

OFFICER'S DELEGATED REPORT

APPLICATION NO: 23/0328/PCM
LOCATION: Former Lakeside School Playing Field, Caroline Way, Frimley, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 8LL,
PROPOSAL: Consultation application from Surrey County Council for the outline application for the erection of part single and part 3 storey building for extra care accommodation to provide self-contained apartments, with staff and communal spaces and associated car parking with access from Caroline Way (landscaping and appearance reserved)
TYPE: Consultation (County Matters)
APPLICANT: Surrey County Council
OFFICER: Duncan Carty
EXPIRY DATE: 18.04.2023

The Borough Council is only a consultee on this application and the determining authority is Surrey County Council. This application has been reported to the Planning Applications Committee because it relates to major development (providing over 10 dwellings and over 1,000 square metres of floorspace).

RECOMMENDATION: RAISE AN OBJECTION

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This is a consultation application to be determined by the County Planning Authority, Surrey County Council (SCC Ref: 2023-0038). This outline planning proposal relates to the erection of a part three storey, part single storey extra care development, for affordable rent, in the form of 2 no three storey wings (to the flank) with 2 no single storey links (to the front and rear). This is a Regulation 3 application for which the applicant and determining authority is Surrey County Council.
- 1.2 The matters for approval include access, layout and scale. The matters of appearance and landscaping are reserved for a future application. The development would include 49 apartments of extra care accommodation (Class C2), for affordable rent, with associated development with car parking and access onto Caroline Way.
- 1.3 The application proposal is considered to be out of scale with the surrounding character with an adverse impact on trees, and would result in the loss of a green space. It is considered to be unacceptable in terms of its impact on local character and residential amenity. However, no objections are raised on highway safety and parking capacity, ecology, Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and flood risk/drainage.
- 1.4 As this application is to be determined by Surrey County Council, it is recommended that objections are raised to the proposal by Surrey Heath Borough Council.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is a former playing field which forms a part of the former Lakeside School in Frimley. The application site relates to a defined Green Space within the settlement of Frimley, falling within the Lanes Character Area of the Western Urban Area Character SPD 2012.

- 2.2 There are footpaths, Field Lane, to the north boundary, and St Catherines Road, to the east boundary. St Catherines Road forms part of the adopted road network but is only accessible by foot in this location. The remaining boundaries are with residential development within Belvoir Close to the west and Kilmartin Gardens to the south. Residential development in Richmond Close lies to the east (beyond the footpath, St Catherines Road) with the former Lakeside School and residential properties in Caroline Way and Melville Avenue further to the north (beyond the Fields Lane footpath). The residential developments around this site are typically two storey cul-de-sac development.
- 2.3 The site is a former playing field and has an area of approximately 0.57 hectares. The application site includes an area of open grassland, which is overgrown, and the land falls to the rear (south) of the site. There are some trees to the north and east boundaries of the site, which are protected under a Tree Protection Order (TPO No 06/75). There are other trees (on the east side of St Catherines Road and in Caroline Way which are also protected under Tree Preservation Orders (TPO/10/74 and TPO/17/68, respectively). To site lies a minimum of about 1.8 kilometres from the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA).

3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1 The application site has no planning history. The wider former Lakeside School site has an extensive planning history of which none are relevant to this proposal.

