

LOCATION:	29, 30 And 30A, Brackendale Close, Camberley, Surrey, GU15 1HP,
PROPOSAL:	Redevelopment of site to provide 25 no. affordable apartments with associated access, hardstanding, carparking, landscaping, bin and cycle stores following the demolition of No. 29 and No. 30 Brackendale Close and associated outbuildings.
TYPE:	Full Planning Application
APPLICANT:	Wooldridge Developments and Accent Group
OFFICER:	Navil Rahman

This application is being reported to the Planning Applications Committee because it is a major development i.e., the number of dwellings exceeds 10.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The application relates to the redevelopment of two residential properties (known as 29 and 30 / 30a Brackendale Close) to provide 25 flats within a singular two and a half storey flatted development, all of which would be shared ownership affordable housing. A new access off Portsmouth Road would be created, with a parking forecourt of 25 vehicles proposed, together with a cycle and refuse store.
- 1.2 The principle of the development is acceptable, but there are significant concerns over the scale, massing and quantum of development and its resultant impact upon the character and appearance of wider surrounding area and the Wooded Hills Character Area. Insufficient detail has also been submitted by way of an up-to-date ecological appraisal failing to demonstrate that the proposal would conserve and enhance biodiversity and ecology in this area. The County Highways Authority raises no objection on highway safety, capacity, and sustainability. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in respect of residential amenity, trees and flood risk. Due to initial officer concerns with the overall scale, massing, and amount of development no legal agreement to secure affordable housing provision or contributions towards SAMM and SANG has been secured.
- 1.3 The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is situated to the corner junction of Brackendale Close and Portsmouth Road, within the settlement of Camberley. The site comprises of two residential plots measuring approximately 0.32 Ha, with two, two-storey, single-family dwellings (together with a single detached garage to No.29 and an outbuilding to No.30) situated on the site.

- 2.2 Brackendale Road is a private residential street characterised by large dwellings set within extensive lineal curtilages. The dwellings are set back some distance from the highway and property frontages are generally marked by hedge and tree lined boundary which give the close a verdant character. The Close is a cul-de-sac and can only be accessed by vehicles from Portsmouth Road at its eastern end. There is however a public footpath situated at its western end which leads to Wilders Close 210m to the southwest.
- 2.3 By virtue of being located on the corner of Brackendale Close and Portsmouth Road, the area around the site is made up of a mixture of development types. To the north of the site, accessed from Portsmouth Road lies 1-10 Brackendale Court, a flatted development, with the Travel Lodge / Toby Carvery site and further residential apartments beyond, whilst to the neighbouring and nearby development to the west and south in Brackendale Close is made up of large spaciouly arranged residential dwellings of varying but traditional designs. The site is also enclosed by a number of mature and semi-mature trees that line its northern, eastern, southern and western boundaries. Specimens situated along the site's eastern and southern boundaries form prominent features of the local street-scene and hold significant amenity value.
- 2.4 The site is located within the Wooded Hills Character Area as defined within the Western Urban Area Character SPD.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 97/1156 Conversion of detached garage into habitable accommodation (a granny annexe) and erection of a single storey rear extension and a single storey side extension) Granted 27.01.1998. This application solely related to 30 Brackendale Close.
- 3.2 14/0493 Erection of a two-storey building with accommodation in the roof to provide 8 no. two bedroom flats with parking and landscaping and associated development following the demolition of existing buildings. Refused under delegated authority on 05.09.2017. This application related solely to 30 Brackendale Close and was refused for the following summarised reasons:
1. The proposed development, by reason of its height, depth, design, mass, scale and resulting reduction in vegetation cover, would result in an incongruous, dominant, and unduly prominent form of development in a corner location harmful to the visual amenities of the Brackendale Close and Portsmouth Road Street scenes and surrounding area, including the Wooded Hills character area. The proposal would therefore fail to respect and improve the character and quality of the area and would be harmful to the aims and objectives of Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Guiding Principles WH1, WH3 and WH6 of the Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012.
 2. The proposed development, due to its height, design, mass, scale, proximity to the northwest flank boundary and rear projection, and number of windows proposed at first floor level (and above) in the northwest flank elevation, would be an unneighbourly form of development resulting in adverse overbearing effects and potential and perceived loss of privacy detrimental to the residential amenities

of the occupier of the adjoining residential property, 29 Brackendale Close. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

Reasons 3 – 5: Harm to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) with no mitigation or legal agreement; insufficient information to justify the proposal and its impact on trees on the site and on adjoining land.

