

# HASCOMBE PARISH COUNCIL

## Annual Parish Assembly

### 25 April 2016

**MINUTES** of the Annual Assembly of Hascombe Parish Council held on **Monday 25th April 2016** in Hascombe Village Hall, Mare Lane, Hascombe at 7.00pm

**Attendees:** Mr C. Orange, Mr P Lye, Mr K Kingham, Mrs Sarah Sullivan and 51 members of the public, including Mr Toby Anstruther and representatives of Protect Our Waverley Campaign (POW)  
Mrs B Weddell – Clerk

**Apologies:** Apologies had been received from Surrey County Councillor Victoria Young and Waverley Borough Councillors Richard Seaborne and Maurice Byham.

#### **MINUTES:**

The Chairman, Charles Orange welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the members of the Parish Council.

#### **Hascombe Smiths Charity Financial Report**

The Clerk, Beverley Weddell, reported the balance in hand at 1 January 2015 was £579.74 and the amount of the 2015 grant was £2000.00 making a total of £2579.74 available for distribution. The Trustees decided to give £100.00 to each of 22 beneficiaries. An annual expenditure of £2200 leaving £379.74 balance in hand at 31 December 2015. The adoption of the Statement of Accounts for Hascombe Smiths Charity for the year ending 31 December 2015 as was proposed and seconded and carried unanimously. The Chairman signed the approved Statement of Accounts.

#### **Chairman's Annual Report**

Charles Orange gave his report on the activities of the Parish council in the past year, which is appended to these minutes

He reported that income for last year was just over £7,300 and came from a small amount levied within the total Council tax bill - being under a fortieth of the total. The largest amounts of expenditure last year were a salary for the Clerk, a £1,440 grant to the Village Hall for external decoration, £1,440 also on grass cutting in the pond area and £1,000 as a contribution towards the cost of planning advice.

#### *Planning applications*

The views expressed by villagers on planning applications had a great influence on any objections which we write to Waverley. 14 applications were considered in Hascombe last year and the Parish Council supported, commented on or made no objection to all of them except those concerning the Woodyard and the Barns at Place Farm – both of which were refused by Waverley Borough Council. A decision on an appeal to the Inspector about the Woodyard building is expected within a few months. We also made comments on but did not object to an application for the conversion of an agricultural Barn into a house at Langhurst Farm which was refused by Waverley.

#### *Dunsfold Park and Airfield and Local Plan*

He stated he had to play a more leading role than previously because there are new Chairmen of both Dunsfold and Alfold Parish Councils. A large number of documents had been produced and read then commented upon. Action included:

- A letter written on 1<sup>st</sup> March to the Secretary of State asking him to call-in the application for consideration by him if Waverley is minded to approve it. This letter was sent from 12 Parish Councils.
- Two reports on the Dunsfold transport assessments which were commissioned in March and April at our request from Vision Transport by a large group of Parish Councils who represent over 21,000 residents mainly in Waverley but also in Guildford and West Sussex.

#### *The Emerging Local Plan*

The Chairman said we intended to question the need for the stated number of homes and critically to examine further the levels of traffic predicted and the adequacy of the transport infrastructure and especially on A281 and the east west roads from Cranleigh and Dunsfold Airfield. He expressed concern that there were planning applications for homes in the Cranleigh area – excluding those at Dunsfold Airfield - which had already been approved or were soon to be considered by Waverley for a total of over 1100 homes.

A summary of action taken during the past year on both Dunsfold Park and the Emerging Local Plan had been placed on the seats for people to read (appended to these minutes).

#### *Neighbourhood Plan*

A steering group had been established to draw up the Neighbourhood Plan and sub committees appointed to progress different aspects. A survey had been made of opinions in the Village which will be taken into account when the Neighbourhood Plan is written. Work has been delayed until more information is known about the Waverley Local Plan to which the Neighbourhood Plan is subordinate.

#### *Lobbying*

A Parish Councillor has attended and represented Hascombe's interests on Surrey County Council's local group and also at Waverley meetings with Parishes. We have also lobbied Surrey County Council to repair Markwick Lane and Mare Lane and clear footpaths.

