise addressed; but a proper design was needed as the existing proposals did not go anywhere near enough to satisfy the requirements of the development.
- People talked to Councillors on an individual basis and all Councillors knew villagers who supported the development, even though they had not submitted comments on it to Waverley. It was **agreed** to add a reference to one-to-one contacts to the response.
- Whether a smaller scheme, including an amended ratio of market to affordable houses, would be viable was something on which the Parish Council could not comment as it was not privy to EHRA's financial appraisal.
- The Parish Council had not sought a development of this size or one that included market housing, of which there was a plentiful supply in Hambledon. Hence the statements in paras. 1, 1.1 and 1.2 of the draft; and it was **agreed** that these should be expanded as suggested during the open session.
- A lack of modestly priced housing militated against people, including older people, who would like to remain in the village; the number of small houses that remained was rapidly dwindling given the tendency for them to be enlarged when they changed hands.
- What constituted genuine local need for affordable housing in Hambledon, including actual numbers, could only be determined by Waverley; but it was **agreed** to add the current number of Hambledon residents on the Waverley housing register to the response.
- Only Waverley could determine whether Orchard Farm was a brownfield site, a rural exceptions site or an amalgam of the two.
- **agreed** that the conclusion would be strengthened by the inclusion of the following wording: "For the reasons given above, the Parish Council considers that the application should be refused".

Several minor textual amendments were also **agreed**, together with proposals (i) that a final draft be circulated to Councillors for approval and submission to Waverley and (ii) for the posting of a news item to this effect on the village web site.

The Chairman then adjourned the meeting to enable a member of the public to reiterate his on-going concern about the numbers in "genuine local need" of affordable housing in Hambledon. It was **agreed** that the relevant sentence of the response should read "For the reasons given below the Parish Council considers this is an aspect upon which Waverley needs to satisfy itself."

The formal business then resumed.

3. FINANCE

Financial statement

Noted that the current account was in credit and included the second instalment (£370) of the Waverley compensation grant for 2016-17.

Cheque for confirmation

C J Rapley – hedge cutting, September (localism initiative)	£840.00
Cheques for signature	
Tim Coleman - September maintenance	£180.00
Gavin Jones – cricket green cutting, July/August, September	£514.86
Workstation – ink, paper, files	£ 28.99

BDO – audit fee £120.00

Audit for the year ending 31 March 2016

Confirmed acceptance of the annual return, including approval of the external auditor's Certificate.

Dunsfold Park

Confirmed the previously agreed contribution of £104 towards costs incurred by the Joint Parishes on a review of Waverley housing figures.

Noted that a contribution (yet to be advised) would be requested towards the cost of the Vision commentary on the new Transport Assessment.

4. PLANNING

Planning applications

Confirmed decisions (attached to the file copy of these minutes) on the following

- WA16/1642: Walnut Tree Cottage, Vann Lane extensions and alterations including double garage
- WA16/1718: 2 Speedwell Cottages, Lane End application for certificate of lawfulness for alterations to existing garage to provide habitable accommodation
- WA16/1803: Stepaside Cottage, Petworth Road certificate of lawfulness for erection of single storey extension
- -WA 16/1813: 4/5 Nutbourne Cotages, Roundals Lane alterations to two dwellings to provide one. <u>Decisions on recent applications</u>
- WA16/1106: Peony Cottage, Woodlands Road erection of 2-storey side extension: granted
- WA16/1423: Enton End Cottage, Station Lane certificate of lawfulness for erection of side and rear extensions: granted
- WA16/1473: 1 Nutbourne Cottages, Roundals Lane erection of dwelling with attached garage following demolition of existing dwelling and attached garage: granted
- WA16/1539: Hazels, Vann Lane certificate of lawfulness for erection of conservatory: granted
- WA16/1597: 6 Nutbourne Cottages, Roundals Lane erection of 2-storey side extension: decision pending.

Farm Cottage

Noted that Historic England had circulated its consultation report and that the details were now being assessed as the basis for a proposed addition of the cottage to the National Heritage List for England.

5. DUNSFOLD PARK: WAVERLEY LOCAL PLAN

On consideration of the previously circulated papers, **agreed** comments arising from the review of the replacement Transport Assessment for Dunsfold Park and **confirmed** previously submitted comments on the Waverley Local Plan (both attached to the file copy of these minutes).

6. VILLAGE MATTERS

Highways and footpaths

Noted that SCC's Western Villages task group would meet on 12 October to prioritise local highway projects for 2017-18 and that Mike Parry and the Clerk would be attending.

Noted that SCC had awarded a new jetting contract; that the offer of funding to enable the Parish Council to commission its own jetter had accordingly been put on hold; and that Mike Parry and the Clerk would be discussing Hambledon's requirements for jetting with SCC on 5 September.

Agreed that SCC's Community Partnership Team should be advised of the underspend of the grant for clearing the blocked gully at the Lane End cross roads (grant £500; actual cost £185)

Hambledon House weddings

Noted that the organisers of these events had requested feedback from the Parish Council with a view to including this in their post-season discussions with Hambledon House and **agreed** that they should be informed that there had been complaints about the noise and its intrusion on domestic life. Superfast broadband

Noted that a group of villagers from Vann/Roundals/Upper Vann Lanes would be meeting on 5 October to discuss possible ways of these hard-to-reach parts of Hambledon acquiring Superfast broadband connections.

7. VILLAGE ORGANISATIONS

Almshouses

Noted that a RHI grant for Almshouse no. 1 was still being pursued.

Village Hall

Noted that the exterior painting had been completed.

Village Shop

Congratulated the shop on winning Godalming Trust's Civic Design Award (Retail Refurbishment) and reaching the finals of the Surrey Life Food and Drink Awards; and noted that over £2,000 had been pledged for the new shop toilet.

8. OUTSIDE MEETINGS

Noted that the Chairman and Clerk had attended the recent Waverley Town and Parish Council meeting at which the main agenda items had been up-dates on the Waverley Local Plan and neighbourhood plans.

9. CORRESPONDENCE

There was none.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 23.00

Date of next meeting: Wednesday 16 November 2016