3.3 21/1268/FFU

Redevelopment of site to provide 30 no. Affordable Apartments with associated access, hardstanding, carparking, landscaping, Bin and Cycle stores following the demolition of No. 29 and No. 30 Brackendale Close and associated outbuildings. The application was reported to Committee on the 9th of June 2022 with an officer recommendation for refusal (See Annex C). Refused 24/06/2022 and is currently subject to an appeal. The application was refused for the following summarised reasons:

1. The proposed development by reason of its scale, massing, general arrangement, proposed quantum and density of units would be harmful to the prevailing character and visual amenities of Brackendale Close by virtue of the fact that it would introduce a flatted development that far exceeds the general built form of other neighbouring and nearby properties, being inconsistent with the pattern of development found within the close (where the site frontage is located). It would also deliver an insufficient level of on-site parking for the number of residents that the scheme could potentially accommodate, plus associated visitor resulting in parking overspill onto Brackendale Close, having significant impact on the open character of the Close and introduce highway safety concerns. In addition, the scheme does not allow for designated private amenity space for the ground floor flats and as such would provide insufficient amenity provisions for the occupiers of these units. The development would fail to comply with Policies CP2(iv), DM9 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy & Development Management Policies 2011 - 2028, Principles 6.2, 6.4, 6.6, 6.7, 6.8, 7.3, 7.8 and 8.6 of the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017, Principles WH1, WH2 and WH3 of the Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012, and Paragraph 124, 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposal would provide a significant under provision of waste storage capacity for the number of units that are proposed, thereby resulting in harm to the visual amenities of the site as well as unsanitary and unhygienic conditions that would pose a health risk to occupiers and neighbouring occupiers. It therefore fails to comply with Policy DM9 (vi) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy & Development Management Policies 2012.

3. The application fails to demonstrate that it could ensure the protection of important green infrastructure and trees within and around the site that contribute to positively to the verdant character and appearance of the area including the Wooded Hills Character Area and does not provide sufficient space to accommodate new and future potential planning that would be able meet maturity. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy & Development Management Policies 2012, and Principles WH1 and WH3 of the Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012, as well as

Paragraphs 131 and 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4, 5 and 6. Relate to the absence of legal agreements in respect Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA), affordable housing provision and contribution towards improvement of pedestrian crossing facilities to entrance of Brackendale Close.

4.0 PROPOSAL

4.1 Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing two dwellings and amalgamation of the two plots to facilitate the construction of a two-storey flatted development to provided 25 residential units together with ancillary landscaping, car parking, cycle and refuse facilities.

4.2 The proposed development would be sited relatively centrally within the plot having a largely rectangular form. It would stand at two and a half storeys in height with accommodation to the roof space facilitated by various dormers to the front, rear and flank elevations measuring a maximum height of 10.7m. It would measure a maximum width of 37.9m and maximum depth of 25m, being set in 18m from the Portsmouth Road boundary, 8.6m from the boundary with Brackendale Court, 10.2m from the boundary with No.28 Brackendale Close and 14.5m from the Brackendale Close Street scene.

4.3 The proposal takes a traditional design approach, designed with a multi-aspect hipped roof and hipped projections. It would be constructed with traditional materials, red/orange brickwork, clay roof tiles and white uPVC windows.

4.4 To the front of the development sits a hardstanding area adjacent to the access off Portsmouth Road providing 25 parking spaces for the residents. Communal amenity space measuring 380sqm is found to the rear and around the side of the block, with the cycle and refuse store sited towards the southwestern boundary adjacent to Brackendale Close. Each unit would be afforded private amenity space. Existing vegetation to the boundaries is sought to be retained and enhanced whilst the proposal would result in the loss of one tree (T14).

4.5 The proposal would provide 25 units in the following mix:

Unit Type	Number of Units	Unit Percentage
1-bedroom	2	8%
2-bedroom	23	92%

4.6 The scheme seeks to provide 100% affordable housing provision all to be shared ownership.

4.7 Relative to the previous submission ref.21/1268 the proposal has been amended in the following manner:

- Reduction of number of units from 30 to 25.
- Footprint reduction from approximately 850sqm to 760sqm.
- Maximum height increased from 9.9m to 10.7m.
- New vehicle access created off Portsmouth Road, position the site to facing onto Portsmouth Road rather than Brackendale Close. Closure of vehicle access off Brackendale Close.
- Minor amendments to the roof design to remove gable and half hipped gable ends.

- Each unit provided with private amenity space including balconies for all upper floor units.
- Repositioning of cycle and refuse store.