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 This is a consultation application under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 to be determined by Surrey County Council (Ref: 2023-0038) for which this Authority is a consultee. The applicant is Surrey County Council who are seeking to deliver social rent extra care apartments, due to a recognised local need, across a number of sites in Surrey, including the proposal at 141 Park Road (23/0326/PCM) being reported elsewhere on this Agenda.
- 4.2 The current proposal is an outline application for the approval of access, layout and scale only with details of appearance and landscaping to be determined under a different (reserved matters) application(s).
- 4.3 The proposal is for the erection of a part three storey, part single storey extra care development in the form of 2 no three storey wings (to the flank) with 2 no single storey links (to the front and rear). The development would include 49 no one bedroom apartments of extra care and associated accommodation, for affordable rent, amounting to 4,294 square metres along with associated development and car parking and access onto Caroline Way. A total of 25 parking spaces would be provided for this development.
- 4.4 The proposed west wing of development would measure 51.7 metres in depth, 16.7 metres in width and a maximum height of 13.8 metres. The proposed east wing of development would measure 55 metres in depth, 16.7 metres in width and a maximum height of 13.8 metres. These wings would be three storeys in height with a double gable roof (including plant room with a flat roofed infill between the gables).
- 4.5 The single storey links would be provided to the front, with a set-in from the front of the flank wings, and to the rear (built up to the rear boundary of the site) and would have a height of 3.7 metres. The rear wing would be set into the ground (at a lower ground level than surrounding land). Flat green roofs are provided over the single storey elements. The maximum width of the development would be 80 metres.
- 4.6 Landscaping would be provided around the proposed building, with the main amenity

provision provided from an inner courtyard and upper floor balconies provided in the flank walls of the wings (projecting beyond the walls of these elevations). Access would be provided from Caroline Way with the parking provided predominantly to the west side of the proposed building.

- 4.7 The facilities provided within the building include an entrance/reception area, kitchen, dining room communal lounge, mobility scooter and cycle store, hairdressing/therapy room, staff office, refuse stores, staff restroom, laundry and changing rooms, sprinkler tank room, cold water storage battery room, telecom room and LV switchroom. These facilities are to be provided on the ground floor.
- 4.8 This planning application has been supported by the following:
- Design and Access Statement;
 - Planning Statement;
 - Utilities Assessment;
 - Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (with Protected Species Survey);
 - Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (and Construction Ecological Management Plan);
 - Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment;
 - Transport Statement;
 - Energy Assessment;
 - Tree Constraints Plan and Tree Protection Plan;
 - Archaeological Assessment (including Trial Trench Evaluation); and
 - Energy statement.

The officer report below makes references to these documents, where applicable.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

5.1 The consultations have been undertaken by Surrey County Council. However, the County Highway Authority has indicated that from their initial assessment, it would be reasonable to expect that any highway impacts could be suitably mitigated. In terms of the consultations undertaken by this Authority, these include the following:

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|--|
| 5.2 | Council's Arboricultural Officer | An objection is raised on the likely impact of the proposal on the health of retained trees, including incursions into their root protection areas [<i>These comments are added at Annex A</i>]. |
| 5.3 | Urban Design Consultant | Has raised concerns about the scale of the development and loss of green space [<i>These comments are added at Annex B</i>]. |
| 5.4 | Environmental Health | No comments received. |

6.0 REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 The neighbour notification and publicity was undertaken by Surrey County Council. However, no representations have been received in support and 63 representations have been received raising an objection, which are outlined below:

6.2 Principle and need [See sections 7.2 and 7.3]

- Currently a green space which should be open for enjoyment by local residents

- Recent objections by NHS on need for care home developments (at Kings Lodge Care Home) and would generate a need for significant primary care support from general practice which must be the same for the current proposal
- Impact on/loss of designated green space (obligation to retain such spaces)
- Very short on evidence of need (local area is over bedded for care homes and sheltered accommodation)

6.3 Character and trees [See section 7.4]

- Insensitive/unsympathetic development
- Scale/height/size is out of character
- Design/layout is out of keeping/eyesore
- Located at end of cul-de-sac of two storey development
- Loss of green buffer/lung between residential developments (as envisaged when originally built)
- Too high density
- Impact on trees (tree root base intake) and future tree growth
- Impact on Tree 8 in south east corner of the site – pressure on canopy spread and rooting (no dig for proposed hardstanding)
- Overpower and dominate the landscape
- Proposed materials are unsympathetic with existing houses [*Officer comment: Appearance is a reserved matter*]
- Close to adjoining properties
- Large proportion of building footprint for the site (0.43 hectares), more open space needed on development

