

NORTH WEST FARNHAM RESIDENTS COMMENTS ON 2018 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Further to the latest amendments (March 2018) made by Taylor Wimpey, the North West Farnham Residents' Association wish to make the following comments. These repeat and incorporate, with some adjustments, the comments made to the Feb 2018 amendments (making these earlier comments dated 7th March now redundant).

LAYOUT and DESIGN

We note the changes made to the previous designs and do generally welcome the improvements, with the changes in characters in areas of the developments and the greater connection with existing Farnham styles.

We note the changes made to the flats. We welcome the reduction in bulk, and restriction of the 2 ½ storey elements. We appreciate the changes made to the earlier draft (Nov 2017) proposals which have made the design less 'flat', though we are disappointed that few of the suggestions drawn up in consultation with the Farnham Society Planning Committee were taken up. We are aware that the Farnham Society are making some specific design comments which we request are given due consideration: in particular we share their concern about the adequacy of some carriageway widths.

We do not object to the occasional use of 2 ½ storey houses proposed in the development. However it is unfortunate that two of these are in sensitive locations next to a cottage and bungalow in Beavers Close. We understand that the windows in the roofs (of plots 3 and 7) which apparently overlook these properties are obscure glazed, but it would be much better if these 2 ½ storey buildings were relocated elsewhere. If they remain then it must be clear in conditions that the obscure glazing cannot be changed.

MATERIALS

We once again stress the significance of the materials used to the actual appearance of the development. We have seen the samples of bricks and tiles that have recently been made available on the web site and welcome the proposed bricks. As regards the tiles we support the submissions of the Farnham Society which request the use of slate tiles (for the grey) and clay tiles (for the red) instead of the concrete tiles proposed.

FLOODING

We are aware that Surrey County Council did not, because of flooding issues, approve the original plans and assume that the Council will check that their concerns have now been met. Though we have been assured by the developer that the development will improve rather than worsen floodwater handling across the site (including around Beavers Close where we have particular concerns), their solutions do seem to depend on good

maintenance of the SuDS. We therefore think that there should be a condition spelling out the Management Company's responsibility for the SuDS; and that this needs to include checking that residents are carrying out their responsibilities (eg for the soakaways on their land); and that the Management Company is required to demonstrate when asked by the public authority responsible for drainage that they are effectively carrying out their maintenance work.

LANDSCAPING AND TREES

We note special reference on Sheet 5 of the soft landscape plan to the need for additional detail on the section behind Numbers 30 to 34 Beavers Road to be established in an arboriculturist site survey. We request that residents of 30 - 34 should be involved in making the decisions arising from this site survey. We note that it is planned for 5 replacement trees along the complete stretch between 34's Western boundary and the eastern end of number 30 – a number which will be insufficient if trees such as poplars are removed. We also note that there are no plans for fencing along this stretch and confusing words (in the boxed note) which do not commit to fencing which we think should be provided.

There has been much discussion on the buffer between the development site and Beavers Close. Much of the resulting proposal is satisfactory, but mature trees have been omitted from behind number 34 (two needed, one behind and one at back of western side) Crondall Lane and also from behind the eastern end of the Beavers Close bungalows.

We are aware that in previous developments new plantings have died without replacement. We request a condition which gives a specific requirement for replanting of plants that have died in the first year (to include in particular those in the buffer area behind Beavers Close).

We welcome the additional trees proposed on the northern edge of the site next to the open space.

FOOTPATHS

We welcome the extent of the pedestrian permeability shown on pages 16 and 25.

We welcome the agreement to create a path from the access to the rear of 32 Beavers Road which had been proposed last Autumn following discussions with the occupants there.

It is noted that the recently established public footpath along the Southern boundary will have to be moved for the plans to be carried out. We have stated before that there are statutory requirements which must be followed to do this (at which any objectors would have the right to object) and we expect that this will be made clear in the conditions attached to any approval.

TRAFFIC and AIR QUALITY

We are aware that the principle of the development at this location was approved at the outline planning stage and that the implications for Air Quality were specifically assessed at that stage. However in the light of the recent question marks over the adequacy and accuracy of Waverley's air quality monitoring and control, and the fact that this development lies within 500m of the Borough where the Air Quality is above legal limits, we believe that granting of the outline permission should be reviewed.

CONDITIONS

There are a number of points we made in our earlier comments regarding conditions which we feel should be attached to the final planning permission.

Design

We have referred above to the 2 ½ storey buildings on plots 3 and 7 which overlook a cottage and bungalow in Beavers Close. With this issue in mind we request a restriction on usual permitted development rights on the houses backing on to Beavers Close and Beavers Road so that they cannot have bedrooms and consequently windows in their roof spaces.