4.8 The application has been supported by the following documents:

- Design and access statement
- Affordable housing statement
- Transport statement
- Arboricultural impact assessment
- Phase 1 ecology report
- Landscape and ecological master plan and management plan
- Noise impact assessment
- Air quality assessment
- Sustainability & energy statement
- Flood risk assessment & drainage strategy
- Drainage statement

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

5.1 The following external consultees were consulted, and their comments are summarised in the table below:

External Consultation	Comments received
County Highways Authority	Further detail was requested in respect of access gradient details, visibility splays, swept path drawings and question regarding the cycle storage capacity. These matters were addressed by the applicant following further submissions and subsequently no objections have been raised with conditions relating to the securing of the access details, parking, construction management plan and travel plan sought. (See Annex A for a copy of their response).
Lead Local Flood Authority	Raise no objection and are satisfied the drainage scheme meets relevant requirements. Recommend condition in relation to SuDS.
Thames Water	The developments sit within 20m of Thames Water Sewage Pumping Station and would therefore be contrary to best practice in Thames Water Codes for Adoption raising objection. Notwithstanding, in the event of a grant of permission an informative should be attached to inform future residents of this information.
Joint Waste Solutions	Raise no objection.

Surrey Wildlife Trust	Consider the ecological report outdated and recommend an updated report prior to determination.
-----------------------	---

5.2 The following internal consultees were consulted, and their comments are summarised in the table below:

Internal Consultation	Comments received
Environmental Services	Raise no objection subject to conditions ensuring the recommendations of the noise and air quality assessments are adhered to whilst a Construction Environmental Management Plan is recommended.
Housing Servicing Manager	Raises objection. Would require seeing a mix of tenure of the affordable housing offer. Previous scheme was supported as the housing association was bringing forward another site at the time for 100% affordable rented units which is now not the case.
Urban Design Consultant	Raised no objection to the proposed layout, scale and design of the proposal, however, recommends more soft landscaping is introduced to the parking area. (See Annex B for a copy of their response).
Arboricultural Officer	Raise no objection subject to minor amendments to Arboricultural report and conditions in relation to tree protection, tree retention and landscaping.

6.0 REPRESENTATION

6.1 A total of twenty-seven letters of consultation were sent on the 02/02/2023 to neighbouring residents together with a site notice dated 03/02/2023 displayed on site and a press notice issued on the 15/02/2023. A total of thirty-two letters of objection including one letter of objection from the Brackendale Close Residents Association, together with zero letters of support were received as part of the public consultation exercise. The comments are summarised and responded to below.

6.2 The table below summarises the material planning reasons for objection:

Material Objection	Reason for	Officer Response
<u>Design</u>		
The proposal is marginally reduced relative to previous refusal. Has a greater overall height and would view similarly relative to previous submission. Scale, size and density out of character with both Brackendale Close and Portsmouth Road.		Officer considers the overall quantum, scale and size of development to be unacceptable resulting in an overdevelopment of the site. This is discussed further in section 7.4 of the report.

<u>Amenity</u>	
Loss of privacy and light to No.28 Brackendale Close.	The proposed development owing to the separation between the elevation (18.9m) with No.28, noting the mature vegetation between the sites, and the height of the proposed balconies, it is not considered to result in any significant adverse amenity harm to these occupiers' amenity.
<u>Highways and Parking</u>	
Increased parking pressures and overspill. Insufficient parking provided on site to accommodate maximum capacity of residents and visitor parking. Whilst the entrance has been relocated this would not overcome parking overspill issues.	The proposed development is considered policy compliant in respect of parking guidelines set out by Surrey County Council Highways. The location is considered relatively sustainable, and users are able to cycle, walk or take a bus to local facilities and therefore would not be dependent on private vehicle ownership. Where some level of parking overspill is expected, given the relocation of the site entrance, there is considered sufficient capacity in the surrounding area to ensure no adverse parking pressure.
Retention of pedestrian access on Brackendale Close would encourage parking on the Close, particularly close to the junction resulting in harm to highway user safety as would the need for larger refuse collection vehicle. Site is used for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the motorway and walk to/from Camberley having a steady flow of walkers and cyclists. Increased street parking will result in safety concerns for these users and anti-social behaviour.	The pedestrian access would not directly encourage parking on the Close and it is considered there is sufficient capacity in the surrounding area to ensure no adverse parking pressure. Where a larger waste operative vehicle is required to service the site, this is infrequent and unlikely to adversely impact upon highway user safety. No objections have been raised by Surrey County Council Highways on safety grounds.
The public modes of transport are not of a high quality to support the future residents.	The location is considered relatively sustainable, and users are able to cycle, walk or take a bus to local facilities.
<u>Drainage and Flood Risk</u>	
The existing infrastructure cannot support the proposal in respect of foul and surface water drainage.	The Local Lead Flood Authority have reviewed the submissions and raised no objections on these concerns neither do Thames Water.
<u>Other Issues</u>	
Builders have removed trees from the site without consent and therefore no confidence in statements to retain and enhance planting.	Any grant of planning permission would be subject to compliance with conditions relating to the retention, protection and enhancement of the soft landscaping. Failure to accord with any conditions would be in breach of planning permission and subject to planning enforcement.
The proposed affordable housing is not affordable owing to no reasonable pricing.	The proposed type of affordable housing is one that is needed in this part of the borough and given the 100% level it is considered to be supportable.

