

Examination Statement

Focused Questions for Contingency Hearing Session

Savills on behalf of Redwood South West Limited

Waverley Borough Council Local Plan Part 2
Examination in Public – **Matter 2: Housing requirements,
supply and allocations**

August 2022

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This Examination Statement in regard to the Inspector's Focused Questions has been prepared by Savills on behalf of Redwood (South West) Limited ('Redwood'), who have promoted the land at Red Court, Scotland Lane ('the Site') since 2017 (also referred to as Site LAA 987). This Statement follows Examination Statements submitted by Redwood in June 2022 to the Inspector. For ease of reference this is also referred to as 'Scotland Park Phase 2' (or Promotion B). The other promotion of land at Red Court 'Scotland Park Phase 1' (LAA 1124) (or Promotion A) has ceased as the site now benefits from planning permission for 50 dwellings (granted via Appeal in February 2022).
- 1.2. A planning application has now been submitted and registered for Scotland Park Phase 2 (also land noted within LAA 987) which broadly comprises: up to 130 dwellings, Green Infrastructure incorporating a strategic SANG, a scout facility / nursery, and education provision. All accessed from Midhurst Road (ref. WA/2022/01887). The development is proposed on circa one-fifth of the site, the remainder forming enhanced Green Infrastructure. The site is located on the southern edge of Haslemere within the AONB.
- 1.3. Redwood's Representations to Waverley Borough Council (WBC) Regulation 19 Local Plan consultation have been given the following comment references 975, 976, 1003, 1005, 1006, 1008, 1011, 1010, 1242, 1243, 1244 and 1245.
- 1.4. Submitted with this Statement are two enclosures. **Enclosure 1**, is Housing Trajectory 1A. **Enclosure 2** is Housing Trajectory 2A. Both have been prepared by Neame Sutton, who are representing a consortium of developers which Redwood is part. Mr David Neame, provided evidence at the last session on Housing, on 21st July, which he referred to this evidence. The evidence is now formally submitted to the Examination.

2. Response to Inspector's Focused Questions for the contingency hearing session

Matter 2: Housing requirements, supply and allocations

Questions:

1) Taking into account evidence provided by the Council during the July hearings, and any updates to this pursuant to corrections and clarifications requested prior to closure of those hearings, are the requirements set out in proposed main modifications (MMs) for the following settlements justified:

a. Witley (including Milford)?

b. Haslemere?

(NB: in framing a response to Question 1(a), above it would be helpful if the Council could supply an update to the notes provided in respect of the restrictive covenant relating to the Milford Golf Club (MGC) site, in the light of the hearing statement received on this specific matter. The Council may also wish to pursue a Statement of Common Ground with the MGC site promoter/developer in respect of up-to-date delivery assumptions).

2.1. No. In answer to this question, it is notable that the Examination is still awaiting updates and clarifications, including further evidence, from Waverley Borough Council (WBC). This follows the matters raised in evidence at the 21st July Hearing session, whereby the delivery trajectory / housing completions provided by the Council on 18th July was questioned (WBC-LPP2-29). The specifics of Redwood's case will be provided by Mr David Neame in evidence again on 6th September, with reference to **Enclosures 1 and 2**.

2.2. The presently available list of Main Modifications is LPP2/CD1/26 (version 3). Redwood objects to the absence in the Main Modifications of any substantive alterations to some of the emerging allocations, and the absence of consideration/ identification of the required additional development allocations. Redwood has outlined previously objections to selected allocations in Haslemere and Hindhead. In Redwood's opinion, LPP2 as drafted is unsound, and it is respectfully requested that on, or shortly after 6th September Hearing session, the Inspector consider outlining the potential remedies, to ascertain whether WBC will offer additional Main Modifications. Redwood's position remains that LPP2 is capable of being found sound with modification.