*The Chairman's separate report concerning action taken in 2015/16 on the proposed development at Dunsfold Park and Airfield and the Emerging Local Plan is appended to these minutes.*

The Chairman opened the meeting for local reports.

#### **Waverley Borough Councillors Maurice Byham and Richard Seaborne**

Cllrs Byham and Seaborne were unable to attend as they were required to attend a meeting at Waverley. Their report written report is appended to these minutes.

#### **Mr Toby Anstruther, Landowner Hascombe Estate**

Mr Anstruther stated that he had in the past neglected discussions with residents directly and through the parish council. He had met with a resident recently and had welcomed his approach. It was agreed that a series of meetings would be set up, two or three times a year, to keep lines of communication open. Discussions would cover current and expected planning applications, as well as access over the estate, which was one of the big issues. Mr Anstruther welcomed walkers and maintained the footpaths over the estate. In the past, much wider access had been granted, which was originally a condition of the Woodland Grant Scheme and access was maintained when the scheme came to an end. Discussions should be held with the parish council, such as what is involved, who pays for maintenance

etc. and what the implications are. It had been about 25 years since Mr Anstruther had farmed the estate; there are currently three separate enterprises – the farm, woodland and residential, not all working together. He was very keen to bring them back together, for himself, the farm and the village. It would be approximately five years before farming starts but he was encouraging Ashley Ward to replant hedges under the auspices of a high level stewardship campaign and would be looking for a farming partner. Mr Anstruther had converted to organic farming in Scotland and it was his personal preference for the future of farming and creates a landscape we want to live in and food we want to eat. As part of the process, he was looking at other assets and buildings to provide a reliable income stream.

When asked about the Hascombe Hill car park, Mr Anstruther responded that the prospect is it will stay closed for the time being.

Residents raised concerns about use of the footpaths by horse riders and cyclists, Mr Anstruther responded that there was nothing to stop an owner riding on a footpath and that the hunt rides through as well. He always welcomed communication and was happy to hear from residents if there's a problem.

Mr Anstruther was asked for his thoughts on the latest proposals for housing a Dunsfold Park and whether he would object. He responded that he had no desire to see the aerodrome turned into housing. Now that he lives outside of the south east, he is amazed how crowded it is whenever he comes down and if the aerodrome could not be built on that would be fantastic. He said that he was open to learning about the application before making a view but would have no issue about objecting.

On the question of housing, Mr Anstruther said that the parish council had mentioned a need for affordable housing in or around the village, but he was not specifically looking for more housing to be built on his land. He stated that he does not continue to own land in Hascombe to make money but because it is a lovely place.

Regarding the Woodyard, which was awaiting an appeal decision, Mr Anstruther said that the process he had been going through had been based on planning advice, which was that planning permission for the commercial activity was the most likely possibility and that he would be unlikely to get permission for residential use, which goes against what residents said they would like. Planning policy may change, and he would pursue the current planning process and then discuss what will actually happen to the site when the outcome of the appeal is known.

The Chairman thanked Mr Anstruther for coming down from Scotland to attend the meeting and said that he would look forward to future meetings.

#### **Friends of Hascombe.**

Shirley Jeffrey spoke on behalf of the Friends of Hascombe, as the Chairman and Secretary sent their apologies. She reported that the Friends of Hascombe was strong financially and in terms of membership and hopefully, through improved communications, they would reach a wider audience, hopefully reflecting the changes to the village demographics. There was a need for new committee members, which was not an onerous task with about five meetings held per year and the same number of events. She said that they would very much like to recruit associates, people with various skills so that it spreads the load of the committee. The Friends would also like to increase its membership, which was not expensive at just £5 for single membership and £8 for a family. Forthcoming events included the village clean-up on 7<sup>th</sup> May, a skittles match with Dunsfold on 14<sup>th</sup> May and on 12<sup>th</sup> June combining with Dunsfold for the Queen's 90<sup>th</sup> birthday celebrations.