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 In considering this development regard is given to Policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP5, CP6, CP11, CP12, CP14, DM7, DM9, DM10, and DM11 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 Appraisal SPD 2012 (WUAC); Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD 2019 (AAS); Development Contributions SPD (2011); the Infrastructure Delivery SPD (2014); the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG); the Written Ministerial Statement 24.05.21 (WMS); the Council's First Homes Policy Guidance Note 2021 (FHP); the National Design Guide 2017 and Surrey County Council Vehicular, Cycle and Electric Vehicle Parking Guidance for New Development (2021).

7.2 Refusal 21/1268 is a material consideration. This refusal established that the principle of development was acceptable but that the quantum of development would be harmful to the character of the area, and for the other reasons summarised in section 2. The key issues to therefore be considered are:

- Principle of development, affordable housing provision and housing mix.
- Impact on the character, appearance, and trees of the surrounding area.
- Impact on residential amenity.
- Impact sustainability, highway safety and parking capacity.
- Impact on flood risk and drainage.
- Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.
- Impact on biodiversity and ecology
- Other matters.

7.3 Principle of development

i) Land use

7.3.1 Policy CP1 of the CSDMP is relevant for the assessment of the application.

7.3.2 The application site is within the settlement area, is not designated and there are no policy restrictions preventing the redevelopment of the site for residential purposes. The proposed development accords with the Council's spatial strategy, would contribute towards the Council's housing stock, and would be an appropriate form of development in this residential setting. However, this must be balanced with other matters including good quality design, standard of accommodation, residential amenity, highway impact and biodiversity to demonstrate its overall acceptability.

7.3.3 The proposed redevelopment of the site for increased residential development would therefore satisfy the objectives of Policy CP1 of the CSDMP.

ii) Affordable housing provision and housing mix

7.3.4 The NPPF and Policy CP6 of the CSDMP requires the provision of a range of housing sizes across the Borough. Policy CP6 does not, however, specify a precise mix of housing types and the site characteristics and viability will be considered.

7.3.5 Policy CP5 of the CSDMP requires the provision of 40% of the proposed housing to be affordable (or ten units). This is normally split between socially rented and intermediate (shared ownership). The definition of affordable housing, as set out in Annex 2 of the NPPF, has widened the options for affordable housing.

- 7.3.6 The proposed range of housing is limited, providing 92% 2-bedroom units and 8% 1-bedroom units. Whilst the range of housing type on offer could be improved, the site sits in close proximity to a mix of both dwellings (predominantly 3+ bedroom) and flatted developments which contribute towards a mixed and inclusive community by enabling a variety of housing types to meet the identified local needs. The proposed development would not unduly harm the existing balance in the locality. Noting the need to optimise housing delivery on site, whilst taking into account the specific locational characteristics of the area, it is considered that the proposed housing mix on offer would be considered appropriate in this instance.
- 7.3.7 The Council's Local Housing Needs Assessment (2020) identifies that there is a net need for 87 affordable rented units per annum and 102 shared ownership units in the west of the borough. It advises that the level of net housing need in the Borough is considerable, and the Council should seek the maximum affordable housing provision from development as viably possible. First-time buyers are the main market in Camberley accounting for up to 50% of property sales, largely seeking 1 and 2-bedroom properties.
- 7.3.8 The proposal seeks to provide 100% affordable housing provision in the form of shared ownership units. The Council's housing manager has stated that a mix of tenure is required to support for the proposal. However, the Council as identified above has a need for this type of affordable housing, of this size, and whilst a mix of tenure would be preferable, the development provides in excess of policy requirement (40% or 10 units), and it is considered that this additional benefit sufficiently weighs in favour of the proposal.
- 7.3.9 The proposed development would therefore provide an acceptable housing mix and provision of affordable housing that meets the objectives of Policy CP5 and CP6 of CSDMP in helping meet an identified affordable housing need in this part of the borough. However, as no legal agreement has been entered into in respect of the delivery of the affordable housing, this also forms a reason for refusal.

