

Minutes of the Extra Ordinary Meeting of Ewhurst Parish Council 1<sup>st</sup> August 2018

Present: Councillors Turner, Dixon-Henry, Davis, White, Benoy, Benson and Francis

126 (2018) Apologies for absence: Richard Cleaves, Tom Fawcett and Jane Bromley

127 (2018) Declarations of Interest: None

128 (2018) Minutes of the meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> July 2018 were approved with the exception of minute 139 (2018) "The war memorial "chainlink" was to be repainted should have read "ironwork"

This has been changed and initialled in the minutes of the day. The minutes were then approved unanimously.

129 (2018) Adjournment. Some 37 representative from Ellens Green, Cox Green and Ewhurst were asked to comment on Planning Application WA/2018/1109 Land centred coordinates 509165 134836 South. Outline application for the erection of 53 dwellings including 16 affordable dwellings with associated access, parking, open space and drainage ponds. (All matters reserved except access)

130 (2018) Cllr Turner asked that comments should not be of a personal nature and allowed half an hour for visitors to air their comments on the application.

Roger Nash of the Rudgwick Preservation Society read his statement which is attached to these minutes as appendix one.

West side of Cox Green, WA/2018/1109

**OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF 53 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, CAR PARKING, OPEN SPACE AND DRAINAGE PONDS (ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT ACCESS)**

To Ewhurst Parish Council

Points raised, Rudgwick Preservation Society (expanding on our response to Waverley BC):

- \* This Ewhurst development is on the edge of the parish, edge of the borough, edge of the county, having no relationship whatsoever to existing settlement in Ewhurst parish.
- \* Effectively therefore an extension to Rudgwick but outside its boundaries.
- \* How can Ewhurst PC possibly support this site, given its peripheral location distant from all village facilities and services offering no centrality, no natural growth to the main nucleated settlement? All logical planning within the boundaries of an administrative area should aim to expand existing settlements in that area.
- \* We believe the tight inclusion of only the curtilages of Cox Green's properties in the 1996 transfer to Sussex has protected, and will protect, the land behind, which is outside the Built Up Area Boundary of Rudgwick as defined by HDC. There are precedents where backland development has been reused by HDC, for example at Middle Gingers and Swallow Ridge.

\* All new residents will want to use Rudgwick amenities and facilities (businesses may benefit, but public services such as the medical practice, the school, and our roads and shop parking could be overwhelmed. In addition there may be issues and bureaucracy involved in cross-border admissions to school, when a primary school like Rudgwick is currently full, but not, I am told, medical facilities, the alternative being longer journeys in Surrey, to Cranleigh doctors and Cranleigh junior and secondary schools (by bus). This development is not in convenient walking distance of services. The lack of an all-through primary school in Ewhurst is an issue. The bus service to Horsham and Guildford is only hourly, six short days per week.

\* Roads through Rudgwick and the very busy A281, notably the junction with Church Street and the community in Bucks Green, will be impacted, and there is growing traffic paralysis in Cranleigh High Street with all the development around Cranleigh let alone Ewhurst.

\* Any S106 money coming from developments like this one would accrue to Waverley and to Ewhurst, not to Rudgwick, which is grossly unfair.

\* It is for Ewhurst to say, but is not this number of 55 houses higher than the desirable allocation for new housing in the Ewhurst Neighbourhood Plan? Moreover, as it is not included in any future NP for Rudgwick, being outside the parish, it would make a mockery of any number we might wish to allow in our parish.

\* The site of the proposed development is in an area of Great Landscape Value as designated by Waverley. There are therefore excellent reasons to object on countryside grounds.

\* In reality, and contrary to what is said in the documentation from consultants to Mr Beckwith-Smith, the land behind Cox Green houses was created as parkland by Mr John Aungier, the owner of over 1000 acres of the Lynwick Estate from the 1890s to 1922, when it was broken up and sold. One of the houses he built was Oakfield, Cox Green, a house with high spec facilities for its day, possibly his first house in the locality. It was Aungier who removed the hedgerows sometime between 1895 and 1912, retaining the standard oaks which now add considerably to the park-like landscape on rolling slopes where many of us regularly walk the footpath. This area is worthy of protection. Moreover, the HDC landscape area designation for the ridge from Rudgwick to Rusper makes clear the need to preserve old parkland landscapes.

\* Ewhurst PC should take special note that all drainage from this site falls ultimately into Cranleigh Waters, whose catchment also includes much new development in Cranleigh. Despite attenuation ponds, and other devices, there are genuine concerns for enhanced flood risk downstream.