Trees

We repeat our request for tree preservation orders on significant existing trees and for conditions relating to ensuring that plants that die off are replaced. (We are writing separately to the Tree Preservation Officer regarding our request for TPO's)

As referred to above we request a condition which gives a specific requirement for replanting of plants that have died in the first year.

Flooding

As referred to above we think that there should be a condition spelling out the Management Company's responsibility for the SuDS; and that this needs to include checking that residents are carrying out their responsibilities (eg for the soakaways on their land); and that the Management Company is required to demonstrate when asked by the public authority responsible for drainage that they are effectively carrying out their maintenance work.

Traffic

We are aware that part of the S106 agreement is £223,370 towards a Puffin crossing on West St between Crondall Lane and the Borough and highway infrastructure and sustainable transport improvements in Farnham Town Centre. The development will add traffic to local roads that are already crowded at rush hour times. In particular there are jams at the Crondall Lane, West St junction which will become greater with the traffic from the development; and the 'rat run' along Beavers Road, past parked cars and the Potters Gate primary school will become worse. .To address these increasing problems the S106 moneys (and other as necessary) should be used to enable:

- a) Changes to be made at West St / Crondall Lane (such as traffic lights or a mini roundabout)
- b) A 20 mph limit to be created on Beavers Road (also on most of Falkner Road and on Potters Gate)

In addition the whole new estate should become a 20mph limit zone from the start.

(We are writing to Surrey County Council with these requests, but would ask for Waverley's support in directing S106 moneys as above.)

Environment and Footpath Improvements

The S106 agreement identifies £25,000 each for environmental and footpath improvements in the vicinity of the site. We request that North West Farnham Residents Association is consulted on how this money is to be spent. (We are writing to Surrey County Council with these requests, but would ask for Waverley's support in directing S106 moneys as above and for Waverley's direct action regarding any of the environmental money they are responsible for spending)

Open Space

The outline permission was granted on the basis that the open space on the top field was secured permanently as open space (technically for the 'life of the development' which, given that ownership will quickly be in different hands, will be permanent) and that the strip on the Western side would be a permanent ecological zone. We understand that the legal agreement relating to the top field has been signed (if not there should be a condition that it is before development starts); and that a change of use to public open space has been agreed.

However as regards the strip to the Western side of the development the situation is not clear to us. In correspondence by email regarding the definition of open space for the change of use regarding open space, Ms Kellas (case officer) emailed to Stewart Edge (NWFR) on 8 Mar 2017 (email in italics - my bold type)

*This land (ie strip to Western side) is not in the agreement, **as this land is protected by conditions to be maintained for ecological purposes, as such it requires a high level of protection from public usage.** For this reason, this area of land could not be included within the definition of public open space for the legal agreement. The definition of public open space only includes the land to the north and other communal areas within the site.*

*This reflects legal advice sought following the meeting, **as the area requires fencing off and protection. The conditions will require this in perpetuity.** As this area of land falls within the application site and is within the control of applicant, **it is appropriate to control this by way of condition.** The difference with the land to the north is that it did not fall within the application site.*

***The area falls part of the application site subject of the reserved matters application. As such it is within the control of the Council to impose further conditions if found necessary.** However, I would add that strong controls over the use of this land were imposed at the outline stage.*

We have been unable to identify in Officer reports before or after the granting of Outline permission where exactly the control by conditions referred to above '**protected for ecological purpose ...the conditions will require this in perpetuity**' has been established. We would appreciate clarification of this before the Committee meeting. We think it likely that (in line with the final comment that it is within the control of the Council to impose further conditions if found necessary) that a condition requiring another legal agreement, signed before the development can start, would be the most certain way to ensure this protection in perpetuity.

School Places

We are aware that an education contribution has been required through the S106 agreement for £229, 534 to be made 'towards the improvement of secondary education facilities within 3 miles of the site'. We are surprised that no similar money has been set aside for primary education. In any event, whatever the terms of the S106 agreement, it will be essential that, since as soon as the development is complete there will be children in the properties, sufficient school places for the expected new children (at primary and secondary level) are made available as the houses are completed.

(We are writing to Surrey County Council with this request, but would ask for Waverley's support in directing S106 money as above.)

On the assumption that some of the above comments will be ignored the NWFRA objects to the application as a whole.

Stewart Edge for
North West Farnham Residents Association
stewartedge@hotmail.co.uk 28 Mar 2018