7.4 Impact on the character, appearance, and trees of the surrounding area

- 7.4.1 Part 12 of the NPPF and Policy CP2 and DM9 of the CSDMP states that new development should use the land efficiently within the context of its surroundings and promote high quality design. Principles 6.4, 6.7, 6.8, 6.9, and 7.3 of the RDG are relevant whilst the site falls within the Wooded Hills Character Area and therefore guiding principles WH1-WH6 the WUAC are also relevant.
- 7.4.2 Relative to the previous refusal ref.21/1268/FFU the proposal has been amended as outlined in paragraph 5.7 of this report. The principal alteration being the reduction in the number of units and that the site now is accessed and faces onto Portsmouth Road rather than Brackendale Close. This alteration helps to shift the focus of the development away from Brackendale Close, and subsequently its impact upon the pattern and layout of development to the Close is lessened. The access paths of the existing dwellings would be replaced by soft landscaping and the absence of fencing/walling is considered appropriate. The Council's Urban Design Consultant has welcomed the reduction to the number of units, and subsequent reduction to the scale of the development, considering it an improvement from an urban design perspective, raising no objection to the overall design, scale and size of the development.

- 7.4.3 It is recognised that the neighbouring sites north of the site on Portsmouth Road consists of flatted developments as well as the Toby Carvery, however, by virtue of their position they sit in markedly differing context to that of the application site. Whilst the site now faces onto Portsmouth Road, it is still necessary to view the development in context of the site surroundings which includes Brackendale Close. The surrounding area, is characterised by its open, verdant nature, giving a semi-rural feel to the area.
- 7.4.4 In the officer's opinion whilst this scheme is an improvement, the proposal owing to its overall design, scale and size, has still failed to address the principal concerns regarding the overall and dominance of the development. The development remains a singular block, that whilst set centrally away from the boundaries, retains a considerable width and depth, giving it an overly bulky and dominant form that represents an overdevelopment of the site. The reductions to the width and depth are considered insufficient, and whilst the gable and half hipped roof ends have been removed, the ridge height has been increased. In seeking to maximise the use of the roof space, the design results in a top-heavy form, accentuating its overall bulk and size whilst the owing to its considerable size it results in a large expanse of flat roof resulting in a contrived and unattractive roof form contrary to Principle 7.5 of the RDG.
- 7.4.5 Similarly, the concerns regarding the density of the development remain. Even with the site facing onto Portsmouth Road, this proposal still lies on the corner of Brackendale Close. The creation of this large singular building, at a density of 81 dwellings per hectare, exceeds that of the established surroundings, being out of character and scale with the surrounding area contrary to Principle 6.4 of the RDG.
- 7.4.6 To the front of the site/Portsmouth Road elevation the hard landscaped car parking is located. The proposed parking layout is relatively squeezed, not allowing for any soft landscaping to be integrated between parking bays to relieve the large areas of hardstanding and highlights the overdeveloped nature of the proposal. The proposed layout results in an entrance that is functionally and visually dominated by car parking. This is contrary to Principles 6.7 and 6.8 of the RDG.
- 7.4.7 Excluding the lack of soft landscaping to car parking forecourt, the indicative soft landscaping to the site boundaries and to the other areas of the development are considered appropriate and acceptable. The removal of the Tree 14 (Category B) and other category U trees would be considered acceptable subject to appropriate tree replacement planting which could be secured by planning condition. No objections have been raised by the Council's Arboricultural officer with the development now not resulting in harm to T21 and subsequently overcoming reason for refusal No.3 of application ref.21/1268.
- 7.4.8 Overall, the proposed development by reason of its overall scale, size, design and layout would be considered an overdevelopment of the site, introducing an urbanising form of development that harmfully contrasts with the surrounding verdant, semi-rural character. The proposed layout results in a significant area of hard landscaping, creating an unattractive frontage to the site. The proposal therefore would be contrary to Policy CP2 and DM9 of the CSDMP, Principles 6.4, 6.7, 6.8, 6.9, and 7.3 of the RDG, and Principles WH1 and WH3 of the WUAC.

7.5 Impact on residential amenity

- 7.5.1 Policy DM9 of the CSDMP and Principles 6.2, 6.4, 7.6, 8.1, 8.2, 8.5 and 8.6 of the RDG refer to the protection of neighbouring amenity and securing good quality accommodation for future residents.
- 7.5.2 North of the site sits Brackendale Court, a flatted development of 10 flats whilst to the west is No.28 Brackendale Close, also a flatted development. The boundaries between the site and these properties are occupied by thick trick lined hedgerows providing established screening between the sites whilst noting these are flatted

developments, the proposed separation distances of 8.6m and 12.2m and 18.9m respectively to the nearest elevations ensures no significant amenity harm arising from the development in respect of outlook and daylight/sunlight. Where balconies are found to the elevations facing these boundaries, given their height, the separation distances and the context of the vegetation, it is considered there would be no significant privacy harm arising.