**The White Horse**

Paul and Sorrell Morganti were the new owners of the White Horse and Paul addressed the meeting. He said that they hadn't moved to Hascombe to own and manage a pub but to live in the beautiful countryside and saw the pub as a core binding the community. They had been troubled by the endless decline in the fortunes of the pub, some operational, and the building also suffered decades of neglect and underinvestment. A lot of work had been done in the previous few weeks and they saw themselves as custodians of old buildings that they wanted to see survive for another hundred years. The pub was the core of the community and without it Hascombe ran the risk of becoming a thoroughfare. For the pub to work, had to be a commercial exercise and if it wasn't commercially viable and successful it wouldn't succeed. A new chef had recently started along with new front of house staff and internal refurbishment was currently going on. Paul asked residents to do their bit to support the village pub.

**St Peter's Church**

Dennis Evans spoke on behalf of the church and said that he echoed Paul Morganti's sentiments about rejuvenating the pub and doing that in parallel with the church. When he came to Hascombe in 1968, he had stayed at the b&b in the pub. There was a vibrant congregation intermingled with the pub, which was really special. This continued for quite a few years with good landlords and a good vicar and the White Horse and church were populated by a whole cross-section of the village. Over the last few years, quite a few of the older families had passed away or were no longer able to support the church as they used to and there was a need to repair that. The church has a new rector, although these days he is priest-in-charge. Priests-in-charge used to be licensed for three to five years but now he has the right to stay as Rector at Dunsfold and Hascombe until he retires. There may be an impact should Dunsfold Park be agreed as the church would need to reorganise itself, but the support of residents was needed both physically and financially. The Quinquennial inspection had just been carried out by the architect and although there was not one huge single item to be funded, there were a number of things which would be reasonably expensive, such as the wall by the road which was beginning to crumble. Dennis asked residents to think seriously about how they valued the church, both as a hatching, matching and despatching facility and as a regular place of worship. He said that they would like to see parishioners more often and would try to communicate with residents more fully than they had over the previous year. Any suggestions about how residents would like to see services evolve, would be welcomed.

**POW Campaign**

Bob Lees report for Protect Our Waverley Campaign is appended to these minutes.

After Charles Orange had duly thanked the speakers and people who help make the village special, an enjoyable drinks party ensued with sausages kindly provided by Kevin Kingham.

**CHAIRMAN**.....

**DATE**.....

## **Report from Waverley Borough Councillors Maurice Byham and Richard Seaborne**

Members and Officers of Hascombe Parish Council and residents attending the 2016 Annual Assembly, firstly let us apologise for not being with you this evening. We our hope that you are having a productive meeting. We are both required to attend a meeting of the Waverley Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Charles has asked us to make some brief comments on current Waverley matters that affect Hascombe Parish. Three issues stand out as being of most relevance to Hascombe and indeed to the surrounding parishes. These are the 2016-17 Waverley budget, progress on the Waverley Local Plan and determination of the major Dunsfold planning application for 1800 houses and an increase in commercial space.

In terms of the budget settlement, following a 52% cut in the Revenue Support Grant from the Government and after holding its share of Council Tax constant for the previous five years, Waverley has approved an increase in the Band D equivalent charge for its element of Council Tax for 2016/17 of £5. This equates to an additional 10 pence a week. This increase has enabled Waverley to produce a balanced budget for 2016/17 without making cuts to services through financial constraints. Included in the budget report for 2016/2017 are proposals to maintain funding for the borough's voluntary and charitable organisations and agree new funding for environmental enforcement and litter picking on key roads.

Of longer term concern are the impacts of the Government's new requirements on social housing, which require a 1% reduction in rents per year for the next four years and for higher value council owned houses to be sold off when they become void and the proceeds returned to the Government. These measures have a huge impact on Waverley's long term business plan so a major review will be carried out during this financial year to identify necessary measures to manage the consequences of the Government's requirements.

Generation of the Waverley Local Plan continues. Highways England has recently requested that Waverley and Guildford Borough Councils submit a joint assessment of their traffic situation and forecasts, particularly focussed on the impact on the A3. The consequence of this requirement is that the assessment of traffic that Surrey County Council is carrying out, as key input to the Waverley plan, has been delayed. It is now scheduled to be completed and published by mid-May. Previously all chapters of the plan were due to be completed by early April. The delay in the transport assessment means that publication of the Local Plan is now scheduled for July with submission in November, which is still within the Government's timetable for Local Plans.

