

<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>AMENDMENTS FOR</u></b> <b><u>DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE 4 JULY 2013</u></b></p>
---

**Item 2**

Application No.           12/00958/OUT

Proposal

OUTLINE: Planning application for the development of up to 3,850 no. dwellings including access, demolition of buildings, a local neighbourhood centre (including retail, office and community uses), small scale employment, two primary schools, a waste facility, day care provision, associated amenity space, pavilion, green infrastructure, Sustainable Drainage Systems, together with landscape structure planting and the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) (Matters for Approval Access Only) to include FULL approval of details for Maida Zone - Phase 1 comprising 228 dwellings, demolition of buildings, internal roads, garages, driveways, pathways, boundary treatment, pedestrian/cycleways, substation, associated parking spaces, Sustainable Drainage Systems, associated amenity space, hard and soft landscape works and full details of engineering operations associated with infrastructure requirements and service provision for this phase.

Address

**Land at the Ministry of Defence's former Aldershot Garrison known as: Wellesley, Aldershot Urban Extension, centred on Queen's Avenue and Alisons Road, Aldershot, Hampshire.**

**Late Representations**

**Surrey County Council Transportation Development**

Following their initial response regarding lack of information on which to base a cross-border transport assessment, SCC officers met with the applicants' transport consultant on 7<sup>th</sup> May and undertook to respond following further work.

On 30<sup>th</sup> May 2013 WSP on behalf of the applicants, submitted additional Transport documents including a technical note responding to concerns raised by SCC in respect of The Shepherd and Flock Roundabout; the A31 Hickley's Corner; and the Lakeside Road/Ash Hill Road Junction (B3411). The technical note contains information suggesting that the effect of the proposal on the Shepherd and Flock and Hickley's Corner locations would be small (and marginal) reductions in morning peak hour flows and smaller increases in evening peak hour flows. With regard to the B3411 the document suggests that the junction materially affected by the development however is that at Lakeside Road/Vale Road, but that whilst there

would be an increase in traffic along the B3411 Ash Hill Road in an westbound direction, the junction would still be below its theoretical capacity.

A formal response was received from SCC on 1<sup>st</sup> July stating notwithstanding the applicants submissions, they remain ‘...unconvinced of any betterment to junctions to the south...’ and concerned that the proposed mitigation provided for the transport network of Surrey is inadequate.

Their recommendation is therefore that, in addition to the provision of the A331 northbound slip and the mitigation measures agreed with Hampshire County Council, Surrey County Council should be a party to the S.106 agreement in order to secure a financial contribution to the value of 30% of the total transport package in respect of the three areas referred to above plus safety measures on the A331 approaches to the M3 junction to facilitate the increase in northbound movements generated by the development.

In response a summary from the applicants has confirmed their view that, based on the agreed modelling the package of measures associated with the AUE development would result in a net reduction of traffic flows entering Surrey.

On the final point it should be noted that The Highways Agency have recorded no objection to the proposal.

It is therefore considered that the contribution requested is not justified.

#### Herstmonceux East Sussex

A further letter from the respondent reported at 8.7.3 of the report (received on 1<sup>st</sup> July) repeats and updates the representations received earlier and asks that they are brought to the attention of the committee members.

#### Environment Agency

Having been advised of the incorporation of their recommendations into the proposed conditions a further letter dated 4<sup>th</sup> July 2013 has been received from the Environment Agency confirming their position remains as set out in their earlier response.

#### Waverley Borough Council

A late representation from Waverley Borough Council (1<sup>st</sup> July 2013) states support for the Surrey County Council Position on cross-border highway impact.

#### Natural England

A letter dated 4<sup>th</sup> July 2013 from Natural England confirms subject to provisos that their objection to the proposal is **withdrawn**

## **Report Addenda**

### **Section 9.7 Add:**

#### **9.7.23 Habitats Regulations Assessment**

The analysis in the preceding paragraphs (9.7.1 to 9.7.22) constitute the Council's Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), required under the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2010. The Council has concluded that the Wellesley proposals are not likely to have a significant effect on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA), either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Consequently, the Council has concluded that an appropriate assessment is not required. The recommendation to grant planning permission is subject to conditions and S.106 provisions in accordance with the provisions of S.68(2) of the regulations.

9.7.24 The Council has also considered the impact of the Wellesley proposals on the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham Heaths Special Area of Conservation (SAC). On the basis of the information presented in the Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Grainger, Dec 2012), and subject to the S106 obligations relating to the implementation and maintenance of SANGs described in Section 9.7, 12.12 and 12.13, the Council is also satisfied that the Wellesley proposals will not have a significant effect on the SAC, alone or in combination with other plans or projects. An appropriate assessment is not therefore required.

**Section 9.13.12** last line should read '...if Grainger are unable to subsequently agree this with HCC.'

**Section 12.3** Extra Care Housing should read:

'Provision of land at nil cost to HCC or their procured partner to provide 100 Extra Care Housing Units for elderly people (at HCC's own expense), number of units to be deducted from total number of affordable housing units. Precise location to be agreed'.

#### **Section 13.2.1** Approved Drawings

Condition 22                      Drawing listed as '44) HPA31 – Architectural Details Sheet 6' should read '44) HPA41 – Architectural Details Sheet 6'.

#### **Section 14.2** Informative 1

add "grant permission is compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998." at the end.