6.4 Residential Amenity [See section 7.5]

- Increase in noise and disturbance
- Increase in pollution (traffic noise, lighting, carbon emissions, mechanical plant fumes, noise)
- Overlooking/loss of privacy
- Overlooking from balconies
- Loss of light and outlook
- Overbearing impact/"penned-in" feeling from development
- Close to adjoining properties
- Daylight study ignores 2 Melville Avenue
- Submitted details show trees in full leaf which would only occur in part of the year and would therefore have a greater impact (after leaf fall)

6.5 Highway safety and parking capacity [See section 7.6]

- Impact on highway and pedestrian safety – dangers to both pedestrians (school children and local residents including older people, disabled, dog walkers, cyclists, and future residents) and road users at Field Lane crossover (even with traffic calming measures). No improvements to footpath links (to Regent Way)

- Increased traffic flow/footfall
- Limited width of approach road (Caroline Way)
- Potential parking issues
- No local facilities (shops, doctors' surgeries, hospital, library) and further from local centres than indicated (in traffic statement)
- Inadequate parking provision (25 spaces) to provide for local residents, staff, carers, visitors, contractors, deliveries, utility vehicles (e.g. refuse trucks) and deliveries, taxis, shuttle buses – disingenuous to indicate that residents would not own cars
- Compare parking provision with sheltered housing at 84-100 Park Street (61 spaces for 61 apartments)
- Misleading comments on traffic statement indicating spaces will not result in overspill parking and adequate off-street parking available on local roads (for visitors)
- Accident risk from reduced visibility on local streets due to overspill parking
- Contractors and staff parking during construction and overspill onto local streets
- Parking assessment made on an individual basis and not following guidance for sheltered/extra care units (of one space per unit)
- Impact from parking (at weekends/Bank Holidays)
- Impact on road infrastructure
- Increased risk of traffic accidents (records do not include collisions)
- Access/egress from drives
- Limited access for emergency vehicles
- May require parking restrictions on local roads and subsequent knock-on effects of on-street parking
- One bookable visitor space for the development
- Impact at peak times (school traffic)
- Inadequate public transport provision
- Inadequate access

6.6 Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area and ecology [See sections 7.7 & 7.8]

- Site unused since (at least) 2009 and is a haven for local flora and fauna (wildlife)
- Loss of local ecology including flora and impact on wildlife (including bats, badgers, foxes, insects, kites)
- Environmental sustainability
- Wildlife study carried out after digging had commenced
- Badgers have left the site (for nearby gardens)
- Impact from light spill on, and commuting connectivity for, bats
- Loss of dark zone for bats

6.7 Other matters

- Insufficient details on drainage (surface water and four sewer) especially to take into consideration new regulations) [*Officer comment: This is a County Council application and the level of details provided for this application would be a matter for that Authority. However, a drainage report has been provided*]
- Other local brown field sites (including Siemens site) would be more suitable for this

development [*Officer comment: This is not the current proposal*]

- Site should be used/allocated as a park [*Officer comment: This is not the current proposal*]
- Upcoming Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill will reduce housing requirements/needs [*Officer comment: This is not a material planning consideration*]
- Sustainability [*Officer comment: This is noted*]
- Impact on drainage/flood risk (site takes run-off from adjoining land (higher land to the south)) [*See section 7.9*]
- Impact on quality of life from increased traffic [*Officer comment: This is noted*]
- Duty of care to all residents (safety)/safeguarding risk to young children (safe route to school) [*Officer comment: Similar concerns have been raised on highway safety grounds (as indicated above). However, a “duty of care”, in itself, would not be a reason to refuse such an application*]
- Designated as a Local Area of Play (LAP) or a Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) for a use beneficial to local population [*Officer comment: It has been designated as a green space only – not as a LAP or LEAP*]
- Size of retaining wall and potential subsidence risk [*Officer comment: This would not be a reason to refuse this application*]
- Loss of view [*Officer comment: This is not a material planning consideration*]
- Proposal is “inappropriate development in the Green Belt without special circumstances” [*Officer comment: This site is not in a Green Belt and is a defined green space within the settlement*]
- Loss of dog walking/ball games facility [*Officer comment: There was evidence of such use of this land on the site visit but the land is locked/secured and is not open to the public for such uses*]
- Conflict with local plan [*Officer comment: This is not explained further*]
- Affect local geology [*Officer comment: This is not explained further*]
- General dislike of proposal [*Officer comment: This is not explained further*]
- Strain of existing community facilities [*Officer comment: This is not explained further*]
- Latest Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) discounts this site for such development [*Officer comment: The SLAA discounts this site on its suitability and viability concerns. The SLAA is a technical study of available land to support the emerging Local Plan as a part of the evidence base. However, the SLAA does not grant, or refuse planning permission*]
- Updated Local Plan is at Reg 18 stage and has no weight [*Officer comment: The policies are at an early stage and have no weight in decision making*]