\* The existence of a grade II Listed building at Crouchers, abutting the site, is in itself a strong objection. The test for this is whether the development will do substantial harm to the setting of the Listed building. The developer argues on contestable evidence this is not the case (less than substantial

harm as opposed to substantial harm being the critical point here). We would argue that just because he has left a buffer zone of open ground does not overcome the issue of the view, particularly from upstairs windows, being changed forever from quiet enjoyment of a parkland-like landscape to a semi-urban one of built environment. Crouchers occupies a corner plot, incorporating part of the roadside waste of the green at Cox Green, and in the front overlooking an old-fashioned grassed triangle junction, where there will be much greater traffic movement if the scheme goes ahead. The view is too open and the traffic issue too great for this to be anything other than 'substantial harm'.

\* The proposed new access to the estate is onto a narrow lane, with consequent increased traffic west to Baynards, and particularly east to the aforementioned triangle where visibility is limited on a very sharp bend with tricky slopes. Perhaps the most dangerous maneuver here is traffic from Cranleigh turning right into the lane. There is a danger that highway improvements here may be required which will destroy the rural feel of the junction as well as the setting of Crouchers.

\* Earlier this year, Waverley assessed all proposed building land in their Call for Land. This site was summarily dismissed as 'Unsuitable', as was the equivalent site in separate ownership to the east. WBC must be strongly advised that to go back on this judgement would be totally unacceptable now. There are so many building sites in Waverley as a whole, it is time for a pause, not a time for headlong growth.

\* Finally, there is a lot at stake here, as we all know that the owner of the land on the east of Cox Green has put in a similar application on 11 acres for 57 units, with 131 parking spaces, and has also just submitted a plan for the access road to HDC (DC/18/1520). If both developments were to go ahead Rudgwick would be altered beyond recognition, yet none of the 100+ houses would be in Rudgwick parish. Protect Rudgwick now! Protect Ewhurst's landscape!

A representative of Rudgwick Parish Council reported that they would be voting against the development.

All these points were reiterated except for one resident who was much in favour of the development to ensure that his family could afford to live in the village in the future. The representative from Planet Consulting explained the principals of the development being not high density and good design to meet Waverley's housing need and a boost for the local shops and cross border benefits for both Rudgwick and Waverley.

The adjournment came to an end and then members present then discussed the application. The pros and cons were weighed and the balance came out as against the development as it would benefit from waiting until after the Neighbourhood plan had come to fruition.

Most of the audience then left the room.

Planning application AG/2018/0008 for movement of an agricultural track was noted.

Planning application WA/2018/1169 change of use from two independent dwellings to three following partial demolition – happy to support.

131 (2018) Parish business.

Cllr. Turner said that with regard to the Laburnum tree in the playground and the possibility of accidents with the seed pods – he had met with the tree Officer from Waverley on site and asked for this opinion. He said that in his opinion the risks from the pods were miniscule but that it might be wise to remove the diseased branch that directly overhangs the picnic table, thus avoiding much of the fall of seed pods. It was agreed to do this in the late Autumn – **ACTION MT** It was also agreed that if any such matters were reported to councilors in the future, the name of the reporter and the date should be recorded and passed on to the Clerk for action.

Cllr. White showed members various paint combinations for the redecoration of the Village Hall and a decision was made.

He also proposed that rather than have paper towels and bins that need emptying in our public buildings – we should have electric hand driers – and he would get a quote for the electrics in addition to the keen prices that he already had for the drying units. The long term saving to the Council would be considerable. It was agreed that further research and possible sponsorship could be found prior to precepting for this work in December.

Cllr. White said that even with his best and toughest tools he was unable to lift the water meter and stopcock cover for the Glebe Centre. It was agreed to ask Anita to contact Thames Water and get them to replace the cover as at present we could not ascertain our water use or have access to the stopcock in case of flood due to burst pipes.

The sad matter of Wendy's illness was raised and members were asked to contact Anita concerning bookings for our public buildings.

The proposed swale on the Common by Ewhurst Green was briefly discussed and noted.

Wildflower garden; Members were still not totally convinced about the proposed location or the viability of this plan – it was suggested that we should get advice from the Duke of Edinburgh award/LEAP/Sayers Croft before proceeding.

It was agreed that Cllr Dixon-Henry would make the first approach to LEAP and then Cllr. Turner would join forces to carry out any actions. **VD-H/MT**