The Dunsfold determination work is ongoing and is also dependent on the transport work being carried out by Surrey. This work now has access to Part 2 of the independent Mott MacDonald transport study which was released in February. Our latest understanding from Officers is that comments received during the initial consultation period have been reviewed, and Dunsfold has been asked to address certain issues in the proposal. Opportunity for additional consultation on changes will take place during May with a view to a determination being made in June.

## **Report from Bob Lees, POW**

Good evening, welcome and thank you for joining us.

I am Bob Lees, Chairman of the Protect Our Waverley Campaign Group. I moved to Dunsfold five years ago and have spent most of my career in road transport systems so I know a fair bit about traffic and traffic related issues.

I'm delighted that the Parish Council has asked us along this evening to give us this opportunity to talk to you and forgive for reading from this script. I want to ensure that all my key points are properly covered.

About 3 months ago a group of people from the Cranleigh and Dunsfold areas got together to discuss how we might go about stopping the Dunsfold New Town and decided to form an action group. In fact, as I shall go on to outline, the current planning issues are much broader than Dunsfold Park, and need to embrace such major issues as the Waverley Local Development Plan and hence the name for the campaign, Protect Our Waverley.

Before I get into what we are about, I am going to tell you what we are NOT about. We are NOT about condemning the need for more houses. Indeed, the Committee, and I am sure all of you, accept that more houses are required to meet LOCAL demand.

We are here to challenge Dunsfold Park New Town and all that entails rather than to engage in a debate on whether houses are needed and in what number. Protect Our Waverley is about campaigning, in a constructive way, against the current raft of proposals to develop large settlements in the parts of Waverley which don't have the infrastructure to support them. We aim to achieve this by influencing Waverley Borough Council to reject these applications on planning grounds. This means that, for example, we have to persuade other parts of Waverley Borough that building a New Town on DP won't solve their problems, in fact it is likely to add to them!

Most Waverley residents want to see a distribution of housing in the towns and villages where it is required to meet the truly local need. Housing is needed close to existing employment and not lumped together in one rural unsustainable location.

So where have we got to? We've published a website and a facebook page. We've put up posters and distributed leaflets explaining how representations can be made to Waverley. We've delivered an objection letter to Waverley, followed up by a detailed HGV and employment analysis and a letter querying the lack of pre-application consultation and requesting that this consultation now be undertaken. We will continue to make representations to Waverley as and when we have more information.

A letter has been sent on behalf of the local Parishes, supported by POW, to the Secretary of State to ask for the application to be called in. This would entail planning inspectors determining the application rather than Waverley. This has been acknowledged and if Waverley are minded to grant permission the SoS will consider calling the application in, which is the same state we were in last time.

Waverley is still accepting representations and will do so until very shortly before the meeting of the Planning Committee to decide this application. This is unlikely to be before the end of June so if you haven't put in your objection yet please do so, it is still valid.

Make no mistake, this is going to be around for a long time and all objections count! To date Waverley have registered over 1250 objections.

Here is a key planning consideration.

In 2012 the Government introduced a new short planning framework at the heart of which is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The conclusion is that unsustainable development will be rejected. In the forward of this framework Greg Clark, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, says that "sustainable' means ensuring that better lives for ourselves doesn't mean worse lives for future generations". In other words un-sustainable means in the wrong place. The critical issue here is whether the proposed Dunsfold New Town is or is not sustainable and if it is unsustainable Waverley must refuse planning permission. We have no doubt that it **is** unsustainable and therefore Waverley **must** refuse planning permission as they have done before. This is not only our view but the view of the government 3 times in the past, the last being in 2009 when the then Secretary of State refused consent, one of the main reasons being its unsustainable location. And at a meeting of the Waverley Executive on 5th April this year councillor Brian Adams, the planning portfolio holder for Waverley, said:

**"Unfortunately Dunsfold Park exists in what is currently an unsustainable location due mainly to the absence of satisfactory transport links and services. To make it sustainable will take a long time and be very expensive."**

He went on to say:

**"Our spatial strategy is assuming it [Dunsfold Park] will be found to be satisfactory, if it [Dunsfold Park] isn't it will leave a big hole in it [the plan]"**

We should not take councillor Adams statement to mean that Waverley are against Dunsfold Park, rather that Waverley have known that this site is unsustainable throughout. His admission is that they don't have a plan B so they will push this for all they are worth rather than trying to reduce the Waverley housing target and/or find more sustainable sites. Make no mistake this plan is developer led, not plan led. After all Waverley have used the developers own documents to support this as a site for the Local Plan, surely they should be doing their own basic analysis of DP as a valid site, not relying on the flawed submissions of a developer.

One of the prime reasons that we are in this state today regarding unsuitable planning applications is Waverley's lack of a Local Plan and their inability to produce one. This has allowed applications such as Sweeters Copse to be considered and granted and now there are 2 more applications about to be approved just over the road between Cranleigh and the A281! Be very clear, Waverley's inaction and woeful approach to this key issue is to blame for a lot of the planning grief we are seeing today. Although jokes have been made about the Cranleigh, Dunsfold, Alfold urban sprawl, if DP and Springbok are given the go ahead along with recently approved and to be approved applications in Cranleigh then that is exactly what we are going to get!

It has become apparent that we not only have to campaign against such applications, we also have to keep reminding Waverley about their own procedures which they continually conveniently ignore. I go back to one of the letters we recently submitted to Waverley about their lack of consultation on the DP application. Waverley's Statement of Community Involvement quite clearly states what they and the applicant should do for such a large and far reaching application and they equally clearly failed to do it. It is not too late, Waverley should now consult and conduct information forums according to their own rules.

In Waverleys enthusiasm to dump all these houses on this end of the borough, they have lost sight of their own guidelines and rules. Apart from urging any of you who haven't objected to the application to date to object, I also urge you to put pressure on your local borough councillors and the council leaders to get their house in order and to properly apply the planning rules rather than their own extreme interpretation of them.

As an example, planning rules state that each application must be judged on its own merit, which is fine until you look at the detail. Waverley have been merrily approving applications in the eastern end of the borough which when taken on their own maybe have merit, BUT when the cumulative effect is taken into account, are clearly breaking the local infrastructure, such as roads and sewage treatment and therefore as such become unsustainable! What will it take for Waverley to properly deal with this?

So it is important that we not only campaign against the grant of planning permission but also campaign against the inclusion of Dunsfold Park and other large scale developments as suitable sites in the shortly to be published draft Local Plan. Well I say shortly, at the Executive meeting I just referred to, the publication of the new Local Plan was delayed yet again, and is now not expected to be made public until July, and one may ask July of which year? Waverley should not deal with this application until this new local plan has been published. This planning application is premature, opportunistic and unsustainable.

About the application itself, this is only an outline application. So for the housing the only certainty is that there will be 1,875 dwellings. The precise location of the buildings, their heights, their designs, the number of affordable houses are all reserved matters, that is, matters that will be negotiated between the developer and Waverley after outline planning has been granted. The applicant's Planning Statement gives a glimpse of the sort of new town that it wishes to build. It will not be anything like the surrounding villages. The housing density will be up to 100 dwellings per acre in the centre, with buildings four stories high and two 100 foot towers. Also we should keep in mind that this application is also for a substantial increase in the industrial space with commensurate increase in HGVs. The applicant has been very open in describing its aims to expand to 3400 houses, but with land all around Dunsfold Park owned by the same people, where will it stop? Remember the only reason for this application is because Dunsfold Airfield is still here. If it had been rightfully returned to fields after the Canadians left at the end of the war it would never have been considered for housing because it is miles away from railway stations and only has one minor A road nearby. I will say again it is totally in the wrong place.

Remember your view counts and you should write to your local Councillor, and your MP in addition to submitting your objection to Waverley. Also remember that it is one objection per person, not one objection per household.