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATION

- 7.1 The application site lies in a defined green space within the settlement of Frimley and the defined Lanes Character Area. The relevant policies are Policies CP1, CP2, CP5, CP6, CP9, CP11, CP14, DM9, DM10, DM11, DM13, DM15 and DM17 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 (CSDMP); Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 (as saved) (SEP); and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); as well as advice within the Surrey Heath Residential Design Guide 2017 (RDG); Western Urban Area Character SPD 2012 (WUAC); Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD 2019 (AAS); and the National Design Guide. The main issues to be addressed in the consideration of this application are:

- Principle for the development;
- Need for the development;
- Impact on character and trees;
- Impact on residential amenity;
- Impact on highways safety and parking capacity;
- Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area;
- Impact on ecology; and
- Impact on flood risk and drainage.

7.2 Principle for the development

7.2.1 Policy DM15 of the CSDMP indicates that defined green spaces in settlement areas will be protected by restricting development to appropriate informal recreation uses or facilities that are of a scale commensurate with the size of the space. The proposal would result in the loss of this green space through redevelopment. It is noted that the site is currently vacant and not currently put to a recreational purpose. However, there has not been an assessment of the loss of this space by Surrey County Council, as the determining authority, in conjunction with Sports England, against the future needs for recreation. It is therefore considered that the principle for this development is not established and an objection is raised on this basis.

7.2.2 The wider impact of the proposal and the assessment on the need from the proposed use are set out below but this assessment takes into consideration that it would result in the loss of this defined green space.

7.3 Need for the development

7.3.2 Paragraph 124 of the NPPF indicates that planning decisions should support development which makes efficient use of land, taking into account the identified need for different types of housing and other forms of development, and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it.

7.3.3 Policy DM14 of the CSDMP indicates that the Council would seek to identify opportunities to enhance and improve community facilities within the Borough, whether through the provision of co-located or new facilities. Paragraph 62 of the NPPF indicates that the type and tenure of housing needed for different groups, including older people and people with disabilities, should be assessed and reflected in policies. In terms of the need for this development, an assessment is required on what facilities the proposal would provide and any knock-on benefits and disbenefits this would have on the care provision in the local area.

7.3.4 The current proposal relates to the provision of extra care apartments. The future residents would be expected to be mobile (and may drive a car) but with a care package tailored to their needs. The needs statement provided for this application indicates that of the various types of specialised housing, Extra Care accommodation has the greatest shortfall between provision and demand, particularly within the affordable rental provision. Whilst it is noted that there is a level of provision of care and nursing homes, for which there is currently no needs, extra care provision is more limited, as indicated in the provided needs assessment from the applicant, and there remains a need for such accommodation. In addition, the provision of 100% socially rented accommodation is a significant benefit of the proposal.

7.3.5 As such, the assessment below has been made on this basis.

7.4 Impact on character and trees

7.4.1 Policy DM9 of the CSDMP states that development will be acceptable where it respects and enhances the local character of the environment and protects trees and vegetation worthy of retention and provide high quality hard and soft landscaping where appropriate. Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should support development

that makes efficient use of land subject to the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting. Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that development should function well and add to the overall quality of an area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; are sympathetic to local character, including the built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (e.g. increased densities).