- 2.3. To provide further context, Redwood is unclear on WBC's position given it was contended within the July 2022 Examination Hearing Sessions that they considered they were able to demonstrate a 5.1 years supply, however within the Committee Report for Land at Green Lane Farm Green Lane Badshot Lea Farnham (ref: WA/2022/00978), the Case Officer concluded a 4.3 year supply and the consequent application of the tilted balance. Redwood note that this application was refused by the Planning Committee on 23rd August. At the Hearing on 21st July, WBC outlined in evidence that it might not matter whether a 5YHLS were demonstrated for the purposes of LPP2. Redwood strongly disagrees, given the relevance of LPP2 in the context of the LPP1 Inspector's conclusions.
- 2.4. Redwood suggest that WBC provide clarity on their position. In any case, Redwood wholly disagree with any position over 5 years supply as a number of scenarios outlined in Neame Sutton's submissions all demonstrate that the supply is well under this (see **Enclosures 1 and 2**, trajectories 1A and 2A, which Mr Neame referred to at 21st July Hearing session).
- 2.5. There are increasing uncertainties placed on the timescales for delivery of Dunsfold now that it has been confirmed that the preferred bidder, Columbia Threadneedle has withdrawn. Even considering this alone, demonstrates that WBC would be unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply without making additional housing allocations. If the numerous other issues discussed with some of the other draft allocated sites (discussed in Redwood's Matter 6 Statement and within the Examination Hearings) are also taken into account, the situation over the next 5 years is even more concerning. WBC need to be planning positively and considering actions they can take to avoid the continuous sequence of being unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply year after year. This simply results in less controlled planning through a number of speculative planning applications, some of which might not be sustainably located.
- 2.6. Redwood maintain a position that Milford Golf Course is not deliverable in the next five years, noting a number of Inspectors have now considered the site to be undeliverable owing to the restrictive land covenant.

2) Do the Council's updated trajectory and related information provide a justified basis for setting out the anticipated rate of development for specific sites (per paragraph 74 of the Framework) by way of appropriate main modifications?

- 2.7. No. See answer and evidence provided in respect of Q1.
- 2.8. **Enclosure 1** outlines Trajectory 1A, which takes all of the information that the Council has published on

15 and 18 July 2022 into account and simply retains Neame Sutton's position on delivery of Dunsfold that has been supported by numerous S78 Inspectors. This outlines a land supply of some 3.9 years at 1st April 2022, over the period 2022-27. The supply sources, highlighted yellow, are those which Redwood contend.

2.9. **Enclosure 2**, outlines Trajectory 2A, which takes all of the information supplied by the Council and then applies the NPPF Annex 2 test of deliverability to the various new supply sources now relied upon by the Council, for example emerging Neighbourhood Plan allocations should not be relied upon, and additional sites included in the assumption should be removed without any written justification from the Council. In addition, this Trajectory applies the previous windfall assumptions. This outlines a land supply of some 3.5 years at 1st April 2022, over the period 2022-27.

2.10. The remedy is the provision of a revised Housing Trajectory by the Council, taking on board realistic delivery assumptions for Dunsfold, removing Milford Golf Course, and applying NPPF Annex 2 requirements, along with, a suite of additional allocations, all with the objective of ensuring a pipeline 5YHLS at least for the periods 2022-27 and 2023-28. LPP2, to be sound on adoption, must enable a 5YHLS.

3) Does any additional information provided by the Council provide a justified basis for the anticipated rate of development relating to:

a. Allocation DS01 – Haslemere Key Site?

b. Allocation DS07 – Fairground Car Park?

2.11. No, the Council, despite the request made at the Hearing Session of 19th July 2022, has still not provided any evidence to demonstrate the deliverability of these sites. There is an absence of information on land control, masterplanning, technical constraints etc (see Redwood's Examination Statement, Matter 6, Table 3.3 – Redwood South West Position on the emerging LPP2 Allocations). The oral evidence provided on 19th July was entirely unconvincing. As there is such uncertainty surrounding their delivery they cannot reasonably be assumed to be delivered by 2032. If the numerous issues do happen to be resolved then they could be considered as windfall sites. However, to allocate them further heightens the chances of WBC being unable to demonstrate a 5YHLS now, and in years to come.

4) Is any further update available in respect of the application to modify/vary the planning obligation relating to the Royal School's Farnham Lane site?

2.12. Following Surrey County Council's email on the presently live application on 30th June 2022 (**Enclosure 3**), it is very clear that they feel there are issues to resolve. It is also not clear why this response was not raised in the Hearings in July, and why the response was only uploaded on 11th August 2022 on the planning application website (ref. WA/2021/03150). There is no further correspondence available on this application to clarify if these issues have moved forward.

2.13. Redwood maintain their position on the Royal School site as included in the Matter 7 Statement, and associated issues in the Matter 1 Statement. At best, the complexities associated with the successful delivery of the Royal School, mean it should be considered toward the later end of the plan period. Redwood's position is maintained, that there are sequentially more sustainable sites (including Scotland Park Phase 2), which a robust LPP2 should reconsider for allocation / inclusion in the delivery trajectory.

5) Is any further update available on the planning application to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace in relation to Allocation DS14 - Land at Secretts, Hurst Farm, Milford?

2.14. No comment.

Charles Collins
Director