There are sheets around where you can sign up for campaign updates, also please keep an eye on our web and Facebook pages.

As you may now realise this is a large task we have and if anyone feels they have a particular skill, particularly in the line of research and report writing, that could assist the campaign then please talk to us the end of the meeting.

## **Chairman's report to Annual Assembly 25<sup>th</sup> April 2016**

### Action taken in 2015/6 on the proposed development at Dunsfold Park and Airfield and the Emerging Local Plan

In May we sent a reasoned objection to Waverley on an application for nearly 10,000 sq metres of new business space which was approved by Waverley. It will result in increases in HGV and other traffic. Dunsfold Park's own Transport reports stated that the A3 can be reached via the junction at Milford and showed that 16% of the car trips would be to Milford or Godalming or beyond. These will of course largely be via Markwick Lane and B 2130.

In July we commented on the request for a scoping opinion re the Airfield development including criticism of the vehicle traffic surveys and recommending that traffic counts be made on B2130 west of A 281 including in Markwick Lane and the centre of Hascombe.

I attended a briefing on the emerging Local Plan in August and followed this up by emails to some Waverley Councillors asking that Waverley's Mott MacDonald reports into the transport consequences of including Dunsfold housing in the Local Plan should include studies of the east-west traffic.

On December 1st I asked a question before the Waverley Executive meeting concerning a paper on the Emerging Spatial Strategy pointing out that the housing locations looked like a number exercise with a balance to dump housing on Dunsfold and asked why a full investigation of transport and other infrastructure aspects of a large development at Dunsfold Airfield and industrial zone had not been fully considered before proposals were considered for the amount of housing on the site.

The papers for the large Dunsfold planning application were put on the Waverley website just after the New Year.

Representatives of 10 Parish Council's attended a meeting in this Hall on 20 January and we agreed that a joint submission would be made to Waverley stating that we were unable to meet the deadline of 5<sup>th</sup> February for comments due to the large amount of documents to study. We also agreed to consider asking for the Secretary of State to call-in the application and to consider commissioning a joint transport report from Steve Parsons of Vision Transport who had previously written a report in 2015 for some of the Parish councils.

I asked a question at the Waverley Council meeting on February 16<sup>th</sup> on behalf of 8 Parish Councils about the adequacy of the consultation process for the large Dunsfold planning application.

We asked 11 other Parish Councils including some in West Sussex and Guildford, to send a letter from us all to the Secretary of State. This was sent on 1<sup>st</sup> March and asked him to call-in the planning application because we felt that it flew in the face of previous decisions about the Airfield, pre-empted the ability of Waverley to determine the extent of its housing needs and had significant effects beyond Waverley in Guildford and West Sussex. The letter was supported by CPRE branches in Guildford and Waverley and by the Protect Our Waverley Campaign Group. The letter was suggested by Alan Ground and Richard Woolf of Dunsfold and written following

advice from a QC which was paid for by 25 individuals. If the SoS agrees with the request, he will inform Waverley that if they are minded to approve the application they cannot grant the permission without his consent which would only be given after proper consideration by him.

Eleven Parish Councils agreed to commission a report by Vision Transport Planning on the transport and traffic. A summary of the conclusions in the report was released to the Press on 16<sup>th</sup> March. The conclusions included that the number of vehicle trip rates had been underestimated (including on Hascombe's roads), that Employment trip rates had been greatly understated, and that the A281 corridor forecasts did not show traffic impact or junction performance appropriately. The report has been included in the papers to be considered for both the Dunsfold Planning application and for the Emerging Local Plan.

Early this month on 5<sup>th</sup> April I asked a question at the Waverley Executive meeting as to whether a proper examination had been made of the details behind the arithmetical model which supports the calculation of the number of houses required to be built in Waverley to 2031. Two reports were sent to me which are being studied.

A further report by Vision Transport Planning was requested by the Parishes in early April to review the two reports from Mott MacDonald on traffic aspects of the Emerging Local Plan. These had been commissioned by Waverley and were published in February. This Vision report was received at the weekend and is being studied. It will shortly be sent to the Parishes and issued to Waverley. A press release will be written giving the main conclusions.