- 7.4.2 Principle L1 of the WUAC states that development shall be small scale and up to two storeys in height, reflecting the historic plot dimensions, architectural detailing and scale and massing in all development; and, for development facing Field Lane which would provide the front elevation of the development, to have good articulation and active frontages. Principle L3 of the WUAC states that proposals which seek to introduce development that is out of keeping with the strong historic character of the Lanes will be resisted with particular regard had to building scale and massing, roofscapes, and architectural detailing.
- 7.4.3 Principle 6.7 of the RDG requires housing development to seek the highest density possible without compromising local character, the environment or the appearance of the area. Principle 6.6 of the RDG would require new residential development to respond to the size, shape and rhythm of the surrounding plot layouts. Principle 6.9 of the RDG would require car parking courts to be designed with active frontages and attractive places with high quality hard and soft landscaping. Where parking courts are provided to the front of development they should be enclosed with strong landscape screens and not be dominant elements in the streetscene. Principle 6.10 of the RDG indicates that where bays are provided, they should accommodate no more than a cluster of three cars. Soft landscaping should be provided between such clusters.
- 7.4.4 Whilst the site is a designated green space, it is predominantly surrounded by residential development which is typically two storey in height and suburban in nature. The approach to the site is through this residential area. The site lies within the Lanes character area with it fronting onto a historic route (Field Lane), which is a footpath in this location. The proposed development does not appear to have taken into consideration this character designation. The proposal would provide a width of development facing Field Lane which does not reflect the historic and existing plot dimensions of the surrounding suburban development, also failing to comply with Principle L1 of the WUAC.
- 7.4.5 The proposed development would provide 2 no three storey wings of development with single storey links across the site which would be out of scale with surrounding development providing a dominant and prominent form of development which be greater in height than what would be expected for this character area, failing to comply with Principle L1 of the WUAC. It would provide a more urban form of development in a suburban location. The east wing would be angled against the west wing and single storey links which would appear incongruous in this location. As well as the overall height, the width and depths of these wings would be out of scale with surrounding development. The proposal would also provide accommodation (plant) at roof level which would be provided as flat roof elements between double gables which would provide a poor design solution, clearly visible from various angles around the site, including the approach from Caroline Way.
- 7.4.6 Whilst, appearance is a reserved matter, the inclusion of balconies, which are flank facing, which protrude beyond the flank walls of these wings, would be a poor design solution.
- 7.4.7 The proposed parking area would be provided to the west flank of the application site. The proposed spaces would be provided in a bank of 18 parallel spaces with 7 end-to-end spaces without any soft landscaping to break up this hardstanding area, failing to comply with Principles 6.9 and 6.10 of the RDG. In addition, there is little soft landscaping relief to the front of the proposed building, with no proposed soft landscaping to the immediate front of the proposed wings. Whilst it is noted that landscaping is a reserved matter, this

layout would appear to provide a poor quality to the environment.

- 7.4.8 The Council's Urban Design Consultant (UDC) has raised concerns about the proposal. The proposal would result in an over development of the site, particularly in relation to the building footprint and unrelieved scale of the development, with the proximity of the development in relation to the residential development to the south a particular concern.
- 7.4.9 The Council's Arboricultural Officer has raised objections to the proposal on potential impact on retained trees. The north and east boundaries include a number of prominent trees, and a part of the development would incur into the root protection area of these trees. It has not been adequately demonstrated how the development can be constructed without harm to these affected trees. In particular, concerns are raised with some more extensive excavations towards the south east corner of the site, where there could be an impact on boundary trees in this corner of the site, as well as the north east corner due to the proximity of the proposed development in this location.
- 7.4.10 As such, the proposal due to its proposed height, width and depth (especially in relation to the wings), would have an adverse visual impact on local character and possible impact on trees, providing an urbanising effect in this suburban area. An objection on these grounds is raised with the proposal failing to comply with Policies CP1, CP2 and DM9 of the CSDMP and the NPPF, and advice in the RDG and WUAC.