- 7.5.3 To the south and eastern boundaries is Portsmouth Road and Brackendale Close, with properties sited to the opposite side and sufficiently set away to mitigate any potential amenity impact.
- 7.5.4 The Department for Communities and Local Government Technical Housing Standard – Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS) sets the requirements for internal space within new dwellings and is suitable for application across all tenures. Principle 8.6 sets out that flatted developments will be expected to provide outdoor amenity space for each unit.
- 7.5.5 All units would meet the minimum space standards set out within the NDSS document. In addition, the internal layouts are well designed, ensuring acceptable levels of outlook, privacy, and natural light for all units. Where some units are single aspect, these are not north facing and therefore would receive adequate amounts of natural light.
- 7.5.6 All units would be afforded private amenity space in the form of balconies or ground floor private outdoor garden terraces, being of a size in line with that set out in the RDG. The ground floor amenity spaces would be appropriately landscaped with defensible planting which is considered appropriate. In addition, 380sqm of communal amenity space would be provided for resident's enjoyment. Whilst much of this garden space would be subjected to shading caused by surrounding vegetation at various points of the day, it is considered to be large enough to ensure that areas would be subjected to sunlight throughout most of the day.
- 7.5.7 Taking all matters on balance, no objections are raised to the overall quality of accommodation on offer and like the previous application no objections are raised to the impact upon existing neighbouring residential amenities, so complying with Policy DM9 (iii) of the CSDMP (2012)

7.6 Impact on sustainability, highway safety and parking capacity

- 7.6.1 Paragraphs 105 and 110 of the NPPF promotes sustainable transport objectives whilst Policies CP1, CP11 and DM11 of the CSDMP refer to development in sustainable locations and minimising the impact on the highway network, providing accessibility for all users. The Surrey County Council Vehicular Cycle and Electric Vehicle Parking Guidance for New Development provides guidance on parking levels.
- 7.6.2 The site is situated within the settlement of Camberley facing onto Portsmouth Road which benefits from public transport links towards Frimley and Camberley via the No.3 and X94 services. Portsmouth Road also benefits from a public footpath, and designated cycle route. The surrounding area benefits from local amenities, schools, a hospital and green spaces in relative walking distance and therefore the site is considered to fall within a sustainable location. In addition, in the event of a grant of permission all parking bays would be provided with electric vehicle fast charging points to cater for and encourage the use of electric vehicle.
- 7.6.3 The proposed development seeks to provide new access off Portsmouth Road onto the site and no objections are raised in principle to the creation of this access. The applicant has submitted further detail in respect of the gradient level and demonstrating the visibility splays of the access point which has been reviewed by the

Surrey County Highways who are in accepting of the revised details. Waste operatives would collect refuse bins via Brackendale Close as existing which is considered acceptable and appropriate. Where the previous application sought a financial contribution towards providing a pedestrian link to the public footpath on the western side of Portsmouth Road as well as an informal crossing point across Brackendale Close at the junction with Portsmouth Road, these are not considered directly necessary to facilitate the development, with the pedestrian access now via Portsmouth Road.

- 7.6.4 The proposed development would result in a net gain of 23 units, and the associated vehicle trips are estimated to result in an additional 84 to 86 traffic movements per day with 9 to 10 movements in each peak hour. No objections to highway safety, or traffic congestion were raised in application ref.21/1268/FFU and the current proposal would result in lesser traffic movements and being directed away from Brackendale Close. No objection has been raised by Surrey County Council on this matter and as such, the proposed development would not be considered to result in harm to the safety of the users on the highway network.
- 7.6.5 The proposal would provide 25 parking bays (with 2 blue badge spaces included) and 25 cycle spaces within a sheltered, secure cycle store resulting in a 1:1 ratio of parking/cycle spaces per unit. It is recognised that the previous application raised concerns with respect to a 1:1 parking ratio potentially having an impact on nearby residential amenity with the proposal deemed to have provided insufficient parking for the potential number of occupants, along with visitors and disabled parking for this location given the potential cumulative impact. The proposal whilst maintaining the same ratio is reduced in number by 5 units, whilst the access onto the site has been altered thus reducing traffic activity on Brackendale Close. Given these factors, noting that the site is situated in a relatively sustainable location and accords with SCC Parking Guidelines it is considered that any proposed parking overspill would be to a lesser extent and have a less harmful impact on the character of the area due to the reduced traffic activity on the Close. No objections have been raised by Surrey County Highways on this matter.
- 7.6.6 Overall, it is therefore considered that the proposed development would be acceptable on access, parking and highway safety grounds, in accordance with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the CSDMP, and NPPF, subject to the compliance of conditions which would have been applied in the event of the application being recommended for approval.

