#### WOKING BOROUGH COUNCIL

### DRAFT NOTES OF A MEETING OF THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK WORKING GROUP

## Held on 16 December 2021 In Virtual Meeting

Present: Councillor Simon Ashall

Councillor Tahir Aziz
Councillor Will Forster
Councillor Adam Kirby
Councillor Louise Morales

Ernest Amoako Daniel Ashe

Stephanie Broadley

Absent: Councillor Steve Dorsett

Councillor Gary Elson

**Actions** 

# 6. Outlook, Amenity and Daylight Supplementary Planning Document

Ernest Amoako introduced the report which outlined the various responses to the consultation on the Outlook, Amenity and Daylight Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and requested the Working Group to recommend to Council to adopt the SPD for the purposes of ensuring high quality design of development in the Borough. The draft SPD was considered by the Working Group on 22 July 2021 and approved by the Executive for a six weeks consultation period at its meeting on 9 September 2021. The consultation period was between 27 September 2021 and 8 November 2021.

Members briefly talked through the representations that people had made during the consultation and the response to these.

The Chairman questioned whether Appendix 2, which detailed other authorities' separation distances, needed to be included as part of the documents (page 39). Ernest Amoako commented that he had advised at a previous meeting that this should not be included, but it had been the wish of the Working Group to include it. The Chairman thought that it was relevant for the consultation but did not think it was relevant to be included now. Councillor S Ashall thought that the Executive should consider the document in the same format that the Working Group had done which included Appendix 2. It was suggested that as part of recommendation to the Executive, the Working Group state that having considered the document again, they as the Working Group would like to reconsidered the initial recommendation to include Appendix 2 in the document and would like to remove it. The Executive could then decide if they wanted to retain or remove.

It was agreed that reference to Appendix 2 relates to the examples of separation distances of other local authorities.

It was then suggested that the recommendation to the Executive would be that Appendix 2, page 39 was removed from the documents.

ACTION: E Amoako

The Chairman flagged up drawing 9 on page 25 and thought that it was missing a line down the middle. It was thought that to make it clearer to developers that they needed to provide 30m per flat, then this line should reinstated.

ACTION: E Amoako

Councillor S Ashall commented on point 3.7, page 27 regarding the character of the area and said that his experience of this was that Planning Officers often stated that the character of the area was not defined and was mixed. Councillor S Ashall wondered whether we needed to be more specific regarding this. Ernest Amoako commented that a lot of resource had gone into preparing character studies of the areas within the Borough. When decisions were made this character assessment would be considered and then also the design principles so that a view could be formed. These documents were not meant to stifle innovation or creativity and each application needed to be considered on its own merit.

Point 4.3, on page 26, Councillor S Ashall commented on the policy regarding privacy at the front of properties verses the back and the situation where properties did not have dual aspect. Councillor S Ashall asked if Ernest and his Team could consider whether there was any wording that could be added to this, without undermining policy, to cover those situations when properties were single aspect.

On point 4.13, privacy through screening, Councillor S Ashall commented that screening with trees etc was not permanent and would like the wording/definition considered regarding this. Ernest Amoako suggested that a simple solution would be to remove the word permanent from the text and then every application would be considered on its own merits in relation to the area.

Points 5.3 and 5.5, page 31, Councillor S Ashall asked that the relationship between the two tests was clarified and it be explained exactly what it meant if the results of the two tests were different (i.e. pass one but not the other). Ernest Amoako commented that he would look at the wording again regarding this to ensure that it did not give the impression that it was acceptable not to pass either one of these tests.

ACTION: E Amoako

It was noted that there was a typo in 3.10, page 22 when a sentence was repeated.

ACTION: E Amoako

Regarding page 37, are we able to get a contribution to future amenities. Ernest Amoako advised that you could use CIL for amenity space. Council decides what to use the CIL money on. The asked why CIL levy for the Town Centre had been relaxed. Ernest advised that the CL levy had been set to reflect development viability of different zones within the borough. This point

would remain in and we would continue to remind officers to seek contribution to the public realm for those developments that did not have any amenity space.

Regarding page 38, the Chairman queried whether something could be added regarding family amenity for flats and duplex and questioned whether this could be tightened any further. Ernest Amoako commented that this needed to be looked at in a cumulative manner. It was agreed that the wording would be changed from 'may be' to 'will only be' acceptable if it has equal provision for family amenity.

## ACTION: E Amoako

## RECOMMEND that

- i. the various representations to the Outlook, Amenity and Daylight SPD consultation together with Officer's responses and recommendations as set out in Appendix 1 be noted;
- ii. the revised Outlook, Amenity and Daylight SPD included in Appendix 2 be adopted as Supplementary Planning Document for the purposes of managing development across the borough and other planning decisions;
- iii. the Executive removes Appendix 2 from the Supplementary Planning Document; and
- iv. the requirements of the SPD should apply from the date of adoption, in this case 10 February 2022.