7.5 Impact on residential amenity

- 7.5.1 Policy DM9 of the CSDMP indicates that development will be acceptable where it respects the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and uses. Principle 6.7 of the RDG requires housing development to seek the highest density possible without impacting on residential amenities. Principle 8.6 of the RDG requires communal outdoor amenity space to be provided for flatted developments with Principle 6.8 of the RDG setting out the minimum space requirements. Principle 8.1 of the RDG states that development which have a significant effect on the privacy of neighbouring properties will be resisted.
- 7.5.2 The nearest residential properties are on the south side of the application site, with the single storey rear element of the proposal located about 1.3 metres from the rear site boundary. The side main wall of 11 Kilmartin Gardens and 13 Kilmartin Gardens are set approximately 1.4 metres and 2 metres from this mutual boundary, respectively. The rear elevations of the proposed development (at three storey height) would be located close to these properties. There would be separation distances from the development (at this height) of a minimum of about 13 metres, extending to 15 metres from the side boundary of 11 Kilmartin Gardens, and 14.6 metres from the flank boundary of 13 Kilmartin Gardens, as well as about 20 metres from the rear boundary of 14 Kilmartin Gardens. It is noted that the development is on the north side of these properties which would reduce the impact of the proposal on sunlight to these properties. However, it is considered that with this built form, especially where they are located close to a boundary with the rear amenity space for these adjoining properties, an overbearing impact could occur. It is considered that, noting the height, bulk and width of the wings of the development in these locations, this level of separation would result in material harm to the residential amenity of the occupiers of these properties.
- 7.5.3 As indicated above, there are change in levels across the site. The proposal would include a reduction in ground/floor levels close to the south site boundary, compared with the existing land levels. The resulting reduction in floor level for the single storey element to the rear, along with the proposed flat roof of this element of the proposal, would result in a reduced impact from this element of the proposal on adjoining residential properties, to the south of the site. The applicant has indicated that the height of the single storey element of this development, adjacent to this boundary, would be no higher than the boundary fence which could reduce its potential impact to these properties. However, if this element of the proposal would be visible above the fence line on this boundary, a further overbearing impact is likely to occur.

- 7.5.4 The north east corner of the proposed development would be set about 6.7 metres from the north east boundary of the application site, and 18.5 metres from the rear boundary of 2 Melville Avenue (31.3 metres to the main rear wall of this property). The north elevation of the west wing of the proposal would be located 10 metres from the north boundary, 24.4 metres from the flank boundary of 20 Caroline Way. It is acknowledged that there are trees and other vegetation in between. However, the size of the development, noting the width and height of these wings, would have an overbearing impact on these properties. Noting the level of separation, it is not expected that the proposal, even with these properties being on the north side of the development, would result in a significant loss of light.
- 7.5.5 The proposal would be set 21.6 metres from the west boundary of the site, with 14 and 23 Belvoir Close. This would provide a level of separation which would not result in any material overbearing impact on these adjoining properties. The proposed building is set a sufficient distance from all other nearby residential properties not to cause material harm on any potential overbearing impact, particularly noting the levels of separation and, in places, retained and protected trees.
- 7.5.6 The proposal would provide balconies to the west and east flanks with 180 degree views. This could lead to overlooking of, and loss of privacy to, residential gardens around the site, but particularly beyond the south boundary of the site, which is considered to be unacceptable.
- 7.5.7 The proposed development would provide some amenity to the central courtyard amounting to 790 square metres with a depth of 24 metres, with some further accommodation possible to the east side of the development. Principle 8.6 of the RDG indicates such amenity provision should have a minimum depth of 3 metres. As such, it is considered that the level of amenity space for future residents would be acceptable. The proposal would result in increases in noise levels around the site, especially in the activity in the car park area. However, whilst the comments of Environmental Health team are awaited, it is not expected that the noise levels would be unacceptable in a residential area.
- 7.5.8 As such, the proposal is considered to be unacceptable in terms of its impact to adjoining residential properties, not complying with Policy DM9 of the CSDMP.