7.7 Impact on flood risk and drainage

- 7.7.1 Paragraph 167 of the NPPF and Policy DM10 of the CSDMP seek to ensure that development does not unduly increase flood risk.
- 7.7.2 The site falls within a Flood Zone 1 wherein more vulnerable uses such as residential development area considered acceptable. The proposal includes a surface water drainage scheme and no objections have been raised by SCC who are satisfied with the submitted details subject to a condition relating to SuDS.
- 7.7.3 Thames Water have raised an objection based on the location of the development within 20m of Thames Water Sewage Pumping Station which would be contrary to best practice in Thames Water Codes for Adoption, however objections have not been raised on any other grounds. Whilst the location of the site may result in odours impacting future residents of the site, this is not consistent across the year, and the site seeks the redevelopment of an existing residential site, with residential development also in the surrounding area. Therefore, whilst it would be preferable for development to fall outside of the 20m zone, given the existing context, this would not be a sustainable reason for refusal, whilst this was not raised as a reason for refusal in the previous application. In the absence of an objection Thames Water have

recommended an informative is attached to any decision notice to advise future residents which is considered appropriate.

- 7.7.4 Subject to these conditions, the development would raise no objections on drainage and flood risk grounds and would comply with Policy DM10 of the CSDMP and the NPPF.

7.8 Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

- 7.8.1 Policy CP14B of the CSDMP and Policy NRM6 of the SEP seek to protect the integrity of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (SPA) requiring proposals provide appropriate measures in accordance with the AAP.

- 7.8.2 The Council has sufficient capacity of SANG for the development in the event planning permission is granted for the proposed development. The applicant has confirmed that the SAMM contribution would be secured through a legal agreement prior to the determination of this application.

- 7.8.3 Social housing relief has been applied for as part of the submitted CIL documents and therefore the proposal would not be CIL liable, and subsequently would be required to make payment towards SANG. This would be secured through a legal agreement prior to the determination of this application.

- 7.8.4 The applicant has stated agreement in entering into a legal agreement to secure SAMM and SANG monies and subject to this agreement the development would be in accordance with Policy CP14 of the CSDMP, Policy NRM6 of the SEP and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD. However, given that this application is not acceptable in other regards, the SAMM and SANG payments have not been requested from the applicant and as such it forms a reason for refusal.

7.9 Impact on biodiversity and ecology

- 7.9.1 Policy CP14A of the CSDMP refers to the protection of biodiversity and ecology.

- 7.9.2 The application is supported by an ecological impact assessment with Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) consulted as part of the application. SWT have recommended that the ecological assessment is outdated (over 2 years) and therefore an updated assessment should be provided. It is recognised that no objections were previously raised by SWT in application ref.21/1268/FFU however, the submitted document fails to provide an updated position in respect of local ecology and its absence the application has failed to demonstrate whether protected species and their habitats are present on site, whether the proposal would be likely harm these and whether any mitigation is required. The proposal therefore fails to safely ensure the protection of any protected species and their habitats on site, failing to demonstrate that the proposal would conserve and enhance biodiversity the application is contrary to policy CP14A of adopted Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the adopted NPPF (2021).

7.10 Other matters

- 7.10.1 The application is accompanied by a Sustainability and Energy Statement which indicates that the scheme could be served by a combination of photovoltaic panels, flue-gas heat recovery units and wastewater heat recovery units, and that such installations could result in carbon reductions of up to 15.92%, which exceeds the 10% carbon reductions target detailed within Policy CP2. It is also confirmed that water efficiency measures would be installed within the apartments to restrict water usage to

a maximum of 110l per person / per day in order to comply with building regulations requirements. As such, it is considered that these provisions would provide appropriate carbon savings and renewable energy sources on site and comply with the requirements of Policy CP2 of the CSDMP.

7.10.2 The Joint Waste Solutions Operations Manager has reviewed the proposal and has confirmed that there are no objections to the access arrangements to the site. The proposal provides a dedicated waste store for residents which meets capacity requirements set out by Joint Waste Solutions and is therefore considered acceptable in this regard, overcoming the previous reason for refusal. It would therefore satisfy Policy DM9 of the CSDMP.

8.0 PUBLIC SECTOR EQUALITY DUTY

8.1 Under the Equalities Act 2010 the Council must have due 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 due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty. The proposal is not considered to conflict with this duty.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposed development would be considered acceptable in principle in terms of land use, given its existing residential use and context whilst the proposal would provide 100% affordable housing provision which would be considered in favour of the proposal. However, the proposed quantum, scale and size of development is considered unacceptable resulting in a harmful addition to this setting, which is characterised by its verdant, semi-rural nature. The proposed design results in a top-heavy form of development, with its bulk exacerbated by the expanse of flat roofing. It is therefore considered an inappropriate scale and density of development for this setting and is recommended for refusal.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by reason of its overall quantum, scale, size, design and density, would represent an overdevelopment of the site, failing to integrate positively within the surrounding area resulting in a dominant, urbanising and incongruous form of development that would fail to respect the verdant, semi-rural character and form of the area, including the Wooded Hill Character Area. The proposed building results in an overly bulky, large span of development without sufficient break, whilst the parking forecourt would result in a large area of hardstanding without relief. The proposal therefore would be contrary to Policy CP2 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy & Development Management Policies 2012, Principles 6.4, 6.7, 6.8, 6.9, and 7.3 of the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017, Principles WH1 and WH3 of the Western Urban Area Character Supplementary Planning Document 2012.
2. Insufficient information has been submitted by way of an up to date ecological appraisal, to demonstrate whether protected species and their habitats are present on site, whether the proposal would be likely harm these and whether any mitigation is required. The proposal therefore fails to safely ensure the protection of any protected species and their habitats on site, failing to demonstrate that the proposal would conserve and enhance biodiversity the application is contrary to policy CP14A of adopted Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the adopted NPPF (2021).

3. In the absence of a payment or a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP14B (vi) (European Sites) of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and Policy NRM6 (Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area) of the South East Plan 2009 (as saved) in relation to the provision of contributions towards Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANGs) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) measures, in accordance with the requirements of the Surrey Heath Borough Council's Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted January 2019).
4. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure the required provision of affordable housing, the proposal is contrary to Policy CP5 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative(s)

1. This Decision Notice is a legal document and therefore should be kept in a safe place as it may be required if or when selling your home. A replacement copy can be obtained, however, there is a charge for this service.
2. The applicant is advised that if this application had been acceptable in all other respects, the scheme would be Liable to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Schedule which came into effect on 1st December 2014. Therefore, if this decision is appealed and subsequently granted planning permission at appeal, this scheme will be liable to pay the Council's CIL upon commencement of development.
3. The applicant is advised that the application has been considered on the basis of the following submissions:

21-J3596-LP01, 21-J3596-201A, 21-J3596-201A, 21-J3596-202, 21-J3596-203, 21-J3596-204, 21-J3596-205, 21-J3596-206, 21-J3596-207, 21-J3596-208, 21-J3596-209, 21-J3596-210, 21-J3596-211, 21-J3596-212, and 21-J3596-213 received 25/01/2023

Documents:

Design and Access Statement September 2022
 Planning Statement January 2023
 Accommodation Schedule September 2022
 Affordable Housing Statement September 2022.
 Transport Statement September 2022
 Arboricultural and Planning Integration Report and Arboricultural Impact Assessment Plan December 2022
 Phase 1 Ecology Report letter 9 June 2021
 Detailed Landscape Proposals Rev B January 2023
 Landscape Masterplan January 2023
 Landscape and Ecological Management and Maintenance Plan September 2022
 Sustainability & Energy Statement 26 September 2022
 Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy and Appendices October 2022
 Noise Impact Assessment March 2021
 Air Quality Assessment September 2021
 Statement 11 October 2022
 Statement on Parking Provision September 2022
 Telecoms supplementary information September 2022
 CIL Additional Information Requirement Form 24 January 2023
 CIL Social Housing Relief Claim Form 24 January 2023

4. In order to comply with regulations 75 to 78 of the Habitat Regulations you are required to (before implementation):

Submit an application for approval, as required by regulation 75, containing:

- (a) details of the development which is intended to be carried out; and
- (b) provide the statutory fee (currently £30) for such an application

Submit Community Infrastructure Levy Form 5: Notice of Chargeable Development so that the Council can ascertain whether your proposal is CIL liable (Monies towards Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) is collected through the charging schedule of the CIL).

Contribute toward the cost of the ongoing management and maintenance of SANG through a Unilateral Undertaking. The Council will levy a contribution for the new residential (Use Class C3) floorspace created.

Contribute a payment towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) monies.

Further information on methods of payment, template Unilateral Undertaking and CIL guidance is available on the Council's website.