7.6 Impact on highway safety and parking capacity

- 7.6.1 Policy DM11 of the CSDMP requires development which would adversely impact the safe and efficient flow of traffic movement on the highway network will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that measures to reduce and mitigate such impacts to acceptable levels can be implemented. All development should ensure safe and well-designed vehicular access and egress and layouts which consider the needs and accessibility of all highway users including cyclists and pedestrians. Policy CP11 of the CSDMP requires development to comply with parking standards.
- 7.6.2 The provision is for 25 car parking spaces in total for this development which equates to about 0.5 car space per unit. The maximum recommended standard is for one car space per unit. Due to the level of care expected for each resident, the level of parking would appear quite low. The traffic statement from the applicant has advised that 5 spaces would be provided for staff, one space for visitors and 19 spaces for residents.
- 7.5.3 The traffic statement also indicates that there is a local bus service nearby and some services are within walking distance. Accommodation for secure cycle and mobility scooter storage provision would be provided. Six two-way vehicle trips would be expected in the morning peak with 5 such trips in the evening peak. A low level of vehicle trip generation would be expected for this development. Access arrangements would provide access to all vehicles (including refuse and emergency vehicles).
- 7.5.4 It is acknowledged that the site lies in a less sustainable location. However, the County Highway Authority has advised that from their initial assessment it would be reasonable to

expect that any highway impacts could be suitably mitigated.

- 7.5.5 As such, no objections are raised on highway grounds with the proposal complying with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the CSDMP and the NPPF.

7.6 Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

- 7.6.1 Policy CP14 of the CSDMP indicates that development will only be granted where the Council is satisfied that the proposal will not give rise to a likely significant adverse effect upon the integrity of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (SPA). All new (net) residential development within 5 kilometres of the SPA is considered to give rise to the possibility of likely significant effect, with development more than 400 metres from the SPA required to provide contributions towards Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANGs) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) measures.
- 7.6.2 Paragraph 3.3 of the AAP indicates that development for residential institutions may give rise likely significant effect on the SPA and will be considered on a case-by-case basis. In reaching a decision, how the development is occupied and used will be considered. The proposal would provide Extra Care apartments which, with a level of care provision, would be a form of residential institution.
- 7.6.2 The proposed accommodation would provide self-contained accommodation for future residents. It is also expected that some residents would have a car, it is considered that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA, unless contributions towards SANG and SAMM measures were provided.
- 7.6.3 However, no objections would be raised if such contributions were secured and would, in terms of its impact on the SPA, comply with Policy CP14 of the CSDMP, Policy NRM6 of the SEP, the NPPF and advice in the AAS.

7.7 Impact on ecology

- 7.7.1 Policy CP14 of the CSDMP requires development to conserve and enhance biodiversity with new opportunities for habitat creation and protection will be explored in particular on biodiversity opportunity areas. Development that results in harm to or loss of features of interest for biodiversity will not be permitted.
- 7.7.2 The application site has been the subject of an ecological evaluation which concluded that there was some activity by bats (foraging and commuting around the edge of the site). The badger survey confirmed that there was no badger activity on the site and that no reptiles found on the site, although the site would provide habitat suitable for reptiles with moderate levels of connectivity. Mitigation measures have been indicated to ensure no harm to any protected species. However, the comments of Surrey Wildlife Trust are awaited.
- 7.7.4 As such and subject to the comments of the Surrey Wildlife Trust, no objections are raised on ecology grounds with the proposal complying with Policies CP14 of the CSDMP and the NPPF.

7.8 Impact on flood risk and drainage

- 7.8.1 Policy DM10 of the CSDMP indicates that development within flood risk zones 2 and 3 (medium and high risk), or on sites of 1 hectare or more, will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that, through a Flood Risk Assessment, that the proposal would, where practicable, reduce risk both to and from the development or at least be risk neutral and, where risks are identified flood resilient and resistant design and appropriate mitigation and adaptation can be implemented so that the level of risk is reduced to acceptable levels, and that the form of development is compatible with the level of risk. Development will be expected to reduce the volume and rate of surface water run-off through the incorporation of appropriately designed Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) at an appropriate level to the scale and type of development.

- 7.8.2 The site lies within Zone 1 (low flood risk). The provided drainage strategy includes the use of green roofs (for the single storey flat roof elements); porous paving in hard paved areas; attenuation tank within car park areas (to hold back water during extreme weather events).
- 7.8.3 As such and subject to any comments from the LLFA, no objections are raised on drainage and flood risk grounds with the proposal complying with Policy DM10 of the CSDMP and the NPPF.

7.9 Other matters

- 7.9.1 Policy CP2 of the CSDMP requires development to contribute towards carbon dioxide emission reductions increase capacity for renewable and low carbon energy methods. The proposal would provide sustainability benefits including the provision of a fabric-first approach to construction design; low permeability (draughts); energy efficient lighting and mechanical ventilation and design/layout to support improvements for solar gain and direct/indirect natural lighting. No objections are therefore raised on these grounds.
- 7.9.2 Policy DM17 of the CSDMP requires development on sites of 0.4 hectares or over to undertake an assessment of the potential archaeological significance of the site. The applicant has provided an archaeology report and has undertaken trial trenches evaluation which concluded that whilst no archaeological evidence was found from the trial, a further archaeological survey would be required (normally provided by condition). However, the County Archaeological Officer comments are awaited but it is likely that no objections would be raised to the proposal on these grounds.
- 7.9.3 The current proposal relates to residential development with a care element falling within Class C2 (of the Use Classes Order). As such, the proposal is not CIL liable.

8.0 PUBLIC SECTOR EQUALITY DUTY

- 8.1 Under the Equalities Act 2010, the Council must have regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation of persons by reason of age, disability, pregnancy, race, religion, sex and sexual orientation. This planning application has been processed and assessed with regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty. The proposal is not considered to conflict with this Duty.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The current proposal is considered to be unacceptable in principle in terms of the loss of the green space and the proposal would be harmful to local character (including trees) and residential amenity. Under the planning balance under Paragraph 11 of the NPPF, any benefits to health/community would not be so sufficient to outweigh this harm. However, there are no objections raised to the proposal on highway safety and parking capacity, ecology, Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and flood risk/drainage grounds. An objection is therefore raised to the proposal.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

RAISE AN OBJECTION for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by reason of its layout and scale including its height, mass, significant increase in floorspace and spread of development,

and limited opportunities for soft landscaping to the site frontage and car parking area, would result in a quantum of development that would be visually prominent and dominant, forming poor relationships with neighbouring properties and harmful to the open and intrinsic local verdant character of the area. The development would therefore fail to respect the character and quality of the area including the Lanes Character Area, contrary to Policies CP1, CP2 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, the National Planning Policy Framework Principles L1 and L3 of the Western Urban Area Character SPD 2012 and Principles 6.4, 6.6, 6.9 and 6.10 of the Residential Design Guide SPD 2017.

2. The proposed development by reason of its height, mass, significant increase in floorspace and spread of development would give rise to an unneighbourly form of development resulting in an overbearing impact and loss of privacy from the balconies on the adjoining residential properties. The development would therefore fail to respect the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining residential properties, Nos. 11 and 13 Kilmartin Gardens, 2 Melville Avenue and 20 Caroline Way, contrary to Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and Principles 6.4 and 8.1 of the Residential Design Guide SPD 2017.
3. It has not been demonstrated that the development could be constructed without harm to significant trees protected under Tree Preservation Order No. TPO/06/75 in the north east and south east corners of the site failing to comply with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.
4. It has not been demonstrated that the principle for the loss of the defined green space, and its reuse for recreational purposes, has been established and the benefits of the proposal do not outweigh this harm failing to comply with Policy DM15 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

Informative(s)

AUTHORISATION

As agreed under the Council's Constitution and adopted Scheme of Delegation

Development Manager/Team Leader/ Principal Planning Officer (s)

Date: